



COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA

Case No. 45 of 2025

In Re:

Mr. Harmeet Singh

House No.3/660, Block B,
Shivalik Vihar, Naya Gaon,
Tehsil Kharar,
District Sahibzada Ajit Singh
Nagar (SAS Nagar) Mohali,
Punjab

Informant

And

Nanuan's (Nanuan Travels)

Plot No. 1060, Janta Land
Private Limited (JLPL),
Industrial Area, Sector 82,
Sahibzada Ajit Singh Nagar
(SAS Nagar) Mohali- 160062,
Punjab

Opposite Party No. 1

**Shaheed Bhagat Singh
International Airport**

(Managed by Chandigarh
International Airport Limited)
Through Chief Executive
Officer, New Civil Air
Terminal, Sahibzada Ajit Singh
Nagar (SAS Nagar) Mohali –
140306, Punjab

Opposite Party No. 2

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. Harmeet Singh (“**Informant**”) against Nanuan’s (Luxury Car Rental Company also known as Nanuan Travels) (“**Opposite Party No. 1**”/ “**OP-1**”) and Shaheed Bhagat Singh International Airport (“**Opposite Party No. 2**”/ “**OP-2**”) managed by Chandigarh International Airport Limited (“**CHIAL**”) under Section 19(1)(a) of the Competition Act, 2002 (“**Act**”), alleging contravention of the provisions of Sections 3 and 4 of the Act.
2. As per the Information, the Informant is a self-employed worker, who works as a solo cab/taxi driver under an All India Tourist Permit issued under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988.
3. OP-1 is a licensed taxi/cab operator which provides all types of taxis/cabs including self-drive car rental services in Chandigarh, Mohali and Panchkula. It is stated that the tender for providing taxi/cab services at OP-2 has been awarded to OP-1.
4. OP-2 is administered/governed/regulated by CHIAL. CHIAL invites public tenders for providing public utility services including taxi/cab services at OP-2.
5. As per the Information, taxi/cab operators apply for the tender and whoever fulfills all the terms & conditions is awarded the tender to provide cab/taxi services at OP-2. It is stated that the taxi/cab operator which gets the license to operate at the airport gets a spot to establish a canopy/booth at arrival gate no. 1 of the airport where it can appoint maximum 2 persons to stand for assisting the travellers who seek taxi/cab services.
6. It is stated that simultaneously, there are other solo cab/taxi drivers in the market, who particularly operate at the airport. Solo cab/taxi drivers are also registered under relevant transport laws/rules, and operate in different manners like working individually by talking to passengers at the airport, registering themselves with online cab/taxi applications (Ola, Uber, Rapido, In Drive, *etc.*), small unions, travel agencies, hotels, companies *etc.*



7. The Informant has stated that any operator who wins the tender for taxi/cab services at the airport gains a dominant position, which is allegedly exploited through several anti-competitive practices like exclusionary practices, predatory conduct and digital market manipulation, causing appreciable adverse effect on competition and severe consumer harm.
8. The Informant has particularly narrated an incident that happened on 10.09.2024, while he was standing at the ground area of OP-2 in front of the arrival gate no. 1 to wait for passengers. It has been alleged that the persons of OP-1 restricted him to stand at that spot and asked him to show if he had a ride booking or not. After the Informant refused to show his mobile, they started threatening him. It is further alleged that the Informant reported this incident to local police, who didn't take any action.
9. It is alleged that OP-1 misuses its privileged position by preventing solo taxi/cab drivers from accessing areas in proximity to arrival gate no. 1 of OP-2. It is also stated that by establishing its booth/canopy directly in front of arrival gate no. 1, OP-1 captures all passengers exiting the airport premises, thereby achieving absolute monopolistic control with zero competition. It is further alleged that this strategic position enables OP-1 to charge arbitrarily high fares to passengers, frequently exceeding the maximum fare limits agreed with CHIAL.
10. It is alleged that OP-1's anti-competitive conduct extends beyond excessive pricing to exploitation of solo cab drivers. It is stated that this exploitation manifests through multiple forms of intimidation and coercion, including death threats directed at solo drivers, threats of physical violence, threats to destroy mobile phones and other personal property and various other forms of intimidation designed to eliminate competition.
11. The Informant has defined the relevant product market as "*Taxi/Cab Transportation Services at Chandigarh International Airport*" based on distinct consumer need, limited substitutability, captive consumer base and regulatory framework.
12. Based on factors like uniform competitive conditions, physical constraints, exclusive access requirements and passenger behaviour, the Informant has identified relevant



