

COMPETITIVE ISSUES IN THE NEW AGE MARKETS – CHALLENGES AND WAY FORWARD

Ayush Srivastava & Ayush Srivastava***

Bennett University, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh

“...content Builds relationship. Relationships are built on trust. Trust drives Revenue”

- **Andrew Davis**

Introduction

The basic definition of ‘market’ is similar in all areas. In the management context, ‘market’¹ is an actual or nominal place where the forces of demand and supply operate, and where buyers and sellers interact (directly or through intermediaries) to trade goods, services, or contracts or instruments, for money or barter. Whereas, in the legal context a market² is a public time and an appointed space used for buying and selling. The ‘New Age Market’ is how the market has evolved and is evolving. New age market are markets, which are backed up by technology such as e-markets, or the online markets. The market for a particular product be it a new age or old age is made up of potential

customers who need it and the willingness as well as the ability to pay for it.

The competition in India is being regulated by the Competition Commission of India (“CCI”) which has enacted a legislation known as the Competition Act of 2002³ to regulate and maintain a healthy competition in India. It further makes sure that no one is using unfair means or no ethical method such as forceful acquisition of competitor to or the commission penalizes misusing the data to get ahead in the competition and the one who tries to do so.

Historical Evolution of Market

Historical evidence of how competition has crimped the strategies of Industries towards

PREFERRED CITATION

- Ayush Srivastava & Ayush Srivastava, Competitive issues in the new age markets – challenges and way forward, *The Lex-Warrior: Online Law Journal*, (2020) 3, pp. 60 – 72, ISSN (O): 2319-8338

* VI Semester, BBA (Hons.), School of Management

** VI Semester, BBA, LL.B (Hons.), School of Law

¹ Investopedia <[https:// www. investopedia. com/terms/m/market.asp](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/market.asp)>, Last accessed on 12th December, 2019

² The Legal Dictionary <[http:// thelawdictionary. org /market/](http://thelawdictionary.org/market/)>

³ Competition Commission of India official website <[https:// www. cci. gov. in/competition-act](https://www.cci.gov.in/competition-act)>

market⁴: Perhaps, competition has been termed as an ‘unhealthy’ word in many books, but if competition taken in a good way, it can help oneself to boost up to full of their abilities. In the forthcoming paragraphs, we’ll be portraying the timeline of how the industries had to refurbish their marketing orientation strategies over time as the competition intensified.

Evolution of the marketing concept: It’s not just we humans who have evolved from apes to homo-sapiens, it’s also our buying pattern and way of perceiving the market which have unfolded over the time-horizon. Mainly after the Industrial revolution, when ‘real manufacturing’ started, from hand-production to machines expanding at a large scale, the concept of ‘marketing’ was discovered. However, markets still existed in the pre-colonial and medieval period, but they were subsisting. There was no felicitous orientation of these markets. To systematize the dynamic realm of ‘marketing’, the overture of market concept happened. Marketing concept is a managerial philosophy, which also has been revised over time to fulfil, stimulate and satisfy the customer at a profit.

Production Orientation Philosophy: Till the great depression had not happened, there was a strong belief in the market that

whenever a firm has a good product. It will automatically generate its sales with little or no promotional efforts. That is if the firm fulfils the need of the customer by offering a product with reasonable price and desired quality there is no need of special marketing efforts. Competition in this era was minimal as the number of firms were limited and the consumers were less demanding.

Sales Orientation philosophy: After a decade, roughly by 1940. When the competition started rising, failures of the production orientation philosophy started giving speed brakes to industries. It was a time to re-shape the earlier concept, the new concept was termed as ‘Sales orientation philosophy’ it holds good to a certain extent till date. Now, producing the best quality products wasn’t the only resort to multiply your sales figures, the firm also had to do aggressive salesmanship entailing effective sales promotion, advertising and mass advertising.

Customer Orientation Philosophy: The dynamics of the business were changing rapidly, competition was so thriving between industries, that a new marketing orientation philosophy had to be brought in only a decade later. In the 1950s, when the great depression was becoming a faint memory and towns became cities, people moved out

⁴ Manoj Sharma, *Evolution of Marketing Concept* <<http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/marketing/evolution-of-marketing-concept-with-diagram/48793>>

to the suburbs, jobs opportunities were upheld, basically pockets were green. Contextually customer regained their confidence, the firms who had to out throw the competition went to follow this new philosophy of customer orientation; wherein the business had to undertake and understand the needs, wants, desires and value of the potential consumers and inventories accordingly, so that consumer specification were totally met.

