

Consumer Protection and Platform Accountability in Indian E-Commerce: A Study with Reference to Judicial Precedents

Vidyadhara Vedha Varmat T¹., Dr. Rajendrakumar Hittanagi²

¹Assistant Professor R.L. Law College, Davanagere, Karnataka

²Assistant Professor (Selection Grade) Karnataka State Law University, Hubballi, Karnataka

Abstract—The fast growth of the E-Commerce in India has altered the traditional consumer markets where the platform based digital transactions have improved access, convenience and economic development. But this change has also brought about a serious legal issue on consumer protection and platform responsibility. The rising rates of flawed products, fake commodities, false adverts and the lack of sufficient redress of grievances has identified the fragilities of online trading platforms. The Parliament in turn responded by enacting the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and then drafted the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020, to update the regulatory system and deal with new challenges in the online economy. This research paper will conduct a doctrinal examination of the legislation that regulates consumer protection in Indian E-Commerce, especially platform liability. It looks at the examples of statutory regulations of product liability, unfair trade practices, disclosure requirements, and the authority of Central Consumer Protection Authority. The paper also examines the judicial precedents to compare the interpretations made by consumer forums and regulatory bodies and how they have applied to cases involving large E-Commerce platforms. The results suggest that there is a definite judicial move toward the old-fashioned view of the mere intermediary defence to a more accountable platform paradigm, particularly when the platforms have the control of the listing, payments, and delivery systems. Meanwhile, the liability is determined according to the adherence to statutory requirements in the 2019 Act and the 2020 Rules. The paper concludes that, although India has established a strong legal framework on digital consumer protection, enforcement, regulatory coexistence, and adaptation is still crucial to promote transparency, accountability, and confidence of the consumer in the emerging digital marketplace.

Index Terms—Consumer Protection; E-Commerce; Platform Liability; Consumer Protection Act, 2019; E-Commerce Rules, 2020; Judicial Precedents; Platform Accountability.

I. INTRODUCTION

The fast development of the E-Commerce has changed the character of trading and consumer transactions in India. With the growth of internet penetration, cell phones and systems of digital payment, consumers can now find it convenient and efficient to shop goods and services online. E-Commerce has led to economic growth, enhanced market accessibility, and consumer choice because India is one of the fastest-growing digital economies according to Internet and Mobile Association of India (IAMAI), where millions of consumers use online platforms to conduct their everyday transactions through Amazon, Flipkart, and Myntra¹.

The digital economy has however brought with it the effects of a new type of risk and vulnerability to consumers. Online transactions, unlike in the traditional trade, require minimal physical contacts with goods and sellers, and thus the consumer relies on the information provided by the platform. The implementation of consumer rights has also been observed to be difficult in digital market places due to the presence of defected products, counterfeit products, misleading advertisements and absence of effective grievance redressal mechanisms².

The other big trend in contemporary business is the rise of platform-based business models. E-Commerce services serve as facilitation agents between the

buyers and the third-party sellers including listing the products, transferring payments, logistics, and dispute resolution. These services tend to exert a lot of control to the transactions and at the same time claim intermediary immunity against legal liability³. The latter dual role has brought up significant legal concerns as to whether platforms should be held accountable to a greater degree than they are under the consumer protection law. To this, the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 were introduced to enhance the protection of consumers and regulate the digital commerce.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Indian consumer protection law has now undergone a transformation to keep up with the changing market conditions and with technological advancements. The initial academic literature was mostly concerned with the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 that had been enacted to gain easy, fast, and cheap redress to consumers. Avtar Singh⁴ noted that the Act represented a significant change to the traditional civil system of law by creating special-purpose quasi-judicial tribunals to resolve consumer disputes and acknowledging consumer rights to safety, information and redressing as important, though they were developed in the era of more traditional commerce and did not foresee the development of digital market places⁵.

The issues of legal challenges of E-Commerce emerged as researchers started looking at the legal issues that arise in the digital space. Pavan Duggal⁶ observed that E-Commerce also presented new types of contractual relationships between platforms, sellers, and consumers, and that frequently, platforms are able to describe themselves as middlemen, and are not liable in the event of bad products or flawed services. This approach of middleman behavior, as Karnika Seth⁷ argued, presented regulatory challenges since platforms are able to present themselves as intermediaries and avoid liability within the event of defective goods or defective services.

