INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA).*

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ALGORITHMIC COLLUSION IN INDIAN COMPETITION LAW: CONSIDERATION FOR ETHICAL GOVERNANCE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

AUTHORED BY - ADV. AGUSTHO NORBERT

ABSTRACT

As Artificial Intelligence reshapes global markets, algorithmic collusion has surfaced as a critical issue for competition law, allowing companies to autonomously coordinate pricing and market strategies without explicit human agreements. This situation undermines fair competition by enabling algorithms to participate in tacit collusion, circumventing traditional antitrust measures that depend on evidence of human intent. This research article explores algorithmic collusion within the context of Indian competition law, assessing how current regulations and enforcement practices are inadequate in tackling AI-driven anti-competitive conduct. By conducting a comparative analysis of the proactive measures taken by the U.S. and the EU, this study identifies significant opportunities for the Competition Commission of India to improve its regulatory oversight and enforcement capabilities. It proposes a comprehensive strategy that includes mandates for transparency, real-time monitoring, algorithmic audits, and predictive analytics to enhance the detection and prevention of collusive practices. Furthermore, the research calls for revisions to the Competition Act, empowering the CCI to confront the distinct challenges posed by AI and to maintain a balanced and competitive digital marketplace. Through these ethical and regulatory recommendations, this paper seeks to provide practical guidance for promoting consumer protection and fostering innovation in India's rapidly evolving AI environment.

INTRODUCTION

As the famous Andrew Carnegie once said "…and while the law of competition may be sometimes hard for individuals, it is best for the race, because it ensures the survival of the fittest in every department."[1] Over the past couple of decades, the Anti-trust law or Competition law, as it is commonly referred to across the world, has gained significant importance, both as a sophisticated tool for development as well as for the destruction of the local market as well

---

[1] Carnegie, A., (1889) Wealth, The North American Review, 148(391), p. 653-64.

as the international market. Approximately 130 countries worldwide have established laws to regulate competition in the market with the help of robust enforcement mechanisms out of which 80 are World Trade Organization (WTO) member countries. However, the rise of Aritificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping and restructuring the competition laws and regulations all over the world. The predominant factors contributing to the above drastic and dynamic changes are the monopolization of AI resources by the Tech-giants, cross-border enforcement challenges and AI-driven mergers that stifle innovation. The traditional Anti-trust laws and regulations are struggling to address and prevent AI enabled practices like the algorithmic collusion, wherein multiple algorithms autonomously coordinate pricing of the various commodities available in the market and the output decisions produced by these algorithms without any form of explicit human intervention, ultimately threaten to diminish the healthy competition among the several market players by enabling firms or entities, to engage in implicit price fixing and convenient resource allocation agreements between them.

The regulatory bodies all around the world, including our very own Competition Commission of India (CCI), who are the ultimate protectors of the consumer and healthy competition in the market, are presented with this unique obstacle. Currently, none of the regulatory bodies are well equipped nor self-sufficient enough to set guidelines or standards in setting forth a comprehensive legislative and procedural framework, which can detect, analyze and mitigate algorithmically driven anti-competitive behaviour of the market players. Given this gap, the sole objective of this article is to critically assess the limitations within the Indian Competition laws, regarding algorithmic collusion and then to propose a solid regulatory and ethical governance measures for addressing these evolving challenges. In pursuit of this objective, this study has employed a comparative methodology, analyzing the foreign regulatory approaches to algorithmic collusion while contextualising these findings within the Indian Legal Framework. This article ultimately aims to provide an actionable insight for adapting existing anti-trust tools to confront algorithmic collusion and to suggest strategies for the CCI to maintain and preserve the market integrity of our nation in this dynamic AI driven era.

ALGORITHMIC COLLUSSION

As the AI advances each passing day, algorithms have increasingly stepped beyond their traditional roles and evolved from being mere tools into strategic players, being capable of subtly aligning the actions of the competing firms. In this era of Digital age algorithms can

play the role of silent partners, who can orchestrate price adjustments and market decisions with utmost precision and leaving minimal traces of any form of collusion. Algorithmic collusion is a rare phenomenon which poses a new frontier in anti-competitive practices where technology rather than physical or verbal corporate agreement becomes the invisible hand guiding collusion in the marketplace. The term "Algorithmic Collusion" can be well described as any form of anti-competitive agreement or convenient coordination among the competing firms or business entities which is facilitated, manifested and executed by the initiative of automated systems. The automated systems in the above context refers to the algorithms or any fruit of AI, and the crucial element being the absence of any kind of human involvement or intervention. Algorithmic collusion occurs "when firms utilize methods that incorporate a reward-punishment structure, that rewards firms for adhering to the supra-competitive results and punishes firms for diverging from it."[2]

AI technologies have rapidly evolved, enabling the algorithms to monitor and assess markets on a vast scale, analyzing competitor's actions and swiftly adjusting prices in response to changing conditions. There is a well debated prevalent theory in competition policy all over the world suggesting that, over time price algorithms will learn to adopt collusive strategies through self-developed reward and punishment mechanisms leading to sustained supra-competitive prices. However, this evolution introduces a significant gray area in accountability as algorithms increasingly operate autonomously and the question about who should bear the responsibility and liability for these anti-competitive behaviours remain unsolved. These algorithms can sustain collusive outcomes without any direct human involvement in setting prices. Unlike traditional cartels, algorithmic collusion does not depend on explicit agreements or pre-set collusive instructions. Rather these algorithms operate through independent decision-making, leading to unintended collusive behaviour, a rare phenomenon often referred to as "Algorithmic Tacit Cooperation". Researches have shown that, during the coming days, some algorithms are capable of learning and adopting collusive strategies effectively even without explicit programming for such purposes.