Social Orientation Philosophy: It was the time when conglomerates were settling down to the ground, there were big business firms who were single handedly controlling the entire market, competition was at its pinnacle. Around the 1970's roughly after a decade of the conglomerate boom. this new marketing philosophy of customer orientation was introduced. It was beyond product differentiation, product quality or customer satisfaction. The businesses had to purvey social and environmental welfare as well, for example a firm manufacturing a pack of cigarettes must produce the best cigarettes, but they should be pollution free, an automobile with the best fuel economy and gearbox but also a much less pollutant one.

Moving to the heart of the article, 'real challenges' that are being faced by the market and its players are being discussed.

Challenges in the New Age Market

While it is very well evident that the Competition Laws of India are very well shaped for the current physical market of India but it is always lagging behind when it comes to the digital market and it is very well evident that the world is moving towards the digital age which is driven by technology and so is the market. The oil or the currency for the new age market is data. There are tons of app whose revenue generation is based on these data. The business model of the current market is *Surveillance Capitalism*⁵ meaning the business model built over Internet or in simpler terms "*the business model of internet*" and using this model several social media and all other such platforms collects user's data and monetize and make big amount of money. Companies like Google, Facebook, Amazon etc. have all built an empire over it.

But when all of the '*Big Data*' a term use to describe a massive amount of both structured and unstructured data which so huge that it is difficult to process using traditional data base as well as software techniques; is in the hands of few digital players like Google, Facebook and Amazon which by using high end

⁵ John Naughton, *'The goal is to automate us': welcome to the age of surveillance capitalism* <[https:// www.theguardian.com/ technology/ 2019/ jan/ 20/](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/jan/20/)

shoshana -zuboff-age-of-surveillance-capitalism-google-facebook>

computing and algorithms have created their market dominance thereby creating an imbalance for new market players and at the same time hurting both the producers and consumers of the data and which may result in a combine problem of *Data Privacy and Net Neutrality*.

Data Privacy is the breach of the users' private data for their own use without users' consent. In the digital age data privacy has also become very basic human right. And these few market giants using advance algorithms based on data derived from social media and their search engines analyze and predict their customer behavior. And prediction like these have previously held these business giants in deep water. They have been using their dominant position till date for their own benefit and creating entry barrier for new comers and as well as exiting players in the market and what is more bothering is the fact that the Indian Government are least concerned with this and have term this task of market as a nuanced task when asked to them and due to the lack of inability of the government to address upon this condition of concentration in the market has resulted in the creation of the digital market oligarchy by small companies such as Google, Facebook, WhatsApp, Amazon etc. and due to these

Economies of scale and scope, data-driven network effects and the control of data creates a high barriers to entry. For example, Google do use the search data of its users to improve its search engine algorithms; new entrants in the markets do not have this advantage. Establishing such a successful platform that can attract sufficient online traffic is a significant challenge for the newcomers. Even if start-ups enter the market, they soon face competitive pressure and may eventually be acquired by dominant platforms. Google has acquired about 212 business entities since its founding in 1998 and the value of these acquisitions is more than \$17 billion⁶. A similar example can be found in the case of Facebook⁷ which has acquired newcomers of WhatsApp and then said that two will function independently, now have collaborated as now the contacts of WhatsApp are now being shown in Facebook and in Instagram which is also owned by Facebook thus implying the entry barrier and irregular use of the dominant position for creating entry barrier for newcomer and this is in return let these market giants enjoy a significant returns to scale. Also, the digital platforms have changed the classical approach of doing business, which defined the goal of a private company as the maximization of profits. The new business model prioritizes growth over

⁶ See <https://acquiredby.co/google-acquisitions/>.

⁷ Natasha Lomas, *Facebook to admit ownership of Instagram, WhatsApp in barely visible small-print* <[https://](https://techcrunch.com/2019/08/03/facebook-to-admit-ownership-of-instagram-whatsapp-in-hard-to-read-small-print/)

techcrunch.com/2019/08/03/facebook-to-admit-ownership-of-instagram-whatsapp-in-hard-to-read-small-print/>

the profits in the short to medium terms, that is, the maximization of the number of users rather than the profits. Dominant platforms can afford such a business strategy given the leeway to incur losses by investors. For instance, Amazon was permitted by investors to grow without any pressure to show the profits, and thereby expanded its business and entrenched its dominance as an electronic commerce (e-commerce) marketplace⁸ and not only are these hampering the classical model these are hampering the classical established Indian markets and their day to day operations.