The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 has come to be broadly accepted in the academic discourse as a groundbreaking move in the field of Indian consumer

law as the 2019 Act statutorily acknowledges E-Commerce relationships, providing digital consumers with the same level of protection as offline consumers⁸. V.K. Aggarwal⁹ has described the introduction of the product liability as a historic move because of the fact that the 2019 Act recognizes E-Commerce transactions as equal before the law, offering equal protection to the digital consumers.

Alongside the 2019 Act, the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 is an important regulatory tool that was reviewed by academic literature. Vinod Dhall¹⁰ has also observed that the Rules would provide certain obligations to the E-Commerce platforms, such as provision of information about sellers, provision of grievance redressal mechanisms, and outlawing unfair trading practices, hence, instilled accountability and transparency in digital markets.

Another significant tool that has been studied by scholars to interpret consumer protection law in E-Commerce could also be judicial precedents. The involvement of platforms in transactions has been increasingly held accountable by the Indian courts and consumer commissions thereby limiting the intermediary immunity as highlighted by Anupam Sharma¹¹. These studies show that the judicial interpretation is instrumental in setting the limits of the platform liability.

Although the literature base is growing, research findings show that there is a lot left in terms of doctrinal exploration of the judicial precedents concerning the issue of platform accountability under Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020. Thus, a thorough doctrinal research study on the changing laws and judicial trend is still necessary to determine the level of consumer protection and the responsibility of the platform in terms of Indian E-Commerce. This gap is aimed to be filled with the present study to discuss the statutory provisions and judicial precedents to determine whether consumer protection law can be effective within the digital marketplace.

III. LEGAL FRAMEWORK GOVERNING CONSUMER PROTECTION IN E- COMMERCE

3.1. Consumer Protection Act, 2019

3.1.1. Background

The Parliament of India enacted the Consumer Protection Act, 1986¹² to offer consumers with an overall legal setup to help them safeguard their entitlements and serve as well as endorse the buyer welfare. Earlier, there was not an easy way out by consumers seeking redressal against their faulty goods, incomplete services and unfair trade practices. The conventional civil litigation was slow and expensive and that was a factor that discouraged consumers to seek justice. The Act came into the fore to initiate specific forums to resolve the dispute quickly and at minimum cost, to acknowledge six fundamental rights of the consumers which are the right to safety, information, choice, representation, redressal, and consumer education.

The Act established three levels of quasi-judicial adjudicatory bodies at the district, state and national stage namely the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum (DCDRF), State Commission as well as the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (NCDRC). It also gave these institutions the power to decide on complaints involving defective goods, inadequate services and unethical trade practices and to grant remedy in terms of recovery of compensation and injunction.

Due to the changing market practices, empowering technology, the rise of E-Commerce and online transactions and matters referred to the development of e commerce, the Indian Parliament passed an Act known as Consumer Protection Act, 2019¹³, which repealed the Act of 1986 and came into force on July 20, 2020. The modernized legal framework will protect the rights of consumers in the digital economy and regulate E-Commerce sites and marketplaces and against deceitful advertising according to the 2019 Act.

The main provisions in the 2019 Act are the creation of Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) with powers to conduct inquiries, product recalls and even class actions against unfair trades; amendment of extending the scope of consumer transactions to also include E-Commerce and lastly the acknowledgment of product liability claims awarded

to manufacturers, sellers and service providers. The Act also includes the use of mediation cells, increases the pecuniary limit of the forums, electronic filing of complaints, as well as, highly restrictive disclosures of endorsements and advertisements by celebrities and influencers.

Notably, section 94 of the Act also enabled the Central Government to issue Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 that govern obligations of E-Commerce enterprises, responsibility of unfair activity and grievance resolution services.

3.1.2. Regulatory regime

Consumer Protection Act, 2019 provides a broad legal framework that addresses E-Commerce transactions expressly in the regulatory framework. A consumer is any person who purchases goods, or otherwise avails services, through any form of offline, online or even electronic transaction including teleshopping or direct selling or multi-level marketing as defined in section 2(7)¹⁴. This has been included so that the digital buyers have equal rights and protection just like other traditional consumers do.

Section 2(16)¹⁵ includes a definition of the industry concept of E-Commerce as the buying or selling of goods or services, such as digital products, by means of a digital or electronic network. This definition captures the marketplace-based and inventory-based models, and therefore, encompasses all kinds of online commercial platforms under the Act.

The creation of a Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) under Section 10 to 27¹⁶ is one of the most important of the institutional innovations brought about by the Act. The CCPA has the authority to safeguard consumer rights, enquire into unfair commercial practices, pass instructions to recall unsafe products or services, direct refunds, and penalize misleading adverts particularly in online shopping and digital promotion.

