Algorithmic Price Discrimination in Indian Ride-Hailing Platforms: Evidence, Asymmetries, and Regulatory Gaps

Sujal Kumar Poddar
Student, Amity School of Business Kolkata, Amity University Kolkata

***Abstract*—The rapid digitization of India's urban mobility landscape, spearheaded by platform aggregators such as Uber and Ola, has fundamentally restructured the economic relationship between service providers and consumers. While these platforms ostensibly utilize dynamic pricing mechanisms to achieve allocative efficiency by balancing real-time supply and demand, emerging empirical evidence and regulatory scrutiny suggest a divergence toward algorithmic price discrimination (APD). This paper investigates the hypothesis that Indian ride-hailing platforms leverage information asymmetries and granular user data—including device telemetry, battery status, and historical purchase behavior—to extract maximum consumer surplus through personalized pricing, rather than merely clearing the market. Furthermore, it examines the "double-blind" nature of these algorithmic systems, where both riders and drivers are subjected to opaque governance structures that obscure the nexus between fare calculations and driver compensation. By synthesizing findings from the Competition Commission of India (CCI) market studies, investigative reports, and comparative analyses of global regulatory frameworks like the European Union's GDPR and the United States' FTC enforcement actions, this research highlights critical gaps in India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDPA), 2023, and the Competition Act, 2002. The study concludes that the current ex-post regulatory approach is insufficient to address the harms of surveillance capitalism in the gig economy and proposes a shift toward ex-ante algorithmic accountability, mandated data fiduciary responsibilities, and transparency audits to safeguard consumer welfare and labor rights in the Global South.**

***Keywords*—Algorithmic Price Discrimination, Dynamic Pricing, Ride-Hailing, Information Asymmetry, Competition Law, Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDPA), Gig Economy, Surveillance Capitalism, India.**

I. INTRODUCTION

The trajectory of urban transportation in India has undergone a seismic shift over the past decade, transitioning from a fragmented, state-regulated market of auto-rickshaws and taxi unions to a duopolistic digital marketplace governed by high-frequency algorithmic decision-making. The entry and subsequent dominance of platforms like Uber and Ola (ANI Technologies) were initially heralded as a triumph of market efficiency, promising to resolve the perennial issues of discovery and bargaining that plagued the traditional "hail-and-ride" model.[1] However, as these platforms have matured, the narrative has shifted from one of convenience to one of concern regarding the opacity of their operational mechanisms, particularly in the domain of pricing. The central thesis of this research is that the pricing strategies employed by these aggregators have evolved beyond simple supply-and-demand balancing into sophisticated forms of algorithmic price discrimination, facilitated by extreme information asymmetry and a regulatory vacuum.

1.1 Defining the Core Concepts: Dynamic Pricing vs. Algorithmic Price Discrimination

To rigorously analyze the Indian context, it is imperative to first disambiguate the terminology often conflated in public and policy discourse. Dynamic Pricing, in its orthodox economic definition, refers to the flexible adjustment of prices based on market-level variables that affect all market participants equally at a specific moment in time.[2] In the ride-hailing sector, this is commonly manifested as "surge pricing," where fares increase during periods of high demand (e.g., monsoon rains, festivals, or rush hours) or low supply to incentivize driver availability and allocate scarce rides to those with the highest immediate utility.[3] This model, while often unpopular, is theoretically defended on the grounds of allocative efficiency and market clearance.[5]

In stark contrast, Algorithmic Price Discrimination (APD)—often termed personalized pricing or surveillance pricing—represents a departure from market-clearing logic toward surplus extraction. APD involves the use of granular, individual-level data to estimate a specific consumer's reservation price or Willingness To Pay (WTP).[6] Unlike dynamic pricing, which reacts to external market conditions, APD reacts to internal user attributes. These attributes may include the user's device type (e.g., iPhone vs. Android), battery level, location history, past acceptance of surge fares, and even spending patterns across other linked services.[7] Under APD, two users standing at the same curb, requesting a ride to the same destination at the same moment, may be quoted significantly different fares based solely on the algorithm's profiling of their respective price elasticities.[9] This practice aligns most closely with first-degree price discrimination, a theoretical construct where the seller captures the entire consumer surplus, leaving the consumer with no net gain from the transaction.[6]

1.2 The Indian Ecosystem Context

The Indian ride-hailing market presents a unique laboratory for studying these phenomena due to its scale, duality, and socio-economic stratification. According to NITI Aayog, India's gig workforce is projected to expand to 23.5 million by 2029-30, with the platform economy forming a critical pillar of non-farm employment.[11] The sector is characterized by a "winner-takes-most" dynamic, effectively operating as a duopoly between Uber and Ola, with newer entrants like Rapido and BluSmart attempting to carve out niche segments.[13]

This market structure is superimposed on a landscape of stark inequality. On the demand side, the user base comprises a rapidly growing urban middle class and elite, for whom app-based transport has become an essential utility due to the inadequacies of public infrastructure. On the supply side, the workforce consists largely of low-skilled, often migrant labor, for whom gig work is not merely a supplemental income source—as is often the case in Western markets—but a primary livelihood.[14] This reliance exacerbates the power differential; drivers are managed not by human supervisors but by "algorithmic bosses" that dictate earnings, working hours, and incentives through opaque "nudges" and gamified targets.[16]

1.3 Thesis on Information Asymmetry

The core argument of this paper is that the operational model of Indian ride-hailing platforms is predicated on a structural "double-blind" information asymmetry that facilitates exploitation.

1. Consumer Blindness: Riders are oblivious to the actual supply-demand conditions justifying a surge. They cannot verify if a "2x" fare is due to a genuine shortage of cars or an artificial scarcity created by the algorithm to test their price tolerance.[18]
2. Driver Blindness: Drivers are equally blind to the total fare paid by the consumer. They are often not shown the destination or the full price before accepting a ride, and the "take rate" (the commission retained by the platform) is frequently obscured by complex incentive structures and levies.[20]

This asymmetry effectively decouples price from cost. In a transparent market, competition would drive prices down to the marginal cost of production. In the algorithmic "black box," prices are decoupled from the cost of service (fuel, time, vehicle depreciation) and are instead pegged to the maximum extractable value from the consumer, while driver payouts are minimized to the lowest acceptable threshold.[22] Current regulatory frameworks, including the Motor Vehicle Aggregator Guidelines 2025 and the Competition Act, 2002, have struggled to keep pace with these technological realities, leaving significant gaps in consumer protection and labor rights.[23]

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The academic and policy literature regarding algorithmic pricing and platform power has burgeoned in recent years, moving from optimistic assessments of the "sharing economy" to critical inquiries into "surveillance capitalism." This section synthesizes global theoretical frameworks with specific empirical studies from the Global South to contextualize the Indian experience.

