Journal of International Commercial Law and Technology
Print ISSN: 1901-8401

Website: https://www.jiclt.com/

Article

Digital Platforms and Competition Law: Balancing Innovation with Market Regulation in International Commerce

Article History:

Name of Author:
Dr. Uttiya Basu[1], Dr. Ranvijay Singh[2], Dr. Komal Krishan Mehta[3], Dr. Sachin Bhardwaj[4], Dr. Vivek Goyal[5] and Khushbu Chudasama[6]

Affiliation:
[1]*Assistant Professor Department of Commerce Adamas University, West Bengal*
[2]*Assistant Professor Department of Law Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar University,Agra*
[3]*Assistant Professor Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar Department of Laws, Guru Nanak Dev University Regional Campus, Ladhewali, Jalandhar-144007 (Punjab) India*
[4]*Assistant Professor SVKM'S Narsee Monjee Institute of Management Studies, deemed to be University, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, India*
[5]*Associate Professor Graphic Era Hill University*
6*Assistant Professor Dr Subhash University*

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Uttiya Basu

How to cite this article:
Uttiya Basu, *et, al,* Digital Platforms and Competition Law: Balancing Innovation with Market Regulation in International Commerce. *J Int Commer Law Technol*. 2026;7(1):333–339.

Received: *20-11-2025*
Revised: *16-12-2025*
Accepted: *04-01-2026*
Published: *23-01-2026*

Abstract: The skyrocketing emergence of the digital platform has made a fundamental overhaul of international trade that has brought about comparatively new efficiencies in the process and have at the same time tested the principles of the global competition law. This research paper is a critical analysis of the conflict between the promotion of technological innovation and introduction of sound market regulation. As the digital giants-often referred to as the gatekeepers-use network effects and large data repositories coupled with vertical integration to solidify their presence in the markets, more and more, traditional ex-post regulatory frameworks have been perceived to be inadequate. In this paper, we discuss the paradigm shift of ex-ante regulations, which is the case with the European Union Digital Markets Act (DMA) and the United Kingdom Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Act. The paper uses a comparative analysis of the European Union, the United States and emerging economies such as India to assess the landmark case law on Google, Amazon and Microsoft. It claims that even though stringent regulation is needed to avoid killer acquisitions and self-preferencing, excessive regulation would turn off the same innovation that leads to consumer welfare. The paper will end with a recommendation of a harmonized international regulatory approach that will allow maintaining the balance between the contestable market and dynamic incentive to technological development.

Keywords: Digital Platforms, Competition Law, Antitrust, Market Regulation, Innovation, International Commerce, Gatekeepers.

INTRODUCTION

The digital economy has grown to be the mainstream of the global market as opposed to a niche market in the modern global market. Amazon, Google, Meta, and Alibaba do not just compete in the market, but are the architects of the market, the middlemen, and, in many cases, the main rivals in the market. This doubled act of being a referee and a player offers a distinct challenge to competition law, and requires a shift out of the paradigms of the industrial era.

The Infrastructural Shift: Platforms as Market Architects

The digital platforms have become the basic human needs of the 21 st century. These firms are market architects and do not simply host transactions, but they set the rules, technical standards and visibility algorithms that govern them. To a small business in international trade, getting de-platformed or shunned by an algorithm is tantamount to being completely refused as a business. This provides platforms with an unprecedented gate keeping capacity, where they dominate the funnel between businesses and their customers around the world.

The Conflict of Interest: Referee vs. Player

The key conflict of the contemporary antitrust is caused by the vertical integration of a platform. A platform that is a referee determines the prices and regulations to all third parties sellers. But when the same platform is one of the players- by introducing its own competing products (such as Amazon Basics) it sets up a conflict of interest.

- **Self-Preferencing:** Major platforms usually use their algorithms to prioritize their products over their competitors.
- **Data Exploitation:** The non-public, high velocity data that third-party competitors produces is used by platform to identify lucrative niche and roll out their own copycat products with lower exposure.

The Logic of Multi-Sided Markets and Network Effects

In contrast to classic markets, digital platforms are multi-sided markets in which value is created due to complicated network effects. These implications cause a winner-takes-all game which renders it almost impossible to enter a market that has already been tipped to an incumbent.

