

Before the Arbiter for Financial Services

Case ASF 079/2025

MB

(‘the Complainant’)

vs

Foris DAX MT Limited

(Reg. No. C88392)

(‘Foris’ or ‘Service Provider’)

Sitting of 6 February 2026

The Arbiter,

Having seen the Complaint made against Foris DAX MT Limited relating to its alleged failure to warn client that his transfer of digital assets (which digital assets were funded by transfer of Euro currency from his bank account with Banque Populaire Auvergne Rhone Alpes to his account with Service Provider) to a fraudulent platform, has caused him a financial loss for which he is seeking compensation of €150,500.¹

The Complaint²

In his complaint form to the Office of the Arbiter for Financial Services (‘OAFS’), the Complainant submitted that he was a victim of a cybercrime perpetrated by a fraudulent person who called himself, Louis Lacroix, representative of NIXSE using platform EXODUS.

¹ Page (p.) 4

² P. 1 - 7 with supporting documentation on P. 8 - 88.

In his complaint, he presented extensive evidence of contracts and exchanges with NIXSE related to investments. However, as the Arbiter has no competence against NIXSE, whoever they may be, this documentation is quite irrelevant to this complaint as Foris was not a party to such knowledge and had no access to such knowledge at the time when the transfers complained of were being executed.

He claims that in total, he invested €163,500 through 6 transactions as shown in the Table below. He had, however, recovered €13,000 so that his net loss is quantified at €150,500.

Date	Amount in EURO	Received by Service Provider
01.09.2023	15,000	p. 63
04.09.2023	10,000	p. 63
23.09.2023	25,000	p. 63
26.10.2023	50,000	p. 66
16.01.2024	35,000	p. 64
19.02.2024	28,500	p. 65
It		
Total	163,500	
Recovered	15,000	p. 10
Net total	150,500	

appears that the fraud was only reported to the French Authorities on 19 March

2025.³ The formal claim against Foris was sent on 27 March 2025.⁴ Both dates are more than a year later than the last payment involved in the fraud (19 February 2024).

From the Reply of Foris referred to hereunder, it results that each of these funds transfers was immediately converted to crypto assets and transferred to three external wallets so that by the end of the process, the Complainant had transferred to external fraudulent wallets USDT 25753.97, SOL 627.6486 and BTC 2.4884546.⁵

He seeks compensation from Service Provider for his total loss of €150,500.

He maintains that Service Provider should have detected the irregularity of the transactions on his account and, therefore, held them responsible for the loss.

He claims that Foris should have protected him from sending his assets to the wallets controlled by the fraudsters and quoted various references to French law on this matter.⁶

Complainant denied he was guilty of negligence and explained that he had no intention of transferring his money for purposes other than investment and the Service Provider (whom he at times refers to as a bank) failed to note the unusual nature of the transfers.⁷ He then quotes various transaction monitoring obligations related to banks and finally concludes as follows:

*“In this case, (Complainant) made no such error and did not disclose any personal data to third parties. As a result, the platform, Crypto.com must return the funds to the client, who has not committed no fault whatsoever”.*⁸

³ P. 116 - 131

⁴ P. 8

⁵ P. 100

⁶ P. 10 -12

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ P. 13

Service Provider's reply

Having considered in its entirety the Service Provider's reply,⁹

Where the Service Provider provided a summary of the events which preceded the Complainant's formal complaint and explained and submitted the following:

1. "Background"

- *Foris DAX MT Limited (the 'Company') offers the following services: a crypto custodial wallet (the 'Wallet') and the purchase and sale of digital assets through the Wallet. Services are offered through the Crypto.com App (the 'App'). The Wallet is only accessible through the App and the latter is only accessible via a mobile device.*
- *Our Company additionally offers a single-purpose wallet (the 'Cash Wallet') (formerly referred to as the Crypto.com Fiat (EUR) Wallet), which allows customers to top up and withdraw fiat currencies from and to their personal bank account(s). This service is offered by the legal entity Foris MT Limited.*
- *(The Complainant), e-mail address xxxxx@gmail.com, became a customer of Foris DAX MT Limited through the Crypto.com App and was approved to use the Wallet on 25 August 2023.*
- *The Company notes that in the submitted complaints file, the Complainant's representative has outlined the desired remedy as: (i) reimbursement for incurred financial losses."*¹⁰

The Service Provider then provided a timeline for the transactions of the Complainant's account with them. These included above-listed inward transfers of Euro fiat currency. These funds were then converted to crypto assets and transferred out to three external wallets as above referred to.