2.1 Theoretical Underpinnings: From Dynamic Pricing to Algorithmic Collusion

Economic theory traditionally categorizes price discrimination into three degrees. First-degree (perfect) discrimination, where each consumer pays their exact WTP, was long considered theoretically possible but practically unfeasible due to the high cost of obtaining individual preference information. However, scholars like *Ezrachi and Stucke (2016)* and *Bar-Gill (2024)* argue that the advent of Big Data and machine learning has drastically reduced these information costs, making near-perfect price discrimination a reality in digital markets.[25] Algorithms can now infer WTP from proxies such as device telemetry, browsing history, and location data, allowing firms to segment markets with unprecedented granularity.[10]

In the specific context of ride-hailing, dynamic pricing is defended by platforms as a mechanism for "market equilibration." *Banerjee et al. (2015)* and *Hall et al. (2015)* provided early theoretical support, arguing that surge pricing acts as a signaling mechanism that increases driver supply during peak demand, thereby reducing wait times and improving overall welfare.[5] However, this "efficiency defense" is increasingly challenged by literature on "algorithmic collusion." *Calvano et al. (2020)* demonstrated through simulations that self-learning pricing algorithms, driven by profit-maximization reinforcement learning, can learn to collude tacitly without any human instruction. In an oligopolistic market like India's, these algorithms can independently discover that maintaining supra-competitive prices yields higher returns than price wars, effectively creating a "digital cartel".[28]

Furthermore, the "Hub-and-Spoke" cartel theory has been adapted to the digital age. Legal scholars argue that when multiple drivers (spokes) use the same algorithmic platform (hub) to determine prices, it constitutes a horizontal agreement to fix prices, even if the drivers never communicate with each other. While the CCI has previously dismissed this interpretation, noting the lack of explicit agreement, academic consensus is shifting toward recognizing the algorithm itself as the coordinating mechanism.[30]

2.2 The Global South Perspective: "Digital Taylorism" and Precarity

Literature emerging from the Global South, and specifically India, provides a critical counter-narrative to the "efficiency" discourse. The work of *Sreehari (2023)* and *Jha et al. (2025)* on Uber drivers in Kerala and Mumbai characterizes algorithmic management not as a neutral optimization tool but as a form of "digital Taylorism." This involves the decomposition of driving labor into minute, measurable tasks monitored by constant surveillance.[16] The algorithm exerts control through "nudges"—soft behavioral interventions—and strict penalties for non-compliance (e.g., deactivation for low acceptance rates), creating a paradox where drivers are nominally "independent contractors" but practically stripped of all autonomy.[32]

This dynamic is exacerbated by what *Zuboff* terms "surveillance capitalism," where the platform's accumulation of data ("behavioral surplus") is used to predict and modify human behavior. In India, this manifests in the "gamification" of labor. *Dermawan et al. (2020)* and *Wood et al. (2019)* describe how platforms use variable reinforcement schedules (e.g., "Complete 3 more rides to unlock ₹200") to keep drivers logged in during unsocial hours, often at wages below the minimum survival threshold when fuel and depreciation are accounted for.[34]

Social hierarchies also play a distinct role in the Indian platform economy. *TNI (2023)* and *Fairwork India* reports highlight that the gig economy re-entrenches existing caste, gender, and religious stratifications. Algorithmic bias can amplify these inequalities; for instance, female drivers may face safety-related algorithmic penalties for refusing rides in certain areas or at certain times, which the system interprets simply as "low acceptance".[36] The literature thus positions the Indian ride-hailing market not just as an economic phenomenon but as a socio-technical system of control that leverages digital precarity.

2.3 Regulatory Discourse: The Lag of Law

There is a consensus in legal scholarship that current regulatory frameworks are ill-equipped to handle the velocity and opacity of algorithmic decision-making. While the European Union has moved toward "ex-ante" regulation with the Digital Markets Act (DMA) to prevent gatekeeper abuse before it occurs [37], India's approach remains largely "ex-post," reacting to harms only after they have become widespread. The CCI's 2022 Market Study is frequently cited as a pivotal moment where the regulator acknowledged the "black box" problem but stopped short of enforcement, recommending "self-regulation" instead.[20]

Scholars like *Radhakrishnan and Sinha (2020)* at the Centre for Internet and Society argue that transparency is a necessary but insufficient condition for accountability. They propose that without "explainability" and the ability to audit the logic of the algorithm, mere disclosure of terms is meaningless.[39] This gap is particularly glaring in the context of the new Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDPA) 2023, which legal analysts criticize for lacking the specific "rights to automated decision review" found in GDPR Article 22, thereby leaving Indian subjects vulnerable to algorithmic determinism.[41]

III. EVIDENCE AND INDICATIVE PRICING PATTERNS

The theoretical possibility of algorithmic price discrimination in India is supported by a growing body of empirical evidence, ranging from regulatory probes to investigative journalism and crowdsourced data. While platforms consistently deny engaging in personalized pricing, attributing all fare variances to "marketplace dynamics" [22], the patterns observed suggest a more manipulative reality.

3.1 The "Battery Gate" and Device Discrimination

One of the most contentious and illustrative examples of potential surveillance pricing involves the use of device telemetry to assess a user's urgency. In 2025, a series of investigations and social media experiments in India brought this issue to the forefront.

- Battery Level Exploitation: An experiment conducted by a Delhi-based entrepreneur and subsequently verified by media outlets revealed a consistent pattern: a user with a critically low phone battery (e.g., <10%) was shown a significantly higher fare than a user with a full battery for the same trip request. The economic rationale inferred here is that a user with a dying phone has a severely limited "search capability"—they cannot risk their phone dying while checking a competitor app or walking to a bus stop. Their demand becomes highly price-inelastic, and the algorithm, detecting this vulnerability via the app's read-permission on battery status, adjusts the price to extract the maximum premium.[8] Although Uber denied using battery level as a pricing variable, the US Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has explicitly noted that such "surveillance pricing" based on urgency signals is technically feasible and prevalent in the digital economy.[26]
- Platform Discrepancy (iOS vs. Android): Further cementing the discrimination argument, multiple reports and widespread user complaints have documented that users booking via iOS (iPhones) are frequently charged higher fares than those using Android devices for identical routes at identical times. In the Indian market context, iPhone ownership is a strong proxy for higher purchasing power and affluence. A study reported by *The Times of India* found that searches conducted simultaneously on both platforms in Chennai consistently showed higher fares on iPhones.[43] This effectively acts as an "affluence tax" levied by the algorithm. Consequently, the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) issued notices to Ola and Uber in early 2025 regarding this "differential pricing," terming it a *prima facie* unfair trade practice violative of consumer rights.[44]

3.2 Surge Pricing Opacity and "Phantom" Demand

Surge pricing is ostensibly a function of high demand and low supply. However, evidence suggests that platforms manipulate these variables to create artificial scarcity or justify hikes that do not correlate with market reality.