---

[2] Harrington,J., (2018) Developing competition law for collusion by autonomous artificial agents, Journal of Competition Law & Economics, 14(3), p.331-363.

POSITION OF THE FOREIGN COUNTRIES ON DEALING WITH ALGORITHMIC COLLUSION

Countries around the world, especially the USA and Europe are increasingly focusing on tackling the issue of algorithmic collusion, understanding its potential to disrupt fair competition in the digital sphere. As the use of algorithms for decision making becomes more prevalent across various sectors, there is a growing concern about these systems unintentionally or intentionally engaging in anti-competitive actions without explicit agreements companies. In response regulatory bodies in these regions, including the U.S Federal Trade Commission (FTC), the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the European Commission (EU) are adopting a proactive approach, utilizing a range of tools and strategies to mitigate these risks and maintain competitive standards in this digital era.

In USA, the issue of algorithmic collusion has emerged as a priority for regulatory agencies such as the FTC and the DOJ. These agencies are tasked with enforcing anti-trust laws and preventing practices that hinder fair competition. They recognize the unique challenges that algorithms present in ensuring fair competition, especially in sectors where algorithmic technologies play a crucial role in determining prices and marketing decisions. The concern is that algorithms might engage in covert coordination by analyzing competitor's actions and adjusting their own strategies, which could harm consumers by keeping prices artificially high or restricting access to the market. US regulators have an history of being proactive in addressing anti-competitive practices with significant cases establishing guidelines for dealing with competition issues related to technology. For instance, in the year 2016, the FTC settled with the Google concerning its dominant position in the online search market and its potential impact on the competition. Although the case did not specifically address algorithmic collusion, it highlighted the FTC's dedication to monitoring the practices of dominant technology companies and their competitive behaviour. This settlement showed that even algorithms designed for consumer convenience and optimized service delivery could raise concerns when they inadvertently or strategically affect market competition. Moreover, U.S. authorities have initiated dialogues and partnerships with academic institutions and the industry to gain a deeper understanding of algorithmic collusion. Acknowledging that these systems can evolve and potentially engage in collusive activities on their own, regulators are developing frameworks for monitoring and controlling such behaviour. Enforcement efforts such as investigations and settlements are complemented by policy guidance to establish clear limits on the use of algorithms and ensure adherence to antitrust laws. The U.S. government has also

emphasized the importance of transparency in the design and deployment of algorithms. By encouraging companies to disclose how their algorithms work, regulators can more effectively evaluate whether these technologies inadvertently lead to anti-competitive outcomes. For example, the FTC has advocated for the inclusion of compliance considerations in the design of algorithms to reduce the risk of tacit collusion. However, regulatory oversight remains a challenge due to the fast-paced nature of technological advancements and efforts are being made to develop more comprehensive solutions to address these challenges effectively.

In Europe, the issue of algorithmic collusion is recognized as a major obstacle to fair competition. The European Commission which is in charge of overseeing competition policies across the European Union (EU) member countries, has made significant strides in tackling this problem, adopting a more active role in investigating and penalizing anti-competitive actions by big tech companies. The EC's strategy on algorithmic collusion underscores its dedication to preventing the monopolization of digital markets and ensuring equal opportunities for businesses and consumers. A notable instance of the EC's alertness was its 2017 ruling to impose a €2.4 billion fine on Google for exploiting its market power in the online search sector. The Commission determined that Google had used its dominant position to favor its own shopping service over rivals thereby distorting competition. Although this case did not solely focus on algorithmic collusion it highlighted the need for regulating digital marketplaces where algorithms play a significant role in decision making and market interactions. European regulators have taken a proactive stance in formulating a comprehensive policy framework for regulating digital markets which includes guidelines on the appropriate use of algorithms. The EC has implemented various strategies to address anti-competitive behaviour driven by algorithms from conducting market research and issuing policy recommendations to collaborating with stakeholders to increase awareness of potential risks. Moreover the EC has worked on establishing a stronger legal framework to deal with the complexities introduced by artificial intelligence and algorithmic technologies in competition law. A key effort from the European Commission is the Digital Markets Act 2022 (DMA) designed to regulate digital gatekeepers, specifically the large technology companies with significant market influence. This legislative proposal includes provisions that tackle the use of algorithms, ensuring that companies cannot use them to strengthen their market position or engage in covert forms of collusion. The DMA is part of the EC's wider initiative to ensure that digital markets remain open and competitive especially as AI and algorithmic systems become integral to market operations.

The EC has also stressed the importance of algorithmic transparency, pushing for companies to adopt ethical practices and provide information on how their algorithms work. Following a similar approach to the FTC, the EC encourages companies to design algorithms with compliance in mind, incorporating measures to prevent collusion. European regulators have also taken a firm stance on data collection and sharing, emphasizing that data should not be utilized in ways that facilitate collusive activities, such as monitoring competitors pricing strategies.

The USA and the EU acknowledge that the intricate nature of algorithmic collusion necessitates a comprehensive strategy. By integrating enforcement efforts, policy recommendations and direct interaction with stakeholders from the industry, these regions are working together to mitigate the risks associated with algorithmic decision making. Furthermore, regulatory bodies in the U.S. and the EU are increasingly emphasizing the importance of transparency and responsibility in the design of algorithms. They require companies to disclose details about their algorithmic systems, enabling authorities to better understand how these systems might inadvertently facilitate collusion. . International organizations and forums such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) are also playing a role in facilitating dialogue and cooperation on the regulation of algorithmic collusion. These platforms enable countries to share insights, discuss policy challenges, and develop best practices for managing the impact of algorithms on competition. Both the USA and the EU have acknowledged the need to confront the complex issue of algorithmic collusion in digital markets. Through proactive strategies that combine enforcement actions, policy guidance, and engagement with stakeholders, competition authorities in both regions are taking steps to reduce the risks posed by autonomous algorithms.