The Service Provider concluded that:

⁹ P. 95 - 102 with attachments from p. 103 - 108

¹⁰ P. 95

Based on our investigation, the Company has concluded that we are unable to honor the Complainant's refund request based on the fact that the reported transfers were made by the Complainant himself.

While we sympathize with the Complainant and recognize that he may have been misled or induced into transferring funds to an alleged fraudster, it is important to note that these transfers were made solely at the Complainant's request. We must also emphasize that the addresses the funds were transferred to, do not belong to the Company and as such, any due diligence of the ownership of these addresses falls under the responsibilities of the provider of said wallets.

Unfortunately, Crypto.com cannot revoke any virtual asset withdrawals because blockchain transactions are fast and immutable.

The Complainant is solely responsible for the security and authenticity of all instructions submitted through his Wallet as outlined in the Foris DAX MT Limited Terms of Use.

Please see the relevant section of the Terms of Use for your reference:

QUOTE

6.2

Without prejudice to the foregoing and any other terms in these Terms, we assume that any and all instructions received from your Enabled Device have been made by the rightful owner. You are solely responsible and liable for keeping your enabled Device safe and maintaining adequate security and control of your login and authentication details (including, but not limited to, your username, and password), and shall likewise be solely responsible for any access to and use of the Crypto.com App and the Services through your Enabled Device, notwithstanding that such access and/or use may have been effected without your knowledge, authority or consent. We will not be liable to you for any loss or damage resulting from such access and/or use.

...

7.2 Digital Asset Transfers

...

(b) Crypto.com processes all Digital Asset Transfers according to the instructions received from you and does not guarantee the identity of any recipient. You should verify all transaction information prior to submitting instructions for a Digital Asset Transfer to Crypto.com as the Digital Asset Transfer may not be cancelled or reversed once processed by Crypto.com unless Crypto.com decides at its sole discretion that the transaction should be cancelled or reversed and is technically capable of such cancellation or reversal. You acknowledge that you are responsible for ensuring the accuracy of any instructions submitted to Crypto.com and that any errors may result in the irreversible loss of your Digital Asset.

...

UNQUOTE

In summary, it seems conceivable that the Complainant has been the victim of an alleged scam. However, due to the nature of the external wallet and the fact that it is not hosted or operated by the Company, we can neither confirm nor deny this.

Whilst we fully empathize with the Complainant in this regard, it cannot be overlooked that he had willingly transferred his virtual asset holdings from his Crypto.com Wallet to external wallet addresses which he nominated.

As outlined above in the Foris DAX MT Limited Terms of Use, the Complainant is solely responsible for the security and authenticity of all instructions submitted through the Crypto.com App and, as such, the Company cannot accept liability for the veracity of any third party or for the instructions received from the Complainant themselves.”¹¹

Hearings

For the first hearing on 29 September 2025, the Complainant failed to make presence and was represented by his French counsel.

¹¹ P. 101 - 102

This raised objections from the Service Provider who in the absence of possibility to cross-examine the evidence submitted by Complainant, claimed that such evidence should not be considered.

The Arbiter ruled that in the absence of Complainant making himself available for cross-examination, he is taking a clear position that the payments and transfers complained of were executed with the full authority of the Complainant and the Service Provider need only defend themselves from the claim that through their monitoring systems, they should have stopped the transfers to external wallets controlled by the fraudsters as there were clear signs of fraud.

Complainant's lawyers assented to such ruling and confirmed that all payments were made with full authority of the Complainant.¹²

The Arbiter explained that as Complainant has accepted that he had personally authorised the transfers subject of this complaint,¹³ the issue of not being at fault because he did not disclose his secret credentials is irrelevant. The relevant issue is whether the Service Provider could or should have done anything, according to law and regulations, to identify the fraud and stop the payments in spite of their being fully authorised.

The legal representative referred to the investment position indicated for a value of €750,000 without any stop-loss protection.¹⁴

At the hearing, the Arbiter requested the Complainant's representative to file a copy of the fraud report made to the French Authorities and to inform whether a complaint was filed against his home bank.

