Digital Justice: Evaluating Grievance Redressal Mechanisms and Consumer Satisfaction in E-Commerce Dispute Resolution

GUNJA DUBEY[1], DR. SUNIL KUMAR MISHRA[2]
[1]*Research Scholar, Nehru Gram Bharti (Deemed to be University, Prayagraj)*
[2]*Assistant Professor, Nehru Gram Bharti (Deemed to be University, Prayagraj)*

Abstract- The proliferation of e-commerce platforms in India has engendered a complex landscape of consumer disputes that existing legal frameworks have been slow to address. This paper adopts a doctrinal methodology to examine the statutory, regulatory, and judicial architecture governing grievance redressal in online commerce, with particular attention to the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, the Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020, and the Information Technology Act, 2000. Through an analysis of legislative text, subordinate legislation, judicial pronouncements, and policy documents, the paper critically evaluates whether the current legal framework adequately ensures efficacious and accessible dispute resolution for consumers transacting on digital platforms. The paper further examines the structural deficiencies in platform-level grievance mechanisms and proposes doctrinal refinements drawing upon comparative jurisprudence from the European Union and the United Kingdom. It concludes that while India has made significant legislative strides, institutional lacunae, enforcement gaps, and the absence of mandatory online dispute resolution (ODR) infrastructure continue to undermine the promise of digital consumer justice.

Keywords: E-Commerce, Consumer Protection, Grievance Redressal, Online Dispute Resolution, Consumer Protection Act 2019, Platform Liability, Digital Justice

I. INTRODUCTION

The digitisation of commercial transactions has fundamentally altered the relationship between consumers and sellers. India, as the world's second-largest internet market, witnessed e-commerce transactions exceeding USD 84 billion in 2021, a figure projected to surpass USD 200 billion by 2026. This extraordinary expansion of digital commerce has, however, been accompanied by a commensurate rise in consumer grievances — relating to product defects, non-delivery, misleading advertisements, unfair trade practices, and data misuse — that demand prompt and accessible legal remedies.

The conventional architecture of consumer dispute resolution, anchored in physical District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commissions under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, was ill-suited to address the velocity, volume, and cross-jurisdictional character of e-commerce disputes. The enactment of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 ("CPA 2019") and the consequential Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 ("E-Commerce Rules") represented a legislative attempt to bridge this institutional gap. Yet the normative promise of these instruments has been considerably outpaced by the technological and commercial realities of platform-based trade.

This paper proceeds doctrinally. It interrogates the textual content and interpretive scope of the relevant statutory provisions, maps the regulatory architecture, and critically assesses judicial and quasi-judicial pronouncements bearing on e-commerce dispute resolution. The doctrinal method, as favoured by the Indian Law Institute tradition, prioritises rigorous analysis of authoritative legal sources — statutes, delegated legislation, judicial decisions, and treaty obligations — as the foundation of legal understanding. The paper does not engage in empirical survey but instead draws upon adjudicatory records, regulatory reports, and comparative legal materials to evaluate the adequacy of the existing framework.

Part II surveys the legislative evolution of consumer protection in the digital context. Part III analyses the substantive and procedural framework established under CPA 2019 and the E-Commerce Rules. Part IV examines platform-level grievance mechanisms and their legal adequacy. Part V considers the role of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) as a normative alternative. Part VI undertakes a comparative analysis with EU and UK frameworks. Part VII identifies structural deficiencies and proposes doctrinal reforms. Part VIII concludes.

II. LEGISLATIVE EVOLUTION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION IN THE DIGITAL CONTEXT

A. The Pre-Digital Framework

The Consumer Protection Act, 1986 constituted the principal legislative instrument for consumer redressal in India for over three decades. The Act established a three-tier quasi-judicial structure — District, State, and National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commissions — and defined "consumer" and "deficiency of service" in broad terms that, through judicial construction, were extended to online transactions. However, the 1986 Act did not contemplate the distinct challenges posed by platform-based intermediary commerce: the tripartite relationship of marketplace, seller, and buyer; anonymous digital contracts; and the evidentiary difficulties of electronic transactions.