- **Direct Network Effects:** The more users on a given side, the more valuable the service (e.g. social networks).
- **Indirect Network Effects:** The value of one side of the market increases due to the increase in the other side (e.g. more developers on the Android Play Store mean more phone users, and reverse also).

LITERATURE REVIEW: EVOLUTION OF ANTITRUST THOUGHT

The academic discourse of digital competition has gone through a radical change and has followed three different waves that manifest the recapitulation of the various interpretations of market power in the internet era.

The First Wave: The Efficiency Era and Consumer Welfare

Originally, the intellectual and legal mainstream was dominated by the Chicago School of thought, first propounded by scholars such as Robert Bork (1978).1 The Chicago School was characterized philosophically by the Consumer Welfare Standard according to which the only pro-competitive conduct by a company was lower prices or greater efficiency. The rise of the digital giants was mostly hailed during this time. Since the services such as search engines and social media were provided at a 0 price point, the classic models of economics, including the SSNIP test (Small but Significant and Non-transitory Increase in Price) showed that no harm was being inflicted on consumers. Researchers claimed that these platforms were by definition useful, and the scale of them was the outcome of the high efficiency and not a predatory phenomenon.

The Second Wave: The Structuralist Revival and New Brandeisians

The second wave came as an outright refutation of this price-oriented approach, most notoriously expressed by Lina Khan (2017) in the Antitrust Paradox of Amazon.3 In this school of thought, the present-day antitrust model is ill-equipped to deal with the gatekeeper status of contemporary platforms. Khan stated that possessing the means of controlling the infrastructure of trade, the logistics and the payment systems, cloud hosting, etc., platforms may resort to predatory pricing that may appear to be efficiency, but, in reality, will kill the motivational aspect of the market structure, i.e., its democratic health.5 This is where he emphasizes that the concentration of the economic power and data is the threat to the healthy functioning of the market, making it to look like efficiency instead of the destruction of the competitive structure in the market."

The Third Wave: Algorithmic Power and Behavioral Exploitation

The existing literature is a third wave that is incorporating behavioral economics and data science into the law discussion. This period is dominated by authors, such as Ariel Ezrachi and Maurice Stucke (2016), and their writings emphasize how Virtual Competition is manipulated by technological tools that are invisible to the traditional law.6 The new theories of harm include:

- **Algorithmic Tacit Collusion:** This is whereby pricing bots attain a supra-competitive price as they learn to shadow one another without any human agreement ever being sealed.
- **Behavioral Discrimination:** The application of the Big Data to profile and practice perfect price discrimination by charging each user a price equal to their willingness to pay.7
- **Dark Patterns:** Attempts to control consumer choice and raise switching costs through the use of misleading user-interface design.

According to this new wave, the digital economy is evolving at a faster rate than the legal system. Since the digital markets are prone to a rapid tip towards one player because of the network effects, it is too late to wait until, after the fact, the court makes an ex-post (after the fact) determination, which is why this wave can decisively recommend ex-ante regulation, i.e., the establishment of proactive rules such as the Digital Markets Act adopted by the EU, so that by the time the court makes its decision, the markets can be still competitive.

3. Theoretical Framework: The Economics of Digital Platforms

In order to understand the complex legal issues of digital economy, it is essential to first break down the economic peculiarities of digital platforms that make them stand out of the traditional brick-and-mortar businesses. The key to this realization is the notion of network effects, which are the main driver of expansion and the most difficult entry point in the global business. Digital platforms are also successful under direct network effects, where the value of a product grows exponentially with the number of users on the same side of the market - most often observed in social media and communication products.

In addition to this is the strength of indirect network effects that take place in multi-sided markets where the value of the platform to a particular group of people is enhanced through the increase in the size of another group. To illustrate, the presence of an increasing number of third-party sellers in a given e-commerce marketplace makes it more appealing to the consumers, and vice versa, a large number of consumers encourages more sellers to post their products. According to Haucap and Heimeshoff (2014), these loops of self-reinforcing promote the so-called winner-takes-most dynamic. When a platform has reached a sufficient size, these networks produce barriers to entry so that it becomes highly difficult to replace an incumbent with a more technologically advanced product even in cases where the new entry point has a superior product. This results in market tipping as the competitive process is no longer concerned with the rivalry within the market but rather a struggle within the market.

