

The complaint

Mr A complains that Revolut Ltd hasn't paid him a £50 reward following a referral promotion.

What happened

In 2024, Mr A had an option through his Revolut app to earn a referral reward by inviting someone to sign up for a Revolut personal account. He referred his daughter. She completed an application, but the account was aborted after approximately 20 minutes. At that time, Mr A's daughter was a minor and did not meet the criteria for an adult account.

In July 2025, Mr A referred his daughter again. By this time, she was over the age of 18. Mr A says his daughter set up an account and completed the required steps including opening an account from his referral link, topping up the account and making two purchases. Mr A did not receive the £50 referral reward he was expecting.

Mr A contacted Revolut. In its final response letter, Revolut said the invitee's account was not eligible because under the referral reward terms the invitee must be a new customer and should not have held any Revolut account before.

Mr A referred the complaint to this service. He felt his daughter was not a Revolut customer before because she failed the verification process in 2024.

Our Investigator looked into the concerns and recommended that the complaint should be upheld. He noted that the terms and conditions of the referral promotion state an invitee must "*successfully open a Revolut Personal account, for the first time.*" He noted Revolut did not clearly define what constitutes an open account. He said the position was ambiguous, so thought it would be fair and reasonable for Revolut to honour the £50 referral reward for Mr A.

Revolut didn't agree. It said any person who previously signed up for a Revolut account, even if they were not able to make use of it at the time, is ineligible to be an invitee for a referral at a later point. It said the fact that Mr A's daughter had not been able to gain the functionality of the account previously does not change the fact that they had previously signed up.

Our Investigator didn't think it was reasonable of Revolut to count the aborted application as a valid sign up for a Revolut account. But Revolut said the matter of what is to be treated as a valid sign up is its own policy to set. As no agreement could be reached, the complaint has been referred 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.

At the outset, I want to be clear that it's not my role to ask Revolut to change its business policies and processes. I agree Revolut is free to design its own promotions. But it is my role

to assess whether Revolut have applied its policies and processes fairly, and in the individual circumstances of this complaint, I don't think it has.

Revolut has explained that its decision is to *“treat any previous account that can be linked to a referral invitee as an existing customer.”* Revolut considers it has correctly applied the terms of its promotion and Mr A did not qualify to receive a referral payment for this invitee.

The terms and conditions of Revolut's reward scheme give full details of how rewards can be earned. I've looked carefully at these terms and conditions to see if Revolut made it sufficiently clear it would consider any person who had previously signed up for a Revolut account, even if they were not able to make use of it at the time, ineligible to be an invitee for a referral at a later point. Having done so, I consider the position to be ambiguous.

The referral terms say:

*“For you to be eligible for your Reward, your Invitee **must** satisfy the below steps before the date set out in the In-app Referral Invite:*

- ***Successfully open a Revolut Personal account, for the first time, using your unique referral link. (Someone who has previously signed up for a Revolut Personal account with any of our global entities will not earn you a Reward.)***

The terms do not define what Revolut considers to be an open account, nor do they define what Revolut considers signing up for an account to be.

When Mr A first attempted to refer his daughter to Revolut, she was a minor and not old enough to hold a Revolut account. Revolut has explained that this first application did not meet its verification procedures and the account was aborted after just 20 minutes. Against this backdrop, I can see why Mr A thought the first referral was not a successful application. It's clear this first application did not proceed beyond initial verification steps. No card was ordered and no card purchases were made.

Revolut considers *“the exact prerequisite for an invitee to be eligible for the referral invite is not that they did not hold a [functional] Revolut account previously, but that they did not sign up for a Revolut account previously.”* But its terms do not clearly explain what it considers a previous sign up for a Revolut personal account to be. To my mind, applying and being turned down for an account and signing up for an account aren't immediately obvious as being one and the same thing. I consider there to be a lack of clarity here, particularly when the other wording which Revolut puts in bold refers to successfully opening an account.

The sentence Revolut is seeking to rely on from its terms could be interpreted in a number of ways. One further interpretation could be that it is only new accounts from customers who have already registered or created a Revolut account with one of its global entities that are not eligible for a referral. Mr A's daughter didn't have any previous dealings with any of Revolut's other global entities, so I can appreciate how Mr A could have quite reasonably concluded that information was not relevant to him or his intended invitee.

When a term is capable of multiple interpretations, it is typically interpreted in the favour of the customer. I consider the ambiguities I've highlighted to still stand even after considering the natural meaning of the words and the factual context in the individual circumstances of this complaint.

When considering what is fair and reasonable, I'm mindful that Mr A has ultimately introduced his daughter to Revolut and he had a legitimate expectation that he would receive a referral reward for doing so based on the information made available to him. A reward is

only paid if an account is opened and put into operation by the new customer. As such, Mr A did not receive any referral reward for the first application.

In the individual circumstances of this complaint, I can appreciate why Mr A did not consider that his daughter had previously registered or created an account and I can understand why he was expecting Revolut to make the reward payment to him. For the reasons I've explained above, I think Revolut should honour the £50 referral incentive payment and pay it to Mr A. It remains open to Revolut to consider rewording its terms and conditions if it wishes to avoid similar confusion occurring in the future.

My final decision

My final decision is that I uphold this complaint and Revolut Ltd should now pay Mr A £50.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr A to accept or reject my decision before 7 May 2026.

Claire Marsh
Ombudsman