The Arbiter also requested the Service Provider to submit copies of KYC documents at onboarding stage and any KYC related exchanges with Complainant during the course of the payments.

¹² P. 110

¹³ P. 76

¹⁴ P. 110

A copy of the report to French Authorities was sent following the first hearing.¹⁵

A second hearing was held on 24 November 2025 for the evidence of the Service Provider. As Complainant was present for the second hearing, he was given the opportunity to confirm all that his legal representative had stated on his behalf at the first hearing. He re-confirmed that all payments were duly authorised by him.

Invited to make any further submissions, the Complainant did not have anything to add and when, on cross-examination he was asked why it took him over a year to file a report of the scam to the French authorities, he replied:

"I say that this happened in the entire course of the exchanges with this person Mr. Lee which were over the phone. Little by little, the interaction developed and gained trust. As soon as I realised that the mechanisms were being put in place, I was asked, me and others, to the proof of this in email and also to the mail message exchanges. And he was asked each time to put a little bit more and more to reinvest, and that he could be able to recover starting the following months, the sums that he could possibly get back.

*And, so this actually became a sort of spiral stretched out over a year. And so, in fact, by the time I realized what was happening, it was too late, and so I tried to re-inject funds once at their request, and then they also threatened me to tell me that I had signed loan contracts and also all the documents. And, so, I felt trapped until the moment I decided to stop everything and then seek help to try to recover something from this fraud."*¹⁶

He said he needed time to understand the matter and, also, to ask his friends and to understand the action that he needed to proceed.

The Service Provider then proceeded with their evidence and stated:

"The complainant became a client and user of the service provider on the 25th of August 2023.

¹⁵P. 116 - 131

¹⁶P. 134

The disputed transactions in question relate to withdrawals of cryptocurrency, which is purchased on the Crypto.com app to 3 different wallet addresses between the 7th of September 2023 and 19th of February 2024.

These wallet addresses are what we call non-custodial addresses, which means they are not serviced by Crypto.com or, as identified from data on the blockchain.

They are not provided by service providers of the same sphere.

From the evidence at hand, and the agreement of the complainant himself today, these transactions were fully authorised by him.

At the time of the withdrawals, none of the address wallets in question were subject to any warnings from our own internal investigations or any third-party transaction monitoring tools used. And as such, we have no responsibility for the withdrawals insofar as they seem to have been pursuant to the user's instructions.

Furthermore, in the course of the complainant's disputed transactions, the service provider had provided numerous warnings regarding withdrawals to the external wallets.

The first of these warnings would have appeared when the user added a new withdrawal address to the Crypto.com app, also known as whitelisting.

And this warning takes the form of a full-screen pop-up.

A similar warning appears at the time of each withdrawal whether or not the withdrawal address is newly whitelisted or is being sent to a withdrawal address that has already been whitelisted on a previous occasion.

Both pop-up warnings specifically warned the complainant against scams, and to not whitelist or withdraw digital assets to investment platforms touting unrealistically high returns, people the complainant did not know well and to any source the complainant did not have complete confidence in.

In respect of the warning displayed during the withdrawals, the complainant is further warned that the withdrawal is irreversible.

The complainant was also encouraged to learn more about safety and protection from scams by clicking the link 'Learn More'.

This link takes users to the regularly updated Crypto.com Help Center page, 'Avoiding Digital Currency Scams'.

Upon the complainant confirming that they had read the scam warning by clicking on the confirm and withdraw button on the pop-up warning, the complainant confirmed they accepted the risks involved and took full responsibility for the withdrawals to the external wallet, specifically agreeing to and acknowledging that the withdrawals were irreversible.

And that the service provider would not be liable for assets sent to the external wallets.

In spite of the numerous warnings mentioned above, the complainant proceeded to make the withdrawals to the external wallets. And this can be seen as the complainant being negligent to disregard these warnings.

It is noted that the screenshots of warnings were not included in the service provider's original reply, and should Mr. Arbitrator require this evidence, we will be happy to supply it in due course.

We would like to stress that there was nothing in our own controls as well as the controls of our third-party employed tools to indicate that there was any malicious or scam activity involved in these cases at the time these happened.

And we were not communicated with or brought to the attention of the complainant's concerns with these transactions until these transactions had already been completed.