- Disconnect between Rider Pay and Driver Receipts: A critical piece of evidence regarding the extractive nature of the algorithm is the divergence between the surge multiplier charged to the rider and the amount passed to the driver. The CCI's 2022 Market Study observed instances where the surge collected from the rider was not fully transferred to the driver. Instead of acting as a pass-through incentive to attract more cars (the stated purpose of surge), the platform retained a portion of the surge revenue, effectively treating it as a profit margin.[20]
- Artificial Scarcity and "Phantom Cars": Surveys conducted by *LocalCircles* indicate that 85% of users experience surge pricing, often in situations where driver availability appears adequate visually (e.g., many cabs are visible on the in-app map). Furthermore, 71% of users reported issues with drivers cancelling rides specifically to induce a surge or because the algorithmic payout offered to the driver was too low despite the high fare shown to the rider.[47] This suggests the algorithm may be optimizing for the platform's "take rate" rather than market clearance.
- The "Upfront Pricing" Black Box: Recent independent research on Uber's "upfront pricing" model in the UK and US—which shares the same tech stack as India—revealed that since the

shift from fixed rate cards to algorithmic pricing, the platform's take rate has increased while driver pay has become volatile and decoupled from distance/time. Drivers reported earning less for the same work, while riders paid more, with the algorithm capturing the difference.[21]

3.3 Drip Pricing and Dark Patterns

Beyond the base fare, platforms employ "dark patterns"—deceptive user interface designs—to inflate costs and coerce transactions.

- Drip Pricing: A comprehensive 2024 survey revealed that 59% of app-taxi users in India experienced "drip pricing," where hidden charges (such as "technology fees," "booking fees," or "priority access fees") are added at the very end of a transaction, after the user has already committed to the purchase.[19]
- Forced Action and Cancellation Loops: The same survey found that 90% of users experienced "forced action," where they were compelled to cancel a ride and pay a penalty because the driver refused to move or demanded cash. The platform's interface often hides the option to dispute these charges or makes the process prohibitively difficult (a pattern known as "interface interference").[19]
- Advance Tipping as Auctions: In 2025, the government was forced to ban the practice of "advance tipping" after it was found that platforms were using it as a de facto auction mechanism. Users were nudged to add a tip *before* the ride to secure a driver, effectively creating a tiered service where non-tippers were ignored by the allocation algorithm. This turned a gratuity into a mandatory surcharge for basic service reliability.[49]

3.4 Discrepancies in Regulatory Findings

There exists a notable contradiction in regulatory assessments. The Competition Commission of India (CCI) conducted a controlled experiment in its 2022 study to test for personalized pricing. The study concluded that it found *no evidence* of personalized pricing based on the specific parameters tested (which were limited) but acknowledged significant opacity and recommended transparency measures.[42] However, legal scholars have heavily criticized this finding, arguing that the CCI’s methodology was flawed because it conflated "personalized pricing" with "dynamic pricing" and failed to test for sophisticated, transient variables like battery level or real-time behavioral history.[38] The CCI's "clean chit" stands in sharp contrast to the more recent findings of the CCPA in 2025, which found sufficient grounds to launch a detailed probe into differential pricing based on mobile operating systems, highlighting the evolving nature of the evidence.[46]

IV. ANALYSIS: INFORMATION ASYMMETRY AND EXPLOITATION

The core theoretical problem in the Indian ride-hailing market is not merely the existence of high prices, but the structural information asymmetry that allows platforms to decouple price from value. This section analyzes this asymmetry through three dimensions: consumer exploitation, labor subordination, and market distortion.

4.1 The "Black Box" of Consumer Pricing

In a traditional competitive market, prices serve as transparent signals of value and scarcity. In the algorithmic ride-hailing market, the price is a "black box" output derived from proprietary code that no participant can audit.

- Decoupling from Cost: The marginal cost of a ride (fuel, vehicle wear, driver time) is relatively static. However, algorithmic pricing introduces extreme volatility that is uncorrelated with these costs. When a platform charges higher prices based on behavioral data (e.g., a user's history of accepting high surges), it is extracting consumer surplus. This moves the market from a uniform price mechanism to a discriminatory one, approaching first-degree price discrimination.[6] The "battery gate" example illustrates this perfectly: the cost to provide the ride has not changed, but the price has skyrocketed because the user's ability to refuse has collapsed.[8]
- Manipulation of Perception: Platforms use interface design to manipulate consumer perception of scarcity. "Phantom cars" on maps or "high demand" notifications serve to lower the consumer's price elasticity. The consumer has no independent way to verify if demand is actually high or if the supply is artificially constricted. This lack of verification capability constitutes a market failure.[19]
- The Trust Deficit: The LocalCircles survey finding that 74% of users believe drivers cancel due to opaque payment modes highlights a breakdown in trust. The algorithm creates a "prisoner’s dilemma" where both driver and

rider suspect the other (or the platform) of cheating, leading to suboptimal outcomes like cancellations and extended wait times.[48]

4.2 Algorithmic Management as Labor Control

For drivers, the algorithm acts as an unaccountable, omnipresent manager that governs their economic existence.

- Algorithmic Wage Discrimination: Research from the Worker Info Exchange and studies on the Global South indicate that platforms engage in "algorithmic wage discrimination," paying different drivers different amounts for the same work based on their acceptance history. If a driver is predicted to accept a lower fare (based on their historical behavior of chasing targets or being close to a bonus threshold), the algorithm offers them less. This mirrors the consumer-side discrimination, effectively squeezing the driver's surplus as well.[21]
- Information Hiding: Drivers are frequently not shown the drop-off location or the full fare before accepting a ride. This information blindness prevents them from making rational economic decisions. When they do discover the destination or fare is unprofitable (e.g., a long trip to a remote area with no return fare), they cancel. The platform then penalizes them for this cancellation, locking them into a cycle of coercion where they must accept blind risks to maintain their standing.[34]
- Gamification and Precarity: The use of "incentives" (e.g., "Complete 10 rides for ₹500 bonus") is a form of behavioral modification. It forces drivers to work longer hours and accept unprofitable rides to unlock the bonus. This "all-or-nothing" gamification shifts the financial risk from the platform to the driver; if the driver completes 9 rides and the 10th is unavailable, they lose the entire bonus.[17]

4.3 Structural Dominance and Network Effects

The duopoly of Ola and Uber creates a "winner-takes-most" dynamic that entrenches these abusive practices.

- Barriers to Entry: The massive data advantage possessed by incumbents acts as a formidable barrier to entry. A new competitor cannot replicate the efficiency of the pricing algorithm without the historical data on traffic, demand, and user behavior accumulated over a decade. This data concentration reinforces the dominance of the existing players.[54]
- Tacit Collusion: As noted in the OECD and CCI reports, self-learning algorithms in an oligopoly can learn to coordinate prices without human intervention. If Algorithm A raises prices and Algorithm B follows suit (signaling), they reach a higher equilibrium price than in a competitive market. This "algorithmic collusion" is difficult to prosecute under current laws because there is no explicit agreement between human executives, yet the outcome is indistinguishable from a cartel.[28] The CCI's dismissal of "hub-and-spoke" allegations in the past failed to account for this autonomous learning capability.[30]

V. COMPARATIVE REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS

Regulating algorithmic pricing requires a multi-pronged approach involving competition law, consumer protection, and data privacy. A comparative analysis reveals that India’s framework is currently fragmented and reactive compared to the more comprehensive, rights-based approaches emerging in the EU and the rigorous enforcement seen in the US.