ALGORITHMIC COLLUSSION IN INDIA

The issue of algorithmic collusion is starting to gain attention in India particularly when it comes to digital marketplaces, ride-sharing platforms, and online shopping. As more companies use algorithms to set prices and handle various competitive elements of their offerings, worries are growing about the possibility of these systems either accidentally or intentionally encouraging behaviour that goes against fair competition. Algorithmic collusion happens when algorithms are designed in a manner that might result in price fixing, market division or other actions that harm competition even if there's no direct agreement among the companies involved. The effect of this collusion on the well being of consumers in India could

be significant leading to increased costs, fewer options, and less competition in the market. The CCI serves as the main agency in charge of monitoring competition and stopping practices that hinder fair competition within the nation. It implements the Competition Act which is designed to safeguard consumers against unjust actions such as agreements that limit competition, manipulation of markets and behaviour that leads to monopolies. As a primary regulatory body, the CCI has the authority to probe and penalize businesses engaged in cooperative schemes, including those related to algorithmic collusion. Nonetheless, pinpointing and tackling such actions is challenging due to the complex characteristics of algorithmic systems and the swift evolution of technology in the digital marketplace.

The CCI is the number one authority tasked with figuring out and addressing anti-aggressive practices, inclusive of instances regarding algorithmic collusion. The CCI's obligation consists of investigating collusive behaviour, imposing consequences on corporations discovered guilty and running to make certain arrangements to the aggressive market for the gain of consumers. Algorithmic collusion however gives new demanding situations for the CCI because the nature of collusion in those instances is regularly implicit, without the specific agreements generally found during the formation of a cartel. The CCI has investigated instances where algorithmic collusion is apprehended on receiving genuine complaints from the consumers of our nation. One instance is the ride hailing sector, wherein allegations of algorithmic collusion had been made in opposition to corporations like Ola and Uber. In the year of 2018, the CCI initiated proceedings against OLA and UBER on receiving information from Mr. Samir Agrawal, alleging that these corporations had engaged in price-fixing via means of the use of algorithms to decide fares. However the CCI was forced to dismiss the allegation under Section 26(2) of the Competition Act 2002 since there was lack of sufficient evidence to prove any instance of any kind of agreement or understanding created or executed between the cab aggregators and their respective drivers nor between the drivers inter se regarding the price-fixing. Being aggrieved by the decision of CCI, the informant filed an appeal before the NCLAT but unfortunately the NCLAT upheld the decision of CCI. Thereafter the informant appealed to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India but owing to the utter dismay, the apex court also refrained from interfering with the findings of the CCI and NCLAT.

Similarly, the airline enterprise in India has confronted scrutiny for capability price fixing via algorithmic means. In 2014, the CCI investigated pricing practices amongst airways because there was an increasing trend among the enterprise regarding the usage of trusted third-

party software programs to dynamically alter fares primarily based on a couple of elements like competitor pricing, reserving trends and seasonality. Although the CCI discovered proof that airways used comparable software program to manipulate fares, it couldn't substantiate the presence of collusion due to the lack of proof to prove that these similar third-party algorithms had been used to restore fees in a coordinated manner. The algorithms had been visible as gear to manipulate dynamic pricing as opposed to devices of collusion.

CAN A "MEETING OF ALGORITHMS" AMOUNT TO AN ANTI-COMPETITIVE AGREEMENT?

The rapid advancement of AI has led to the transformation of marketplace in ways that are unimaginable. Traditional and orthodox competition models were based on a common understanding that anti-competitive behaviours like price-fixing, output limitation and market division required human factors like the company executives, managers or the entire firms as such, making deliberate choices on their own or under specific influence or instruction. However, the scenarios have changed and the common anticipated moves of the enemies have come to an halt as the companies have started to increasingly rely on the AI driven algorithms for pricing, market analysis and decision making. Owing to these new challenges have emerged in the form of identifying, regulating and preventing anti-competitive behaviours. This has led to a pressing question for competition regulators all around the world that can a meeting of algorithms amount to an anti-competitive agreement? This in other words mean that, could interactions among the autonomous algorithms operated by competing firms without any traces of human intent result in coordinated actions that will effectively restrict the competition?

To address this question, it is very essential to first understand what constitutes an anti-competitive agreement in both a general sense and then with reference to the India's Competition Act, 2002. In broad terms an anti-competitive agreement is any arrangement between businesses that diminishes or eliminates competition in a particular market. Such agreements might aim to control prices, limit production or divide markets, making it harder for new players to enter the market and thereby reducing the consumer options. The Competition Act 2002 in India defines anti-competitive agreements more specifically in Sections 3(1) and Section 3(3). These provisions state that any agreement causing or likely to cause an appreciable adverse effect on competition in India is illegal and prohibited. The Act prohibits practices such as price-fixing, output restriction, market sharing and bid rigging. These provisions are vital in protecting consumer interests and ensuring a competitive market

place. The Act recognizes that such agreements need not be written or formalized to be unlawful; any form of coordination that restricts competition, even if its unspoken or informal, it can fall within the scope of anti-competitive agreements. In practice, an anti-competitive agreement often requires a meeting of minds or some degree of intentionality. The firms alleged to have been involved in the creation and formation of anti-competitive agreements must have shared understanding or communication that drives their collective actions against competition. However the rapid integration of AI and autonomous algorithms into business practices has challenged this traditional view and has created situations where such agreements may arise without any human intention or explicit communication.