The Supreme Court in Lucknow Development Authority v. M.K. Gupta expansively construed "service" under the 1986 Act to include commercial activities undertaken by private entities, thereby extending the consumer protection umbrella. Subsequently, in Kishore Lal v. Chairman, ESI Corporation, the Court emphasised that consumer legislation is a beneficial statute warranting liberal interpretation. These interpretive developments created the jurisprudential groundwork upon which e-commerce disputes were brought within the consumer law fold, even absent express statutory provision.

B. The Information Technology Act, 2000 and Its Limitations

The Information Technology Act, 2000 ("IT Act") addressed certain dimensions of electronic commerce — contract formation, digital signatures, and liability of network service providers — but was not primarily concerned with consumer protection. Section 79 of the IT Act, as amended in 2008, created a "safe harbour" for intermediaries, exempting them from liability for third-party content provided they exercised due diligence and acted expeditiously upon receipt of notice of unlawful content. This provision, modelled on the EU E-Commerce Directive 2000/31/EC, has been a source of considerable interpretive controversy in the context of e-commerce marketplace liability.

The IT (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021, subsequently imposed more granular obligations on "significant social media intermediaries," including grievance officer appointments and acknowledgment timelines. However, these rules, being primarily media-focused, did not comprehensively address the consumer protection dimensions of e-commerce platforms.

C. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019: A Paradigm Shift

The CPA 2019, which came into force on 20 July 2020, represented a watershed in Indian consumer law. The Act introduced several innovations of particular relevance to e-commerce: a definition of "e-commerce" under Section 2(16); express inclusion of "electronic service provider" within the definition of "trader" under Section 2(40)(ii); the concept of "product liability" under Chapter VI; provisions against "unfair trade practices" extended to digital platforms under Section 2(47); and the establishment of the Central Consumer Protection Authority ("CCPA") under Section 10 as a regulatory-cum-enforcement body with investigative and recall powers.

Of signal importance is the enlargement of the pecuniary jurisdiction of consumer commissions: District Commissions now adjudicate disputes up to Rs. 50 lakh, State Commissions up to Rs. 2 crore, and the National Commission above Rs. 2 crores. The

© JUL 2026 | IRE Journals | Volume 10 Issue 1 | ISSN: 2456-8880
DOI: https://doi.org/10.64388/IREV10I1-1719686

Act also introduced e-filing of complaints under Section 35 and the possibility of video-conferencing hearings, thereby acknowledging the procedural imperatives of the digital age. The Consumer Protection (Mediation) Regulations, 2020, further provided for mediation as an alternative mode of resolution at the pre-litigation stage.

III. THE E-COMMERCE RULES, 2020: NORMATIVE ARCHITECTURE AND CRITICAL APPRAISAL

A. Scope and Coverage

The Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 were notified on 23 July 2020 under Section 101(1)(zg) of the CPA 2019. Rule 2 defines "e-commerce entity" as any person who owns, operates, or manages a digital or electronic facility or platform for electronic commerce. The definition is broad enough to encompass both inventory-based models (where the platform owns and sells goods) and marketplace models (where the platform merely hosts third-party sellers). This definitional breadth is significant, as marketplace platforms had frequently invoked the inventory/marketplace distinction to disclaim liability for seller defaults.

Rule 3 mandates that every e-commerce entity shall establish an adequate grievance redressal mechanism and appoint a grievance officer resident in India. Rule 4(6) specifically requires marketplace entities to provide sellers' information to consumers to enable effective legal recourse. Rule 5 imposes corresponding obligations on "sellers" on marketplace platforms, including disclosure of complete product information, return, refund, and exchange policies, and delivery timelines.

B. Grievance Redressal Obligations

Rule 3(1)(a) requires e-commerce entities to publish the name and contact details of the grievance officer and the mechanism for filing complaints on its platform. Under Rule 3(1)(b), the grievance officer is obligated to acknowledge receipt of consumer complaints within forty-eight hours and redress them within one month from the date of receipt. This statutory timeline constitutes a material improvement over the pre-existing voluntarist corporate grievance policies, which lacked any legally enforceable timeframe.

