

Date of Institution : 11.12.2025
Date of Final Hearing : 15.05.2026
Date of Pronouncement : 25.05.2026

BEFORE THE DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL
COMMISSION:KURNOOL

Present: Sri Karanam Kishore Kumar, B.A., B.L., President

Sri N.Narayana Reddy, B.A., B.L., Member
And

Smt S.Nazima Kausar, PGDBM., M.Com., MBA., B.Ed., Member

Monday the 25th day of May, 2026
CONSUMER COMPLAINT No.12/2026

Between:

Ullaji Chennamma,
D/o. Ullaji Yesaiah,
R/o H.No.7-107, P.Chinthakunta Village,
Allagadda Mandal, Nanyal District,
Andhara Pradesh-518 543.

...Complainant
(Through: Sri RJ.Sarveswar, Advocate)

-Vs-

Ola Head Office (Bengaluru Office),
Represented by its the Grievance Officer,
2, Hosure Road,
Koramangala Industrial Layout,
Koramangala,
Bengaluru, Karnataka-560 095.

...Opposite Party
(Through: Sri.K.Gopichand, Advocate)

ORDER

(As Per Smt S.Nazima Kausar, Women Member, on behalf of the Bench)

CONSUMER COMPLAINT No.12/2026

1. This complaint is filed under section 35 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, praying to direct the opposite party:-

- A. To pay compensation of Rs.5,00,000/- for mental agony harassment and litigation expenses caused to the complainant.
- B. Order further compensation as punitive damages as this Hon'ble Consumer Commission deems fit in the interest of equity, justice and good conscience.

2. The case of the complainant in brief runs as follows:- The complainant is a resident of P.Chithakunta Village, Allagadda Mandal, Nandyal District. The opposite party is the Ola Head Office Bengaluru Office, represented by its The Grievance Officer, Koramangala, Bengaluru.

The complainant submits that she is a registered consumer of the Opposite Party's platform, "Ola Cabs", owned and operated by ANI Technologies Private Limited. On 11.10.2025 at about 7:08 A.M., the complainant booked an Ola Auto from Coastal Andhra Region, Pottur Vari Thota, Guntur, to Acharya Nagarjuna University (ANU) to appear for the Andhra Pradesh Junior Civil Judge Mains Examination (Paper-I), accompanied by her mother.

It is submitted that the auto driver who arrived came in a vehicle bearing Registration No.AP39VC6108, which was different from the vehicle shown in the Opposite Party's Ola application. When the complainant questioned the discrepancy, the driver insisted that the complainant share the OTP to commence the trip. Relying upon the good faith and credibility of the Opposite Party's service, the complainant shared the OTP and the ride commenced.

It is humbly submitted that, instead of proceeding on the correct route, the driver deliberately diverted the route, taking the complainant approximately 25 kilometers away from her intended destination. Thereafter, the driver stopped the vehicle on the Narasaraopet-Guntur Road at Sitaram Nagar and demanded additional payment to drop the complainant at the correct location. Upon the complainant's refusal, the auto driver behaved rudely and aggressively, refused to continue the trip, and forced the complainant to cancel the ride against her will at around 7:28 A.M.

It is further submitted that, due to the said misconduct, the complainant and her mother were left stranded on the highway, suffering immense mental agony, fear, insecurity, and emotional distress, particularly as the complainant was on her way to attend an important judicial mains examination. Having no other option, the complainant was compelled to arrange another auto at her own expense in order to reach the examination centre. Owing to the aforesaid incident, the complainant underwent severe fear, anxiety, and mental stress, which adversely affected her performance in the Andhra Pradesh Junior Civil Judge Mains Examination.

Further submitted that, the complainant immediately raised a complaint through the Ola App and subsequently sent formal written complaints to the Nodal Officer and the Grievance Officer on 14.10.2025 detailing the incident. However, no resolution was received from the Opposite Party. Thereafter, the complainant issued a legal notice dated 11.11.2025 to the Opposite Party, which was duly served on 14.11.2025. Despite receipt of the said notice, the Opposite Party failed to respond or redress the grievance of the complainant. Hence, this complaint.

3. Opposite Party is contended that the complaint is not maintainable either in law or on facts. The Opposite Party contended that the complaint is not maintainable for non-impleading of the driver, who is a necessary party to the proceedings. It was submitted that ANI Technologies Private Limited merely operates an online platform connecting independent third-party drivers with customers and has no direct control over the conduct of such drivers.

Therefore, the Opposite Party cannot be held liable for the alleged acts of the driver.

The Opposite Party further submitted that, upon receiving the complainant's grievance through the app, it promptly conducted an internal review and, as a precautionary measure, suspended the concerned driver and off-boarded the vehicle from the platform. According to the Opposite Party, these actions were taken in good faith and do not amount to an admission of liability or deficiency in service.

It was also contended that the complainant did not suffer any monetary loss, as no payment was made to the driver and no amount was collected by the Opposite Party in respect of the ride. The Opposite Party maintained that it is neither feasible nor legally obligatory to monitor the conduct of thousands of independent drivers registered on its platform and therefore denied any deficiency in service or unfair trade practice, asserting that the complaint is false and frivolous.

