



## CASE STUDY

### COMPETITION COMMISSION OF INDIA

Case No. ... of 2026

#### In Re:

SKG..... Informant Vs. 23..... Opposite Parties

The present Information has been filed by SKG ('Informant') under Section 19(1)(a) of the Competition Act, 2002 ('Act'), against 23 Opposite Parties *inter alia* alleging contravention of the provisions of Sections 3 and 4 of the Act.

#### Submission by the Informant: -

1. The Informant is engaged in legitimate business activities and invests considerable resources in marketing and client acquisition through online platforms. As per the Information, certain dominant players in the digital ecosystems including major technology companies and their associated Artificial Intelligence or ad-serving systems are allegedly engaging in practices that unfairly restrict the Informant's market access and divert its commercial opportunities to competitors.
2. The Informant's digital identifiers (such as email IDs, website accounts, or ad campaign data) are being manipulated or interfered with. Further, leads and customers who search for or interact with the Informant's brand are diverted to competitors, despite paid marketing efforts by the Informant and such diversion constitutes "market allocation" and denial of market access under Section 3(3) and Section 4(2)(c) of the Act, respectively.
3. The platforms with a dominant position in online advertising and search services are using their control to bias search results and ad placements, intentionally suppressing visibility of the Informant's business which amounts to imposing unfair or discriminatory conditions in the sale of services, in contravention of Section 4(2)(a) (i) of the Act.
4. There are attempts to influence international customers (including those in the USA) to boycott the Informant's brand. It is stated that if this involves collusion among competitors or coordinated platform behaviour, it represents a concerted refusal to deal.

5. The Informant is deprived of access to customers/clients and markets despite legitimate advertising expenditure, compounding the pre-existing harm to its funding and business stability.
6. The Informant further states that competitors gain an unfair advantage through manipulated visibility, therefore harming not only the Informant but also consumer choice and market transparency, leading to appreciable adverse effect on competition ('AAEC') in India's digital services market.
7. The Informant has sought the following interim relief under Section 33 of the Act from the Commission: to restrain ongoing hijacking, diversion of traffic and suppression of listings; order for restoration of fair access to digital marketing and ad-serving systems; and immediate cease-and-desist order (injunction) to stop all acts of defamation and malicious interference with the Informant's client acquisition and business relationships. Further, the Informant has requested the Commission to issue a direction to investigate abuse of dominance and collusive behaviour.

#### Points to be considered:

1. There are 23 OPs arrayed in the present matter; however, the specific role, conduct, and contribution of each OP have not been mentioned in the Information.

Decide the case under Section 33 of the Act for grant of relief to the Informant.

**Disclaimer: The case study has been framed from the facts and figures available in the public domain with some modifications/assumptions so as to enable members to apply their professional skills to answer the same and hide the identity of the case. Author is not to be held liable for any resemblance of the facts and figures with any case.**

**Winner of Case Study – January 2026**

**CS Sampada Joshi - ACS - 72637**