Therefore, insofar that the transactions have been completed to the full satisfaction of what we were asked to execute on behalf of the complainant, we would say that the service provider bears no responsibility with regard to the disputed transactions.

*Asked to confirm that Crypto.com has no affiliation with NIXSE, I say, yes, we can confirm that we have no affiliation.*¹⁷

Complainant's representative did not cross-examine the evidence.

¹⁷ P. 135 - 137

The Arbitrator demanded that the parties submit the documentation he had asked for in the first hearing.

From the Complainant, he was expecting evidence of the claim made against Banque Populaire Auvergne Rhone Alpes. The legal representative of the Complainant informed that they have not engaged with the Bank as they felt it had sufficiently fulfilled its due diligence. So, in their procedural strategy, they chose to exclude Banque Populaire.

From the Service Provider, he was expecting the AML KYC documents exchanged with the Complainant at onboarding and during the payments stage (if any).¹⁸ He was also expecting copies of the warnings given to Complainant at the whitelisting and payment stages related to the three fraudulent external wallets.¹⁹

Final Submissions

In their final submissions, the parties basically repeated what had already emerged in the complaint, the reply and the hearing proceedings.

However, the Service Provider's assertions that the Complainant was not available to give live evidence and for cross-examination²⁰ is incorrect as such facility was available at the second hearing as above explained.

Having heard the parties

Having seen all the documents

Considers

Applicable Regulatory Framework

Foris DAX was, at the time of the events leading to this complaint, the holder of a Class 3 VFAA licence granted by the Malta Financial Services Authority ('MFSA') under the Virtual Financial Assets Act, 2018 ('VFAA').

Apart from the relevant provisions under the VFAA, and the *Virtual Financial Assets Regulations, 2018 (L.N. 357 of 2018)* issued under the same act, Foris DAX

¹⁸ Subsequently submitted p. 147

¹⁹ Subsequently submitted p. 142 - 146

²⁰ P. 149

was also subject to the rules outlined in the Virtual Financial Assets Rulebook ('the VFA Rulebook') issued by the MFSA. The said rulebook complements the VFAA by detailing *inter alia* ongoing obligations applicable for VFA Service Providers.

Chapter 3 of the VFA Rulebook specifically includes the rules applicable for VFA Service Providers which such providers must adhere to.

The Arbiter further notes that in the year 2020, the MFSA has also issued a '*harmonised baseline guidance on Technology Arrangements*'²¹ applicable to its licence holders (including under the Virtual Financial Assets) titled '*Guidance on Technology Arrangements, ICT and Security Risk Management, and Outsourcing Arrangements*' ('the Guidance').

Further Considerations

Having considered the particular circumstances of the case, including the submissions made and evidence provided, the Arbiter considers that at no stage has the Complainant raised any doubt as to his having authenticated the transactions personally.

The Arbiter further considers various factors, including, the nature of the complaint, activities involved, and the alleged shortfalls as further detailed below:

- The Complaint involves a series of payments made by the Complainant from his account held with Foris DAX, to unknown external wallets.

The Arbiter considers that **except as deliberated hereunder under Fiduciary Duty obligations**, no adequate and sufficient evidence has however emerged to substantiate the claim that the Service Provider could have itself prevented or stopped the transaction. This is also given the nature of the transactions which involved crypto assets, the type of service provided, and other reasons as outlined below.

²¹ Guidance 1.1.2, Title 1, '*Scope and Application*' of the '*Guidance on Technology Arrangements, ICT and Security Risk Management, and Outsourcing Arrangements*'.

- The exchange of fiat currency into crypto and withdrawals from one's crypto account, including withdrawals to an external wallet is part of the typical services provided to millions of users by operators in the crypto field such as the Service Provider.
- Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated nor emerged that the alleged fraudster, to whom the payment was made by the Complainant, was another *Crypto.com* App user and, thus, a client of the Service Provider in the first place. The transfer was rather indicated to have been done to an '*external wallet*' and hence the Service Provider had no information about the third party to whom the Complainant was transferring his crypto.
- The Complainant seems to have only contacted the Service Provider well after the last of the disputed transactions was already executed and finalised.²²

Once finalised, the crypto cannot be cancelled or reversed as specified in the Service Provider's Terms and Conditions of Use (and as typically indicated on various other internet sites).²³

Once a transaction is complete, and accordingly is not in a pending state, the crypto transaction cannot be cancelled or reversed by the Service Provider as provided for and warned in the Terms and Conditions of Foris DAX.