4. The complainant filed sworn affidavit, and Ex.A1 to Ex.A9 are marked. The opposite party filed sworn affidavit and no documents are marked.

5. We have perused the available records and written arguments filed by the complainant and opposite party and heard oral arguments of both sides.

The complainant relied on decision reported in:-

- 1. First Appeal No.743/2022** the Honble State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Punjab Chandigarh, Uber India Systems Private Limited -Vs- Mohit Bansal and another, decided on 04.06.2024.

6. Now, the points that arise for consideration are:

- i. Whether there is any deficiency of service on the part of the opposite party or not?
- ii. Whether the complainant is entitled to the reliefs as prayed for or not?
- iii. If any relief, then to what extent?

7. POINTS i to iii:- The complainant booked an Ola Auto on 11.10.2025 from Pottur Vari Thota, Guntur, to Acharya Nagarjuna University to appear for the Andhra Pradesh Junior Civil Judge Mains Examination, accompanied by her mother. Ex.A2 is the hall ticket of the complainant showing the examination date as 11.10.2025. Ex.A3 is the location map of the auto ride. Ex.A4 is the ride details dated 11.10.2025, showing the booking time as 7:08A.M. and the fare as Rs.199/-. Ex.A5 contains the details of the auto bearing Registration No.AP39 VC6108.

After the booking, the auto driver arrived in a vehicle bearing Registration No.AP39VC6108, which was different from the vehicle shown in the Ola application. The driver insisted that the complainant share the OTP, and thereafter the ride commenced. It is alleged that the driver deliberately diverted the route and took the complainant approximately 25 kilometers away from the intended destination. Thereafter, the driver stopped the vehicle on the Narasaraopet-Guntur Road and demanded additional payment to drop the complainant at the correct location. Upon the complainant's refusal, the driver refused to continue the trip and left the complainant stranded on the road at about 7:28 A.M.

The complainant was compelled to arrange another auto at her own expense to reach the examination centre. Subsequently, the complainant raised a complaint with the Opposite Party on 08.01.2025, to which the Opposite Party replied on 10.01.2025 apologizing for the incident, as evidenced by Ex.A1. As no satisfactory resolution was provided, the complainant issued a legal notice to the Opposite Party on 11.11.2025. Ex.A7 is the tracking report showing service of the legal notice on the Opposite Party. Ex.A8 is another complaint sent by the complainant through email on 14.10.2025 requesting the Opposite Party to initiate legal action against the driver and to pay compensation of Rs.5,00,000/- towards the mental agony suffered by the complainant. Ex.A8 and Ex.A9 contain the details of the auto and the route map shared with the Opposite Party.

To substantiate its contentions, the Opposite Party filed its written version stating that it merely provides an online platform facilitating the booking of cabs between independent third-party drivers and customers, and that it has no control over or direct involvement in the alleged conduct of such drivers. The Opposite Party further stated that it took immediate corrective measures by suspending the concerned driver from the platform and off-boarding the vehicle as a precautionary measure. In support of its contention, the Opposite Party filed copies of the Registration Certificate (RC) and Driving Licence of the auto driver.

We relied upon the decision reported herein:

First Appeal No.637/2023, State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Uber India System Private Limited -Vs- Upendra Singh, decided on 11

November, 2024, Delhi State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission has upheld a district commission's ruling against Uber India Systems for failing to provide a cab on time and for not addressing a customer's complaints. The panel identified this as a "deficiency in service" and ordered the company to compensate the complainant with Rs.30,000/-. "As a service provider facilitating the transportation process, the appellant (Uber) has an obligation to ensure services are provided without undue delay or inconvenience. Its inability to deliver on this responsibility constitutes a clear deficiency in service, and the appellant must be held accountable for the resultant harm caused to the complainant,"

On a careful and close perusal of the pleadings, documents, and evidence placed on record by both parties, it is evident that the complainant had booked an Ola Auto on 11.10.2025 from Pottur Vari Thota, Guntur, to Acharya Nagarjuna University for the purpose of attending the Andhra Pradesh Junior Civil Judge Mains Examination, which was an important career-oriented examination. The complainant was accompanied by her mother while proceeding to the examination centre. The documentary evidence filed by the complainant, particularly the hall ticket, ride details, route map, and vehicle particulars, clearly establishes that the ride was booked through the Ola platform and that the complainant had relied upon the services offered by the Opposite Party in good faith.

It is further observed that the auto which arrived for the ride was not the same vehicle as reflected in the Ola application at the time of booking. Despite the discrepancy, the driver insisted that the complainant share the OTP generated through the platform before commencing the ride. Believing the representation made through the platform and trusting the reliability of the

Opposite Party's services, the complainant shared the OTP and commenced the journey.