Section 49(2)¹⁷ gives definition of product liability that shifts the liability to the manufacturing company, service providers, seller and in some cases even in the case of E-Commerce. In case a platform alters a product, does not reveal significant details, or directly contributes to the sale of damaged goods, it can be considered the object of consumer losses. This makes it possible to trace a higher percentage of

responsibility that online platforms could not hide behind the disguise of intermediaries.

More so, the Central Government under Section 94 has permission to make rules to stop unfair trade practices in E-Commerce. Under this power, the government published the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020¹⁸, which among other things, set out obligations of E-Commerce entities, transparency requirements and mandates consumer grievance redressal mechanisms as well as prohibit deceptive pricing or misleading reviews.

Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and ecommerce

Section	Provision	Relevance to E-Commerce
S 2(7) ¹⁹	Definition of “Consumer”	Includes consumers buying goods or services through digital/electronic means.
S 2(16) ²⁰	Definition of “E-Commerce”	Defines E-Commerce as buying/selling of goods/services via digital/electronic networks.
S 10–27 ²¹	Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA)	Investigates unfair trade practices and misleading ads in digital commerce; issues recall and refund orders.

S 49(2) ²²	Product Liability	Holds E-Commerce platforms liable for defective goods or lack of warnings/disclosure.
S 94 ²³	Rulemaking Power for E-Commerce	Authorizes government to frame rules for preventing unfair trade practices in E-Commerce.
—	Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020	Specifies duties, grievance redressal, data protection, and liability of E-Commerce entities and marketplaces.

3.1.3. Judicial precedents concerning Consumer Protection in E-Commerce

1. Naresh Kumar v. Snapdeal.com & Ors.²⁴

This case has laid the ground that e-commerce platforms cannot escape liability by asserting middle-man status when they are knowingly participating in transactions. The District Forum made Snapdeal

equally responsible along with the seller in terms of delivering faulty items, highlighting that the platform received funds and gained financial profit in terms of the sale. The Forum decided that said involvement gave rise to service relationship in the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 and the deficiency of redress was deficiency in service. The case is important in that it made it clear that those platforms which have transactional control over themselves have direct liability to consumers and cannot get away by just identifying themselves as facilitator.

2. Sanjay Aggarwal v. ANI Technologies Pvt. Ltd. (Ola Cabs).²⁵

The case applied the consumer protection principles to aggregator platforms. Ola was sued by the Forum on deficiency in service leading to inconvenience caused to the consumer due to cancellation of a booked ride. It dismissed the defence by Ola that it was a mere middleman and stressed that it controlled its operations through bookings, setting of the fare, and delivering the services. The ruling pointed out that digital aggregators offering technology-enabling services take the liability in the performance of the services and redressing grievances. The significance of this case is that it expanded the platform liability beyond goods-based e-commerce and declared the responsibility of service-based digital platforms, which strengthened the responsibility of app-based intermediaries.

3. Ajay Kumar v. Amazon.in²⁶.

This case strengthened the platform accountability in the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, especially with reference to counterfeit goods. The Forum found Amazon guilty of unfair trade practice and a lack of service in the promotion of selling fake products. It has focused on the fact that Section 94 and E-Commerce Rules provide that platforms have affirmative obligations to guarantee the authenticity and transparency of the sellers. The decision made it clear that marketplace platforms have a duty of due diligence and cannot avoid the liability of being intermediaries. This ruling has been of great importance in enhancing consumer protection by appreciating the immediate regulatory responsibilities of the e-commerce players to be taken under the contemporary consumer law paradigm.

4. Kavita Guleria v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd.²⁷.

The case reiterated the fact that the e-commerce sites that have an end-to end control over the transactions are liable to service failure. Myntra had been guilty in supplying a product of a different character than that one which it had indicated on the online platform and not providing a redress within a period of time. The Forum disallowed the intermediary defence of Myntra and underlined that it controlled the product listing, payment and delivery. The case determined that this type of operational engagement imposes a service directive on consumers. The significance behind this decision lies in the idea that platforms that take care of all the aspects involved in the transaction can no longer avoid liability in case of errors happening within the ecosystem they are operating.

