



सत्यमेव जयते



Fair Competition  
For Greater Good

**COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA**

**Case No. 31 of 2025**

**In Re:**

**Mr. Vedansh Pandey**

**Informant**

WB-25, Plot No. 8, UG/F, Flat No. 104,  
Gali No.1, Ganesh Nagar-II, Near MCD Office,  
Shakarpur, Delhi-110092

**And**

**Roppen Transportation Services Private Limited**  
(‘Rapido’)

**Opposite Party**

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Sai Prithvi Arcade, Megha Hills,  
Sri Rama Colony, Madhapur,  
Hyderabad- 500081

**CORAM**

**Ms. Ravneet Kaur**  
**Chairperson**

**Mr. Anil Agrawal**  
**Member**

**Ms. Sweta Kakkad**  
**Member**

**Mr. Deepak Anurag**  
**Member**

**Order under Section 26(2) of the Competition Act, 2002**

1. The present Information has been filed by Mr. Vedansh Pandey (‘**Informant**’) under Section 19(1)(a) of the Competition Act, 2002 (‘**Act**’) alleging contravention of the



provisions of Sections 3 and 4 of the Act by Roppen Transportation Services Private Limited (**'Rapido'**/ **'Opposite Party'**/ **'OP'**).

2. The Informant is the Director of Mantramugdh Communications and Consultancy (OPC) Private Limited which runs '*Anything Legit*', a licensed aggregator under the Uttarakhand On-Demand (Information Technology Based) Contract Carriage Transport Rules, 2020. It is stated that the pilot phase of operations commenced in November, 2024.
3. The OP, as per information available in the public domain, provides technology-based services and acts as an intermediary for facilitating: (i) on-demand transportation services by means of two-wheelers and (ii) pick up and drop off services of packages from one location to the other through service providers/drivers.
4. It is averred by the Informant that between 21.07.2025 and 24.07.2025, the Informant's compliance team conducted a covert audit in Rishikesh, Tapovan and Dehradun by booking multiple rides *via* OP's platform. It is stated that the following practices were revealed through the audit:
  - a) The motorcycles used for the rides were found to have private registration numbers, in clear violation of commercial transport regulations that mandate yellow number plates for any vehicle being used to carry passengers.
  - b) Vehicles *sans* contract carriage permits and commercial insurance coverage were being deployed for public transport *via* OP's app.
  - c) Informal sums were being paid to certain law enforcement officials in order to evade vehicle seizure or penalties while operating without proper permits.
5. It is also alleged by the Informant that the OP operates a hub and spoke arrangement by allowing dispatch of two wheelers with no permit (white plate), encouraging off-app cash solicitations and identity/account sharing. It is alleged that the vertical restraints foreclose lawful supply, decrease prices below cost and divert demand from competitors, including the Informant, resulting in violation of Section 3 of the Act.



6. It is alleged by the Informant that the variable cost per kilometer is approximately Rs.1.50 lower than a yellow plate operator, which enables fare-undercutting by 15-30%, diverting all the rides from the Informant's platform across Dehradun-Rishikesh. It is stated that the Informant has incurred a loss of Rs.10 Lakh and a 90% decline in active drivers, several of whom switched to OP's platform. The Informant has annexed various news articles and documents such as the measures taken by the State Transport Authority, CM Helpline Status Log, *etc.*, to substantiate the allegation that private vehicles are being used as bike taxi to provide two-wheeler passenger transport services in the State of Uttarakhand.
7. As per the Informant OP has violated the provisions of Section 4 of the Act, *inter-alia*, by providing services at a lower price, as compared to its competitors, in violation of Section 4(2)(a)(ii) of the Act. It is also alleged that the OP has indulged in the practice of denial of market access by steering customers in its favour which is in violation of Section 4(2)(c) of the Act.
8. For assessment of abuse of dominance by the OP, the Informant has defined the relevant product market as '*App-based on demand two-wheeler passenger transport services*' and the relevant geographic market as the '*Uttarakhand Cluster*'. However, it is pertinent to note that the Informant, inspite of demarcating the geographical market as Uttarakhand, prays for a pan India investigation by the Director General ('DG').
9. The Informant has filed an Interlocutory Application ('I.A.') No. 411 of 2025 on 03.10.2025, seeking the following interim reliefs under Section 33 of the Act:
  - a) direct a geo-fenced suspension of any two-wheeler without a valid transport permit in the State of Uttarakhand, with immediate effect, pending disposal of the Information;
  - b) direct the OP to discontinue off-app cash solicitations and block identity/account sharing on its platform across India, pending inquiry;