The development of algorithms capable of market analysis and independent decision-making has opened up new possibilities for business to optimize their operations. Algorithms can monitor market dynamics on a large scale, rapidly analyzing competitor's pricing strategies and adjusting prices in real time to maintain competitiveness. However as the AI driven algorithms evolve, they are not simply responding to market conditions rather they are learning from them and adapting over time. This capability of the algorithms has resulted in the creation of the rare phenomenon of "Algorithmic Collusion", in which algorithms autonomously coordinate their actions in a way that reduces competition, even if they were not explicitly programmed to do so. Algorithmic collusion occurs when algorithms interact in a way that results in coordination pricing or market allocation. Unlike traditional cartels, where collusion is driven by explicit agreements or direct human input, algorithmic collusion arises from the autonomous actions of algorithms that learn from each other's behaviour in the marketplace. A pricing algorithm will observe that raising prices has little impact on demand, likely because other firm's algorithms are making similar adjustments. Over time these algorithms can form a stable pattern of price increases that benefit all parties involved without any direct communication or agreement between the companies. This type of collusion is particularly challenging for competition regulators because it lacks the typical indicators of anti-competitive behaviour. There are no secret meetings, emails or other forms of communication that can be used as evidence of collusion. Instead regulators are faced with a scenario in which autonomous systems are behaving in a coordinated manner, yet without any clear intention from the companies themselves to undermine competition.

In a typical anti-competitive agreement, firms reach an understanding that allows them to control aspects of the market such as prices or market territories to their mutual benefit. This

requires some form of communication or agreement, which serves as evidence of collusion. However in the case of algorithms, the coordination arises not from a direct human agreement but from the algorithm's very own learning processes. Algorithms can interact with each other in a market setting and adjust their behaviour based on observed outcomes, ultimately arriving at a coordinated pricing strategy that resembles a cartel. This phenomenon is often referred to as "Algorithmic Tacit Cooperation" and is particularly challenging to address within our current legal framework. If we consider the specific anti-competitive behaviours prohibited by the Competition Act 2002 several parallels emerge. For instance, in terms of "Price Fixing", algorithms could independently but consistently set prices at similar levels thereby reducing price competition and resulting in inflated prices for consumers. When in terms of "Output Restriction", algorithms may autonomously decide to limit supply to boost demand and prices. If multiple algorithms adopt similar strategies, this could mirror the outcome of a traditional output restriction agreement. However, in terms of "Market Sharing", in certain scenarios algorithms might learn not to compete aggressively in specific market segments, effectively dividing the market without any explicit instructions from their human operator.

Therefore these kind of behaviours results in outcomes similar to those of traditional anti-competitive agreements, even though the coordination arises from algorithmic interactions rather than human made agreements. This raises significant regulatory challenges because although the outcomes are anti-competitive, there will be no clear "meeting of minds" or "documented agreement" to examine. For regulators like the CCI, the lack of explicit evidence complicates efforts to identify and prosecute algorithm driven anti-competitive behaviour.

CHALLENGES AHEAD OF THE COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA

The rapid increase in algorithm usage along with the advancement in machine learning has brought significant shift in the digital market sector. These transformations have sparked an extensive discussion among the competition police reformers regarding their implications for competition agencies and the ways in which they can carry out the enforcement activities. The CCI is confronted with a dynamic array of challenges in tackling algorithmic collusion, a phenomenon that is transforming the competitive dynamics of digital markets. While advancements in algorithms and machine learning yield significant efficiencies such as reduced operational costs, enhanced product quality, and improved resource allocation these same

technologies also give rise to intricate, self-perpetuating forms of collusion that evade conventional detection methods. Unlike traditional collusion which typically involves direct interactions or agreements among competitors, algorithmic collusion can occur without any overt communication or planning. Algorithms are capable of autonomously responding to market conditions and competitor pricing, leading to coordinated anti-competitive behaviours. This ability for independent adaptation enables algorithms to generate outcomes similar to those of traditional collusion, yet without the usual indicators of coordination, thereby presenting unprecedented regulatory challenges. The CCI must recognize that existing antitrust frameworks, originally designed for human behaviours, may not be readily applicable to the automated, autonomous decisions made by algorithms in the contemporary digital economy. The CCI's efforts to combat algorithmic collusion are further complicated by a variety of specific challenges. Among the most significant is the difficulty of detection, as algorithmic collusion often manifests within intricate, highly interconnected systems, making it hard to pinpoint collusive behaviour or trace its origins. The lack of transparency associated with many algorithms exacerbates this challenge, as their operations and decision-making processes occur in the background, shielded from regulatory oversight. Algorithms frequently employ machine learning techniques, such as deep learning, which involve multiple layers of complex decision-making that may not be easily understood, even by their developers. This lack of clarity restricts regulators capacity to comprehend how algorithms arrive at their decisions.

When evaluating algorithms as instruments that facilitate an established infringement, the legal proceedings tend to be relatively uncomplicated. However, the situation becomes significantly more intricate when algorithms function beyond conventional legal boundaries, promoting collusion without direct interaction or overt coordination among competitors. These algorithms are transforming digital markets by improving transparency, expediting business decisions, and allowing companies to respond almost instantaneously to the strategies of their competitors. This digital interconnectedness can result in firms imitating one anothers behaviours, thereby heightening the risk of tacit collusion and potentially driving prices upward. This phenomenon resonates with longstanding concerns regarding the "oligopoly problem" where firms in concentrated and transparent markets recognize the advantages of mutual cooperation without the need for formal communication. Over time, companies operating in such environments may elevate prices to levels comparable to those of a monopoly, solely through strategic awareness and alignment. Historically, competition law has faced challenges in addressing the oligopoly dilemma due to its restricted applicability outside

of markets characterized by a small number of competitors, significant entry barriers, and high transparency. Nevertheless, algorithms may now extend this challenge beyond traditional oligopolistic frameworks, as they enhance market transparency and enable responses without human intervention. Functioning as intermediaries, algorithms swiftly gather, process, and analyze market data, ensuring synchronized price adjustments with a level of accuracy and rationality that often exceeds human capabilities. Furthermore, algorithms may bolster collusive stability by mitigating human error and irrational behaviour. This situation prompts critical inquiries regarding whether tacit collusion, facilitated by these advanced technologies, is becoming increasingly common in digital markets. Should ongoing research validate this trend, competition authorities may need to reevaluate their strategies concerning tacit collusion, as the conventional tools within existing competition law frameworks may prove inadequate.