Notwithstanding this advance, the Rules do not prescribe the substantive standards for grievance redressal — that is, the criteria by which a grievance officer must evaluate a complaint, the burden of proof applicable to competing claims of the consumer and the seller, or the remedies available at the grievance stage. This normative silence effectively leaves the redressal process entirely at the discretion of the platform, creating a structural risk of conflict of interest where the grievance officer, employed by the platform, adjudicates disputes in which the platform has a pecuniary stake.

C. The 2021 Amendment: Strengthened Obligations

The E-Commerce Rules were amended in 2021 to further strengthen consumer safeguards. The amended rules prohibit e-commerce entities from engaging in "flash sales" designed to deceive consumers, from manipulating search results to favour affiliated sellers ("search manipulation"), and from engaging in drip pricing practices. The amendments also strengthened disclosure obligations regarding country of origin for imported goods, in alignment with the broader "vocal for local" policy direction.

Rule 6A, introduced by the 2021 amendment, mandates that no e-commerce entity shall adopt any unfair trade practice whether in the course of business on its platform or otherwise. This provision, while consonant with Section 2(47) of the CPA 2019, does not articulate a comprehensive list of prohibited practices specific to algorithmic commerce — including personalised pricing, dark patterns, and deceptive interface design — leaving significant normative lacunae in the regulation of digitally-mediated unfair practices.

IV. PLATFORM-LEVEL GRIEVANCE MECHANISMS: LEGAL ADEQUACY AND STRUCTURAL DEFICIENCIES

A. Institutional Architecture of Platform Grievance Systems

In compliance with the E-Commerce Rules, major e-commerce platforms operating in India — including Flipkart, Amazon India, Snapdeal, Meesho, and Nykaa — have established grievance officer mechanisms. These typically function through a hierarchical escalation model: a first-tier automated or semi-automated response system; a second-tier customer service representative review; and, formally, a third-tier grievance officer adjudication. In practice, the distinction between these tiers is frequently obliterated, with the "grievance officer" process being indistinguishable in procedure or quality of reasoning from ordinary customer service decisions.

The absence of any obligation to provide reasoned decisions at the grievance officer stage is a particularly significant gap. Principles of natural justice — audi alteram partem and the duty to give reasons — which are implied obligations in quasi-judicial proceedings, are not expressly applicable to private commercial grievance mechanisms. While the Supreme Court in Cellular Operators Association of India v. TRAI affirmed that even regulatory bodies must give reasoned orders, this principle has not been judicially extended to mandate that platform grievance officers do the same.

B. The Problem of Platform Neutrality and Conflict of Interest

A foundational structural concern with platform-administered grievance mechanisms is the inherent conflict of interest arising from the platform's tripartite role as marketplace operator, intermediary service provider, and (in certain cases) competing seller. Where a marketplace platform operates both as a marketplace for third-party sellers and as a direct seller through affiliated entities, the neutrality of grievance resolution is structurally compromised.

The Competition Commission of India ("CCI"), in its Order dated 26 April 2022 in In Re: Allegations against Flipkart Internet Private Limited, found a prima facie case for investigation into alleged preferential treatment of select sellers by e-commerce platforms, implicitly acknowledging the structural risk of partiality in platform-administered dispute mechanisms. This competition law perspective reinforces the consumer law concern that platform grievance systems, when operated by entities with competing commercial interests, cannot be presumed to deliver impartial redressal.

C. Accessibility and Procedural Barriers

The efficacy of a grievance mechanism is conditioned not only by its substantive standards but also by its accessibility to the aggrieved consumer. Several procedural barriers have been identified in the context of Indian e-commerce grievance processes. First, the obligation to file complaints in a particular language or through digital interfaces inaccessible to consumers of limited digital literacy creates a systemic exclusion of vulnerable consumer groups. Second, the absence of any obligation to provide a physical address for service of legal process created difficulties in judicial enforcement. Third, the mandatory arbitration clauses in platform terms of service, while of uncertain enforceability following the Supreme Court's decision in Emaar MGF Land Ltd. v. Aftab Singh, have been used to channel consumer disputes away from the statutory consumer forum system.