Business sectors like mobile, grocery, food, electronics or electrical appliances, lifestyle, and hotels are deeply affected the advanced algorithm mechanism and bigdata few online giants have let to conflict in the physical and digital market. In the case of Hotel Industries according to CCI⁹ they are giving preferential treatment to select few hotel vendors and hotel industries in general are suffering to the price displayed in OYO or Trivago and the actual desk price and how are they running in losses. And due to Swiggy, Zomato restaurants are forced due lower its prices further to attract customers. Similarly,

Amazon have hampered all the retail market with absolute dominance and all the data are with them and they predict customer behaviour using the big data.

Dominant platforms with the existing data have also expanded into other related businesses, with the only objective of accessing more data. For instance, Google gives its Android operating system free of charge to the mobile telephone manufacturers, thereby enabling it to collect the user data. In addition, Google also provides many other services, like video sharing, price comparison, cloud computing as well as online payment system services, and these have provided additional consumer data, increasing the quality of its search engine services, and on the other hand, the value of data sold to the advertisers for better-targeted advertising. This makes Google attractive for both users and advertisers and increases its advertising revenues. Facebook and Google are the dominant digital advertising companies, and had a combined share of 58 per cent of the \$111 billion market in the United States in 2018¹⁰ and in India 68%¹¹ market share; Amazon, the world's largest online retailer,

⁸ L Khan, 2017, Amazon's antitrust paradox, *The Yale Law Journal*, 126(3):564–907

⁹ Press Trust of India, *Competition Commission of India initiates ecommerce market study* <[https:// yourstory.com/ 2019/08/competition-commission-india-ecommerce-startups](https://yourstory.com/2019/08/competition-commission-india-ecommerce-startups)>

¹⁰ See <[https:// www. bloomberg. com/ news/ articles/2018-09-19/amazon-increases-ad-market-share-atexpense-of-google-facebook](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-09-19/amazon-increases-ad-market-share-atexpense-of-google-facebook)>

¹¹ Venkat Ananth, Shelly Singh, *Google and Facebook prey on digital advertising for content by news producers. Fair play?* <[https:// economictimes. indiatimes. com/ industry/ services/ advertising/google-and-facebook-prey-on-digital-advertising-for-content-by-news-producers-fairplay/articleshow/70355258.cms?from=mdr](https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/industry/services/advertising/google-and-facebook-prey-on-digital-advertising-for-content-by-news-producers-fairplay/articleshow/70355258.cms?from=mdr)>

has a 4.2 per cent of the market share. These figures highlight the key linkages between control of data, market power and the increasing monetization of the data via digital advertising in the business models of digital platforms, which all is possible because of the quantity of data they all possess and this led to the creation of entry barriers for new players. Research on behavioural tendencies shows that there is cognitive cost in switching platforms, in terms of time, effort, energy and the concentration and sustained thought required; the competition is not therefore just “one click away”. This further reinforces the dominant platform market power and dominance. Given a handful of dominant platforms that do not face any competition, consumers have few choices and almost no control over the collection and use of their data. This has raised competition and consumer protection concerns in India.

Hence, the digital economy poses a problem for the competition policy because competition is vital for boosting productivity and long-term growth as it derives out inefficient producers and stimulated innovation. So, instead of assessing the short-term benefits due to specific digital markets, there is a need to estimate the potential long-term cost implied by the inability of a new rival to enter into the digital market.

The problem that we have is our market is growing but the laws surrounding them are not. The Competition Act of 2002 is the only act governing the market in India.

Make in India

Make in India is an initiative by the Indian government which was launched on 25th September 2014 and its ultimate objective was to make India a global manufacturing hub. But using this initiative which only says that one can come and use Indian resources and manufacture in India, selling in India is not a compulsion on it. In simpler terms the government through this initiative are giving an open invitation to foreign marketers to come in India use the country resources and skills and sell the product wherever they want to sell which may or may not include India. The ultimate objective to increase sector share in the economy and for increasing FDI's in India. However, in the beginning it was going upwards but ultimately it failed to achieve it due to following reasons:¹²

- **Investment not Direct:** The fact is that a large number of FDI is neither foreign nor direct but comes from Mauritius-based shell companies.
- **Recycling of Indian Black money:** The Indian tax authorities estimates that most of these investments were

¹² See <<https://www.jatinverma.org/five-years-of-make-in-india-initiative-success-or-failure/>>

“black money” from India, which was routed via Mauritius.