The swift advancement of algorithmic technologies has posed considerable challenges to the enforcement of competition laws, underscoring the urgent necessity for the Competition Act of India, 2002, to revise and expand the definition of "agreement." Traditionally, competition laws have been predicated on the idea that an "agreement" signifies a clear consensus among competitors, typically evidenced through direct communication, formal contracts, or observable actions such as public price announcements. However, the rise of algorithmic collusion introduces a type of anti-competitive conduct that does not conform to this conventional framework. Algorithms empower competitors to engage in collusion indirectly and autonomously, eliminating the requirement for explicit communication. These technologies facilitate immediate and continuous adjustments to pricing and output in reaction to competitors' actions, creating an environment where firms can effectively coordinate their strategies to stabilize market conditions without any overt indications of collusion. To more effectively tackle these challenges, the CCI must broaden its interpretation of "agreement" as defined in the Competition Act. Algorithms not only enable tacit collusion through indirect signaling but also allow for real time price modifications that simulate competitive responses, ultimately leading to a collusive market equilibrium. For example, in a "follow-the-leader" approach, one company's algorithm may adjust prices in accordance with changes made by the market leader, responding swiftly without any direct communication. Alternatively, firms might publicly disclose a pricing algorithm, prompting competitors to adopt it, thus establishing a de facto collusive arrangement that evades traditional definitions of agreement. The CCI's current interpretation of agreements may not adequately address the complexities associated with these contemporary anti-competitive tactics.

Revising the approach of the CCI towards the identification of anti-competitive agreements would significantly improve clarity for businesses navigating the increasingly digital landscape. Enhanced guidelines and a modern interpretation of collusion in relation to algorithms would assist companies in distinguishing between permissible competitive practices and those that breach competition laws. Currently, under the prevailing legal framework, mere parallel conduct—where companies act similarly without explicit coordination—typically does not signify collusion. However, the rise of algorithms complicates this assessment, as it becomes challenging to determine whether parallel pricing or output strategies are truly independent or suggestive of a tacit collusion arrangement. By embracing a more adaptable approach that considers the interdependent decision making enabled by algorithms, the CCI could establish a regulatory framework that reflects the realities of algorithm-driven markets, where conventional methods of identifying collusion may fall short. Furthermore, expanding the CCI's interpretive framework concerning agreements is crucial for addressing the economic ramifications of algorithmic collusion within Indian markets. In the absence of a comprehensive framework to confront this challenge, the risk of supra-competitive pricing and diminished consumer choice escalates, thereby threatening market competitiveness and consumer welfare. Should algorithms empower firms to maintain collusive pricing across a broader spectrum of industries, the traditional "oligopoly problem" could either be replicated or exacerbated. Historically, factors such as high market transparency, stable conditions, and a limited number of competitors have facilitated tacit collusion. However, algorithms can generate similar conditions in markets that are not typically oligopolistic, potentially nurturing collusive environments even among a larger pool of participants or where transparency is artificially enhanced through shared data.

Revising the definition of "agreement" within the Competition Act is essential for bridging the divide between conventional anti-collusion measures and the evolving landscape of the digital economy. This transformation would enable the CCI to effectively oversee and mitigate the anti-competitive threats posed by algorithm-driven coordination. By refining its definitions and interpretative strategies, the CCI would establish itself as a forward-thinking regulator, ensuring that India's competition laws are in harmony with global trends where regulatory bodies are increasingly examining the influence of algorithms on market collusion. Such a transition could also motivate businesses to focus on ethical algorithm development, encouraging them to implement safeguards against unintended collusive effects, thereby promoting a fair and competitive digital marketplace in India.

Determining accountability in cases involving algorithmic decision making presents considerable challenges for the CCI due to the inherent complexities of ascribing responsibility. As algorithms increasingly function autonomously, pinpointing who is accountable for anti-competitive actions becomes intricate. The traditional view of holding human operators solely liable may not suffice when algorithms are capable of making pricing decisions independently, without direct human intervention. This challenge is intensified by the fact that many algorithms are engineered to operate with minimal oversight, creating a disconnect between human agents and the outcomes produced by these systems. For instance, when a pricing algorithm autonomously modifies rates based on competitive behaviour, the difficulty lies in determining whether liability rests with the designers of the algorithm or the companies implementing it. As a result, establishing responsibility for potential collusion becomes ambiguous in such scenarios. Moreover, evaluating the degree to which individuals could have foreseen or influenced the behaviour of algorithms is crucial for assessing liability. Algorithms that are designed to learn and adapt from data can complicate the determination of culpability. If an algorithm autonomously adjusts its pricing strategies based on market dynamics without explicit guidance from its developers, it becomes problematic to demonstrate that those developers acted with negligence or intent to collude. This situation raises further questions about whether creators intentionally design algorithms that could facilitate anti-competitive practices. Proving intent or negligence in this context is complicated, particularly when algorithmic operations may not be entirely transparent or predictable. The unpredictable nature of algorithmic actions heightens concerns regarding consumer welfare and market fairness, emphasizing the need for regulatory frameworks capable of addressing the distinctive characteristics of algorithm driven behaviour.