- c) order immediate preservation (freeze and escrow) of electronic data/logs maintained by the OP from 01.10.2024 till conclusion of proceedings, state-wise, including:
- i) KYC/permit files (PDF/images/metadata), onboarding records;
  - ii) ride-search/match/dispatch logs, cancellation and re-assignment logs;
  - iii) pricing/surge logs and fare overrides;
  - iv) device IDs, IP addresses, GPS traces, account linkages, exception/whitelist tables;
  - v) feature-flag histories and policy-change logs; together with deletion logs and retention settings; and to file an affidavit of preservation within 7 days.
- d) direct non-retaliation by the OP against any rider/driver/whistle-blower cooperating with the inquiry, and provide a dedicated reporting channel (email/app form);
- e) direct fortnightly compliance reports by a named officer of the OP to the Commission, including a state-wise dashboard of lawful mixed fleet, enforcement triggers and remedial steps;
- f) permit service by e-mail and treat digitally signed filings as sufficient for interim purposes;
- g) pass such other orders as the Commission may deem fit in the interest of justice and equity.

10. The Informant has also sought the following reliefs:

- a) direct DG investigation under Section 26(1) of the Act with pan-India scope;
- b) cease and desist order with market corrective directions across India;
- c) monitor for a period of twelve months with key performance indicators and independent audits;



d) cost of litigation.

11. In the ordinary meeting held on 07.01.2026, the Commission considered the Information and decided to pass an appropriate order in due course.

12. At the outset, the Commission notes that the Informant has alleged that the OP without verifying permit fees, commercial-tax premiums, annual fitness testing and third-party passenger risk insurance, *etc.*, allows the usage of private/unlicensed bike-taxi while offering the service of two-wheeler passenger aggregation, which in turn enables the OP to offer rides at cheaper prices. The Informant has alleged that the OP has violated the provisions of Section 4 of the Act, *inter-alia*, by providing services at a lower price, as compared to its competitors, in violation of Section 4(2)(a)(ii) of the Act. It is also alleged that the OP has indulged in the practice of denial of market access by steering customers in its favour which is in violation of Section 4(2)(c) of the Act. The Informant has also cursorily stated that the OP operates a hub and spoke style platform arrangement.

13. The Commission notes that the crux of the allegation raised by the Informant is that private vehicles without necessary permits, are being used by the OP and is of the view that the same falls beyond the purview of the Act. A special legislation, *i.e.* Motor Vehicles Act, 1988, is in place to deal with the allegations raised in that regard. The Commission also notes that the Information is devoid of any evidence to indicate any competition concern as envisaged under the provisions of Section 3 and/or Section 4 of the Act. Therefore, having regard to the nature of allegations raised in the Information, the Commission is of the view that the delineation of the relevant market and subsequent assessment of dominance and abuse may be dispensed with.

14. Thus, having read the Information and the annexures, the Commission is of the view that no *prima facie* case of contravention under Section 3 and/or Section 4 of the Act has been made out by the Informant and that the present Information be closed forthwith under Section 26(2) of the Act. Consequently, no case for grant of relief(s) as sought under Section 33 of the Act arises, and the same is also rejected. Accordingly, the I.A. No. 411 of 2025 is disposed of as dismissed.



15. The Commission while holding the above has expressed nothing on the merits of the legal rights and remedies available to the Informant.
16. The Secretary is directed to communicate the order to the Informant, accordingly.

**Sd/-**  
**(Ravneet Kaur)**  
**Chairperson**

**Sd/-**  
**(Anil Agrawal)**  
**Member**

**Sd/-**  
**(Sweta Kakkad)**  
**Member**

**Sd/-**  
**(Deepak Anurag)**  
**Member**

**Place: New Delhi**

**Date: 17.03.2026**