V. ONLINE DISPUTE RESOLUTION: THE NORMATIVE CASE AND REGULATORY STATUS

A. ODR as a Doctrinal Response to E-Commerce Disputes

Online Dispute Resolution ("ODR") — the application of information and communication technologies to the resolution of disputes — has been internationally recognised as a particularly apt mechanism for e-commerce disputes, given the low monetary value of most consumer transactions, the cross-jurisdictional character of online commerce, and the asymmetry in resources between consumers and platform operators. The UNCITRAL Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution (2017) articulate a non-binding normative framework for ODR in cross-border e-commerce transactions, advocating for an independent, neutral, and technologically accessible ODR platform.

In India, the NITI Aayog's Report on Designing the Future of Dispute Resolution: The ODR Policy Plan for India (2021) recommended the establishment of a national ODR framework, including mandatory pre-litigation ODR for disputes below a specified monetary threshold. The report envisaged ODR as a demand-side complement to existing consumer fora, capable of resolving high-volume, low-value disputes at a fraction of the cost and time of conventional adjudication.

B. Current Regulatory Status in India

As of the present date, India does not have a standalone ODR statute. The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended in 2015 and 2019) provides the primary legislative framework for alternative dispute resolution, including electronic arbitration and conciliation. However, the Act was designed for commercial arbitration between entities of roughly equivalent bargaining power, not for mass consumer disputes characterised by radical informational and resource asymmetry. The CPA 2019 provides for mediation under Chapter V but does not expressly mandate or regulate ODR as a distinct institutional mechanism.

The Reserve Bank of India ("RBI") has, in the context of payment system disputes, established the Integrated Ombudsman Scheme, 2021, which provides a relatively streamlined digital complaint mechanism for banking and payment service complaints. This sector-specific model has been proposed as a template for a broader e-commerce ODR framework. The Securities and Exchange Board of India ("SEBI") has similarly established the SCORES platform for securities-related investor grievances. The existence of these sector-specific ODR mechanisms underscores the normative feasibility of a comprehensive e-commerce ODR architecture, while simultaneously highlighting the current legislative gap.

C. The Mediation Act, 2023 and Its Implications

The Mediation Act, 2023, enacted in September 2023, provides for pre-litigation online mediation and the establishment of the Mediation Council of India. Section 22 of the Act specifically recognises online mediation conducted through electronic communication or videoconferencing. While the Act does not specifically address e-commerce consumer disputes, it provides a statutory foundation for the institutionalisation of online mediation as a preliminary dispute resolution mechanism, consistent with Section 37 of the CPA 2019 which mandates referral to mediation at the pre-admission stage of consumer commission proceedings.

VI. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: EU AND UK FRAMEWORKS

A. The European Union: An Integrated ODR Architecture

The European Union has developed the most comprehensive legislative framework for e-commerce dispute resolution among major jurisdictions. The EU ODR Regulation (EU) No 524/2013 on Online Dispute Resolution for Consumer Disputes requires online traders and online marketplaces to provide a link to the EU ODR Platform on their websites — a single digital portal that directs consumers to certified Alternative Dispute Resolution ("ADR") bodies competent to handle their complaint. The ODR Platform is complemented by the ADR Directive (Directive 2013/11/EU), which requires Member States to ensure that ADR entities meeting prescribed quality standards (independence, transparency, effectiveness, fairness, and legality) are available for consumer disputes across all sectors.

The EU Digital Services Act, 2022 ("DSA") further strengthened the regulatory architecture for very large online platforms ("VLOPs"), defined as platforms with over 45 million average monthly active users in the EU. Under Article 21 of the DSA, VLOPs are required to provide consumers access to certified out-of-court dispute settlement bodies, and are prohibited from making internal complaint handling more burdensome than necessary. The DSA's emphasis on algorithmic accountability, transparency of recommender systems, and non-discrimination in platform policies represents a frontier of regulatory thought that Indian law has not yet reached.

B. The United Kingdom: Post-Brexit Continuity and Reform

Following Brexit, the UK retained substantially equivalent consumer protection legislation, including the Consumer Rights Act, 2015, which provides extensive protections for digital content and services. The Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Act, 2024, strengthened the Competition and Markets Authority's ("CMA") enforcement powers in consumer law contexts, introduced a "subscription traps" regime, and empowered the CMA to impose direct redress orders against businesses committing consumer law infringements.