5.1 European Union: The Gold Standard of Ex-Ante Regulation

The European Union employs a robust, ex-ante regulatory model that prioritizes fundamental rights and proactively defines the obligations of digital gatekeepers.

- GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation): Article 22 is a cornerstone provision that grants individuals the right *not* to be subject to decisions based solely on automated processing that produce legal or similarly significant effects. This article has been successfully leveraged by drivers in Amsterdam (the *Uber vs. Driver* cases) to challenge "robo-firings" and demand transparency regarding how their pay and performance are calculated. The courts have ruled that drivers are entitled to access the logic behind the algorithmic management.[55]
- Digital Markets Act (DMA): The DMA designates large platforms as "gatekeepers" and imposes specific, non-negotiable obligations. It explicitly prohibits self-preferencing and mandates data portability. Crucially, it prevents gatekeepers from using data collected from business users (drivers) to compete against them

or to manipulate market conditions. This targets the information asymmetry directly.[37]

- Uber Data Transfer Fine: In 2024, the Dutch Data Protection Authority fined Uber €290 million for transferring European drivers' data to the US without adequate safeguards, demonstrating the EU's willingness to enforce data sovereignty and protect gig workers' privacy rights.[59]

5.2 United States: Enforcement through Existing Agencies

The US lacks a comprehensive federal data protection law but relies on vigorous enforcement by federal agencies like the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) under existing statutes.

- FTC Surveillance Pricing Inquiry: In 2024, the FTC launched a major inquiry into "surveillance pricing," issuing 6(b) orders to companies to disclose how they use consumer data for personalized pricing. The FTC is treating this as a potential violation of the FTC Act's prohibition on "unfair and deceptive acts or practices." The agency has explicitly flagged the use of non-public data (like battery level or location history) to set prices as a priority enforcement area.[7]
- Antitrust and Consumer Protection Actions: The FTC and the Department of Justice (DOJ) have sued platforms like Lyft for misleading earnings claims, securing multi-million dollar settlements. For instance, Lyft was fined $2.1 million for inflating potential driver earnings in advertisements, a practice deemed deceptive under consumer protection laws.[61]

5.3 India: A Fragmented & Evolving Landscape

India's regulatory response is a patchwork of sector-specific guidelines and general laws, which often leaves gaps for algorithmic exploitation.

5.3.1 Competition Commission of India (CCI)

The CCI is the primary market regulator but faces structural limitations.

- Market Studies vs. Enforcement: The CCI's 2022 study on the cab aggregator industry was a landmark document that acknowledged the opacity of algorithms. However, it lacked enforcement teeth, resulting only in recommendations for "self-regulation" and transparency, which platforms have largely ignored.[38]
- Digital Competition Bill (Proposed): This proposed bill aims to introduce ex-ante regulation similar to the EU's DMA, identifying "Systemically Significant Digital Enterprises" (SSDEs) and imposing obligations to prevent self-preferencing and data misuse. However, it is yet to be enacted, leaving the regulator to rely on the slower, ex-post Competition Act of 2002.[24]
- Legal Challenges: The Competition Act struggles with the concept of "collective dominance." Since Uber and Ola are distinct legal entities, proving they are "jointly dominant" or effectively colluding via algorithms is legally challenging without evidence of explicit human conspiracy.[38]

5.3.2 Consumer Protection (CCPA)

The Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) has emerged as a proactive enforcer in 2024-25.

- Notices on Differential Pricing: The CCPA's issuance of notices to Ola and Uber regarding the iOS vs. Android pricing discrepancy signals a significant shift. It indicates that the regulator is willing to treat algorithmic price discrimination as an "unfair trade practice" under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019.[44]
- Ban on Dark Patterns: The CCPA has issued specific guidelines preventing "dark patterns" like false urgency ("Only 2 drivers left!") and interface interference, directly targeting the manipulative design elements of ride-hailing apps.[62]

5.3.3 Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDPA), 2023

India's new privacy law contains critical gaps regarding algorithmic governance.

- Lack of Automated Decision Rights: Unlike GDPR Article 22, the DPDPA *does not* provide data principals with a specific right to opt-out of automated decision-making or profiling. This is a fundamental weakness that prevents users from legally challenging algorithmic pricing or drivers from contesting automated deactivations.[41]
- Legitimate Uses Exemption: The Act allows data processing for "legitimate uses," which are broadly defined. This could potentially give platforms legal cover to process behavioral data for "business purposes" (i.e., pricing optimization) without obtaining explicit, granular consent from the user.[41]

5.3.4 Motor Vehicle Aggregator Guidelines (2020 & 2025)

- Surge Caps: The 2020 guidelines initially capped surge pricing at 1.5x the base fare. The 2025 revision raised this cap to 2x during peak hours, effectively legalizing higher surges. While intended to increase supply, without transparency mechanisms, this simply expands the range for potential price discrimination.[65]
- Driver Share Mandate: The guidelines mandate that drivers receive 80% of the fare. However, enforcement is weak because the "fare" is calculated dynamically by the platform. Platforms often deduct "service fees," "taxes," and "levies" from the gross amount *before* calculating the 80% split, effectively obfuscating the actual percentage and retaining a higher share.[67]

Table 1: Comparative Regulatory Analysis of Algorithmic Governance

Feature	European Union (GDPR/DMA)	United States (FTC/Sectoral)	India (DPDPA/CCI/MV Act)
Automated Decision Rights	Strong: Right to human review and explanation (GDPR Art. 22).	Moderate: Sector-specific (e.g., credit scoring), focusing on bias.	Weak: No explicit right to opt-out or review automated decisions in DPDPA.
Surge Pricing Regulation	Market-driven but subject to strict transparency and anti-gouging norms.	Market-driven; FTC monitors for "deceptive" pricing practices.	Capped: Regulated caps (1.5x - 2x base fare) via MV Guidelines.
Personalized Pricing	Regulated: Must be disclosed to the consumer (Omnibus Directive).	Under Investigation: FTC "Surveillance Pricing" inquiry underway.	Under Investigation: CCPA probe on iOS/Android differential pricing.
Data Portability	Mandated: DMA requires real-time portability for business users.	Limited: No federal mandate; some state laws (CCPA/CPRA).	Limited: DPDPA focuses on fiduciary duties rather than portability rights.
Gig Worker Status	Presumption of Employment: Platform Work Directive aims to reclassify.	Independent Contractor: Mostly, though challenged by Dept of Labor.	Aggregator Model: Social Security Code 2020 recognizes them as a distinct category, but implementation is pending.

VI. POLICY AND REGULATORY RECOMMENDATIONS

To address the nuances of algorithmic price discrimination and the structural information asymmetry in the Indian ride-hailing sector, a "light-touch" regulatory approach is insufficient. The following recommendations propose a structural shift toward algorithmic accountability, drawing on global best practices and local requirements.

6.1 Mandating Algorithmic Audits and Explainability

The "black box" nature of pricing must be dismantled to ensure market fairness.

