

The complaint

Mr D has complained Revolut Ltd lodged a fraud-related marker on the industry fraud database, CIFAS, in his name.

What happened

Mr D had been running an account with Revolut since the end of 2022. In November 2024 Revolut blocked use of Mr D's account after getting a fraud notification from another bank (who I'll call M). M's customer had sent £1,500 to Mr D's account with M after being the victim of an investment scam. Mr D had then sent £1,485 to his Revolut account, which was all spent within a couple of days.

Revolut wasn't convinced by Mr D's story that he'd received money from a family friend's wife as a loan. They confirmed that they were closing Mr D's account on 29 November 2024. They also lodged a fraud-related marker on the CIFAS database.

In 2025 Mr D asked Revolut to remove the marker. Revolut confirmed they'd done nothing wrong and wouldn't remove the marker.

Mr D brought his complaint to the ombudsman service. He later engaged a representative to assist in his complaint.

Our investigator noted Mr D's evidence changed when he went back to Revolut in 2025 as he told them that he'd agreed to offer a currency exchange service for someone within a local WhatsApp group, although he didn't know the name of the person who sent the money to his account with M. Our investigator noted that this was a significant change to the story Mr D had originally told Revolut. Even considering the time that had passed, she wasn't convinced by what Mr D was now saying. She felt he'd been aware this money was most likely fraudulent and his account statement clearly showed he spent this after receipt. She confirmed that Revolut had enough evidence to lodge a CIFAS marker.

Disappointed with this outcome, Mr D has asked an ombudsman to review his complaint. His representatives made various points which they wished to be considered, including whether Revolut had conducted their independent review into what had happened.

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.

Having done so, I've reached the same outcome as our investigator. I'll explain why.

It is clear what the requirements are prior to lodging a marker. Specifically:

“There must be reasonable grounds to believe that an identified fraud or financial crime has been committed or attempted.

The evidence must be clear, relevant and rigorous.”

Revolut must be able to provide clear evidence that an identified fraud was being committed, and Mr D was involved. This means that they must have more than a suspicion or a concern that Mr D may be involved.

There's also a requirement that Revolut should be giving the account holder an opportunity to explain what was going on.

I've seen the evidence provided by Revolut. This confirms that they received a complaint from another bank on 19 November 2024 that one of their customers had been the victim of a scam. This individual had paid £1,500 into Mr D's account with M on 15 November after believing she was making an investment and would be receiving a profit.

A bank statement from M shows that Mr D immediately sent £1,485 to his Revolut account. He then sent £1,055 to someone he'd made payments to previously, transferred £300 to another account he held and made three card payments.

Mr D confirmed to Revolut that the person he sent over £1,000 to was a good family friend and this money was a personal loan. He had no other evidence that Revolut would have been hoping to see to back up this claim. But Revolut would have been able to note that Mr D had made previous (relatively low-value) payments to this individual. The last payment was about six months before this transaction and was for £20.

I can see that Revolut's conclusion after their investigation and review into Mr D's account was that the account "*showed a high degree of complicitness in confirmed fraud*". The information Mr D provided to them was contradictory to the report they'd seen from the fraud victim.

I know Mr D's representative has specifically asked about the fraud report. I can confirm I have seen the report Revolut received from M. There seems nothing within this that would suggest this wasn't a genuine report about fraud.

In Mr D's submission to our service, and similarly when he asked Revolut to remove the CIFAS marker in August 2025, his evidence had changed. He said the payment he'd received was for a currency exchange. Although he didn't know the original sender personally, Mr D said that currency exchange was a regular activity within the WhatsApp group and he'd taken the opportunity to carry some out. The problem with this evidence is that whilst I can see Mr D received £1,500, I can see no related currency exchange activity being undertaken for the individual he was supposedly providing a service to. Mr D has supplied some screenshots about individuals offering or looking for currency exchange but nothing that relates to this instance. There are also no statements from any money transfer groups or bank accounts showing any currency exchange being conducted.

Revolut believed that at a minimum Mr D willingly participated in an unlicensed money exchange. They accepted he may not have been aware of the specific crime but his participation in "*such a high-risk scheme*" made him complicit.

I'd, in fact, go slightly further than Revolut's supposition. I believe that if Mr D was involved in a genuine currency exchange, he'd have been in a position to provide evidence of this. As demonstrated above, this doesn't exist. In fact, the evidence shows that the income he supposedly received for a currency exchange was then used to send some money to a family friend and himself.

I think the evidence shows Mr D was in receipt of fraudulent funds and importantly knew that this was the case.

In accordance with the rules about lodging a marker, I accept that Revolut acted properly. On this basis, I don't believe it would be fair and reasonable to ask Revolut to remove the CIFAS marker.

My final decision

For the reasons given, my final decision is not to uphold Mr D's complaint against Revolut Ltd.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr D to accept or reject my decision before 22 May 2026.

Sandra Quinn
Ombudsman