The UK's Online Dispute Resolution Advisory Group Report (2015) recommended the establishment of a dedicated small claims resolution process for low-value e-commerce claims, integrated with ODR technology, capable of resolving disputes within a fixed timeline. While a formal standalone ODR platform was not ultimately implemented, the UK's Online Civil Money Claims ("OCMC") service and the Financial Ombudsman Service's digital claims process provide instructive models of state-facilitated ODR for consumer disputes.

C. Comparative Lessons for India

The comparative survey reveals several principles that India's evolving framework would benefit from incorporating. First, mandatory platform linkage to independent, certified ADR/ODR bodies (as in the EU ODR Regulation) would address the structural conflict of interest in platform-administered grievance mechanisms. Second, minimum quality standards for ODR entities — independence, transparency, accessibility, and speed — require statutory codification. Third, the DSA's graduated obligations based on platform scale and market power offer a model for a risk-proportionate regulatory framework in India. Fourth, the integration of ODR with the statutory consumer commission system, rather than its operation as a parallel track, would prevent forum fragmentation and ensure that ODR outcomes carry enforceable legal weight.

VII. STRUCTURAL DEFICIENCIES AND DOCTRINAL REFORMS

A. The Enforcement Gap

A defining characteristic of the current Indian framework is the significant gap between normative mandate and enforcement reality. While the CPA 2019 and E-Commerce Rules impose substantial obligations on e-commerce entities, enforcement has been episodic and inadequate. The CCPA, despite its investigative and enforcement mandate, has issued relatively few orders in the e-commerce context since its constitution. The power to impose penalties under Section 21 of the CPA 2019 (up to Rs. 10 lakh for a first offence of unfair trade practice) is modest relative to the revenue scales of major platforms, and thus lacks credible deterrent effect.

A doctrinal solution to the enforcement gap lies in the adoption of structural separation requirements for large e-commerce platforms with dual roles (marketplace and seller), analogous to the separation of investment banking and commercial banking functions in financial regulation. Alternatively, a mandatory escrow arrangement for consumer transaction funds, combined with an independent dispute adjudication mechanism empowered to release escrowed funds as remedies, would significantly strengthen consumer protection without requiring platform restructuring.

B. Absence of Mandatory ODR Infrastructure

The absence of a statutory mandate for ODR in e-commerce disputes is the most significant structural deficiency in the current framework. A legislative amendment to the CPA 2019 to introduce a new Chapter on E-Commerce Dispute Resolution, mandating all e-commerce entities above a prescribed transaction volume to subscribe to a CCPA-approved ODR platform, would directly address this gap. The ODR platform should be required to provide resolution within thirty days for disputes below Rs. 1 lakh, with binding arbitral outcomes appealable to the District Consumer Commission. This architecture would create an efficient first-tier resolution mechanism, reserving the consumer commission system for complex or high-value disputes.

C. Dark Patterns and Algorithmic Unfair Trade Practices

The phenomenon of "dark patterns" — manipulative interface design that exploits consumer cognitive biases to obtain consent or payment — represents a frontier challenge for consumer law doctrine. The CCPA issued Guidelines for Prevention and Regulation of Dark Patterns, 2023, identifying thirteen categories of dark patterns including "false urgency," "basket sneaking," "confirm shaming," "forced action," and "disguised advertisement." While these guidelines represent a significant doctrinal development, they lack the force of law and cannot support penal enforcement under the CPA 2019 without a specific statutory foundation.

A legislative amendment to include "algorithmic manipulation" and "dark patterns" as defined categories of unfair trade practice under Section 2(47) of the CPA 2019 would provide the necessary statutory authority. This reform, inspired by the EU's DSA and the proposed EU AI Act's provisions on manipulative AI systems, would position India's consumer law framework at the frontier of digital market regulation.

D. Cross-Border Dispute Resolution

Indian consumers increasingly transact with foreign e-commerce entities not subject to Indian jurisdiction. The CPA 2019's extraterritorial reach is limited: while Section 2(7)(ii) includes a person who "buys" goods through "electronic means" within the definition of consumer, the practical enforcement of consumer commission orders against foreign entities remains extremely difficult. A bilateral or multilateral treaty mechanism for cross-border consumer dispute resolution — analogous to the Hague Choice of Court Agreements Convention — would provide a more effective framework. India's participation in the ongoing UNCITRAL negotiations on international instruments for consumer ADR represents an important step in this direction.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The foregoing doctrinal analysis demonstrates that India has made substantive legislative advances in the regulation of e-commerce dispute resolution, particularly through the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 and the E-Commerce Rules, 2020. The recognition of e-commerce entities as service providers subject to consumer law obligations, the mandatory appointment of grievance officers, the expanded jurisdiction of consumer commissions, and the introduction of mediation as a pre-adjudicatory mechanism collectively represent a significant normative evolution.