The conventional Essential Facilities Doctrine, which has traditionally been used to regulate the physical infrastructure, such as railroads or electricity grids, is being recast in the context of big data in the context of international commerce. The new necessity is information; it is the non-rivalrous but exclusionable resource that drives the contemporary economy. Dominating platforms use extensive data storage and advanced analytics to forecast consumer action with surgical accuracy, fine-tune proprietary algorithms and invisibly enter neighboring markets. This is also called leveraging and enables a powerful company in one industry to leverage its data advantage to take over a second industry.

The limitation of the data flow allows these platforms to exit the role of a middlemen and become the "gatekeepers" of the digital trade route. The inability to access the data required to compete because of the monopoly of one entity leads to a foreclosure of the competition. Such a data-based dominance enables some form of a process of “enveloping a platform ingests the functionality of the would-be competitors, further solidifying its role and rendering the global market less competitive to small, innovative companies.

4. The "Kill Zone" and Killer Acquisitions

The strategic acquisition of new competitors has become one of the main concerns of regulators in the high-stakes sphere of international commerce which is a rather serious change of the classic pattern of merger analysis. It is a gradually developing phenomenon that is characterized by the Kill Zone a figurative and a financial area around a leading platform where the opportunity of new startups to become a part is procedurally diminished. In this zone, any innovation that can become a threat to the ecosystem of the incumbent is either binary: either the dominant platform copies the innovation and does so with its increased resources and data, or preemptively takes over the entrant before they can achieve critical mass.

There are far greater economic effects of these Killer Acquisitions than the short-term elimination of a competition. The existence of a leading platform, as it is implied by the research conducted by Kamepalli et al. (2020), already changes the way investments are made radically. Once a platform increases its scope, venture capital funding in startups which are in the same technological or service line of attack starts to evaporate. The investors, who are cautious of the

platform to either copy the features of the startup or coerce them to make a low-value acquisition, feel that the risk involved is too high and the chances of successful IPO too low. This brings about a kind of a shadow effect where not only innovation is strangled by corporate hand, but the withdrawal of capital to support competitive development has been boxed out in advance.

Moreover, making such acquisitions is legally difficult because such deals frequently do not even satisfy the more traditional definitions of size-of-transaction that confer regulatory scrutiny. A technology giant in global business could purchase a start-up that has no revenue and a large number of users or an exclusive patent. As long as traditional antitrust metrics are concerned, the outcome of such a merger seems innocent since this would not directly affect market share or consumer prices. Nevertheless, there is the long-term cost: the loss of potential competition the risk that the acquired startup might have become a force of disruption, or a platform-competitor by itself. The systematic absorption of these future competition seeds by dominant players helps them in ensuring that their position in the market is not cut off by any other player and as a result they no longer have the dynamic and market-driven innovation processes, which are replaced by the centralized and corporate-driven R&D processes. This change poses a risk to the very contestability of the global markets, with the direction of new entrants going up to be a competition with the giant shifted to be taken over by the giant."

5. Landmark Case Laws and Judicial Trends

5.1 The Google Android Decision

The case of Google Android has become the precedent in the fast-changing environment of the world economy, as the limits of market domination and vertical integration were changed. This case shows how the antitrust doctrines, which have been in place since the early 20th century, specifically the prohibition of so-called tying and bundling, are being adjusted to the realities of digital ecosystems.

The Legal Framework: Article 102 TFEU and Section 4 of the Indian Competition Act

In the Indian Competition Act (2002) Section 4, under the treaty on functioning of European Union (TFEU), Article 102, an abuse of dominant position is achieved when a firm employs its control over a market to make unfair terms or to limit competition. One main theory of harm in each jurisdiction is that of tying, as a powerful company makes the accessibility of a product that is a must (the tying product) conditional upon the purchase or consumption of a distinct service (the tied product).

Online, Google has been detected in the market to have used its market lead in licensable smart mobile operating systems (Android) and mobile app stores (Google Play Store) to secure its market position in general search services. In particular, Google undertook signing the Mobile Application Distribution Agreement (MADA) by Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) as a necessity to license the Play Store: pre-installation of the full package of the Google Mobile Services (GMS), comprising Google Search and the Chrome browser, was obligatory (European Commission, 2018; CCI, 2022).