The current legal landscape may not adequately address the intricacies introduced by algorithmic decision making. As the CCI navigates these evolving dynamics, it may face challenges in establishing clear standards for illegality and liability in situations involving algorithmic conduct. The absence of established legal precedents can make it difficult for the CCI to adopt consistent approaches to liability that effectively encompass the complexities of algorithm driven behaviour. Additionally, the potential for shared liability among the algorithm's creator, user, and beneficiary adds another layer of complication. Determining how to allocate responsibility among these parties can lead to disputes that heavily depend on the specific circumstances surrounding each case. For example, if an algorithm results in price-fixing, should liability fall solely on the company utilizing the algorithm, or should the

developers also bear some responsibility? This ambiguity can lead to contention over accountability, further complicating the CCI's enforcement efforts.

As these legal questions emerge in court, they could result in inconsistent rulings, complicating the enforcement landscape for the CCI. If courts interpret the relationship between algorithmic actions and human responsibility in varying manners, this could generate legal uncertainty that undermines the effectiveness and authority of the CCI. Additionally, the complex nature of algorithmic collusion may prompt a reevaluation of existing regulatory frameworks to ensure they adequately address these issues. Adapting competition law to account for the unique attributes of algorithm driven conduct is crucial for maintaining market integrity and safeguarding consumer interests in a digital economy. In this regard, the CCI might benefit from collaborative efforts with legal experts, technologists, and industry stakeholders to foster a more comprehensive understanding of algorithmic behaviour and its implications for competition policy. Ultimately, the relationship between human accountability and algorithmic actions raises intricate legal questions that challenge current frameworks and may require significant adjustments to effectively address competition violations in an increasingly automated market landscape. To effectively address these complexities and ensure proper accountability in algorithmic decision making, it is crucial to investigate suggested strategies that utilize current antitrust instruments while modifying them to tackle the challenges presented by a progressively automated market.

RECOMMENDED APPROACHES USING THE EXISITNG ANTI-TRUST TOOLS

As the landscape of competition law should evolve in response to the growing influence of algorithms and artificial intelligence, it is necessary to identify and implement effective strategies to utilize the existing anti-trust tools within our country and to adopt the necessary measure which is proved to be effective from foreign countries and their respective competition laws and regulations. Now I would like to recommend approaches for the CCI, highlighting the need to adapt current legal frameworks existing in our country to address the unique challenges posed by algorithmic collusion. By harnessing these establishes and practices tools, the regulatory authority within our country can enhance their enforcement capabilities, foster fair competition and can ensure that market dynamics remain conducive to innovation and consumer welfare. The recommended approaches to control and prevent algorithmic collusion can be classified into two: Non-Regulatory approaches and Regulatory approaches.

NON-REGULATORY APPROACHES

As competition law progresses, addressing the challenge of algorithmic collusion necessitates a thorough and strategic approach. Although there are proponents for substantial legislative reforms aimed at reevaluating the current frameworks related to tacit collusion, particularly in the context of AI systems and their accountability, conventional antitrust practices continue to play a crucial role in effectively managing competitive issues. This section delineates several essential strategies, such as conducting market studies, enhancing merger control enforcement, and executing remedial measures. Each of these strategies is vital for maintaining market integrity and sets the stage for a more in-depth examination of market regulation in subsequent sections.

1. **Market Research and Analysis**

   Effective antitrust enforcement hinges on the identification of anti-competitive practices that adversely affect market competition and consumer welfare. Nonetheless, there are situations where a market may display dysfunction without evident collusion among competitors. In such scenarios, competition authorities can undertake market research or sector inquiries to explore the fundamental causes of market failures. These inquiries are vital instruments for regulators, allowing them to gather and scrutinize extensive data concerning market dynamics, competitive interactions, and consumer behaviours. When examining algorithmic collusion, competition authorities should assess whether the algorithms utilized by companies promote coordinated actions that compromise competition. This involves evaluating various market attributes that could lead to collusive results, such as elevated transparency, predictability in pricing tactics, and frequent interactions among market players. By understanding these dynamics, regulators can identify the specific conditions under which algorithmic collusion is likely to occur. The outcomes of market research can provide several notable advantages. For instance, they may lead to recommendations for regulatory measures aimed at removing legal or structural obstacles that hinder competition. If a market analysis reveals that certain regulatory frameworks unintentionally foster collusive behaviour, regulators can advocate for essential reforms. Furthermore, these studies can stimulate advocacy within the business sector, encouraging firms to implement best practices to ensure adherence to competition laws. This may include the establishment of self-regulatory initiatives, such as codes of conduct governing the design and application of pricing algorithms, thereby fostering ethical standards and competitive

integrity within the industry. In regions including the United Kingdom, Iceland, and Mexico, competition authorities are empowered to carry out market investigations that extend beyond simple market studies. These investigations allow agencies to issue non-binding recommendations aimed at assisting businesses in complying with competition regulations. When deemed necessary, authorities may also implement structural or behavioural remedies to reestablish competitive conditions within the market. The adaptability provided by market investigations enables agencies to take proactive measures in addressing potential competition concerns.