5. Avnish Mittal v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd.²⁸.

The case raised the legal requirements that e-commerce sites had previously under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and E-Commerce Rules, 2020. Myntra was accused of supplying the product that was not in accordance with its description and was unable to give a refund promptly. The Forum provided that platforms need to provide proper product representation and redressal of grievances. It compensated as per Section 39, which strengthened the accountability of the platform. The case is noteworthy in that it showed the readiness of the judicial system to implement the statutory requirements and punish non-compliant platforms, which will enhance the trust of consumers in online trading.

6. Vijay Sraw v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd.²⁹.

This case solidified the fact that online trading systems have a responsibility to perform whenever they take an active part in the deal. The decision against Myntra was to pay damages due to supplying a wrong product and also not responding to the complaint. The Forum highlighted that Myntra engaged in the process of listing, payment processing, and logistics made it have direct responsibility to consumers. It opposed the platform taking the process of capping the responsibility to third party sellers. The ruling is significant as it clarified that the platforms that serve as the main consumer interface are not free of liability and they

need to make sure that the transactions performed on their platform are performed properly.

7. Naresh Chandra Patel v. Snapdeal³⁰

The case also enhanced the issue of platform liability in the Consumer Protection Act, 2019. The Snapdeal was found guilty of supplying defective goods and not engaging in the best redressal. The Forum highlighted that the platform helped in the transaction, received payments and regulated delivery thus creating legal responsibility to the consumer. It dismissed the intermediary defence of Snapdeal and refunded and compensated. The case is important as it restated the position that e-commerce sites that gain profits and handle transactions have direct legal liability and cannot get rid of the liability by referring to third party sellers.

3.2. Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020

3.2.1. Background

The future of E-Commerce in India describes the confluence of technology and trade and consumer law in a fast-digitizing economy. The legal framework involved in E-Commerce has evolved over the time in order to stabilize innovation, consumer protection and integrity of the market. The first significant measure to legalize online trade in India was the introduction of the Information Technology Act, 2000, which introduced the legal status of electronic records, digital signatures and electronic contracts.³¹ This Act primarily paved way to the digital commerce by legalizing online agreements and providing the liability cap in the face of such transactions.

This was occasioned by the rise of E-Commerce platforms that necessitated a consumer-focused model. Under Section 101(1) (zg), the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020³², became the first policy change regulating E-Commerce organizations, and unlike prior sector-neutral regulation, this change is platform-neutral. The Rules further defined the three separate models of E-Commerce, namely marketplace and inventory, and the obligations include pricing disclosure, seller identification, refunds and returns policies, as well as grievance redressal mechanisms. Also, the Rules prohibit unfair trade, such as the misrepresentation, price fixing and flash sales, which are aimed at deceiving consumers. The Rules also hold online

marketplaces accountable to ensure that sellers in their platforms comply with relevant laws, especially in terms of warranties, authenticity of products, and consumer rights

Simultaneously, the Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) Policy of the Foreign Exchange Management Act, 1999 governs cross-border ownership in E-Commerce organizations: the policy permits 100 percent FDI under the automatic route in the marketplace model and prohibits it in the inventory-based models in order to avoid monopolistic behavior and in favor of domestic retailers. Such regulatory distinction has informed the business models of key E-Commerce sites like Amazon, Flipkart and Snapdeal.

Follow-up policy consultations have also been dedicated to avoiding so-called dark patterns, misleading user interface patterns that exploit consumer choice. The Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) has also published guidelines in 2023, banning such practices, which is an indicator that India is moving towards a more inclusive digital marketplace ethics framework. accordingly, the regulatory environment of E-Commerce in India has been transformed into a multi-level structure combining technological, consumer, and trade concerns based on the general commercial law instead. Although the framework is dynamic, it shows the resolve of India to have a fair, transparent and accountable digital economy that protects both the consumers and lawful business.

3.2.2. Legal Framework

Key Provisions of the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 and Their Relevance to E-Commerce

Rule / Provision	Summary of the Provision	Relevance to E-Commerce
Rule 2 – Definitions ³³	Defines “E-Commerce entity,” “inventory E-Commerce entity,” and “marketplace E-Commerce entity.” Also clarifies what constitutes a “consumer” in the	Establishes the regulatory scope of the Rules by distinguishing between business models — ensuring clarity on who bears liability

	digital context.	in online transactions.
Rule 3 – Applicability ³⁴	Extends the Rules to all goods and services bought or sold over digital or electronic networks, including foreign entities offering goods or services to Indian consumers.	Ensures extraterritorial applicability, making foreign E-Commerce platforms accountable for transactions with Indian consumers.
Rule 4 – Duties of E-Commerce Entities ³⁵	Mandates entities to be registered as legal persons under Indian law, display legal information (address, contact, registration details), and appoint a grievance officer.	Promotes transparency, consumer awareness, and accountability in E-Commerce operations. Prevents shell or anonymous digital operators.
Rule 5 – Liabilities of Marketplace E-Commerce Entities ³⁶	Requires marketplaces to disclose details of sellers, ensure contract performance, and provide an unbiased platform. They must also establish a grievance redressal mechanism and ensure compliance with applicable laws by sellers.	Protects consumers by ensuring online marketplaces (like Amazon or Flipkart) act as responsible intermediaries and not mere facilitators.