As indicated by the Service Provider, Clause 7.2(b) of its Terms and Conditions regarding the use of the *Crypto.com* App Services specifies that:

*'Crypto.com processes all Digital Asset Transfers according to the Instructions received from you and does not guarantee the identity of any recipient. You should verify all transaction information prior to submitting Instructions for a Digital Asset Transfer to Crypto.com as the Digital Asset Transfer may not be cancelled or reversed once processed ...'.*²⁴

²² Crypto transactions may be processed and completed within a few minutes or hours (as indicated on various websites following a general search on the internet).

²³ E.G. <https://www.chargebackgurus.com/blog/chargebacks-more-volatile-complex-than-cryptocurrency>

²⁴ P. 101

Based on the facts presented during the case, the Arbiter could not conclude that, **except as treated hereunder under the Fiduciary Duty obligations**, the Service Provider failed to adhere to any specific obligation, or any specific regulatory requirements applicable to it, nor did he find any infringement of the Terms and Conditions applicable in respect to the service offered.

In arriving at his decision, the Arbiter considered the following aspects:

i. AML/CFT Framework

Further to the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (Cap. 373) and Prevention of Money Laundering and Funding of Terrorism Regulations ('PMLFTR'), the Financial Intelligence Analysis Unit (FIAU) issued Implementing Procedures including on the '*Application of Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Funding of Terrorism Obligations to the Virtual Financial Assets Sector*'.

These are '*sector-specific Implementing Procedures [which] complement the Implementing Procedures – Part 1 [issued by FIAU] and are to be read in conjunction therewith*'.²⁵ Section 2.3 of these Implementing Procedures detail the monitoring and transaction records obligations of VFA licensed entities.

It is noted that the VFA Act, mainly imposes transaction monitoring obligations on the Service Provider for the proper execution of their duties for Anti Money Laundering ('AML') and Combating of Financing of Terrorism ('CFT') obligations in terms of the local AML and CFT legislative framework.

Failures of the Service Provider in respect of AML/CFT are not in the remit of the OAFS and should be addressed to the FIAU. In the course of these procedures, no such failure was indeed alleged.

The Arbiter shall accordingly not consider compliance or otherwise with AML/CFT obligations in this case.

ii. MiCA and the Travel Rule

²⁵ Page 6 of the FIAU's Implementing Procedures on the '*Application of Anti-Money Laundering and Countering the Funding of Terrorism Obligations to the Virtual Financial Assets Sector*'

As to the identification of the recipient of the funds, it is noted that MiCA²⁶ and Travel Rule²⁷ obligations which entered into force in 2025 and which give more protection to consumers by having more transparency of the owners of the recipient wallets were not applicable at the time of the events covered in this Complaint which happened in 2023. The Arbitrator shall thus not consider the MiCA provisions and Travel Rule obligations for the purposes of this Complaint.

iii. Other - Technical Note

A Technical Note (issued in 2025) with guidance on complaints related to pig butchering was recently published by the Arbitrator. In respect of VFA licensees, the Technical Note states as follows:

“Virtual Financial Assets Service Providers (VASPs)

VASPs should be aware that with the coming into force of Regulation (EU) 2023/1113 and the Travel Rule Guidelines²⁸ their obligation to have reliable records on the owners of external (unhosted) wallets increases exponentially as from 30 December 2024.

Arguments that they have no means of knowing who are the owners of external wallets which have been whitelisted for payments by their client will lose their force.

VASPs have been long encouraged by the Office of the Arbitrator (in decisions dating back from 2022),²⁹ for the devise of enhanced mechanisms to mitigate the occurrence of customers falling victims to such scams.

