

The complaint

Mr G complains about the service he received from Revolut Ltd (“Revolut”) when it blocked a £150,000 payment for 24 hours, despite him having completed its security checks. Mr G says Revolut didn’t give him a proper explanation for the delay beyond referring to “security”, and he thinks he should have been allowed to access his own funds sooner. He also wants to be compensated for the interest lost as a result of the delay.

What happened

Mr G set up his niece as a new beneficiary on his Revolut account and attempted to make a faster payment of £150,000 to her. Despite completing Revolut’s security checks and the beneficiary details matching, Revolut’s automated systems held the payment for 24 hours.

Mr G cancelled the payment and instead tried to transfer the money to his own account elsewhere. But this payment was also subject to a 24-hour hold, after which it was released in-line with Revolut’s processes.

Mr G complained to Revolut about the delay in making an important payment and was unhappy Revolut wouldn’t explain the reason for blocking a transfer to an account he owned, other than citing “security”. Mr G wants to be compensated for the interest he lost.

Revolut didn’t uphold the complaint. It said its payment deferral and 24-hour cooling-off period are automated, apply to all customers, and are an important extra layer of security. Revolut also said its terms and conditions allow it to delay or refuse payments in certain circumstances, which Mr G agreed to when he opened his account.

Unhappy with this response, Mr G brought his complaint to this service. Mr G says that the payment was straightforward and safe, and that the delay served no purpose.

One of our investigators looked into Mr G’s concerns but didn’t think Revolut acted unreasonably given the type and value of the payment and that it was going to a new beneficiary. They explained that it isn’t this service’s role to tell businesses what systems they must have in place to detect fraud or how to operate them and given the increase of fraud and scams in the banking industry, it wasn’t unfair for Revolut to act as it did.

Mr G remained dissatisfied. He said there should be a way for customers to override delays such as providing additional identification or indemnifying a bank against risk, especially when moving money to an account Revolut knows belongs to them and asked for an ombudsman’s 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.

Firstly it might help if I explain that my role isn’t to decide how a business ought to run its systems or what fraud prevention measures it should use and nor can I tell a firm to change

its commercial or operational policies, that's the role of the regulator, in this case the Financial Conduct Authority. Rather my role is to consider whether Revolut treated Mr G fairly and reasonably, and if it hasn't, I would seek – if possible - to put Mr G back in the position he would've been in if the mistakes hadn't happened. And I may award compensation that I think is fair and reasonable.

There's no dispute that Mr G's attempted payment was flagged by Revolut's automated fraud prevention systems. But given the amount involved and the fact the payment was to a new beneficiary, I don't think it was unreasonable for those systems to identify the transaction as one requiring further safeguards.

I appreciate Mr G's frustration, particularly as he was attempting to make a genuine and legitimate payment, and then despite trying to mitigate the issue by moving his own money to another account held by him he still wasn't able to make the payment.

However, the use of automated systems means Revolut applies its security measures consistently across its customer base, rather than making subjective exceptions. I don't think it would be fair or practical to expect Revolut to manually assess each high-value transaction or allow customers to bypass safeguards by signing disclaimers or indemnities.

And as Revolut's terms and conditions explain that it may delay or refuse payments for security reasons, and that such measures can apply even where no fraud is ultimately detected, I'm satisfied that Revolut acted in line with those terms and with its wider obligations to protect customers and prevent financial crime.

Mr G's payment was released following the 24-hour hold which he was informed about and I've seen no evidence he suffered any significant or compensable financial loss as a result of Revolut's actions. So taking everything into account I don't think Revolut acted unreasonably or treated Mr G unfairly.

My final decision

For the reasons I've explained, I do not uphold Mr G's complaint against Revolut Ltd or require it to do anything more.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr G to accept or reject my decision before 19 May 2026.

Caroline Davies
Ombudsman