- **Low productivity of Indian factories:** According to the Mackinsey report, the Indian workers are less productive and skilled as compared to its counterparts like China and Thailand.
- **Small Sizes of Industrial Units:** Another reason is the size of the industrial units which is too small for attaining economies of scale, investing in the modern equipment and developing the supply chains.
- **Complicated Labour Regulations:** Due to Complicated Labour Laws its difficult for plants to equip themselves with only less employees.

The infrastructure of the manufacturing industry is not good enough to compete with India’s counterpart. Power outages are much higher in India and the electricity cost is about the same in India and China. Inconvenient transportation is another reason for the slow growth of the initiative (transportation takes much more time in India). Bureaucratic procedures and corruption continue to make India less attractive to investors.

Apart from these it has often led to more challenges like because of these there is lots of overseas expansion which is in turn had affected adversely to the domestic manufacturers and also the excessive red tape is creating a deterrent for foreign direct investment which is leading to further increase in the Indian Economy.

Cases:

The Competition committee of India is though being capable fail to exercise the power and the disposal rate of the competition commission is more than the hearing rate and adjudication rate. However, lately the Competition Commission of India¹³ is being able to target the mischievous activities done by Google by abusing its dominant position in the market.

In February, Last Year the Google was fined with Rs. 136 crores fine for “search bias” and abusing its dominant position in the market. The allegations did largely revolve around the design of the Google search engine result page. It was also alleged that the company was leveraging its dominance in the web search¹⁴ to strengthen its position in online syndicate search services, as competitors were denied access to the market. Now the CCI has submitted a 14-

¹³ Sruthi Radhakrishnan, *The Hindu explains: Competition Commission of India vs Google* <<https://www.thehindu.com/business/Industry/the-hindu-explains-competition-commission-of-india-vs-google/article28263298.ece>>

¹⁴ Zaheer Merchant, *CCI order says Google appears to have abused Android dominance in India: report* <<https://www.medianama.com/2019/07/223-cci-order-says-google-appears-to-have-abused-android-dominance-in-india-report/>>

pager report against google in which it was contended for the following:

Making pre-installation of its proprietary apps like Google Play, Google Home, Google Maps etc. conditional, the CCI said, Google “reduced the ability and incentive of device manufacturers to develop and sell devices operated on alternate versions of Android”, which “amounts to prima facie leveraging of Google’s dominance”.

The complainants alleged that Google is engaged in abusive behavior similar to the kind outlined in the European case. They said Google was engaged in anti-competitive practices “with the aim of cementing Google’s dominant position”.

Google has already been slammed three times with hefty fines by the European Union for anti-trust issues:

In June 2017, the European Commission¹⁵ fined Google with 2.4 Billion Euros for abusing its dominance as a search engine by giving illegal advantage to its own comparison-shopping service.

In July 2018, Google was again imposed with a fine of \$ 5 Billion the European Union¹⁶ for violating the anti-trust, telling that Google abused its position in three major ways: by compulsorily bundling Search and Chrome with its Play Store and operating system;

blocking phone manufacturers from running forked versions of Android; and paying phone manufacturers (such as Apple) and service providers to “exclusively pre-install the Search app on their devices.

In March 2019, the European Commission¹⁷ fined Google with €1.49 billion, or 1.29% of its 2018 turnover, for breaching EU antitrust rules. The commission alleged that Google abused its market dominance by placing restrictions on third-party websites which prevented Google’s rivals from placing the ads on the websites. The restrictions related to Google’s advertising contracts with the publishers, which favored Google’s own ads over the publishers’ (and thus competitors’) ads. The company’s practices amounted to an abuse of Google’s dominant position in the search ads intermediation market, the commission stated, since it prevented competition on merit. It said, “Market dominance is, as such, not illegal under EU antitrust rules [but] dominant companies have a special responsibility not to abuse their powerful market position by restricting competition, either in the market where they are dominant or in separate markets.

