

The complaint

Ms F complains about the service provided to her by Revolut Ltd.

What happened

In November 2025, Ms F made a substantial transfer of funds into her Revolut e-money account with the intention of moving the funds to a separate savings pot after. However, she then found that Revolut had provided incorrect information about the limits on how much she could move to the savings pot.

When it came to light that the amount Ms F had transferred was over the savings pot limit, the surplus was transferred back to the account the funds had come from – an account Ms F held with another provider.

In doing so, Revolut transferred the payment without Ms F's consent via SWIFT, but her other account provider didn't accept SWIFT payments. As a result, Ms F's money was caught up between the two businesses for seven days until they were credited back to her e-money account with Revolut.

Ms F wanted to transfer the returned funds out of her Revolut account, but she was given further incorrect and contradictory advice about transfer limits. But Ms F was able to avoid further problems by splitting the funds into smaller amounts and sending payments via a different method.

Unhappy with what had happened, Ms F complained to Revolut. And it upheld Ms F's complaint. It credited her account with £75 in recognition of the distress and inconvenience caused and £368.22 to cover the interest loss Ms F had incurred for the seven days her money was caught between Revolut and the other account provider.

Ms F didn't think that Revolut had fully recognised the impact of what had happened and referred her complaint to this service. When responding to this service's enquiries, Revolut offered to increase the distress and inconvenience payment to £150. But Ms F rejected the increased offer.

One of our investigators looked into the complaint. He said that by refunding £368.22 to Ms F's account Revolut had acted fairly as it had covered any loss of interest for the seven days her money wasn't available to her. But he thought Revolut should pay Ms F an additional £350 compensation to fully recognise the distress and inconvenience caused.

Revolut agreed to the investigator's recommendation. But Ms F didn't and she asked for her complaint to be referred to an Ombudsman. So, it's been passed to me to reach a final decision.

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.

Ms F has set her complaint in a lot of detail. In doing so, she has raised several complaint points and I'm aware I have only summarised the circumstances of her complaint above. So, I'd like to reassure her that I have read and considered her correspondence in full. And I hope the fact that I do not respond in a similar detail here will not be taken as a discourtesy. As an informal dispute resolution service, we are tasked with reaching a fair and reasonable conclusion with the minimum of formality. In doing so, it is not necessary for me to respond to every point made, but to consider the circumstances of the complaint as a whole.

Revolut hasn't disputed that it didn't provide Ms F with the level of service it should have. And Ms F has said that she is not seeking a further payment in respect of the lost interest. So, I don't need to make a finding on these issues.

What is in dispute and what I must decide is whether the £350 compensation payment recommended by the investigator - in addition to the £75 already credited to Ms F's account, is fair and reasonable to recognise the distress and inconvenience caused. Or if I should direct Revolut to do more.

I've thought carefully about the impact Ms F has said this matter had on her. This includes: the amount of the money involved; being without her funds for seven days; the potential of facing a second lengthy delay due to further incorrect and contradictory advice; worry about her money being lost; concern about what would have happened if she had transferred more money (which had been her intention initially); Revolut providing unsuitable currency exchange advice; and that there was confusion about whether Ms F was dealing with a staff member or an automated service.

Firstly, I must explain that I can only award compensation for any distress and inconvenience caused by what did happen – not what might have happened had Ms F transferred more money than she did or if she hadn't taken the steps to mitigate any further problems. I'm also mindful that Ms F's money wasn't lost. Rather, I'm persuaded that Ms F would have known that her money had been transferred to her other account provider and that it was returning it to Revolut.

But I do accept that what happened could have been avoided if Revolut had provided correct information about the savings pot deposit limits. And it should have discussed how to transfer the money back to Ms F's other account rather than automatically sending the money by SWIFT when it became apparent that she had transferred too much. Furthermore, it was seven days before Ms F's money was returned to her Revolut account, which would have been worrying given the amount involved. And further incorrect information was then given to Ms F. So, overall, I'm satisfied that Revolut made a number of mistakes which caused Ms F a lot of worry and inconvenience.

But Revolut has accepted this and has agreed to pay Ms F an additional compensation payment of £350 on top of the £75 previously paid - making a total of £425. In my view this is fair and reasonable for the reasons given above. So, I won't be making an additional award.

My final decision

For the reasons given above, I uphold this complaint.

In addition to the payments already made as set out above, Revolut Ltd should now pay Ms F a further £350 compensation payment in recognition of the distress and inconvenience caused to her.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Ms F to accept or

reject my decision before 24 March 2026.

Sandra Greene
Ombudsman