Rule 6 – Liabilities of Inventory E-Commerce Entities ³⁷	Imposes obligations on platforms owning the inventory to deliver products as described, honor warranties, and ensure quality. Prohibits misleading	Directly binds inventory-based models to consumer protection norms and prevents deceptive
---	--	---

	advertisements.	practices in direct online sales.
Rule 7 – Grievance Redressal Mechanism ³⁸	Mandates appointment of a grievance officer, display of contact details, and resolution of consumer complaints within one month of receipt.	Institutionalizes consumer grievance redressal in E-Commerce, ensuring timely dispute resolution and platform accountability.
Rule 8 – Unfair Trade Practices Prohibited ³⁹	Prohibits manipulation of prices, false representation, misleading advertisements, and abuse of consumer data.	Protects consumers from predatory sales tactics, false discounting, and data exploitation common in digital marketplaces.
Rule 9 – Record Keeping and Transparency ⁴⁰	Requires entities to maintain records of complaints, orders, and product details. Also mandates disclosure of return, refund, exchange, warranty, and delivery policies.	Promotes transparent information sharing and facilitates consumer claims in disputes or regulatory investigations.
Rule 10 – Prohibition of Discriminatory Practices ⁴¹	Bars E-Commerce entities from discriminating among consumers or sellers and from indulging in “flash sales” designed to unfairly limit consumer choice.	Encourages fair competition, prevents algorithmic manipulation, and protects small sellers from being sidelined by dominant platforms.
Rule 11 – Compliance and Enforcement ⁴²	Mandates cooperation with government agencies and imposes penalties for non-	Empowers regulators to enforce compliance and ensures that

	compliance under	consumer
	the Consumer Protection Act, 2019.	interests remain central to E-Commerce governance.

The Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 have been made under Section 101(1)(zg) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and is the first exhaustive regulatory effort in India to regulate the behavior of online retail outlets and online payment gateways in a way that was just, responsible and protective of consumers in online markets. The fundamental purpose of the Rules is to bring parity between innovation and consumer welfare by bringing in commitments that are similar to those used on offline traders and therefore remove regulatory discrepancy between the physical and digital markets.

3.2.3. Judicial Precedents on Consumer Protection E-Commerce Rules 2020

1. Debasis Pattnaik v. Flipkart Internet Pvt. Ltd., Managing Director.⁴³

The case elucidated the applicability of the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020, and especially the part on disclosure by the sellers. The District Consumer Commission concluded that Flipkart was not at liberty to avoid the liability by excusing of the intermediary status where it did not reveal the information about sellers and helped to recover the grievances. In a case that involved Rule 5(2), the Commission stressed that marketplace platforms do have positive statutory requirements to provide transparency and traceability. The ruling is important as it has already settled that adherence to the E-Commerce Rules is obligatory and non-observation of the disclosure and grievance requirements amounts to the deficiency of the service, enhancing the responsibility of platforms in online consumer relations.

2. Sri Nishit Deogharia v. Flipkart Internet Pvt. Ltd.⁴⁴

The case emphasized the need to have contractual responsibility between e-commerce websites and sellers in accordance with the E-Commerce Rules, 2020. The Commission has stressed the fact that Rule

6(4)(a) stipulates that the platform must have enforceable contracts with the seller to guarantee quality of the products and protection of consumers. It has made it clear that platforms cannot be passive intermediaries but should involve aggressive oversight of sellers by legally binding the agreement. The ruling matters since it acknowledged that contractual compliance was a major aspect of platform accountability and strengthened that the inability to have an effective system of seller control could lead to the establishment of deficiency in the service provision under the Consumer protection law.