Furthermore, in the Arbitrator’s decisions of recent months there is a recommendation that VASPs should enhance their on-boarding processes

²⁶EU Directive 2023/1114 on markets in crypto assets <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/AUTO/?uri=celex:32023R1114>

²⁷ EU Directive 2023/1113 <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/AUTO/?uri=CELEX:32023R1113&qid=1740401464257&rid=1> and EBA Guidelines on Travel Rule <https://www.eba.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2024-07/6de6e9b9-0ed9-49cd-985d-c0834b5b4356/Travel%20Rule%20Guidelines.pdf>

²⁸ *Guidelines on information requirements in relation to transfers of funds and certain crypto-assets transfers under Regulation (EU) 2023/1113 - EBA/GL/2024/11 of 04/07/2024*

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32023R1113>

<https://www.eba.europa.eu/publications-and-media/press-releases/eba-issues-travel-rule-guidance-tackle-money-laundering-and-terrorist-financing-transfers-funds-and>

²⁹ Such as Case ASF 158/2021

where retail customers are concerned warning them that custodial wallets may be used by scammers promoting get-rich-quick schemes as a route to empty the bank accounts of retail customers and disappear such funds in the complex web of blockchain anonymous transactions.³⁰

Compliance with such recommendations or lack thereof will be taken into consideration in future complaint adjudications.³¹

The Arbiter will not apply the provisions of the Technical Notes retroactively.

Hence, for the avoidance of any doubt, the said Technical Note is not applicable to the case in question.

iv. Duty of Care and Fiduciary Obligations

It is noted that Article 27 of the VFA Act states:

“27. (1) *Licence holders shall act honestly, fairly and professionally and shall comply with the requirements laid down in this Act and any regulations made and rules issued thereunder, as well as with other legal and regulatory requirements as may be applicable.*

(2) *A licence holder shall be subject to fiduciary obligations as established in the Civil Code (CAP 16) in so far as applicable.*³²

Article 1124A (1)(a) of the Civil Code (Chapter 16 of the Laws of Malta), in turn further provides the following:

“1124A. (1) ***Fiduciary obligations arise in virtue of law, contract, quasi-contract, unilateral declarations including wills, trusts, assumption of office or behaviour whenever a person (the “fiduciary”) –***

(a) owes a duty to protect the interests of another person and it shall be presumed that such an obligation where a fiduciary

³⁰ Such as Case ASF 069/2024

³¹ Emphasis added by the Arbiter

³² Emphasis added by the Arbiter

acts in or occupies a position of trust is in favour of another person; ...³³

It is further to be pointed out that one of the High Level Principles outlined in Section 2, Title 1 ‘General Scope and High Level Principles’ Chapter 3, Virtual Financial Assets Rules for VFA Service Providers of the VFA Rulebook, that applied to the Service Provider at the time of the disputed transactions in 2022, provides that:

“R3-1.2.1 VFA Service Providers shall act in an ethical manner taking into consideration the best interests of their clients and the integrity of Malta’s financial system.”

It is also noted that Legal Notice 357 of 2018, Virtual Financial Assets Regulations, 2018 issued under the VFA Act, furthermore, outlined various provisions relevant and applicable to the Service Provider at the time. Article 14 (1) and (7) of the said Regulations, in particular, which dealt with the ‘*Functions and duties of the subject person*’ provided the following:

“14. (1) A subject person having the control of assets belonging to a client shall safeguard such assets and the interest of the client therein.

...

(7) The subject person shall make appropriate arrangements for the protection of clients' assets held under control and shall ensure that such assets are placed under adequate systems to safeguard such assets from damage, misappropriation or other loss and which permit the delivery of such assets only in accordance with the terms and conditions of the agreement entered into with the client.”

The Arbiter is of the view that for the general fiduciary obligations to apply in the context of the VFA ACT, there must be something which is truly out of the ordinary and which should really act in a conspicuous manner as an out of norm transaction which triggers the application of such general fiduciary duties.

³³ Emphasis added by the Arbiter

In the particular circumstances of this case, there is an event which is out of the ordinary to a degree which should have triggered the application of the fiduciary duties of the Service Provider, in particular:

1. In the AML document submitted,³⁴ Complainant had indicated that he planned annual transactions for a value in the range €20,001 – €60,000 and an annual income in the range of €20,001 – €40,000.
2. As explained in the Table (reproduced below), the first 3 payments in the space of 22 days had cumulatively already reached €50,000. When the 4th payment for €50,000 was transferred a month later, that should have triggered a few questions which the Service Provider did not make even though that payment was taking the cumulative payments in less than 2 months to 167% of the upper range of transactions indicated to be performed annually in the KYC process.
3. The 5th and 6th for further €63,500 bringing total cumulative payments to €163,500 in less than 6 months further accentuated the degree of the obligation to trigger questions which the Service Providers failed to make. Compared to an annual income higher range of €40,000, and an annual turnover higher range of €60,000, there was a clear case to pause payments and ask questions to Complainant the answers to which could have generated suspicion of fraud.