geographic market as “*territories of States of Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh*”, as Chandigarh International Airport is the gateway to these states’ territories.

13. It is stated that in order to maintain its monopolistic control in the market, OP-1 uses violence as a deterrent mechanism. Further, it is alleged that OP-1 has corrupted local law enforcement institutions as despite numerous complaints were filed by the Informant, yet no investigation or lawful action was initiated on the complaints.

The key allegations, as stated by the Informant are as under:

14. Market Foreclosure and Exclusionary Conduct: It has been alleged that OP-1 uses its strategically placed booth near the arrival gate no. 1 to capture all exiting passengers, creating an absolute monopolistic control with zero competition. By using criminal force and other illegal means, OP-1 prevents solo cab drivers from accessing public areas near arrival gate no. 1 to pick up passengers.

15. Exploitative Pricing: It has been alleged that by eliminating competition, OP-1 is able to charge arbitrarily high fares, often violating the maximum price limits set in its agreement with the CHIAL.

16. Intimidation and Violence: It is alleged that OP-1 enforces its monopoly through coercion. This includes death threats, threats of physical violence, and use of hired enforcers to assault drivers who protest their exclusion.

17. Institutional Corruption: The Informant has alleged corruption of local law enforcement agencies. It is also alleged that the Informant was physically assaulted, threatened, and coerced by the police officials inside the police station.

18. The Informant has filed an Interlocutory Application (‘IA’) bearing IA No. 488 of 2025 dated 18.12.2025, seeking interim relief under Section 33 of the Act, requesting to:

- i. Restrain OP-1 from preventing solo cab/taxi drivers from accessing public areas at Chandigarh Airport and from interfering with their lawful right to operate under All India Tourist Permits.
- ii. Prohibit the forced cancellation of passengers confirmed through online bookings with digital platforms including Ola, Uber, Rapido, In Drive, etc.



- iii. Stop all forms of violence, intimidation, and harassment against competing drivers, including death threats and physical assault.
- iv. Direct CHIAL to enforce tender terms and conditions impartially and prevent violations of license agreements.
- v. Ensure protection of the Informant from retaliation given the documented pattern of violence and institutional corruption.

19. Based on aforesaid facts and allegations, the Informant has prayed before the Commission to grant the following reliefs:

- i. Direct the Director General (“**DG**”) to conduct a comprehensive investigation under Section 26(1) of the Act into the systematic abuse of dominant position by OP-1 in the relevant market of “*taxi/cab transportation services at Chandigarh International Airport*”.
- ii. Examine the anti-competitive practices including predatory pricing, market foreclosure, digital booking interference, and systematic elimination of competition through violence and institutional corruption.
- iii. Investigate the structural monopolistic conditions created by the tender system that enables any licensee to abuse its dominant position systematically.
- iv. Hold OP-1 and others guilty under Sections 3 & 4 of the Act and pass orders imposing rigorous monetary penalty commensurate with the severity, duration and nature of the anti-competitive conduct under Section 27(b) of the Act.
- v. Direct appropriate authorities to take corrective action regarding institutional corruption that enabled and facilitated the anti-competitive conduct.
- vi. Issue guidelines for digital marketplace protection ensuring that confirmed online bookings cannot be manipulated or cancelled through coercion.
- vii. Pass any other order that the Commission deems fit and proper in the interest of competition, consumer welfare and market efficiency.