- Regulatory Audits: The CCI should establish a specialized "Digital Markets Unit" equipped with the technical expertise to conduct algorithmic audits. This does not require making proprietary code public, which would compromise trade secrets. Instead, regulators should have the power to "sandbox" and test the algorithms using synthetic data to verify inputs and outputs. This would allow them to detect if discriminatory variables (like battery level or device type) are being used to determine fares.[68]

- Explainability for Users: Platforms should be required to disclose the *parameters* determining a specific fare in real-time. A user should know if they are being charged a surge due to "high demand," "adverse weather," or "low driver supply." Generic "surge" labels should be disallowed. If a price is personalized based on user history, this must be explicitly stated, as required in the EU.[26]

6.2 Strengthening Data Protection for Economic Rights

The DPDPA, 2023 needs to be bolstered through rules and amendments to specifically protect economic interests in the digital age.

- Prohibiting Discriminatory Inputs: The use of non-essential device telemetry—such as battery level, phone model, charging status, and app usage history—for the purpose of pricing should be explicitly banned. These data points serve as proxies for urgency and affluence, facilitating unfair profiling. Pricing algorithms should be restricted to service-related variables (distance, time, traffic, aggregate supply/demand).[8]
- Right to Inference Access: Users and drivers should have the legal right to access not just the raw data held about them, but the "inferences" drawn from that data (e.g., "high willingness-to-pay score," "churn risk score," or "driver acceptance profile"). This transparency is essential for individuals to understand how they are being categorized and treated by the platform.[57]

6.3 Standardizing the Definition of "Fare" and "Commission"

To resolve the driver-rider information asymmetry and restore trust:

- Unified Digital Receipts: The Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH) should mandate a standardized digital receipt format. This receipt must show the driver exactly what the rider paid (gross fare) and show the rider exactly what the driver received (net earnings). This transparency would immediately expose excessive "take rates" and prevent platforms from hiding margins under obscure fee headings.[21]
- Strict Enforcement of the 80-20 Split: The 20% cap on platform commission (as per MV Guidelines) must be enforced on the *gross* fare paid by the consumer. Platforms should be prohibited from deducting "booking fees," "technology fees," or other levies *before* calculating the driver's share. The definition of "fare" must be all-inclusive to prevent accounting loopholes.[65]

6.4 Ex-Ante Regulation for Systemic Platforms

India should expedite the enactment of the Digital Competition Bill to bring large aggregators under ex-ante supervision.

- Designating SSDEs: Uber and Ola should be designated as Systemically Significant Digital Enterprises (SSDEs) due to their market dominance. This would subject them to higher standards of conduct, including prohibitions on self-preferencing and data silo requirements.[24]
- Data Silos and Purpose Limitation: SSDEs should be prevented from cross-utilizing data from other services (e.g., food delivery, financial services, or credit apps) to influence ride-hailing pricing without explicit, separate consent. This prevents the leveraging of dominance in one sector to extract surplus in another.[70]
- Interoperability: Promoting open protocols like the Open Network for Digital Commerce (ONDC) can reduce the duopoly’s power. By allowing drivers and riders to connect across platforms through open APIs, the network effect lock-in can be broken, fostering genuine competition based on service quality and price rather than data monopoly.[17]

VII. CONCLUSION

The transformation of India's ride-hailing sector into an algorithmic marketplace has delivered undeniable convenience and scale, yet it has come at the significant cost of transparency, fairness, and trust. The evidence presented in this report indicates that the dynamic pricing mechanisms employed by platforms like Uber and Ola have evolved into sophisticated systems of algorithmic price discrimination. By leveraging "double-blind" information asymmetries, these platforms extract surplus from consumers through surveillance pricing—using proxies like battery levels and device types—and exploit drivers through opaque algorithmic management and wage discrimination.

While India has made strides with the Motor Vehicle Aggregator Guidelines 2025 and the active enforcement of the Consumer Protection Act by the CCPA, the overall regulatory framework remains reactive and fragmented. The gap between the technological capability of platforms to micro-target prices and the state's capability to audit these practices is widening. The clean chit given by the CCI in 2022 stands in stark contrast to the findings of the CCPA in 2025, highlighting the urgent need for a cohesive, technically grounded regulatory strategy.

For India to ensure a fair digital economy that benefits all stakeholders, it must move beyond simple price caps and symptom management. The path forward requires a fundamental restructuring of data rights and market governance. Mandating that the algorithms governing public infrastructure like urban transport are auditable, explainable, and accountable is not an impediment to innovation but a prerequisite for a just market. Without such structural interventions, the "efficiency" of the gig economy will continue to be subsidized by the precarity of the driver and the algorithmic exploitation of the consumer.

Author's Biography

Sujal Kumar Poddar is pursuing a Bachelor of Business Administration (Finance) at Amity University Kolkata. He is an EPAYF Fellow at the Impact and Policy Research Institute (IMPRI) and a UN DESA SDG Advocate, with research interests in sustainable finance, public policy, and development economics. He has participated in the Harvard College Project for Asian and International Relations (HPAIR) and is an Aspire Leaders Program Fellow. Sujal also serves as the Founder of God's Wish Foundation and Co-Founder of Femrage, initiatives focused on social development and gender equity. He is based in Kolkata, West Bengal.

REFERENCES (INTEGRATED)

[38]Competition Commission of India. (2022). *Market Study on Cab-Aggregator Industry: With Special Emphasis on Surge Pricing*.

[68]Competition Commission of India. (2024). *Market Study on Artificial Intelligence and Competition*.

[42]Khaitan & Co. (2022). *Indian Competition Authority releases its market study findings on the Taxi and Cab aggregator industry*.

[2]Nected.ai. (2025). *Dynamic Pricing vs. Price Discrimination*.

[6]Centro Competencia. (2025). *Algorithmic Pricing Discrimination*.

[3]Botta, M., & Wiedemann, K. (2020). *To Discriminate or Not to Discriminate? Personalized Pricing in Online Markets*.

[10]Bar-Gill, O. (2024). *Algorithmic Price Discrimination: When Demand Is a Function of Both Preferences and (Mis)perceptions*.

[4]Zeithammer, R. (2024). *Algorithmic Pricing: Implications for Consumers, Managers, and Regulators*.

[1]Rohit, P. G. (2018). *A Comparative Study of Ola and Uber in India*.

[23]Ministry of Road Transport and Highways. (2025). *Motor Vehicle Aggregator Guidelines 2025*.

[65]Sanda Law Offices. (2020). *Guidelines for Cab Aggregators: Licensing and Pricing Controls*.

[67]Lok Sabha Secretariat. (2025). *Question AU3020: Clarification on Surge Pricing Rationale*.

[41]IISPPR. (2024). *AI and Data Protection Challenges in Automated Decision-Making*.

[64]Latham & Watkins. (2023). *India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 vs. the GDPR*.

[63]Usercentrics. (2023). *India Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDP Act)*.

[16]Sreehari, T. (2023). *Algorithmic Management and Labour Autonomy in the Gig Economy: A Case Study of Uber Drivers in Kerala*.

[31]Jha, D., Jha, S. K., & Guha, A. (2025). *A Critical Evaluation of the Indian Ride-Hailing Ecosystem and its Impact on Decent Work Standards*.

