

The complaint

Mr M is unhappy that Revolut Ltd wouldn't accept the information he provided them about his source of funds and didn't complete the transfer of his account balance in a timely manner.

What happened

Mr M opened an account with Revolut in November 2019. In January 2020, Mr M attempted to make several foreign payments, at which time Revolut asked Mr M for supporting documents regarding his source of funds. In February 2020, after an account review, Revolut explained that they'd decided to close Mr M's account. Mr M then instructed Revolut to transfer the funds in his account back to their original source.

The transfer of Mr M's funds took longer than expected but Revolut were eventually able to confirm that the funds had been successfully transferred. However, when Mr M checked the destination account, he discovered that only one of the two transfers that had been initiated to transfer the funds had completed. Mr M wasn't happy about this, so he made a complaint.

Revolut looked at Mr M's complaint. They were able to confirm that both transfers had had completed and that therefore all of Mr M's funds had been returned to the source account. However, they acknowledged that the process had taken longer than they would have liked, and so they offered Mr M three months of premium account as a gesture of goodwill.

Mr M wasn't satisfied with Revolut's offer, and he felt that Revolut's actions had caused a business contract to be cancelled and that Revolut should compensate him to the amount of £50,000. So, Mr M referred his complaint to this service.

One of our investigators looked at this complaint. But they didn't feel that it could be demonstrated that the business contract had been cancelled because of Revolut's actions, and they felt that Revolut were entitled to request the information regarding the source of Mr M's funds that they had. Additionally, our investigator noted that Revolut hadn't closed Mr M's account, but only suspended Mr M's ability to fund the account further. Because of this, our investigator felt that Revolut's response to Mr M's complaint, including the offer of three month's premium service, was a fair and reasonable resolution to what had taken place.

Mr M remained dissatisfied, so the matter was escalated to an ombudsman for 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.

Mr M has raised a number of detailed points as to why he's unhappy with Revolut. I'd like to thank Mr M for raising these points, and I hope that he won't consider it a discourtesy that I won't respond in similar detail here. Instead, in line with our role as a quick and informal

dispute resolution service, I've focussed on what I consider to be the key aspects of this complaint.

As such, if Mr M notices that I haven't responded to a specific point that he's raised, it shouldn't be taken that I haven't considered that point – I can confirm that I've read and consider all submissions provided by both Mr M and Revolut – but that I have considered that point but don't feel it necessary to address that point here in order to arrive at what I consider to be a fair outcome – especially if that point has already been addressed and considered by our investigator.

One of the main issues here appears to be that Revolut were asking Mr M to provide additional information about the source of the funds being transferred into his Revolut account, and that Mr M wasn't willing to provide this information.

It is, of course, at Mr M's discretion as to whether he is willing to provide the further information that Revolut were asking for here, and in this instance Mr M chose not to provide it. But having made the choice not to provide the further, I find it difficult to conclude that Mr M has been treated unfairly by Revolut when they subsequently placed a block on Mr M funding the account from the source account about which they had concerns and which Mr M declined to provide further information about.

Mr M contends that Revolut should have requested the information about his source of funds when the account was first opened, and he also contends that Revolut should have accepted the information he had already provided to them regarding such that no further information should have been required.

I can appreciate Mr M's points here – to a degree. But it isn't within the remit of this service to comment on Revolut's internal processes and how they choose to implement them. Rather, this service is concerned with the fairness of outcomes. And, in this instance, it's difficult for me to conclude that it was unfair for Revolut to have asked Mr M for the further information that they did - if Revolut felt it was necessary to do so - regardless of when the information was asked for.

Mr M stated in his testimony to this service that, following his declining to provide the information, Revolut informed him that they were closing his account. However, it's evident from the information available to me that this wasn't the case, and that Revolut acted only to suspend Mr M's account from receiving further funds, with Mr M being free to continue using his Revolut account with the funds already present in it. However, Revolut did explain to Mr M that if he wanted to withdraw the money from his account as a result of this restriction, that he should do so in one transaction.

Mr M did elect to withdraw the money from his account and requested that it be returned to the source account from which it had been received. Revolut don't dispute that completing that request took longer than they would have liked – although I'm satisfied that the timescale wasn't unduly excessive and that Revolut have been able to demonstrate that the full amount of Mr M's funds were eventually transferred - and Revolut have apologised to Mr M for the time that the transfers took and offered Mr M three months of premium account service at no cost as a goodwill gesture because of this.

I commend Revolut's intentions here, but I'm not wholly convinced that offering free premium service is a suitable goodwill gesture here, given that the funding of Mr M's account is restricted and also that Mr M has just withdrawn all of the funds from the account, and I'd encourage Revolut to consider an alternative goodwill gesture in this instance.

Mr M has also expressed his dissatisfaction at the length of time that it took Revolut to supply him with a physical debit card following his opening the account. However, I've seen that Revolut acted quickly to send a debit card to Mr M when he informed them that one hadn't been received, and I'm satisfied that Mr M did receive a physical card in a reasonable timeframe following the account being opened.

Finally, Mr M has stated that he feels that Revolut should pay him compensation totalling £50,000 as a result of the time that he has had to spend dealing with this complaint and because of a work contract that was cancelled as a result of Revolut's actions.

However, this service wouldn't look to compensate a complainant on the basis of time spent dealing with the complaint, and I'm not convinced that Mr M has sufficiently demonstrated that the business contract he refers to was cancelled solely as a result of Revolut's actions here. It also must be noted that, had Mr M chosen to provide the further information that Revolut were asking for, it's likely that the actions of Revolut which Mr M feels have led to the cancellation of the business contact could have been avoided.

All of which means that I find it difficult to conclude that Revolut have acted unfairly or unreasonably here, and it follows from this that I won't be upholding this complaint or instructing Revolut to take any further action at this time.

I realise that this won't be the outcome that Mr M was wanting here, and I hope that he can understand, given what I've explained, why I've made the final decision that I have.

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 M to accept or reject my decision before 10 August 2021.

Paul Cooper
Ombudsman