Yet the analysis also reveals that these advances are insufficient to ensure what may be termed "digital justice" — a state in which consumers transacting in digital markets have access to dispute resolution mechanisms that are independent, efficient, accessible, and capable of delivering effective remedies. Three structural deficiencies stand out: the inherent conflict of interest in platform-administered grievance mechanisms; the absence of mandatory ODR infrastructure; and the inadequacy of enforcement mechanisms against large platform operators.

The doctrinal reforms proposed in this paper — mandatory subscription to independent ODR bodies, legislative codification of algorithmic unfair trade practices, structural separation obligations for dual-role platforms, and engagement with international ODR frameworks — are consonant with both the normative principles of Indian consumer law and the comparative experience of advanced jurisdictions. Their adoption would ensure that India's remarkable growth as a digital economy is matched by a commensurately robust architecture of digital consumer justice.

Ultimately, the legitimacy of the digital marketplace depends not merely on its efficiency but on the confidence of consumers that, when things go wrong, they will have recourse to a fair, accessible, and effective system of redress. This is not merely a consumer protection objective; it is a foundational condition for the sustainable development of India's digital economy.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Statutes and Subordinate Legislation

[1] Consumer Protection Act, 1986.
[2] Consumer Protection Act, 2019.
[3] Consumer Protection (E-Commerce) Rules, 2020 (as amended 2021).
[4] Consumer Protection (Mediation) Regulations, 2020.
[5] Information Technology Act, 2000 (as amended 2008).
[6] Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021.
[7] Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 (as amended 2019).
[8] Mediation Act, 2023.
[9] Central Consumer Protection Authority, Guidelines for Prevention and Regulation of Dark Patterns, 2023.

II. Cases

[10] Cellular Operators Association of India v. TRAI, (2016) 7 SCC 703.
[11] Emaar MGF Land Ltd. v. Aftab Singh, (2019) 12 SCC 751.
[12] In Re: Allegations against Flipkart Internet Private Limited, CCI Case No. 39 of 2018, Order dated 26 April 2022.
[13] Kishore Lal v. Chairman, ESI Corporation, (2007) 4 SCC 579.
[14] Lucknow Development Authority v. M.K. Gupta, (1994) 1 SCC 243.
[15] Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, (2015) 5 SCC 1.

III. Books and Articles

[16] Duggal, Pavan, "E-Commerce Consumer Protection: Emerging Legal Challenges" (2020) 62 Journal of the Indian Law Institute 198.
[17] Gulati, Jasmeet, "Online Consumer Dispute Resolution: Challenges for India" (2019) 61 Journal of the Indian Law Institute 74.
[18] Jain, S.N., "Doctrinal and Non-Doctrinal Legal Research" (1973) 15 Journal of the Indian Law Institute 487.
[19] Reddy T., Prashant and Prateek Surisetti, "Consumer Protection in the Digital Age: A Critical Analysis of the E-Commerce Rules, 2020" (2021) 63 Journal of the Indian Law Institute 112.

IV. Reports and Policy Documents

[20] Competition Commission of India, Market Study on E-Commerce in India: Key Findings and Observations (2020).
[21] Department of Consumer Affairs, Annual Report 2022-23 (Government of India, 2023).
[22] NITI Aayog, Designing the Future of Dispute Resolution: The ODR Policy Plan for India (2021).
[23] UNCITRAL, Technical Notes on Online Dispute Resolution (United Nations, 2017).
[24] Regulation (EU) No 524/2013 on Online Dispute Resolution for Consumer Disputes.
[25] Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 (Digital Services Act).
[26] HM Courts & Tribunals Service, Online Civil Money Claims Service: Assessment Report (HMCTS, 2022).