

## The complaint

Mr S complains that Revolut Ltd didn't do enough to prevent him from losing money to a 'job' scam.

Mr S has used a representative to bring his complaint. But, for ease of reading, I'll mostly refer to Mr S himself where I also mean the representative.

## What happened

The detailed background to this complaint is well known to both parties. So, I'll only provide an overview of some of the key events here. Mr S says that in 2023 he was contacted by someone promoting a job opportunity. He was told he could earn up to £200 per day by helping to 'optimise applications' online. He says he was added to a group messaging chat which included others stating how much they were making. He says he was told to purchase cryptocurrency which he would then use to 'top up' his balance in order to purchase 'review packages'. He would then have to complete a set of tasks to earn commission. He says he received one 'credit' back from the scammers, but everything else he sent, he lost.

The payments Mr S made as a result of the scam are listed below, they were all made using his Revolut debit card. O and C are what appear to be legitimate cryptocurrency exchanges.

Date	Merchant	Amount
13 September 2023	O	£16.90
15 September 2023	O	£135.46
15 September 2023	O	£106.09
15 September 2023	O	£59.57
16 September 2023	O	£1,278.18
16 September 2023	O	£17.04
16 September 2023	C	£1,882.48
16 September 2023	C	£4,415.75

There were three further attempted payments to C instructed later on 16 September 2023 which didn't go through. These were for £8,320.79, £8,316.48 and £3,429.70. And as mentioned above, Mr S also received a credit back into his account on 15 September 2023 for £889.61 which he says was payment for the 'job'.

Revolut declined to provide any redress and the matter was referred to our service. One of our Investigators recommended that the complaint should be upheld. She recommended that Revolut should pay Mr S around £6,300 plus interest. Revolut didn't accept this outcome and so the complaint was passed to me to decide. In January 2026 I issued a provisional decision in which I said:

*"I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.*

*Having done so, I'm intending to reach a different outcome to that of our Investigator. So, I'm issuing this provisional decision to give both sides a further opportunity to comment before*

*my decision is finalised.*

*Mr S hasn't been able to provide any evidence (beyond his testimony) about the scam that he says took place. He says the chats with the scammer were all lost when he changed his phone. He also hasn't been able to provide full statements from his accounts with O and C from where he says the cryptocurrency was purchased before being sent on and lost to the scammers.*

*He has provided some evidence in the form of emails from C which show the purchase and sending on of around 5,150 USDT on 16 September 2023. Having looked at the exchange rates in place at the time, this would appear to relate to the £4,415.75 payment that he made the same day. This does provide some corroboration of what he's said. But in order for me to fairly make an award against Revolut, Mr S would need to evidence that he had indeed suffered a loss to a scam. And on the basis of what I've seen so far, I don't think he has sufficiently evidenced his loss. However, for the reasons I'll come to, even if this could be evidenced, it wouldn't change my mind as to the outcome of this complaint.*

*Revolut should promptly follow the payment instructions provided by their customers like Mr S. But, they should also be alert to the possibility of fraud, scams and the misappropriation of funds and should do what they fairly can to mitigate the risk of the same to their customers. Clearly Revolut can't be involved in every payment, and I think it's fair that there is a degree of proportionality as to what can fairly be expected with regard to when (and to what extent) to intervene.*

*With the above factors in mind, I think Revolut ought to have blocked Mr S' payment of £1,882.48 on 16 September 2023. I don't think I can fairly say that Revolut were wrong to not do more before that point. But at the time of instructing that payment, it represented over £3,177 being instructed to what would've identifiably have been cryptocurrency exchanges in only a few hours. The Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) and Action Fraud had both previously warned about cryptocurrency being a common factor in many scams. So the combined value, frequency and destination of the payments means there was enough going on here such that Revolut should've done more.*

*What I'd have expected here would've been for Revolut to have provided a warning about common cryptocurrency investment scams. But even if they'd done so, I'm not persuaded that this would've either uncovered the scam or have prevented Mr S from instructing further payments. I say this because Mr S hasn't said he was a victim of a cryptocurrency investment scam, it was a job scam. So I don't think such a warning would've resonated with him.*

