

The complaint

Mr S complains that Revolut Ltd won't refund money he lost to a scam.

Mr S is represented by a firm I'll refer to as 'R'.

What happened

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

Mr S fell victim to an investment scam in 2025. He's explained that he completed an enquiry form for an investment advert he saw on social media. This prompted a call from a person claiming to work for an investment firm that I'll refer to as 'F' – which we now know to be a scam. Mr S was told he could receive a £6,000 return from a £200 investment. Under the belief F was legitimate, Mr S decided to invest. To do this, Mr S had to purchase crypto from legitimate providers before forwarding it on to F's trading platform. F advised Mr S to set up a Revolut account and guided him through the investment process with the use of screensharing software.

During the scam, Mr S was led to believe his funds had become 'stuck' and that he needed to put more money in to liquidate it. Despite paying this, Mr S was still unable to withdraw his funds and F asked for more money. This made him realise he'd been scammed. As part of the scam, Mr S made six transactions totalling about £29,000 between 8 July and 19 August 2025 – ranging between £34.90 and £19,500 in value.

R complained to Revolut, on Mr S's behalf in August 2025 – saying Revolut failed to protect him from the scam. R wanted Revolut to refund Mr S and pay 8% simple interest. Revolut rejected the complaint

The complaint was brought to the Financial Ombudsman. Our Investigator didn't however think Revolut were responsible for Mr S's loss. He said Revolut carried out additional checks before processing the second payment, but Mr S didn't answer their questions accurately and provided misleading information. Our Investigator also noted Mr S acted similarly when questioned by his other banking provider – which I'll refer to as 'H' - from where the funds originated. And he said Mr S ignored scam warnings that were relevant to his situation. Because of this, he didn't think any further intervention from Revolut would've made a difference. Nor did he think Revolut could've done anything more to recover Mr S's funds.

R 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 Mr S has been the victim of a scam. I realise it is a lot of money he has lost and so I understand why he would do everything he can to try and recover it. But I must consider whether Revolut are responsible for his loss. I know this will come as a disappointment to Mr S

but, for similar reasons as our Investigator, I don't think they are.

Before I explain why, I want to reassure Mr S that I've considered everything R have submitted in support of his complaint. And so, while I've summarised this complaint in far less detail than what has been provided, I want to stress that no discourtesy is intended by this. If there is a submission I've not addressed, it isn't because I have ignored the point. It's simply because my findings focus on what I consider to be the central issue in this complaint – that being whether Revolut are responsible for any loss Mr S suffered because of the scam.

It isn't disputed that Mr S authorised the payments from his 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.

At which point, I should explain that for me to find it fair and reasonable that Revolut should refund Mr S requires more than a finding that Revolut ought to have intervened. I would need to find not only that Revolut failed to intervene where they ought reasonably to have done so - but crucially I'd need to find that but for this failure the subsequent loss would've been avoided. That latter element concerns causation. A proportionate intervention will not always result in the prevention of a payment. And if I find it more likely than not that such a proportionate intervention by Revolut wouldn't have revealed the payments were part of a fraud or scam, then I couldn't fairly hold Revolut liable for not having prevented them from being made.

I wouldn't have expected Revolut to have carried out additional checks before processing the first payment given its low value. But I think Revolut should've intervened before processing some of the other transactions – such as the second and third payments Mr R made of £4,500 and £19,500 respectively. This is because of their increased value but also because the destination of the funds, a crypto provider, carried a known fraud risk.

Revolut have shown that they carried out additional checks before processing the second payment (£4,500). This included automated questioning and written warnings being provided, as well as a telephone conversation to discuss the payment further. I've therefore considered whether Revolut's intervention at this point was proportionate to the risk associated with the payment. Having done so, I think it was. This is because:

- Revolut told Mr S that they'd identified the transaction as a potential scam. They then told him to answer their questions honestly, and that if he was being pressured to hide any details about the payment then he could be being scammed. Mr S acknowledged this warning, confirming that he understood he might not get his money back if he didn't answer them honestly and it turned out to be a scam.
- Mr S confirmed he was completing the transaction by himself. This was despite Revolut warning that if anyone was telling him what to say then it may be a scam.
- Mr S also acknowledged that if someone was telling him to ignore Revolut's warnings, they're a scammer.

