

The complaint

Miss G complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund money she lost when she was a victim of a scam.

What happened

The background to this complaint is well known to both parties and so I'll only refer to some key events here.

Miss G fell victim to a job scam in October 2025. As part of the scam, Miss G was directed by the scammer to open a Revolut account and a wallet with a legitimate crypto provider (which I'll refer to as 'M'). And she made an £880 Rev payment to M for the purchase of crypto on 22 October 2025, which was then forwarded on as part of the scam.

Miss G realised she'd been scammed when, after making this payment, she was told an error had been made and she had to pay a further £1,500. Miss G reported the matter and raised a complaint to Revolut about what happened. Revolut rejected it and wouldn't refund Miss G – saying they weren't liable for the transaction and they treated her fairly.

The complaint was referred to the Financial Ombudsman. Our Investigator didn't think Revolut had to do anything further. She said, although the payment wasn't unusual or suspicious enough to warrant it, Revolut did intervene and carried out additional checks before processing the payment. But Revolut couldn't have identified Miss G was falling victim to a scam from her responses, and they warned her about the risk of making the payment. Our Investigator also didn't think Revolut could've done anything more to recover the funds.

Miss G disagreed, and so the matter 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.

I'm sorry Miss G has been the victim of a scam. I realise this is a lot of money to Miss G and the loss of it has impacted her greatly. I therefore understand why she'd do everything she can to try and recover the funds. But I must consider if Revolut are responsible for it. Having done so, and while I know this won't be the outcome Miss G is hoping for, I don't think they are. I'll explain why.

It isn't disputed that Miss G authorised the payment from her Revolut account. Generally, consumers are liable for payments they authorise and Revolut are also expected to process authorised payment instructions without undue delay. However, taking into account the regulatory rules and guidance, relevant codes of practice and good industry practice, including the Consumer Duty, there are circumstances where it might be appropriate for Revolut to take additional steps or make additional checks before processing a payment to help protect customers from the possibility of financial harm from fraud.

And so, I've considered whether the £880 payment instruction given by Miss G to Revolut was unusual enough to have expected additional checks to be carried out before it was processed. When considering this, I've kept in mind that electronic money institutions (EMIs) – like Revolut – process high volumes of transactions each day. And that there is a balance for Revolut to find between allowing customers to be able to use their account and questioning transactions to confirm they're legitimate – as it wouldn't be practical for EMIs to carry out additional checks before processing every payment.

Miss G's account was newly opened when this payment was made. So, there wasn't any prior usage available to Revolut for them to determine whether it was out of character for her. But I don't think this prevented Revolut from assessing whether the activity was suspicious or if it potentially carried a known fraud risk.

The £880 payment was going to a well-known crypto provider, which carries a known fraud risk. It was also being made on a newly opened account – which similarly can be a feature of crypto scams (like the one Miss G fell victim to). However, I must also bear in mind that the vast majority of crypto transactions will be made for legitimate purposes. And many of Revolut's customers use their services for this purpose – as some high street banks have taken steps to limit their customer's ability to purchase crypto. The payment, while not an insignificant amount, was also relatively low value compared to the type of payments Revolut processes (including to crypto providers like M). Because of this, I don't think the payment was unusual or suspicious enough whereby I would reasonably have expected Revolut to have had enough reason to suspect it might have been related to fraud or a scam – thereby putting Miss G at risk of financial harm.

Nevertheless, I'm aware that Revolut did intervene before processing the payment. And I think this was proportionate to the risk associated with the payment in these circumstances. This is because:

- Revolut told Miss G that something didn't look right and that they'd identified the transaction as a potential scam. They then told her to answer their questions honestly, and that if she was being pressured to hide any details about the payment then she could be being scammed. Miss G acknowledged this warning, confirming that she understood she might not get her money back if she didn't answer honestly and it turned out to be a scam.
- Miss G confirmed that she was completing the transaction by herself. This was despite Revolut warning that if anyone was telling her what to say then it may be a scam.
- Revolut asked Miss G for the purpose of the payment. But even though there was the option to select 'It's related to a job opportunity', Miss G instead selected 'I'm transferring money to my other account' followed by 'My account with another bank'. Although this wasn't inaccurate, it wasn't the most suitable option available, and it prevented Revolut from knowing the true purpose of the payment and the risk associated with it.
- It also generated further questioning that wasn't relevant to Miss G's situation – as they were tailored to impersonation/safe account scams. That said, when asked if the money was going to an account she controlled, Miss G selected 'Yes, it's my account' instead of 'Yes, it's a new account created for me by someone else'.
- Revolut then similarly provided warnings that weren't particularly relevant to Miss G's situation. They did however warn:

“Never ignore these warnings

Scammers will tell you to ignore warnings. If you've been told to ignore these red flags we've raised, then stop, it's a scam"

Miss G continued with the payment.

I think Revolut took reasonable steps to understand the surrounding circumstances of the payment to establish if Miss G was at risk of financial harm. Unfortunately, due to Miss G not providing the most accurate responses and information, Revolut were prevented from this. I appreciate Miss G was manipulated by the scammer and told how to respond to Revolut's questions to ensure the payment was processed. While I sympathise with Miss G, I can't fairly hold Revolut responsible for that. They were reliant on Miss G providing accurate information and engaging positively with their fraud prevention checks. Revolut wouldn't have known Miss G was being guided by the scammer, which they specifically warned her against, and based on Miss G's responses, I don't think Revolut would've had enough reason to suspect the payment was being made for anything other than legitimate purposes. Nor do I think Revolut could reasonably have identified any underlying vulnerability from their interaction with Miss G. So, I think it was reasonable for Revolut to process the £880 payment upon receiving Miss G's instruction that she wished to proceed.

I understand Miss G feels strongly about this matter. But I think Revolut took reasonable steps, that were proportionate to the risk associated with the payment, to protect Miss G from the risk of financial harm. And given, as I've said, there is a balance for Revolut to find between protecting their customers from fraud or scams and not unduly delaying genuine payment instructions, I don't think the circumstances of the payment indicated a heightened risk of financial harm that warranted further action from Revolut – such as a human intervention.

I've also considered whether, on being alerted to the scam, Revolut could reasonably have done anything more to recover Miss G's losses, but I don't think they could. The only option available was to contact the beneficiary to see if any funds remain. And Revolut did this about an hour after Miss G reported it – which was reasonable in the circumstances. Sadly, M confirmed a refund couldn't be provided as the crypto was successfully delivered. It follows that I don't think Revolut caused any detriment to Miss G in trying to recover her funds – as they did all they reasonably could have.

I have a great deal of sympathy for Miss G as she is the innocent victim of a scam. I'm not trying to place any blame on her for what happened. But it would only be fair for me to direct Revolut to refund her loss if I thought they were responsible – and I'm not persuaded that this was the case. For the above reasons, I think Revolut has acted fairly and so I'm not going to tell them to do anything further.

My final decision

My final decision is that I do not uphold this complaint.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Miss G to accept or reject my decision before 24 March 2026.

Daniel O'Dell
Ombudsman