[34]Dermawan, A., et al. (2020). *Asymmetric Information of Sharing Economy: A Case of Uber*.

[5]Banerjee, S., et al. (2015). *Pricing in Ridesharing Platforms: A Queueing-Theoretic Approach*.

[27]Hall, J., et al. (2021). *The Effects of Dynamic Pricing on Ride-Hailing Platforms*.

[15]Journal of Digital Economy. (2025). *The gig economy and the evolving nature of work in India*.

[14]The Asia Foundation & Sattva. (2022). *India's Gig Economy: Challenges and Opportunities in a Post-COVID World*.

[36]Transnational Institute (TNI). (2023). *Platform Power and the Future of Work*.

[32]Clausius Press. (2025). *Algorithmic Control and the Autonomy Paradox in the Gig Economy*.

[33]Springer Nature. (2024). *Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Gig Economy: Balancing Flexibility and Well-being*.

[35]Singh Publication. (2024). *Gig Economy in India: Employment, Policy, and Platform Realities*.

[55]European Union. *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Article 22*.
[25]McSweeny, T., & O'Dea, B. (2017). *Implications of Algorithmic Pricing for Antitrust Enforcement*.
[9]OECD. (2018). *Personalised Pricing in the Digital Era*.
[7]McCarter & English. (2024). *FTC Surveillance Pricing Study Findings*.
[60]Federal Trade Commission. (2025). *FTC Surveillance Pricing Study Indicates Wide Range of Personal Data Used*.
[37]German Marshall Fund. (2022). *EU's Digital Markets Act and Digital Services Act*.
[58]Didomi. (2023). *EU Digital Markets Act (DMA): Everything You Need to Know*.
[29]Monopolkommission. (2018). *Algorithms and Collusion*.
[28]Calvano, E., et al. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Pricing, and Collusion*.
[8]The Economic Times. (2025). *Low Phone Battery, Higher Uber Fares: Delhi Entrepreneur's Shocking Discovery*.
[22]The Guardian. (2025). *Second Study Finds Uber Used Opaque Algorithm to Dramatically Boost Profits*.
[66]NDTV. (2025). *Ola, Uber Can Hike Peak-Hour Surge Pricing Up to 2x Base Fare Under New Rules*.
[46]Inc42. (2025). *Govt Orders Detailed Probe Into Ola, Uber Over Differential Pricing*.
[49]ETV Bharat. (2025). *Government Bans Advance Tipping on Ride-Hailing Apps After Months of Backlash*.
[71]IJFMR. (2025). *Game Theory and Pricing Strategies of Uber and Ola in the Indian Ride-Hailing Market*.
[47]LocalCircles. (2022). *App Taxi Survey 2022*.
[19]LocalCircles. (2024). *Taxi Aggregator Drip Pricing and Dark Patterns Survey*.
[48]The Indian Express. (2025). *Ride Cancellations in App-Based Taxi Services Rise to 82%.*
[44]BRICS Competition Centre. (2025). *CCPA Issues Notices to Ola, Uber Over Differential Pricing*.
[43]The Times of India. (2025). *CCPA Notice to Ola, Uber Over Alleged Fare Disparity on iPhone, Android*.
[72]Internet Freedom Foundation. *Organizational Mission and Project Panoptic*.
[73]IT for Change. (2022). *Policy Roundtable Report on NITI Aayog's Gig Economy Report*.
[17]Centre for Responsible AI (CERAI), IIT Madras. (2024). *The Algorithmic-Human Manager: AI, Apps, and Workers in the Indian Gig Economy*.
[51]Center for Democracy & Technology. (2024). *The Need for Transparency in AI and Algorithmic Rideshare Platform Decisions*.
[40]Centre for Internet and Society. (2020). *Towards Algorithmic Transparency*.
[18]Scribd (Uploaded Document). *Competition Law and Cab Aggregators in Bangalore*.
[38]NLSIU. (2023). *A Tail Without the Head: A Critique of the CCI Market Study on Cab Aggregators*.
[20]Khaitan & Co. (2022). *Key Findings of CCI Market Study on Taxi Industry*.
[26]Al Jazeera. (2025). *Surveillance Pricing: Why You Might Be Paying More Than Your Neighbour*.
[30]Wolters Kluwer. (2018). *Algorithms and Collusion: Has the CCI Got It Wrong?*
[21]Worker Info Exchange. (2024). *New Research Exposes Deepening Exploitation of Uber Drivers by Algorithmic Pay*.
[49]ETV Bharat. (2025). *Government Bans Advance Tipping on Ride-Hailing Apps*.
[45]DD News. (2025). *CCPA Issues Notices to Ola, Uber Over Differential Pricing*.
[56]Worker Info Exchange. (2024). *Drivers in UK and Europe Set to Sue Uber for Unfair Pay Set by Algorithm*.
[57]Institute of Employment Rights. (2024). *Uber Ordered to Pay Nearly €600,000 in Penalties in Algorithmic Transparency Case*.
[59]European Data Protection Board. (2024). *Dutch SA Imposes Fine of 290 Million Euro on Uber*.
[61]Federal Trade Commission. (2024). *FTC Takes Action to Stop Lyft from Deceiving Drivers*.
[39]Centre for Internet and Society. (2020). *Towards Algorithmic Transparency Policy Brief*.
[11]NITI Aayog. (2022). *Policy Brief: India's Booming Gig and Platform Economy*.
[53]PSF Research. (2024). *Connected But Unprotected: Reimagining Decent Work for India's Gig Workers*.
[12]ILO. (2022). *Expansion of the Gig and Platform Economy in India*.
[41]IISPPR. (2024). *AI and Data Protection Challenges in Automated Decision Making*.
[54]Competition Commission of India. (2024). *Market Study on Artificial Intelligence and Competition*.
[69]Khaitan & Co. (2024). *CCI Issues Landmark Study on AI and Competition*.
[24]Journal of Antitrust Enforcement. (2025). *Digital Competition Bill 2024 Analysis*.
[70]Obhan & Associates. (2024). *Report of the Committee on Digital Competition Law 2024*.
[62]Lok Sabha Secretariat. (2024). *Unfair Trade*

Practices by Ride Hailing Platforms.