The Record-Breaking Fines and Behavioral Remedies

The extent of regulation that was being applied in this situation was not precedented:

- **European Union:** The European Commission fined the company record sums in 2018 (eventually reduced a little by the General Court to) four point three four billion. The Commission claimed that these pre-installation conditions gave a status quo bias, which virtually barred the competitive search engines and browsers market (European Commission, 2018).
- **India:** In 2022, a penalty of 1,337.76 crore (161.9m) was imposed on Google by the Competition Commission of India (CCI) due to the same practices. The order issued by the CCI extended beyond fines and ordered Google to give users the option to select their default search engine when setting up a device and giving OEMs the freedom to create devices based on what the CCI described as forks of the Android platform without losing access to Google applications (CCI, 2022).

The "Zero-Price" Paradox

The first and the foremost consequence of this kind of decisions is the obliteration of the so-called zero-price defense. In decades, the antitrust enforcement could hardly intervene in such areas where the services were provided to customers without money. The Google Android decisions, however, failed to exclude price points at $0 that they were not able to shield the platforms against question. Regulators have now realized that the damage of the digital markets is not executed through the method of high prices, but though the annihilation of choice, loss of creativity, and data mining (Ezrachi and Stucke, 2016). By making its own applications its default, Google preclude the opportunity of its competitors to develop their algorithms in any way and, in the process, monopolized its position by virtue of reinforcing its position with data-driven feedback loops.

Global Implications for International Commerce

Google Android has created a precedent worldwide on how countries control the tech giants. It draws

attention to the tendency towards platform neutrality, according to which the owner of an operating system should provide third-party services, which are as technically fair as its own. This jurisprudence was the driving force behind the Digital Markets Act (DMA) within the EU, which is now actively barring any such tying practices fronting its gatekeepers until they cause harm, even in the first place.

5.2 United States v. Google LLC (2024)

In a precedent-setting decision that changed the face of the digital world, the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia ruled that Google had committed a Sherman Act 2 infringement by quietly enforcing an unlawful monopoly in the general search and search text advertising markets. Google LLC, 2024). According to the opinion of Judge Amit Mehta, a 277-page court ruling pointed out that, although the quality of Google search engine is high, its strength has been illegally enhanced with a set of multi-billion-dollar exclusive distribution contracts.

The Mechanics of Default Exclusion

The court placed a lot of emphasis on the power of defaults given that most users were used to using the search engine installed by default or because they were unaware of the technicality of the task. Google used this bias in behavior by spending more than 20 billion dollars a year to original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) such as Apple and Samsung to make its default search engine located in the out-of-the-box configuration of billions of mobile devices and computers. Google LLC, 2024).

These deals were discovered to have successfully barricaded a substantial part of the market such as 95 percent of smartphones off against potential competitors. By winning through such dominant distribution channels, Google deprived other search engines such as Bing and DuckDuckGo the so-called query scale that would have enabled them to refine their algorithms and deliver a high-quality product (Harvard Law Review, 2025). This formed a self-propagating circle of monopolization: the larger the amount of data, the more the search results, the more advertisement income, the more of which was spent on even greater compensation in default status.

Findings on Market Contestability

One of the most important decisions made by the court was that these contracts discouraged distribution partners to create their own search technologies or engage their competitors (Monash University, 2024). An example would be the agreement with Apple which prevented Apple to switch Google with a different provider, which essentially held the search ecosystem frozen. The court denied Google its defense that it succeed because of a superior product and found that due to the magnitude of its exclusive contracts, genuine competition was no longer financially viable to any other company (Villanova Law Review, 2024).

Finally, the decision concluded that Google did not act as a normal competitive means, but was a strategic attempt to deprive competitors with the oxygen of distribution. The ruling establishes a crucial precedent that impacts global business, marking a shift to a more aggressive approach to the regulation of the utilization of financial leverage by digital gatekeepers to secure the dominance of their ecosystems.

6. Comparative Legal Frameworks

The United States has always employed the wait and see policy in the international arena, leaving it to the judiciary to provide the interpretation of the Sherman act of 1890. On the other hand, the Digital Markets Act (DMA) has been a move toward fairness and contestability by the European Union. This stance of India is a sign that it is a developing digital economy, transitioning to an ex-ante framework specifically to the Systemically Significant Digital Enterprises (SSDEs) to preclude the use of data by global contenders to cut off local startups.