- Revolut asked Mr S why he was making the transaction, and he selected *“I’m transferring money to my other account”* followed by *“My investment account”*.
- This prompted further questioning from Revolut, with Mr S confirming:
 - He hadn’t been asked to install software. This was despite Revolut warning that *“Fraudsters will ask you to install software, like AnyDesk, so they can see your screen and personal information”*.
 - He discovered the opportunity through a friend or family member. This was despite Revolut warning that *“Fraudsters use social media to advertise fake investments”* and there being the option to select ‘online or social media ads’.
 - The money was going to his account.
 - He’d checked reviews and found no mentions of scams – and referenced the legitimate crypto provider that he was using.
- Revolut then provided various warnings which, amongst others, included:
 - This could be an investment scam

Investment scams promise high returns in short periods of time, and may even involve professional-looking online platforms.
 - Be cautious on social media

Fraudsters use social media to promote fake investment opportunities. Read online reviews to check sure if they’re legitimate
 - Don’t give anyone remote access

Scammers may ask you to install software to view your screen. Never agree to anything that gives someone else control.
- Revolut then arranged a call with Mr S to discuss the payment further. As part of the call Mr S confirmed that he came across the crypto provider through an online advert, nobody had suggested he use Revolut and there wasn’t any third party assisting him with the investment. He also confirmed, despite being warned about scammers using it, that he hadn’t installed any software (including screensharing software). Nor had anyone guided him on how to answer any security questions.

Mr S confirmed he wish to proceed and Revolut processed the payment.

I think Revolut took reasonable steps to understand the surrounding circumstances of the payment Mr S was making. I also consider they highlighted some of the common features of investment scams – with many specifically relevant to his situation. And although Mr S was mostly open about the payment being made for investment purposes, he didn’t respond to Revolut’s questioning honestly. Instead, he provided inaccurate information and ignored the warnings provided to him.

R has said that Mr S wasn’t being manipulated or coached on how to respond to any inquiries from Revolut (or H). But having looked at the ‘scam chat’, it seems that Mr S spoke with F via video call at the same time the above payment was flagged by Revolut. It also seems he spoke with F at around the time he made the payments from H to Revolut. And

considering the inaccurate responses he provided Revolut (and H, will I refer to later), I think it's most likely to me that F instructed Mr S as to how to respond to Revolut's questions for the payment to be processed. This is also supported by other parts of the chat whereby, for example, it shows F asking Mr S if he had time to talk prior to him speaking with a company he was applying for a loan from.

I appreciate Mr S was likely being manipulated by F and being guided through the 'investment process' – including, as I've said, making the payments from his Revolut account. While I sympathise with Mr S, I can't fairly hold Revolut responsible for that. They were reliant on Mr S providing accurate information and engaging positively with their fraud prevention checks. And based on his responses to their questioning – both automated and over the phone - I think it was reasonable for them to consider he was making the payment for legitimate purposes. I also think Revolut would've been reassured by Mr S choosing to proceed with the payment following his acknowledgement of the scam warnings they provided. I therefore think the additional checks Revolut carried out at this point were proportionate to the risks associated with the payment at that time.

Although reassured at this point, I think Mr S's subsequent payment (£19,500) ought to have given Revolut reason to suspect he was at a heightened risk of financial harm – given the increased value of the payment and it being made to a crypto provider. I think this warranted further intervention. And a proportionate response to that risk would've been for Revolut to have attempted to establish the circumstances surrounding the payment in more detail before allowing it to debit Mr S's account. I think it should have done this by, for example, directing Mr S to their in-app chat or a telephone conversation to discuss the payment further to establish the circumstances surrounding it.