WORKS CITED

[1] 598 A STUDY OF SURGE PRICING BY UBER AND OLA LEGAL IN INDIA, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://euroasiapub.org/wp-content/uploads/ESS56Dec18RohitPG.pdf

[2] Dynamic Pricing vs. Price Discrimination: Which is Right for Your Business? - Nected, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.nected.ai/us/blog-us/dynamic-pricing-vs-price-discrimination

[3] Algorithmic Price Discrimination and Consumer Protection - Technology and Regulation, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://techreg.org/article/download/11305/13441/24393

[4] Algorithmic Pricing: Implications for Consumers, Managers, and Regulators - UCLA Anderson Review, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://anderson-review.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Algo-Pricing-zeithammer.pdf

[5] Dynamic Pricing in Ridesharing Platforms - ACM SIGecom, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://sigecom.org/exchanges/volume_15/1/BANERJEE.pdf

[6] Algorithmic Price Discrimination as Exploitative Abuse under Article 102 TFEU - (CeCo) UAI, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://centrocompetencia.com/algorithmic-pricing-discrimination/

[7] FTC Surveillance Pricing Study Finds Personal Data Is Used to Set Individualized Consumer Prices and Generate Higher Profits for Companies, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.mccarter.com/insights/ftc-surveillance-pricing-study-finds-personal-data-is-used-to-set-individualized-consumer-prices-and-generate-higher-profits-for-companies/

[8] 'Low phone battery, higher Uber fares': Delhi entrepreneur's shocking discovery sparks debate over fare manipulation - The Economic Times, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://m.economictimes.com/news/new-updates/low-phone-battery-higher-uber-fares-delhi-entrepreneurs-shocking-discovery-sparks-debate-over-fare-manipulation/articleshow/117387009.cms

[9] Personalised Pricing in the Digital Era – Note by the United States, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/attachments/us-submissions-oecd-2010-present-other-international-competition-fora/personalized_pricing_note_by_the_united_states.pdf

[10] Algorithmic Price Discrimination When Demand Is a Function of Both Preferences and (Mis)perceptions, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://lawreview.uchicago.edu/print-archive/algorithmic-price-discrimination-when-demand-function-both-preferences-and

[11] India's Booming Gig and Platform Economy - NITI Aayog, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2023-06/Policy_Brief_India%27s_Booming_Gig_and_Platform_Economy_27062022.pdf

[12] Expansion of the Gig and - Platform Economy in India - International Labour Organization, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ilo.org/media/526416/download

[13] Consumers say top issues with Ola & Uber are drivers cancelling rides - LocalCircles, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.localcircles.com/a/press/page/taxi-aggregator-survey-2024

[14] India Challenges and Opportunities in the gig economy in a post-COVID world - The Asia Foundation, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://asiafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/India-Challenges-and-Opportunities-in-the-gig-economy-in-a-post-COVID-world.pdf

[15] The gig economy and the evolving nature of work in India: Employment, policy, and platform realities in the age of convenience - ResearchGate, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/397331805_The_gig_economy_and_the_evolving_nature_of_work_in_India_Employment_policy_and_platform_realities_in_the_age_of_convenience

[16] Algorithmic Management: Impacts on Labour Autonomy in Gig Platforms with Special Reference to Uber - CJR, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://cjrjournal.in/Uploads/Files/CJRD23_2_SREEHARI.pdf

[17] Gig Economy Report Final - Centre for Responsible AI, accessed on December 31,

2025, https://cerai.iitm.ac.in/docs/Gig-Economy-Report-Final.pdf
[18] Competition Law | PDF | Pricing - Scribd, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.scribd.com/document/872576800/competition-law
[19] 59% of app-based taxi users are regularly experiencing Drip Pricing - LocalCircles, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.localcircles.com/a/press/page/taxi-aggregator-drip-pricing
[20] indian competition authority releases its market study findings on the taxi and cab aggregator industry - UPDATE, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.khaitanco.com/sites/default/files/2022-09/Ergo_16092022.pdf
[21] New Research Exposes Deepening Exploitation of Uber Drivers by Algorithmic Pay, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.workerinfoexchange.org/post/new-research-exposes-deepening-exploitation-of-uber-drivers-by-algorithmic-pay
[22] Second study finds Uber used opaque algorithm to dramatically boost profits - The Guardian, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2025/jun/25/second-study-finds-uber-used-opaque-algorithm-to-dramatically-boost-profits
[23] Motor Vehicles Aggregator Guidelines - Morth, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://morth.nic.in/sites/default/files/circulars_document/MV-Aggregators-Guidelines-2025%20-%20English%20and%20Hindi.pdf
[24] Full article: The Indian draft digital competition bill and report: a critical perspective, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/24730580.2025.2506958
[25] The Implications of Algorithmic Pricing for Coordinated Effects Analysis and Price Discrimination Markets in Antitrust Enforceme - Federal Trade Commission, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_statements/1286183/mcsweeny_and_odea_-_implications_of_algorithmic_pricing_antitrust_fall_2017_0.pdf
[26] 'Surveillance pricing': Why you might be paying more than your neighbour - Al Jazeera, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2025/10/15/surveillance-pricing-why-you-might-be-paying-more-than-your-neighbour
[27] Real-Time Pricing Optimization for Ride-Hailing Quality of Service - IJCAI, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ijcai.org/proceedings/2021/0515.pdf
[28] Artificial intelligence, algorithmic pricing and collusion - Federal Trade Commission, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/public_events/1494697/calzolaricalvanodenicolopastorello.pdf
[29] Algorithms and collusion - Monopolkommission, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.monopolkommission.de/images/HG22/Main_Report_XXII_Algorithms_and_Collusion.pdf
[30] Algorithms and Collusion: Has the CCI got it wrong? | Kluwer Competition Law Blog, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://legalblogs.wolterskluwer.com/competition-blog/algorithms-and-collusion-has-the-cci-got-it-wrong/
[31] A Critical Evaluation of the Indian Ride-Hailing Ecosystem and its Impact on Decent Work Standards - IDEAS/RePEc, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://ideas.repec.org/a/spr/ijlaec/v68y2025i1d10.1007_s41027-025-00557-1.html
[32] Algorithmic Control in the Gig Economy: Power Reconfiguration, Labor Plight, and Management Implications, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.clausiuspress.com/assets/default/article/2025/06/20/article_1750406642.pdf
[33] Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Gig Economy: Balancing Flexibility and Well-Being, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/394152528_Autonomy_and_Algorithmic_Control_in_the_Gig_Economy_Balancing_Flexibility_and_Well-being
[34] Asymmetric Information of Sharing Economy - Metadata etc., accessed on December 31, 2025, https://metadataetc.org/gigontology/pdf/Dermawan%20et%20al.%20-%202020%20-%20Asymmetric%20Information%20of%20Sharing%20Economy.pdf
[35] Drivers of the 'New Age Service Economy': Gig Workers in India, accessed on December 31,

2025, https://ssjar.singhpublication.com/index.php/ojs/article/view/298

[36] Platform Power and the Future of Work : Labor Frontiers in the Cross-Border Digital Economy - Transnational Institute (TNI), accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.tni.org/en/article/platform-power-and-the-future-of-work

[37] The EU's Digital Markets Act and Digital Services Act - German Marshall Fund, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.gmfus.org/news/eus-digital-markets-act-and-digital-services-act

[38] A Non-'Competition' Law Market Study on Cab-Aggregator Industry Devoid of Consideration of Its Cons - Scholarship Repository, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://repository.nls.ac.in/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1294&context=ijclp

[39] Towards Algorithmic Transparency - Centre for Internet and Society, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://cis-india.org/internet-governance/blog/towards-algorithmic-transparency

[40] Towards Algorithmic Transparency - Centre for Internet and Society, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://cis-india.org/internet-governance/algorithmic-transparency-pdf