7. "Dark Patterns" and Consumer Choice Architecture

The critical junction between Behavioral Economics and Competition Law is an up-and-coming field in the international commerce law within the digital context. Regulators are more and more reviewing so-called Dark Patterns, i.e. the deceptive user interface (UI) designs and user experience (UX) designs that are carefully crafted to manipulate, nudge or coerce the user into making a decision that benefits the platform at their cost (OECD, 2022).

The Psychology of Choice Architecture

Dark patterns take advantage of cognitive biases like the status quo bias, loss aversion and decision fatigue to circumvent rational thinking in system 2 and react to information impulsively in system 1 (Kahneman, 2011). With such biases, platforms can create a choice architecture in which the road of least resistance conforms to the strategic objectives of the firm, say, harvesting additional personal data, signing the user up to an ongoing subscription, or avoiding account deletion.

Switching Costs and Non-Price Exploitation

Dark patterns also play an advanced role in the context of international commerce as a tool of raising switching costs. When a platform purposefully complicates or makes it inefficient to export data or cancel a service or transfer to a competitor, it is a kind of psychological lock-in to the degree that it takes

place (Stucke, 2022).

- The Strategy of the Roach Motel: The mode of operation of this type is easy to join a service and almost impossible to leave. In the FTC v. Amazon (2023) case, regulators claimed Amazon used a false design to make it difficult to cancel Prime subscriptions and artificially increase the retention rates among the users.
- Confirmshaming: You characterize the opt-out option as being offensive or shameful (e.g., No thanks, I would rather pay full price), and platforms, in a manner, manipulate the decisional autonomy of the consumer, which the European Data Protection Board (EDPB) has cited as a possible violation of the fairness principles of GDPR.

Regulatory Responses and Provisions

Governments are no longer opting to treat design as an aesthetic option, but are looking at it as a possible misuse of power.

- **Guidelines in India (2023):** The Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) has recently listed 13 common dark patterns such as; basket sneaking and drip pricing as that is now accompanied by a ban on the Consumer Protection Act (Ministry of Consumer Affairs, 2023).
- **EU Digital Markets Act (DMA):** In Article 13, the DMA prohibits the use of any deceptive method by the gatek keeper to impact on a user to alter their choice or consent expressly stating that cancellation of consent needs to be as simple as when granting consent (European Commission, 2022).
- **The US FTC Strategy:** The Federal Trade Commission has shifted to an unfairness doctrine in which it claims that design aspects that entrap customers are an unfair trade practice, as defined in Section 5 of the FTC Act.

With digital platforms still being incorporated across international borders, the legal definition of market power is being extended to a new type of power, interface power, which implies the capacity to influence even the environment that economic choices are undertaken within.

CONCLUSION

The balancing act of policymakers in the context of global trade is not a matter of creating an innovation or regulation anymore in the world of fast-paced global trade. Rather, this research proposes the most effective way forward is the design of the regulation that replicates competition. This includes introducing structures that mimic the pressures and performance of a healthy market, i.e., contestability, diversity and low barriers to entry, even in industries with natural monopolistic power or where a few suppliers control access to the market.

Designing Regulation that Mimics Competition

Conventional regulation is usually centered on fixed price regulation or strict behavioral bans. Competition-mimicking regulation, on the contrary, deals with interoperability and portability of data. Regulators effectively reduce switching costs by imposing on dominant platforms that their services should be able to communicate with third-party competitors (interoperability) and assure that users are able to easily transfer their personal data between one ecosystem to another (portability). That is a re-creation of the competition pressure of a multi-firm market in the orbit of a single platform, where the incumbents have to be innovative to keep users and not to use the lock-in effect.

Adaptive Oversight and Technical Literacy

The future of global business is hinged on the capability of the law to keep up with the changing technology that it regulates. This demands the shift to adaptive oversight as opposed to set and forget legislation. Regulatory institutions need to make technical literacy one of the key competencies and not just a legal or economic personnel.

- **Technologists as Regulators:** Regulatory authorities (including the EU Commission or the FTC) are starting to recruit so-called Chief Technologists and data scientists to review black-box algorithms and discover Dark Patterns in real-time.
- **Regulatory Sandboxes:** Regulatory supervision can become dynamic with sandboxes - regulated environments, in which emerging business model or technology can be trialed, under regulatory oversight. This makes it possible to learn by doing, where the rules will be rewarded according to the actual results on the market as opposed to the hypothetical harms.