Date	Amount in EURO	Received by Service Provider
01.09.2023	15,000	p. 63
04.09.2023	10,000	p. 63
23.09.2023	25,000	p. 63
26.10.2023	50,000	p. 66
16.01.2024	35,000	p. 64

³⁴ P. 147

19.02.2024	28,500	p. 65
Total	163,500	
Recovered	15,000	p. 10
Net total	150,500	

For sake of clarity, the Arbitrator explains that whilst he is not the competent authority to investigate breaches related to AML/CFT obligations, as earlier explained in this decision, he is competent to investigate whether in the process of performing such obligations, the Service Provider failed in its fiduciary duty to warn its customers of reasonable suspicion of fraud/scams emerging in the process of conducting its regulatory duties.

The Arbitrator, when considering the particular circumstances of this case, considers that the Service Provider breached the duty of care and fiduciary obligations towards its customer, the Complainant. For this purpose, a copy of this decision is being sent to the Malta Financial Services Authority (Malta Regulator of CASPs) for their consideration of any regulatory action they may consider appropriate.

Decision

It is probable that the Complainant has, unfortunately, fallen victim of a scam done by a third party and no evidence resulted that this third party is in any way related to the Service Provider.

The Arbitrator notes that the crypto business is a relatively new area with no *harmonised regulation* existing at the time of the disputed transactions. An EU

regulatory framework was only recently implemented effective for the first time in this field in 2025.³⁵

Whilst this area of business had remained unregulated in certain jurisdictions, other jurisdictions like Malta, chose to regulate this field in the meantime and subject it to a home-grown national regulatory regime. While such regimes offer a certain amount of security to the consumer, since they are still relatively in their infancy, may not necessarily reflect the same standards and protections applicable in other sectors of the financial services industry which have long been regulated.

In fact, the Arbiter notes that in his complaint, the Complainant refers to provisions of the PSD 2,³⁶ as translated into French legislation, which whilst applying to Banks are not applicable to VFA licensees. He also at times wrongly addresses Foris as a bank which clearly, they are not.

A person who chooses to venture into the area of crypto which, itself, is typically a highly speculative and risky market, needs to also be highly conscious of the potential lack of, or lesser, consumer protection measures applicable to this area of business as compared to those found and expected in other established sectors of the financial services industry. EU regulatory bodies have issued various warnings to this effect over the past years.³⁷

In deciding what compensation, if any, would be appropriate in the particular circumstances of this case, the Arbiter has to consider whether the breach of fiduciary duty as above explained was the cause of the loss suffered by the Complainant and whether there are any other factors which are more dominant contributors to such loss.

³⁵ Provisional agreement has been reached on the EU's Markets in Crypto-Assets Regulation (MiCA) only in June 2022 - <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2022/06/30/digital-finance-agreement-reached-on-european-crypto-assets-regulation-mica/>

MiCA entered into force in 2025 – <https://www.financemagnates.com/cryptocurrency/can-mica-take-europe-to-the-crypto-promised-land/>

³⁶ EU Directive 2015 - 2366

³⁷ https://www.eiopa.europa.eu/document-library/other-documents/crypto-assets-esas-remind-consumers-about-risks_en
https://www.esma.europa.eu/sites/default/files/library/esa_2022_15_joint_esas_warning_on_crypto-assets.pdf

The Arbiter considers that there are more dominant causes for this loss, namely:

1. The Complainant's gross negligence and greed in making investments expecting quick high returns³⁸ without taking any advice or precautions.
2. Unwillingness to involve Banque Populaire in the claim for compensation.

Point 1. Speaks for itself.

Point 2. The obligations of fiduciary duty and transaction monitoring apply more forcefully to licensed banks than they apply to CASPs/VFA agents. Banks have a much longer relationship with their clients, and they have the data to spot unusual transactions and suspect fraud.

On the other hand, customer's relationship with a VFA is short without much historical data to enable early spotting of unusual patterns of payments.