3. Mohit v. Amazon Seller Services Pvt. Ltd.⁴⁵

The case reiterated that marketplace platforms have to abide by statutory requirements in the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020. The Commission stressed that platforms must provide correct product listing, seller disclosure and redress of grievances. It rejected the issue on the notion that Amazon was not subject to scrutiny on the grounds of intermediary status, and made it clear that the act of complying with the E-Commerce Rules would constitute a section of the legal standard of care to the consumer. The case is important as it established a fact that the Rules create a direct legal liability on platforms and their actions are to be considered in terms of these legal obligations.

4. Kamlesh Kaur v. Amazon India⁴⁶

This case showed that platform liability is determined by meeting the statutory due diligence provisions. The Commission analyzed the activities of Amazon in the framework of Rule 5 of the E-Commerce Rules, 2020 and concluded that the company had complied with the requirements by offering the information about the sellers and ensuring the presence of the appropriate grievance procedure. This made Amazon not liable. The significance of this decision is that it has made it clear that platforms have statutory obligations but that they are not always liable. The disclosure and grievance redressal requirements can help sites avoid being held liable because they have done what the law requires, thus the need to balance consumer protection laws and platform management.

5. Cloutail India Pvt. Ltd. vs. Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA)⁴⁷

This case upheld the wide regulatory mandate of the Central Consumer Protection Authority in the e-commerce industry. The Appellate Authority did not find the capacity of the CCPA to issue orders on product recalls, money refund, and penalties in non-compliant goods sold over the internet. It underlined the fact that the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and E-Commerce Rules, 2020 permit proactive intervention by the regulators to safeguard consumers against unsafe products. The case is notable in that it increased enforcement of regulatory activities and showed that sellers and e-commerce organization may be severely punished in the case of their violation, thus making the digital marketplace more accountable and safer to consumers.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

An examination of the statutory clauses and case laws indicate that there is a major change in the legal perspective on the Indian E-Commerce in regard to platform accountability. Among the major outcomes of the current research is the fact that e-commerce sites can no longer be regarded as the mediators of business deals but are now considered to be participants in the business transactions. It was judged in cases like Naresh Kumar v. Snapdeal.com, Ajay Kumar v. Amazon.in, and Vijay Sraw v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd. have always held the platforms responsible where they have the control of listing product and processing payments and delivery. This is a judicial tendency to impose direct liability on platforms with deficiency of service and unfair trade practice.

The other significant observation is the enhanced legal framework by the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020. These legislations expressly acknowledge the E-Commerce dealings and provide affirmative liabilities to platforms such as; disclosure of sellers, redressal of grievances and transparency mandate. The ruling in the case Debasis Pattnaik v. It can be seen that failure to adhere to these statutory obligations might lead to liability as seen in Flipkart Internet Pvt. Ltd. In the same manner, the Cloutail India Pvt. Ltd. v. CCPA case emphasizes the active nature of the regulatory authorities in favoring

consumer protection by way of recalling the products and imposing fines.

Findings of the study also reveal that courts of law determine the liability of platforms in accordance with the scope of their participation and meeting the law. In *Kamlesh Kaur v. Amazon India*, the platform did not bear any liability since it had met its statutory obligations, meaning that they bear responsibility (conditionally) in case of non-compliance and not automatically. This is a moderate solution that allows consumer protection and fairness to platforms.

But there are still difficulties with enforcement, especially in situations with the third-party sellers and international transactions. Comprehensively, the research results demonstrate that the Consumer Protection Law in India has been developed to improve the responsibility of platforms, increase the rights of consumers, and create transparency in the online market and the role of the judiciary and regulators in the industry is significant in complying with this law.

V. CONCLUSION

The speed at which E-Commerce is expanding in India has radically changed the world of consumer market both in terms of opportunities as well as legal issues. This paper shows that the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 have substantially reinforced the legal environment of digital trade by explicitly identifying the existence of E-Commerce transactions and statutory responsibility in the platforms. The regulatory environment has been boosted by the introduction of the provisions concerning the product liability, unfair trade practices, and the creation of the Central Consumer Protection Authority.

In this paper, the judicial precedents have shown that the legal approach to the accountability of platforms changed significantly. The argument that platforms are only intermediaries has never been accepted in consumer forums, especially in situations where platforms take control over transactions, payment and delivery. Simultaneously, courts have taken a moderate course in shielding platforms against liability in cases where they did not neglect the statutory duties and acted in due diligence. These changes echo the changing of the consumer

protection law to answer to the digital markets.

In general, the paper finds that the current legal system has gone a long way to secure web consumers and hold players accountable. Nevertheless, it is necessary to implement it effectively, enforce it more, and keep it regulated regularly to solve new issues in the digital economy.