International Harmonization of Standards

Owing to the transnational nature of digital platforms, fragmented national laws result in an effect of regulatory arbitrage in which companies transfer their operations to the least-regulated jurisdiction. In order to avoid this, international harmonization should be moved globally.

- **Common set of definitions of Gatekeeper:** Concurrence on what is considered a "Gatekeeper or Systemically Significant Digital Enterprise (SSDE) creates a stable business landscape across the world.
- **Cooperation in Enforcement:** Harmonization does not only consist of shared rules, but shared enforcement as well.

Intergovernmental structures and treaties, such as those Informal Discussions Informal Competition Network International Competition Network (ICN) agencies can also use evidence to coordinate remedies across borders, so that a remedy in one market (such as the EU) does not result in a competitive distortion in another (such as India or the US).

Finally, the idea is that of a Participative Approach to regulation (Bruegel, 2023). This model incorporates the stakeholders (the platforms themselves, small-scale competitors, and consumer advocates) into the development of compliance measures. In doing this, regulation will be a collaborative instrument that will make the digital trade routes open, equitable, and ever-innovative.

REFERENCES

1. Akman, P. (2022). Regulating competition in digital platform markets: A comparative analysis. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, *38*(2), 394–420. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grac010
2. Bork, R. H. (1978). *The antitrust paradox: A policy at war with itself*. Basic Books.
3. Cahill, D., & Wang, J. (2023). Convergence in approaches taken by both East & West to tackle digital platforms anti-competitive practices. *Academic Journal of Nawroz University*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.25007/ajnu.v1n1a1941
4. Chenier, S., & Kumar, R. (2023). Digital competition law: Antitrust implications of Big Tech platforms. *Legal Studies in Digital Age*, *2*(2), 49–60.
5. Ezrachi, A., & Stucke, M. E. (2016). *Virtual competition: The promise and perils of the algorithm-driven economy*. Harvard University Press.
6. Haucap, J., & Heimeshoff, U. (2014). Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay: Is the internet driving us towards monopoly power? *International Economics and Economic Policy*, *11*(1), 49–61. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10368-013-0271-2
7. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
8. Kamepalli, S. K., Rajan, R., & Zingales, L. (2020). *Kill zone* (Working Paper No. 27168). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w27168
9. Khan, L. M. (2017). Amazon's antitrust paradox. *The Yale Law Journal*, *126*(3), 710–805.
10. Petit, N. (2020). *Big Tech and the digital economy: The moligopoly scenario*. Oxford University Press.
11. Stucke, M. E. (2022). *Breaking away: How to overcome Big Tech's corrupting control*. Oxford University Press.
12. Whish, R., & Bailey, D. (2021). *Competition law* (10th ed.). Oxford University Press.
13. **Case Law**
14. *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
15. *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 951 F.2d 1128 (9th Cir. 1991).
16. *Epic Games, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, 559 F. Supp. 3d 898 (N.D. Cal. 2021).
17. *Google LLC v. Competition Commission of India*, Civil Appeal No. 229 (2023).
18. *Google (Android)*, Case AT.40099, Eur. Comm'n Decision (2018).
19. *Google (Shopping)*, Case AT.39740, Eur. Comm'n Decision (2017).
20. *United States v. Google LLC*, No. 1:20-cv-03010 (D.D.C. 2024).
21. Legislation & Government Reports
22. Competition Act, 2002, No. 12, Acts of Parliament, 2003 (India).
23. European Commission. (2022). *Regulation (EU) 2022/1925 on contestable and fair markets in the digital sector (Digital Markets Act)*. http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/1925/oj
24. Ministry of Consumer Affairs. (2023). *Guidelines for prevention and regulation of dark patterns*. Government of India.
25. Ministry of Corporate Affairs. (2024). *Report of the Committee on Digital Competition Law*. PRS India. https://prsindia.org/files/parliamentry-announcement/2024-04-15/CDCL-Report-20240312.pdf
26. OECD. (2022). *Dark commercial patterns*. OECD Digital Economy Papers. https://doi.org/10.1787/44f5e846-en
27. Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1–7 (1890).
28. UNCTAD. (2023). *Global competition law and policy approaches to digital markets*. United Nations. https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ditcclp2023d7_en.pdf