I've therefore considered what would've likely happened if Revolut had done this. I know R disagrees but, on balance, I'm not persuaded this would've made a difference. When considering this, I've also taken into account Mr S's interactions with H – as they also spoke with him on several occasions. H's additional checks included:

- Mr S confirming he was moving his funds to his Revolut account for home improvements and a garden extension. And he was using his Revolut account for this purpose as it received a higher interest rate.
- Mr S confirming he opened his Revolut account on his own – with no third party or adviser assisting him.
- H warned that if anyone was telling him to give false information about the payment(s) then he is being scammed. And that fraudsters coach customers into not telling the truth when speaking to their bank. So, they told Mr S to be completely honest with them so they could protect him and asked if he had been asked to lie or mislead them in anyway.

Mr S denied this – explaining he was doing it all himself. And that nobody had asked him to make payments for a different purpose.

This, in my view, further demonstrates the influence F had over Mr S. This is because despite H warning Mr S of the importance of him answering their questions honestly so to allow them to protect him from fraud or a scam, as well as highlighting some of the common features of scams (with some relevant to his situation), Mr S continued to provide inaccurate information and misled them about the true circumstances of the payments.

R has said that Mr S didn't use the cover story when questioned by Revolut – as he said it was for investment and not home improvement purposes. While this was an accurate reflection of the purpose of the payment, I don't think this demonstrates Mr S wasn't been coached or guided by F. Instead, I think F would've reasonably known that Revolut would've been able to identify the payments were being made to a well-known crypto provider. And so, F would've likely accounted for this by instructing or guiding Mr S to explain it was for investment purposes (as home improvements would've otherwise been seen as a red flag) while ensuring their involvement remained hidden.

I understand R has argued that the scam chat doesn't show any evidence of coaching. But having looked at it, it seems that Mr S spoke with F both frequently and at length over video call – including, as I've said, at the time Revolut flagged the payment. Although I can't be sure exactly what level of coaching was provided by F, I think the circumstances of what happened suggests it was of a high level – as per Mr S's willingness to mislead both Revolut and H but also demonstrated by his trust in F by following their instructions to obtain lending to fund the payments.

And here, I must bear in mind that Mr S disregarded warnings Revolut (and H) provided to him that were clear, specific and relevant to his situation – such as being told to lie about the purpose of the payment or being told what to say, the use of screensharing software, fraudsters using social media to advertise fake investments and being promised high returns in a short period of time. Despite this, Mr S was willing to mislead Revolut as he didn't disclose the true circumstances surrounding the payments – including how he came across the opportunity, denying the use of screensharing software or that he was receiving any instructions from a third party. Given how clear Revolut's warnings were that, in circumstances like Mr S's own that he was very likely being scammed, I think this shows the level of control and influence F had over him.

At which point, I'd like to explain that I have taken into consideration that Revolut ought reasonably to have put Mr S's responses under scrutiny – as they should be aware scam victims can be coached to mislead their banking providers. And so, while I wouldn't have expected Revolut to have interrogated Mr S about the payments he was making, I think they should've probed and challenged Mr S sufficiently so that they could be reassured he wasn't at risk of financial harm from fraud or a scam.

But taking everything into account, including Mr S's interactions with both Revolut and H, I'm simply not persuaded – on balance – that Revolut could've uncovered the scam through a proportionate intervention. Ultimately, from what I've seen, I consider Mr S put a lot of trust in F and was being heavily influenced by them – and to the degree whereby he didn't respond to clear warnings relevant to his situation (and which should've resonated with him). And here, in these circumstances, I'm not satisfied that further intervention from Revolut would've broken the 'spell' Mr S was under.

I sympathise with Mr S's situation as I understand he is the innocent victim of a scam. But sadly, due to Mr S not disclosing the true purpose of the payments he was making and providing inaccurate responses to their questioning, Revolut weren't able to uncover the scam. It follows that I don't think Revolut is responsible for Mr S's loss.

I've considered whether, on being alerted to the scam, Revolut could've done anything more to recover Mr S's losses, but I don't think they could. This is because Revolut could've only sought to recover the funds from the crypto providers, but it had already been forwarded on to F. And even if funds had remained, they would've been in Mr S's own control.

I know Mr S will be disappointed by this outcome. But it would only be fair for me to direct Revolut to refund his loss if I thought they were responsible – and I'm not persuaded that this was the case. For the above reasons, I think Revolut have 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 Mr S to accept or reject my decision before 14 April 2026.

Daniel O'Dell
Ombudsman