Complainant's representative's statement that they excluded Banque Populaire from engagement in responsibility for this loss because "*it sufficiently fulfilled its due diligence*"³⁹ speaks volumes, indicating that the French Bank may have had effectively warned the Complainant to be careful of potential fraud and that he had ignored their warnings.

Banks can only avoid, under the provisions of PSD 2, to reimburse fraud payments even if authenticated and authorised by their client, if the client has shown gross negligence in the process. Unwillingness to proceed with claims against Banque Populaire indicates the likelihood of gross negligence by the Complainant possibly involving disregard of warnings given by the French Bank.

In terms of preamble 71 of the said PSD2,⁴⁰ the PSU (Complainant) shall be responsible for payment of any unauthorised payment transaction only up to a limit of €50, unless the PSU has acted fraudulently or with gross negligence.

³⁸ p. 110 speaks of open positions of €750,000

³⁹ P. 133

⁴⁰Preamble 71 of PSD 2 (**DIRECTIVE (EU) 2015/2366**) states:

In the case of an unauthorised payment transaction, the payment service provider should immediately refund the amount of that transaction to the payer. However, where there is a high suspicion of an unauthorised transaction resulting from fraudulent behaviour by the payment service user and where that suspicion is based

The Arbiter sympathises with the Complainant for the ordeal he may have suffered as a victim of a scam but, in the particular circumstances of this case, he cannot accept the Complainant's request for compensation as he has failed to provide any evidence of direct causation of the breaches of fiduciary duties to the loss incurred.⁴¹

In the absence of such evidence, there are indications that Complainant is forum shopping after exonerating his home bank that has much stronger fiduciary obligations. Declaring, without submitting any evidence that he exonerated other parties potentially responsible, could lead to undue enrichment if the Arbiter were to award any compensation without full information on the responsibility of other actors in the fraud journey.

Consequently, this complaint is not upheld, and no compensation is being ordered.

Each party is to bear its own legal costs of these proceedings.

**Alfred Mifsud
Arbiter for Financial Services**

on objective grounds which are communicated to the relevant national authority, the payment service provider should be able to conduct, within a reasonable time, an investigation before refunding the payer. In order to protect the payer from any disadvantages, the credit value date of the refund should not be later than the date when the amount has been debited. In order to provide an incentive for the payment service user to notify, without undue delay, the payment service provider of any theft or loss of a payment instrument and thus to reduce the risk of unauthorised payment transactions, the user should be liable only for a very limited amount, unless the payment service user has acted fraudulently or with gross negligence. In that context, an amount of EUR 50 seems to be adequate in order to ensure a harmonised and high-level user protection within the Union. There should be no liability where the payer is not in a position to become aware of the loss, theft or misappropriation of the payment instrument. Moreover, once users have notified a payment service provider that their payment instrument may have been compromised, payment service users should not be required to cover any further losses stemming from unauthorised use of that instrument. This Directive should be without prejudice to payment service providers' responsibility for technical security of their own products. (emphasis added by Arbiter)

⁴¹ This line of reasoning was included in decision AFS 042/2024, which decision was confirmed by Court of Appeal (inferior jurisdiction) case ref 35/2025 [file:///C:/Users/mifsa208/Downloads/28_01_2026-35_2025-158407%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/mifsa208/Downloads/28_01_2026-35_2025-158407%20(1).pdf)

Information Note related to the Arbiter's decision

Right of Appeal

The Arbiter's Decision is legally binding on the parties, subject only to the right of an appeal regulated by article 27 of the Arbiter for Financial Services Act (Cap. 555) ('the Act') to the Court of Appeal (Inferior Jurisdiction), not later than twenty (20) days from the date of notification of the Decision or, in the event of a request for clarification or correction of the Decision requested in terms of article 26(4) of the Act, from the date of notification of such interpretation or clarification or correction as provided for under article 27(3) of the Act.

Any requests for clarification of the award or requests to correct any errors in computation or clerical or typographical or similar errors requested in terms of article 26(4) of the Act, are to be filed with the Arbiter, with a copy to the other party, within fifteen (15) days from notification of the Decision in terms of the said article.

In accordance with established practice, the Arbiter's Decision will be uploaded on the OAFS website. Personal details of the Complainant(s) will be anonymised in terms of article 11(1)(f) of the Act.