2. Ex Ante Merger Control

In conjunction with market analyses, competition authorities can adopt a proactive stance by enhancing ex ante merger control frameworks specifically aimed at mitigating risks associated with algorithmic operations. This approach entails a reassessment of the intervention thresholds in merger cases, particularly in sectors where algorithms play a crucial role in influencing competitive interactions. Historically, authorities have concentrated on mergers reducing the number of competitors from three to two, which are often viewed as high-risk scenarios for tacit collusion. However, there is an increasing acknowledgment that coordinated effects can also arise from mergers involving four or five key players. By expanding the parameters of merger evaluations, competition authorities can more effectively pinpoint potential risks linked to algorithmic collusion in markets that are less concentrated. For instance, if a merger modifies market characteristics such as diminishing transparency or amplifying the frequency of competitor interactions it may elevate the risk of tacit collusion. Consequently, authorities should prioritize the assessment of how proposed mergers could influence these vital factors and the probability of coordinated behaviour among market participants. Furthermore, authorities may need to reevaluate their stance on conglomerate mergers, particularly when algorithms enable tacit collusion across various product markets. Algorithms can uncover correlations within large datasets, enabling firms to anticipate competitor actions in seemingly unrelated sectors. This interconnectedness underscores the necessity for a comprehensive evaluation of mergers, as even minor alterations in market structure can have a profound impact on competition.

3. Commitments and Potential Remedies

Competition law enforcement agencies may adopt a behavioural strategy to deter tacit collusion among oligopolists by obstructing the formation of mechanisms that promote collusion. This proactive approach could entail a thorough examination of specific algorithms that support collusive equilibria, including monitoring or signaling algorithms that allow competitors to coordinate their actions without direct communication. While this area of law is still evolving, it is becoming increasingly crucial to acknowledge the potential of competition law in addressing practices driven by algorithms. Actions taken by competition authorities can result in the implementation of remedies, including commitments that firms can undertake to prevent anti-competitive behaviour. These remedies are designed to address and avert harm to the competitive process stemming from unilateral actions or facilitating practices. For example, competition authorities might contemplate the introduction of compliance or monitoring programs specifically tailored to the distinct characteristics of algorithmic behaviour. Such initiatives would assist in ensuring that firms comply with competition principles, thereby reducing the risks associated with algorithmic collusion.

An alternative approach to addressing potential remedies is the establishment of a "notice and take down" procedure. This system would mandate that online platforms swiftly eliminate content associated with identified anti-competitive practices, thereby ensuring a timely reaction to any violations. Additionally, the introduction of auditing mechanisms for algorithms could facilitate oversight to confirm that these algorithms are structured in accordance with competitive regulations. Nonetheless, this strategy encounters obstacles, as algorithms are primarily designed to optimize profits rather than to engage in collusive activities. Moreover, the rapid evolution of algorithmic technology complicates the auditing process, given the swift pace of advancements in machine learning and artificial intelligence. While conventional methods such as market analyses, strengthened merger regulations, and remedial actions can effectively combat algorithmic collusion, they must be continually refined to address the challenges posed by fast-changing technologies. As competition authorities work to uphold market integrity in an increasingly algorithm-centric landscape, a proactive and flexible strategy will be essential for safeguarding consumer welfare and promoting vigorous competition.

REGULATORY APPRAOCHES

There are 8 main regulatory approaches that can be adopted by the CCI- the ultimate competition regulator of our country to contain and regulate the algorithmic collusion and they are follows:

1. **Establishing clear guidelines and framework**

   To effectively address the issue of algorithmic collusion, the Competition Commission of India should create detailed guidelines that clearly define the concept and outline the legal framework relevant to companies in this area. These guidelines should start by identifying specific behaviours that signal algorithmic collusion, such as price-fixing, market allocation, and output restrictions that arise from algorithmic interactions rather than direct communication between competitors. Additionally, the guidelines must clarify the conditions under which such algorithmic behaviours could breach competition law. This assessment should take into account various factors, including the level of autonomy exhibited by the algorithms, the competitive dynamics of the market, and the historical context of competition among the firms involved. By clearly defining what constitutes anti-competitive behaviour, the CCI can improve firms' understanding of their legal responsibilities, thereby promoting compliance and aiding in the investigation of potential violations. Moreover, establishing a strong legal framework is essential for the effective investigation and prosecution of algorithmic collusion cases. The guidelines should outline the procedures the CCI will follow during investigations, including the criteria for assessing algorithmic behaviour. This approach will promote a fair and competitive marketplace by ensuring transparency and accountability in enforcement actions.

2. **Enhancing Algorithmic Transparency and Accountability**

   Transparency is crucial for understanding the operations of algorithms and identifying potential collusive activities. To improve transparency, the CCI could implement several initiatives. Firstly, it could require companies to disclose their algorithmic decision-making processes, particularly for algorithms that have a significant impact on pricing and market behaviour. This requirement would encompass information regarding data inputs, processing techniques, and the various elements that influence algorithmic outcomes. Moreover, companies should be obligated to provide detailed documentation that elucidates the functioning of their algorithms, including insights

into any machine learning methods employed and the rationale behind modifications to pricing or market strategies. Additionally, the CCI could develop a framework that allows regulatory bodies to reverse-engineer algorithms during their investigations. This strategy could involve partnerships with data scientists and technical specialists to enhance the understanding of algorithm functionalities and evaluate their potential contribution to collusion.

3. Implementing Monitoring and Auditing Mechanisms

Continuous oversight of algorithmic operations is crucial for the prompt detection of collusive activities. To support this initiative, the CCI could implement a variety of monitoring frameworks. One viable strategy is to establish a real-time monitoring system that assesses algorithmic behaviour across multiple sectors, thereby facilitating the identification of unusual patterns that could signify collusion. This system could utilize sophisticated analytics to pinpoint pricing irregularities that diverge from competitive norms. Moreover, the CCI might mandate periodic audits of the algorithmic systems utilized by significant corporations, especially in sectors prone to collusion, such as telecommunications, transportation, and retail. These audits would aim to ensure adherence to competition regulations and evaluate the risk of collusive conduct. Additionally, by integrating advanced data analytics and machine learning methodologies, the CCI can analyze market data to reveal trends and patterns indicative of collusion. Through the use of predictive modeling, the CCI would be positioned to anticipate potential anti-competitive behaviours before they manifest.

