

## **The complaint and background**

Ms A, via a representative, complains that Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) didn’t do enough to protect her when she fell victim to an investment scam, resulting in the loss of over £13,000.

Our investigator didn’t uphold this complaint. Although he found Revolut ought to have made further enquiries about some of the payments, he wasn’t persuaded this would have prevented Ms A’s loss. That was because it intervened with other transactions around the same time. The investigator felt that these interventions were proportionate to the risks presented and appropriate warnings had been provided as a result. He also noted that Ms A had provided inaccurate responses to some of the questions asked, which made it difficult for Revolut to uncover the scam.

Ms A’s representative disagreed. In summary, it felt that answers Ms A provided warranted further scrutiny and didn’t accept that further action by Revolut wouldn’t have made a difference.

So, the complaint has been passed to me to decide.

## **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.

Having taken into account longstanding regulatory expectations and requirements, and what I consider to be good industry practice, I agree Revolut ought to have been on the look-out for the possibility of fraud and made additional checks before processing payments in some circumstances.

Revolut did find some of the payments suspicious. Through an automated process, it declined payments and then required Ms A to engage with a ‘scam warning flow’ before she was able to make another payment to the same type of merchant. I think that Revolut ought to have enquired better about some of the payments and why they were being made. But I’m not persuaded this would have prevented Ms A’s loss.

I say this because Ms A had clearly been manipulated into trusting the purported investment and the scammer. Prior to the first payment she made through her Revolut account to the scam, Ms A had been making payments through another financial provider. During this period, Ms A trusted the scammer to the extent that she was willing to borrow funds from others and believed that the scammer was also providing funds for her, following an unexpected loss on the investment.

Within the automated questions, and during a telephone conversation that took place between Revolut and Ms A, I note that Ms A provided some inaccurate responses, as outlined by the investigator. For example, she gave answers to indicate that she was completing the transaction alone, that she’d been introduced to the opportunity by a friend or family member, and that she hadn’t been contacted by anyone on social media. These

answers were misleading and hindered Revolut from being able to identify that Ms A had fallen victim to a scam.

I've reviewed the warnings that Revolut provided to Ms A and I consider these to be proportionate to the risks presented, particularly given the answers Ms A provided. I would also have expected them to resonate with Ms A, as many of them reflected the situation she was in. Revolut provided warnings about fake investment opportunities on social media, the importance of not providing remote access, and the likelihood that it's a scam if a product offers high returns in a short period of time.

I note that Ms A had answered an automated question to say that she had been asked to install software, which is a common hallmark of a scam. But, when asked about this over the phone, Ms A said she *hadn't* been asked to download screensharing software. And, as mentioned above, a warning was also provided about this point.

So, while I think that Revolut could have made better enquiries, I'm not persuaded that this would ultimately have prevented Ms A's loss. She's unsure why she provided incorrect answers, and believes this is likely to be because she'd misunderstood the questions. But, while she may not have intended to deceive Revolut, it remains that Revolut wasn't given accurate information. Had it questioned her further, I'm not satisfied that she would have answered in a substantially different way. Instead, I consider it more likely that she would have continued to have done so in such a way as to avoid alerting Revolut to what was really happening, due to being under the spell of the scammer.

While Ms A has been the victim of a cruel and manipulative scam, and I'm sorry that she's lost so much money, I can only uphold her complaint if I'm satisfied Revolut's failings made a material difference to what happened. For the reasons given, I'm not persuaded they did.

### **My final decision**

For the reasons given 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 Ms A to accept or reject my decision before 30 April 2026.

Melanie van der Waals  
**Ombudsman**