5.1. Recommendations

The proposal to have an even stronger compliance system is also recommended to enhance consumer protection in the E-Commerce environment so that the platforms have responsibility and can redress grievances as soon as possible. Central Consumer Protection Authority needs to be on the go to supervise the E-Commerce players and punish those who do not adhere. Stronger systems of verification of sellers and quality control of the products have to be established at the platforms to avoid fraud and fake sale. Moreover, the consumer awareness program must be undertaken to provide the users with their rights and recourse to the law. More co-ordination of the regulators and embracing of technological monitoring instruments will assist in bringing transparency, accountability and proper enforcement in the dynamic digital market.

VI. FOOT NOTES

1 Internet and Mobile Association of India, Digital in India Report 2023, available at: <https://www.iamai.in> (last visited March 1, 2026).

2 Karnika Seth, *Computers, Internet and New Technology Laws 389* (LexisNexis, Gurugram, 2019).

3 Aparna Viswanathan, *Cyber Law: Indian and International Perspectives 214* (LexisNexis, New Delhi, 2012)

4 Avtar Singh, *Law of Consumer Protection 15* (Eastern Book Company, Lucknow, 2018).

5 J.N. Barowalia, *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act 22* (Universal Law Publishing, New Delhi, 2016).

6 Pavan Duggal, *Cyber Law in India 412* (Wolters Kluwer, New Delhi, 2017)

7 Karnika Seth, *Computers, Internet and New Technology Laws 389* (LexisNexis, Gurugram, 2019).

8 Aparna Viswanathan, *Cyber Law: Indian and*

- International Perspectives 214 (LexisNexis, New Delhi, 2012).
- 9 V.K. Aggarwal, *Consumer Protection Law and Practice* 48 (Bharat Law House, New Delhi, 2021).
- 10 Vinod Dhall, *Competition Law Today: Concepts, Issues, and the Law in Practice* 267 (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2017).
- 11 Anupam Sharma, “Liability of E-Commerce Platforms under Consumer Protection Law,” 8 *Journal of Consumer Policy in India* 78, 85 (2021).
- 12 Consumer Protection Act, 1986, No. 68, Acts of Parliament, 1986 (India).
- 13 Consumer Protection Act, 2019, No. 35, Acts of Parliament, 2019 (India).
- Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020, G.S.R. 462(E), Gazette of India, July 23, 2020 (India).
- 14 Consumer Protection Act, 2019, 2(7), 35, Acts of Parliament 2019 (India).
- 15 IND Consumer Protection Act No 35, of 2019, Jean II, n. 2016, No. 35, Acts of the Parliament, 2019 (India).
- 16 Consumer Protection Act, 2019, SS 10 and ss. 27 No. 35, Acts of Parliament, 2019 (India).
- 17 Consumer Protection Act, 2019, 49(2), No. 35, Acts of Parliament, 2019 (India).
- 18 Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020, G.S.R. 462(E) Gazette of India, July 23, 2020 (India).
- 19 Consumer Protection Act, 2019 S 2(7)
- 20 Id. S 2(16)
- 21 Id. S 10-27
- 22 Id. S 49(2)
- 23 Id. S 94
- 24 Naresh Kumar v. Snapdeal.com & Ors., Consumer Complaint No. 26 of 2015, Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Delhi (2015).
- 25 Sanjay Aggarwal v. ANI Techs. Pvt. Ltd., Consumer Complaint No. 160/2018, Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, New Delhi (2018).
- 26 Ajay Kumar v. Amazon.in, Consumer Complaint No. 73 of 2020, Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Gurugram (2020).
- 27 Kavita Guleria v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd., Consumer Complaint No. 19 of 2021, Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Shimla (2021).
- 28 Avnish Mittal v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd., Consumer Complaint No. 87 of 2022, Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Gurugram (2022).
- 29 Vijay Sraw v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd., Consumer Complaint No. 41 of 2022, Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Chandigarh (2022).
- 30 Naresh Chandra Patel v. Snapdeal, Consumer Complaint No. 112 of 2021, Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Lucknow (2021).
- 31 Consumer Protection Act, No. 35 of 2019, S 101(1)(zg), INDIA CODE (2019).
- 32 Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD & PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION, G.S.R. 462(E) (July 23, 2020).
- 33 Id. at Rule 2(1)(b)–(d).
- 34 Id. at Rule 3.
- 35 Id. at Rule 4.
- 36 Id. at Rule 5
- 37 Id. at Rule 6
- 38 Id. at Rule 7
- 39 Id. at Rule 8
- 40 Id. at Rule 9
- 41 Id. at Rule 10
- 42 Id. at Rule 11
- 43 Debasis Pattnaik v. The Managing Director, Flipkart Internet Pvt. Ltd., Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Comm’n (Nov. 15, 2023).
- 44 Sri Nishit Deogharia v. Flipkart Internet Pvt. Ltd. Dist. Consumer Disputal Redressal Comm. (Oct. 28, 2024).
- 45 Mohit v. Amazon Seller Servs. Pvt. Ltd., Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Comm’n (Jan. 27, 2023).
- 46 Kamlesh Kaur v. Amazon India, Dist. Consumer Disputes Redressal Comm’n (Dec. 28, 2023).
- 47 Cloutail India Pvt. Ltd. v. Cent. Consumer Prot. Auth., CCPA Appeal No. 4 of 2022 (Nov. 4, 2022).