4. Promoting competition through data access

Access to data is essential for fostering competition, particularly in markets dominated by a few powerful entities. To ensure a level playing field, the CCI should support policies that promote data portability, enabling smaller enterprises to access and leverage critical data. This approach would empower these businesses to compete more effectively against larger corporations that enjoy algorithmic advantages. Moreover, the CCI could advocate for the development of interoperability standards that allow firms to share and analyze data while ensuring the protection of consumer privacy and proprietary rights. By nurturing a collaborative data environment, the potential for competition can be enhanced, thereby reducing the risk of collusion. Additionally, in certain situations, the CCI may encourage companies to engage in data-sharing

agreements that increase transparency and foster fair competition while safeguarding sensitive information.

5. **Encouraging Algorithmic innovation and best practices**

The CCI has the potential to cultivate an atmosphere conducive to innovation while mitigating the risks associated with collusion through various approaches. Firstly, the CCI should provide recommendations on best practices for ethical algorithm development that not only encourage competitive conduct but also deter collusive behaviour. Such guidance could include advice on designing algorithms that avoid anti-competitive pricing tactics. Furthermore, the CCI could engage with industry participants, including technology firms and academic institutions, to formulate ethical guidelines for algorithm creation. By promoting a culture of responsible algorithm development, companies will better comprehend their responsibilities under competition legislation. Lastly, the CCI may contemplate establishing incentives for organizations that commit to ethical algorithm practices, such as recognition initiatives or regulatory leniency for those adhering to these guidelines.

6. **Developing a framework for algorithmic design regulations**

Given the inherent risks linked to algorithmic collusion, the CCI may find it necessary to introduce regulations pertaining to algorithm design. One potential strategy could involve banning certain design elements that are recognized as facilitating collusion. For example, algorithms that independently modify prices based on competitors' pricing information without human oversight could face examination and regulation. Moreover, the CCI might consider implementing guidelines for algorithmic coordination, similar to Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics, to prevent algorithms from engaging in autonomous pricing practices that violate competition laws. Additionally, as algorithms and technological environments progress, the CCI should commit to frequently revising its regulations to effectively tackle emerging challenges associated with algorithmic collusion.

7. **Engaging a cross-border cooperation**

Given the global landscape of digital markets, the CCI should emphasize the importance of international cooperation to effectively combat algorithmic collusion. This initiative could commence with the sharing of information among competition

authorities across the globe, facilitating the exchange of insights regarding algorithmic collusion cases, best practices, and emerging trends. Such collaborative efforts would strengthen investigations and allow for coordinated enforcement actions. Furthermore, the CCI could participate in international forums to promote the creation of global standards governing algorithmic practices. These standards would aid in harmonizing regulatory approaches and bolster cross-border enforcement against anti-competitive conduct. Lastly, the CCI ought to explore opportunities for collaborative investigations with its international counterparts in instances involving multinational corporations suspected of algorithmic collusion across various jurisdictions.

8. Public Awareness and Education Initiatives

To improve compliance and increase awareness of the risks associated with algorithmic collusion, the CCI ought to prioritize public education initiatives. This initiative could commence with awareness campaigns aimed at informing businesses about the threats posed by algorithmic collusion and the significance of adhering to competition regulations. Such campaigns may encompass workshops, webinars, and a variety of informational resources. Moreover, the CCI should offer guidance on the ethical application of algorithms, highlighting the potential risks and repercussions linked to anti-competitive behaviours. By empowering businesses with essential knowledge, the CCI can cultivate a culture of compliance and responsible algorithm use. Additionally, partnering with universities and research institutions would enable the CCI to develop educational materials and courses that explore the interplay between algorithms, competition law, and ethical business conduct.

CONCLUSION

Traditional competition frameworks primarily designed to combat explicit, human driven collusion, are inadequate in addressing the nuanced and often obscure pricing and coordination strategies enabled by algorithms. This study conducts a comparative analysis of international practices, particularly focusing on the United States and the European Union, to highlight the necessity for a proactive and clearly defined regulatory approach. While regulators abroad have started to implement measures aimed at enhancing transparency and accountability to mitigate these risks, the Competition Commission of India continues to struggle with the uncertainties introduced by algorithmic collusion in Indian markets. The key findings indicate that algorithms can autonomously set prices and align strategies without

human involvement, posing a distinct challenge to current enforcement frameworks. The study pinpoints specific areas for reform within the Indian Competition Act, recommending updates that would empower the CCI to more effectively identify, investigate, and address instances of anti-competitive behaviour driven by algorithms. By establishing comprehensive guidelines that clarify the nature of algorithmic collusion, including the circumstances under which AI generated decisions contravene competition law, Indian regulatory authorities can bridge significant gaps and promote fairer market conditions. The research outlines a detailed roadmap of solutions, proposing both regulatory and non-regulatory strategies that could significantly bolster the CCI's capacity to tackle AI related competition challenges. Initially, it advocates for transparency and auditing mechanisms that would mandate companies to reveal critical elements of their algorithmic processes, thereby facilitating regulatory oversight and ethical scrutiny of their design. Additionally, the study recommends the implementation of real time monitoring systems and predictive analytics to enable the early detection of collusive behaviours before they compromise market integrity. Moreover, the importance of cross border regulatory collaboration is underscored as vital for effectively addressing cases that transcend national boundaries.