*And had Revolut asked more questions about the purpose of the payments, I don't think Mr S would've disclosed that he was making payments towards an online job. I say this because many of the payments into Mr S' Revolut account (which funded the scam payments) came from his own account with another bank 'L'. L intervened a number of times in the payments from their account to Mr S' Revolut account. And on each occasion, Mr S told them that the payments were being sent to Revolut to then be used to pay towards his university fees. L also identified a payment from their account that appeared to be going to cryptocurrency and they also asked about this. Mr S told them this was 'trading' rather than disclosing it was payment towards a job. L provided various warnings such as the importance of being very cynical about any third-party involvement and ensuring that Mr S retained control of any crypto wallets etc.*

*I acknowledge that I can't know with certainty how Mr S might've answered questions and have responded to a warning from Revolut. But, I think it's more likely than not, it would've been the same as he did with L. And what happened with L is that Mr S didn't share the true*

*purpose of his payments. So I don't think this would've got to the point where Revolut ought to have provided a warning about job scams which might've been impactful and have made a difference.*

*Mr S has also mentioned that Revolut blocked his account on 16 September 2023 but didn't do enough to share that he might be a scam victim. I've considered this, but by that point, the payments in dispute had already left his account. So, I don't think the way in which Revolut communicated at that time made a difference to the losses suffered. I'm also not persuaded there was poor service here to the extent that a compensation award should be made.*

*I've also thought about Revolut's actions after Mr S had reported the scam to them. But given all the payments went to cryptocurrency (which he says was sent on and lost to the scam). I don't think the payments were recoverable. Had they remained in Mr S' accounts with O or C, he already would've had control of them. So, I don't think anything Revolut did or didn't do at that point would've made a difference.*

*Overall, as I don't think Revolut are responsible for the loss Mr S is claiming from them, there isn't a reasonable basis upon which I can require them to do more to resolve this complaint."*

Revolut didn't respond to my provisional decision. Mr S provided a response which I'll address below.

### **What I've decided – and why**

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

Mr S says that whilst he didn't accurately answer the questions from L, this doesn't relieve Revolut of its duty to try to protect him from financial harm. The crux of his position is that further questions from Revolut (in conjunction with those already asked by L) would've been enough for it to be impactful leading to the discovery of the scam. He also doesn't believe it was misleading for him to tell L that cryptocurrency would be 'traded'. He would like me to overturn my provisional decision and to uphold the complaint as our Investigator did.

I've considered all Mr S has said and I note that no further information or evidence of the scam taking place has been provided. So, (in line with what I've set out above) I still don't think Mr S has sufficiently evidenced his loss to a scam such that I could fairly make an award.

But even setting that aside, I can understand why Mr S takes the position he has about any warnings from Revolut. And had the scam been evidenced, I'm not saying that Revolut shouldn't have done more in the circumstances. But I'd still need to be persuaded that Revolut intervening would've made a difference and I'm putting more weight on what happened (when L asked questions) over what Mr S now says he thinks would've happened.

Mr S wouldn't have been able to plausibly tell Revolut that the payments were towards fees (as he largely did with L) because it was apparent they were going to cryptocurrency. And I maintain that it's more likely than not that he would've also told Revolut it was for trading cryptocurrency, resulting in warnings appropriate to investment scams that wouldn't have impacted the job scam he says he fell for. And acknowledging this to be balanced, even if I'm wrong and an intervention would've worked out as Mr S suggests, as I've said above, that wouldn't result in my upholding the complaint because of the lack of evidence of both

the scam and loss arising from it. So whilst I'm sorry to disappoint Mr S, I'm not persuaded to change from the outcome in my provisional decision.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons set out above, my final decision is that I don't uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr S to accept or reject my decision before 24 February 2026.

Richard Annandale  
**Ombudsman**