[41] AI AND DATA PROTECTION: CHALLENGES IN AUTOMATED DECISION-MAKING - IISPPR, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://iisppr.org.in/ai-and-data-protection-challenges-in-automated-decision-making/

[42] Indian Competition Authority releases its market study findings on the Taxi and Cab aggregator industry - Khaitan & Co, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.khaitanco.com/thought-leaderships/Indian-Competition-Authority-releases-its-market-study-findings-on-the-Taxi-and-Cab-aggregator-industry

[43] CCPA notice to Ola, Uber over alleged differential pricing - The Times of India, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/centre-issues-notice-to-ola-uber-over-alleged-fare-disparity-on-iphone-android/articleshow/117483222.cms

[44] CCPA Issues Notices to Ola, Uber Over Differential Pricing - BRICS Competition, accessed on December 31, 2025, http://bricscompetition.org/news/ccpa-issues-notices-to-ola-uber-over-differential-pricing

[45] CCPA issues notices to Ola, Uber over differential pricing; Apple also under scrutiny, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://ddnews.gov.in/en/ccpa-issues-notices-to-ola-uber-over-differential-pricing-apple-also-under-scrutiny/

[46] Govt Orders Detailed Probe Into Ola, Uber Over Differential Pricing - Inc42, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://inc42.com/buzz/govt-orders-detailed-probe-into-ola-uber-over-differential-pricing/

[47] 45% App Taxi consumers faced over 1.5 times rates in 'Surge Pricing' - LocalCircles, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.localcircles.com/a/press/page/app-taxi-survey-2022

[48] Ride cancellations in app-based taxi services rise to 82% in 2025 from 75% in 2023: Survey, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/bangalore/ride-cancellations-in-app-based-taxi-services-rise-to-82-in-2025-from-75-in-2023-survey-10102402/

[49] Government Bans Advance Tipping On Ride-Hailing Apps After Months Of Backlash - ETV Bharat, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.etvbharat.com/en/technology/government-bans-advance-tipping-on-ride-hailing-apps-after-months-of-backlash-enn25122902611

[50] Impact of dynamic pricing and driver behavior on service quality in ride-hailing operations: a study of Bangalore's urban dynamics - Emerald Publishing, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.emerald.com/tqm/article/doi/10.1108/TQM-03-2025-0135/1305121/Impact-of-dynamic-pricing-and-driver-behavior-on

[51] The Need for Transparency in AI and Algorithmic Rideshare Platform Decisions, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://cdt.org/insights/the-need-for-transparency-in-ai-and-algorithmic-rideshare-platform-decisions/

[52] The Plight of Platform Workers Under Algorithmic Management in Southeast Asia, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/04/the-plight-of-platform-workers-under-algorithmic-management-in-southeast-asia?lang=en

[53] Connected but Unprotected: Reimagining Decent Work for India's Urban Gig Workers, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://psfresearch.com/connected-but-unprotected-reimagining-decent-work-for-indias-urban-gig-workers/
[54] Market study on Artificial Intelligence and Competition - CCI, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.cci.gov.in/images/marketstudie/en/market-study-on-artificial-intelligence-and-competition1759752172.pdf
[55] Art. 22 GDPR – Automated individual decision-making, including profiling - General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), accessed on December 31, 2025, https://gdpr-info.eu/art-22-gdpr/
[56] Drivers in UK and Europe set to sue Uber for unfair pay set by algorithm, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.workerinfoexchange.org/post/drivers-in-uk-and-europe-set-to-sue-uber-for-unfair-pay-set-by-algorithm
[57] Uber ordered to pay nearly €600,000 in penalties in algorithmic transparency case - IER, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ier.org.uk/news/uber-ordered-to-pay-nearly-e600000-in-penalties-in-algorithmic-transparency-case/
[58] EU Digital Markets Act (DMA): everything you need to know - Didomi, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.didomi.io/blog/eu-digital-markets-act-dma-everything-you-need-to-know
[59] Dutch SA imposes a fine of 290 million euro on Uber because of transfers of drivers' data to the US, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.edpb.europa.eu/news/news/2024/dutch-sa-imposes-fine-290-million-euro-uber-because-transfers-drivers-data-us_en
[60] FTC Surveillance Pricing Study Indicates Wide Range of Personal Data Used to Set Individualized Consumer Prices, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2025/01/ftc-surveillance-pricing-study-indicates-wide-range-personal-data-used-set-individualized-consumer
[61] FTC Takes Action to Stop Lyft from Deceiving Drivers with Misleading Earnings Claims, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2024/10/ftc-takes-action-stop-lyft-deceiving-drivers-misleading-earnings-claims
[62] GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS RAJYA SABHA UNSTAR, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://sansad.in/getFile/annex/268/AU1804_3nauzT.pdf?source=pqars
[63] India Digital Personal Data Protection Act (DPDP Act) Overview - Usercentrics, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://usercentrics.com/knowledge-hub/india-digital-personal-data-protection-act-dpdpa/
[64] India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act 2023 vs. the GDPR: A Comparison - Latham & Watkins LLP, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.lw.com/admin/upload/SiteAttachments/Indias-Digital-Personal-Data-Protection-Act-2023-vs-the-GDPR-A-Comparison.pdf
[65] Guidelines for cab aggregators: Licensing and Pricing controls ! - S&A Law Offices, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://sandalawoffices.com/guidelines-for-cab-aggregators-licensing-and-pricing-controls/
[66] New Rules For Ola, Uber On Peak-Hour Pricing, Cancellations Announced - NDTV, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/ola-uber-can-aggregators-can-hike-peak-hour-surge-pricing-charge-up-to-2x-base-fare-new-rules-indrive-rapido-8811210
[67] GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MINISTRY OF ROAD TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3020 ANSWERED ON 7TH AUGUST, 2025 M, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://sansad.in/getFile/loksabhaquestions/annex/185/AU3020_Aa6ZS6.pdf?source=pqals
[68] CCI publishes a market study on Artificial Intelligence and Competition - Economic Laws Practice, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://elplaw.in/wp-content/uploads/2025/10/CCI-publishes-a-market-study-on-Artificial-Intelligence-and-Competition.pdf
[69] CCI Issues Landmark Study on AI and Competition - King Stubb & Kasiva, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://ksandk.com/competition/cci-issues-landmark-study-on-ai-and-competition/
[70] COMPETING IN DIGITAL MARKETS: THE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIGITAL COMPETITION LAW – 2024 - Obhan & Associates, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.obhanandassociates.com/blog/competing-in-digital-markets-the-report-of-the-committee-on-digital-competition-law-2024/
[71] To What Extent Has Game Theory Explained the Pricing Strategies of Ride-Hailing Firms Like Uber and Ola in India (2015–2023)? - IJFMR, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/4/51662.pdf
[72] Internet Freedom Foundation - Wikipedia, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet_Freedom_Foundation
[73] A report based on the Policy Roundtable held on NITI Aayog's report titled 'India's Booming Gig and Platform Economy - IT for Change, accessed on December 31, 2025, https://itforchange.net/sites/default/files/2023-01/Event%20Report-%20NITI%20Aayog.pdf