20. The Commission considered the matter in its ordinary meeting held on 25.03.2026 and decided to pass an appropriate order in due course.
21. After perusing the Information along with the documents placed on record by the Informant, the Commission notes that the primary grievance of the Informant is that OP-1, having been granted a license to provide taxi/cab services by OP-2, has misused its alleged dominant position by preventing solo taxi/cab drivers from accessing areas in proximity to arrival gate no. 1 of OP-2. The Informant is also aggrieved that all the exiting passengers are captured by OP-1 which results in absolute monopolistic control with zero competition, in contravention of Sections 3 and 4 of the Act.
22. The Commission notes that OP-1 has been awarded a license for providing taxi/cab services pursuant to a competitive tender process floated by CHIAL to operate through a booth/canopy located in front of arrival gate no. 1 of OP-2. The Commission is of the view that since OP-1 established a canopy/booth on account of being awarded the said tender, the Informant cannot claim a right to stand directly adjacent to it.
23. In this regard, the Commission has examined the relevant clauses of the tender document and the licence agreement executed between OP-1 and CHIAL and notes that as per clause 14 of the license agreement, OP-1 has no exclusive right to operate in the said premises. The said clause is reproduced as follows:
- “14. The licensee shall have no claim for exclusivity and CHAIL shall be at liberty to permit/provide other similar facilities at other area in the terminal building, as may be necessitated by demand or as may be desired by the CHAIL in its sole discretion.”*
24. The Commission notes that awarding tender to OP-1 does not, *per se*, confer any statutory or *de-facto* exclusive right to operate in the said premises. The license merely enables OP-1 to operate within the designated space subject to terms and conditions imposed by CHIAL. Such grant of license through a competitive bidding process, is a standard commercial arrangement and cannot be construed as creating barrier to entry or foreclosing competition in the relevant market.



25. The Commission further notes that as per the Information, there are solo cab/taxi operators like the Informant as well as those registered with online taxi/cab applications (OLA, Uber *etc.*) who are also allowed to provide their services at OP-2. Thus, the allegations that all exiting passengers are captured by OP-1 doesn't hold good as the passengers retain the choice to use app-based taxi/cab service providers or pre-arranged transport (either from company, hotel or self-booked).
26. In view of the allegations levelled by the Informant, the Commission is of the view that the grievances raised by the Informant regarding restriction on solo taxi/cab drivers appear to relate to operational arrangements rather than any anti-competitive conduct attributed to OP-1 flowing from an exclusive right. Therefore, in the absence of exclusivity and given that CHIAL retains the discretion to introduce competing service providers, the Commission finds no material indicating existence of any anti-competitive conduct which necessitates further inquiry by the Commission with regard to contravention of Section 4 of the Act.
27. With regard to violation of Section 3 of the Act, the Commission notes that there is no evidence on record which indicates any anti-competitive agreement including cartel or bid-rigging, necessitating further inquiry by the Commission.
28. Further, as regards the allegation regarding enforcing monopoly through coercion by OP-1, the Commission observes that the same is related to alleged criminal conduct on the part of OP-1 and does not fall within the purview of competition law.
29. The Commission notes that the Informant has not made specific allegations against OP-2, therefore the conduct of OP-2 doesn't merit scrutiny.
30. In view of the allegations raised in the Information and the analysis carried out in preceding paragraphs, the Commission is of the opinion that no *prima facie* case of contravention of Sections 3 and 4 of the Act is made out against OP-1 and OP-2. Accordingly, the Information is directed to be closed forthwith under Section 26(2) of the Act.



31. Consequently, no case for grant of interim relief under Section 33 of the Act, as sought by the Informant arises and the same is also rejected. Accordingly, IA No. 488 of 2025 stands disposed.

32. The Secretary is directed to communicate to the Parties, accordingly.

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

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

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

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

New Delhi

Date: 08.06.2026