¹⁵ Press Release, *Antitrust: Commission fines Google €2.42 billion for abusing dominance as search engine by giving illegal advantage to own comparison-shopping service* <[https:// ec.europa.eu/commission/ presscorner/ detail/en/IP_17_1784](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_17_1784)>

¹⁶ Trisha Jalan, *EU slaps Google with \$5 billion for anti-trust breaches; Google will appeal*, <[https:// www.](https://www.medianama.com/2018/07/223-eu-slaps-google-with-5-billion-for-anti-trust-breaches-google-will-appeal/)

[medianama.com/ 2018/07/223-eu-slaps-google-with- 5- billion-for-anti-trust-breaches-google-will-appeal/](https://www.medianama.com/2018/07/223-eu-slaps-google-with-5-billion-for-anti-trust-breaches-google-will-appeal/)>

¹⁷ Trisha Jalan, *European Commission slaps Google with €1.49 billion for violating EU anti-trust rules* <[https:// www.medianama.com/2019/03/223-european-commission-antitrust-penalty/](https://www.medianama.com/2019/03/223-european-commission-antitrust-penalty/)>

Thus, with Google, it is not something new and CCI is right with their actions against google.

- Some measures have taken by the CCI for improving the current scenario for instance in the case of *Mabindra & Mabindra v. CCI*¹⁸, directed that (a) CCI should frame guidelines to ensure that once final hearings in any complaint has begun, the membership shouldn't vary and it should preferably be heard by a substantial number of seven or at least, five members; (b) Central Government should take the expeditious steps to fill all the vacancies in the membership of the CCI within six months, (c) CCI should ensure that a judicial member is present and also participates in the final hearings. The High Court also declared as void and unconstitutional the statutory right of casting vote given to the presiding member in case of a tie at a CCI meetings. Thereby, improving the constitution of CCI for better governance.
- The government need to monitor agencies and may change the laws for better control and assessment over the market. Like what Germany and

European Union did they have amended their laws and now are able to monitor the acts of Amazon and Apple because of their expanding business vertically in upstream and downstream markets. Starting with Amazon(which started as online bookstore but then it diversified, and sells music, audiobooks and other consumer goods, and has also moved into manufacturing and retailing own brands, competing with other traders on its marketplace, thereby making it possible for the dominant platform to get ahead against the independent traders that are its clients and competitors at the same time) both EU and Federal Cartel Office of Germany (the CCI of Germany) have initiated investigation. Their investigation primarily focuses on third party retailer treatment of amazon and also is the company using the sellers' data to gain an advantage over the products it sells directly¹⁹. The Federal Cartel Office has begun its investigation in order to find out that whether the business practices adopted by Amazon are abusive towards the sellers in the German Marketplace. Having dual

¹⁸ *Mabindra & Mabindra v. CCI*, W.P. (C) 11467/2018

¹⁹ Federal Cartel Office, Germany, 2018, Bundeskartellamt initiates abuse proceeding against Amazon,

Press release, 29 November.

role in the German market place as biggest online retailer and manufacturer in marketplace. Therefore, in a position to potentially impose disadvantageous conditions on sellers competing with its products on its platform. The relevance of such conduct under German competition law indicates dominance of Amazon as well as dependence of online sellers on Amazon²⁰. For establishing dominance, the relevant market needs to be defined as an online marketplace services and, if Cartel Office does make a finding based on this relevant market, it will be the first time that an online marketplace services are recognized as a market by a competition authority²¹. This will set a precedent for investigations in other jurisdictions. But if the CCI in India can make it before we may create history because the position of Amazon in Germany is similar or even more dominating in India.

- In March 2019 a similar complain for similar conduct was filed against Apple with the European Union by Spotify which is an online platform that provides online music streaming

service, in the complaint it states that Apple limits the choices and stifles innovation by playing the dual character of a player as well as a referee, thus, thereby obtaining an unfair advantage and posing disadvantages to other application developers²².

Way Forward

Firstly and fore mostly, CCI must amend the existing Act which is the competition act of 2002 with the features of that of 21st century and need to build antitrust frame work and must need to take into account the algorithms, misuse of big data so that digital platforms for controlling consumer data, must have a responsibility to ensure privacy and respect individual rights to data protection and privacy. There is a need, therefore, to adapt the competition framework by broadening the consumer welfare standard beyond price and market share considerations, as consumer welfare involves not only lower prices but also choice, privacy, data protection and innovation. CCI may first consider the need to adapt the proper framework they apply to the competition cases, then consider whether their tools and analyses are fit enough to address the competition challenges arising

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ See <https://www.out-law.com/en/articles/2018/december/amazon-competition-case-germany/>.