REFERENCES

Books

- [1] Avtar Singh, *Law of Consumer Protection* (Eastern Book Company, Lucknow, 2018).
- [2] Aparna Viswanathan, *Cyber Law: Indian and International Perspectives* (LexisNexis, New Delhi, 2012).
- [3] J.N. Barowalia, *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Universal Law Publishing, New Delhi, 2016).
- [4] Karnika Seth, *Computers, Internet and*

New Technology Laws (LexisNexis, Gurugram, 2019).

- [5] Pavan Duggal, *Cyber Law in India* (Wolters Kluwer, New Delhi, 2017).
- [6] S.N. Jain, *Legal Research and Methodology* (LexisNexis, New Delhi, 2016).
- [7] V.K. Aggarwal, *Consumer Protection Law and Practice* (Bharat Law House, New Delhi, 2021).
- [8] Vinod Dhall, *Competition Law Today: Concepts, Issues, and the Law in Practice* (Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2017).

Journal Articles

- [9] Anupam Sharma, "Liability of E-Commerce Platforms under Consumer Protection Law," 8 *Journal of Consumer Policy in India* 78 (2021).

Statutes

- [10] Consumer Protection Act, No. 68 of 1986, Acts of Parliament, 1986 (India).
- [11] Consumer Protection Act, No. 35 of 2019, Acts of Parliament, 2019 (India).

Rules and Regulations

- [12] Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020, G.S.R. 462(E), Gazette of India, July 23, 2020 (India).
- [13] Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, G.S.R. 462(E), July 23, 2020 (India).

Government Reports and Online Sources

- [14] Internet and Mobile Association of India, *Digital in India Report 2023*, available at: <https://www.iamai.in> (last visited March 1, 2026).

Cases

- [15] Consumer Protection Act Cases
- [16] Ajay Kumar v. Amazon.in, Consumer Complaint No. 73 of 2020, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Gurugram (2020).
- [17] Avnish Mittal v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd., Consumer Complaint No. 87 of 2022, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Gurugram (2022).

[18] Kavita Guleria v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd., Consumer Complaint No. 19 of 2021, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Shimla (2021).

- [19] Naresh Chandra Patel v. Snapdeal, Consumer Complaint No. 112 of 2021, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Lucknow (2021).
- [20] Naresh Kumar v. Snapdeal.com & Ors., Consumer Complaint No. 26 of 2015, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Delhi (2015).
- [21] Sanjay Aggarwal v. ANI Technologies Pvt. Ltd., Consumer Complaint No. 160 of 2018, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, New Delhi (2018).
- [22] Vijay Sraw v. Myntra Designs Pvt. Ltd., Consumer Complaint No. 41 of 2022, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Chandigarh (2022).

E-Commerce Rules Cases

- [23] Cloudtail India Pvt. Ltd. v. Central Consumer Protection Authority, CCPA Appeal No. 4 of 2022 (2022).
- [24] Debasis Pattnaik v. Managing Director, Flipkart Internet Pvt. Ltd., District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (2023).
- [25] Kamlesh Kaur v. Amazon India, District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (2023).
- [26] Mohit v. Amazon Seller Services Pvt. Ltd., District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (2023).
- [27] Sri Nishit Deogharia v. Flipkart Internet Pvt. Ltd., District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (2024).

Statutory Provisions Referenced

- [28] Consumer Protection Act, 2019, §§ 2(7), 2(16), 10–27, 35, 49(2), 94, 101(1) (zg).
- [29] Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020, Rules 2–11.