²² See <https://newsroom.spotify.com/2019-03-13/consumers-and-innovators-win-on-a-level-playingfield/>.

from dominant platforms. The use of surveys and market inquiries may provide deeper insight into competition issues in the markets. Agencies should consider how relevant algorithms function and may therefore need to develop and expand expertise in data analytics and algorithms. CCI also needs to form a special IT cell for monitoring actions of these market giants such as Facebook, Google, Amazon etc. they need to do so because google, Facebook and amazon has majority of big data and they may misuse it and the government specially has to be extra careful in Indian scenario with Google as majority of Indian data is with them and an anti-trust agreement has to be sign with them which says if the data has been misuse then they will not only be banned from India rather they have to pay hefty fine and government should have permission to monitor their data whenever it want. This must be done in order to prevent another Cambridge Analytica from happening because in that case also a mere negligence from the US government allowed a brokerage firm to misuse the Facebook user data without the users consent for the firms own benefit and if google, Facebook or any other market giant does this in India, then Billions of people privacy would be breached and a huge damage may be caused.

India needs also to take into account the horizontal agreements between the company to eliminate competition. For instance let it

be the case of 1+, Oppo and Vivo all being established players in the market and are competing against each other but since BBK electrical owns all of these three no matter who wins ultimately BBK is the one with all the money and these all three creates a barrier for new entrant and CCI must again look into agreements like these because it creates a win-win situation because on the face it appears that they both are competing but in reality the vertical agreement is that OnePlus is targeting different pool of people and Oppo and Vivo a different pool thereby eliminating threat of competition.

CCI in the Competition Act of 2002 need to employ additional criteria for definition of the relevant market in digital sectors. We may learn from Germany which revised its competition law in 2017 to adapt its legal framework and tools to the new features of digital economy, and introduced a provision recognizing free products or services provided by platforms as a market, stating in (section 18(2a)) that “the assumption of a market shall not be invalidated by the fact that a good or service is provided free of charge”. In a recent decision with regard to Facebook, the Federal Cartel Office defined the relevant product market as a “private social network market” and its market definition analysis included considering the various online services referred to as social media and their competitive relationships, as well as direct network effects and the extent

to which digital platforms shaped by network effects can show flexibility in adapting the products they offer, and the case summary noted that “it is not sufficient to have a ‘critical mass’ of users or technical, financial and personal expertise in order to be able to enter neighboring markets and be as successful as on the original market, a service cannot expect to have the same reach when providing a different type of service, due to the strong direct network effects”. Apart from Germany the EU also made changes in the competition act which further help them to solve cases against Amazon and Apple for their market domination and are successfully able to file and investigate the matter because the laws say so.

CCI must also need to do the market power Assessment because in case of digital platform the analysis requires different criteria because the market power is conferred by the access to data. Hence the firm compete for the market rather than competing in the market which leads to winner takes all outcomes and so for monitoring this the CCI may also amend laws like the Germans did. According to Section 18(3(a)) of the revised competition law in Germany which has “a new provision on the criteria to consider in assessing the market position of an undertaking in the case of multisided markets and networks, which include direct and indirect network effects; the parallel use of services from different

providers and the switching costs for users; the undertaking’s economies of scale arising in connection with network effects; the undertaking’s access to data relevant for competition; and innovation-driven competitive pressure”. So, if India adapts a similar law it will be able to assess the market more effectively.

CCI must also, need to have a look into the merger and acquisition of companies in India and the motives why these Mergers are happening. In digital market mergers may lead to gain over more data which may further increase the dominance of the existing dominant player. For example, Facebook acquisition of WhatsApp has led to more dominance over the data and now our contacts of WhatsApp which have an ID on Facebook or Instagram, without our consent is being shown on the suggested friends or people we may know list of both Facebook and Instagram, which is showing misuse of the data by Facebook for their own purpose and dominance and we don’t have our law developed enough to tackle this problem. We also being a developing nation need to protect our start up for getting acquired by the bigger company because they will misuse the data and eliminate competition.

In the end, we would like to conclude by saying that the root cause of the problem is the law we have in our nation. It is not ready enough to deal with the competition and is not up to date with the advanced algorithm

and technologies that the digital market use. It must also be noted that monopolization in the digital economy will not only harm the economy but will also harm the societies and democracies. Digital Platform being global and affects the day-to-day lives of the people worldwide. Therefore, there is a pressing

need for cooperation between competition authorities at bilateral, regional and international level, to address the challenges thrown by the digital economy and to deal with negative outcomes, which may arise because of the digital platforms.