However, instead of proceeding towards Acharya Nagarjuna University through the appropriate route, the driver deliberately diverted the route and drove the complainant and her mother nearly 25 kilometers away from the intended destination. The evidence on record, including the route map and complaint correspondence, clearly indicates that the driver acted in an irresponsible and improper manner. Thereafter, the driver stopped the auto on the Narasaraopet–Guntur Road and demanded additional money from the complainant to drop her at the correct destination. When the complainant questioned such conduct and refused to pay the additional amount demanded, the driver behaved rudely, refused to continue the trip, and left the complainant and her mother stranded midway on the road at an early hour of the morning.

This Commission cannot ignore the fact that the complainant was proceeding to attend a highly competitive judicial mains examination, which required mental composure, punctuality, and emotional stability. Leaving a woman candidate and her mother stranded on a public road under such circumstances undoubtedly caused immense mental agony, fear, inconvenience, humiliation, and emotional distress. The complainant, having no other alternative, was compelled to arrange another auto at her own expense and rush to the examination centre under tremendous pressure and anxiety. Such circumstances would naturally affect the mental peace and concentration of any candidate appearing for an important examination.

The principal defence taken by the Opposite Party is that it merely acts as an intermediary or facilitator providing an online platform connecting independent drivers and customers, and therefore it cannot be held responsible for the misconduct of the driver. However, this contention cannot be accepted in the facts and circumstances of the present case. The ride was booked through the digital platform operated by the Opposite Party, the OTP verification was generated and controlled through the said platform, and the driver who undertook the ride was admittedly attached to the Opposite Party's service network. The complainant availed the service solely because of the assurance, representation, and credibility associated with the Opposite Party's platform.

Merely describing itself as an "online platform" does not absolve the Opposite Party from its responsibility towards consumers who avail services through its application. The complainant had agreed to pay the fare amount of Rs.199/- for the ride, and therefore she squarely falls within the definition of "consumer" under Section 2 (7) of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019. Once the service was booked and commenced through the platform operated by the Opposite Party, the latter owed a duty of care and responsibility to ensure reasonable safety, reliability, and accountability in the service rendered through its associated drivers.

The conduct of the driver in diverting the route, demanding extra money, and abandoning the complainant midway clearly amounts to gross misconduct and deficiency in service. Significantly, the Opposite Party itself admitted in its written version that it suspended the concerned driver from the platform and

off-boarded the vehicle as a precautionary measure. Such action on the part of the Opposite Party itself indicates that there was substance in the grievance raised by the complainant and that the conduct of the driver was improper. Further, the fact that a different vehicle from the one reflected in the booking details was sent for the ride also demonstrates negligence in monitoring and regulating the services being offered through the platform.

Therefore, this Commission is of the considered opinion that the Opposite Party cannot evade liability for the acts of the driver connected with and operating through its platform. The material placed on record sufficiently establishes negligence and deficiency in service on the part of the Opposite Party, resulting in mental agony, inconvenience, and hardship to the complainant.

Though the complainant has claimed compensation of Rs.5,00,000/- towards mental agony and other hardships suffered due to the incident, this Commission is of the view that the said amount appears to be excessive and disproportionate to the nature of the loss established on record. However, considering the mental agony, inconvenience, emotional distress, and the anxiety caused to the complainant at a crucial stage of her examination, this Commission deems it just and reasonable to award a sum of Rs.50,000/- as compensation, which, in the opinion of this Commission, would meet the ends of justice. The Opposite Party is also directed to implement and maintain stricter internal monitoring and verification mechanisms to curb such unfair and negligent practices by drivers operating through its platform, so as to safeguard the interests and safety of consumers.

8. In the result, the complaint is partly allowed, directing the Opposite Party to pay a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) to the complainant towards compensation for the mental agony, emotional distress, and hardship suffered due to the delay in reaching the examination centre. Further, the Opposite Party is directed to pay Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) towards costs of the case. This order shall be complied within 45 days from the date of receipt of this order.

Typed to my dictation by the stenographer, corrected and pronounced by us in the open Bench on this the 25th day of May, 2026.

**Sd/-
WOMEN MEMBER**

**Sd/-
MALE MEMBER**

**Sd/-
PRESIDENT'**

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE
Witnesses Examined

For the complainant:-Nil

For the opposite parties:-Nil

List of exhibits marked for the complainant:-

Ex.No.	Date/Year	Description	Remarks
A1		Complainant Account.	Self Attested Photo Copy.
A2	11.10.2025	Hall Ticket for the Junior Civil Judge Mains Examination	Self Attested Photo Copy.
A3	11.10.2025	Google Map of Auto Location.	Self Attested Photo Copy.
A4	11.10.2025	Ride and fare details	Self Attested Photo Copy.
A5	11.10.2025	Photograph of Auto No. AP 39 VC 6108.	Self Attested Photo Copy.

A6	11.11.2025	Legal Notice.	Office Copy.
A7	14.11.2025	Postal Tracking.	Self Attested Photo Copy.
A8	14.10.2025	Complaint to the Nodal Officer (G-Mail).	Self Attested Photo Copy.
A9	14.10.2025	Complaint to the Grievance Officer (G-Mail).	Self Attested Photo Copy

List of exhibits marked for the opposite party:-No

**Sd/-
WOMEN MEMBER**

**Sd/-
MALE MEMBER**

**Sd/-
PRESIDENT**

Pronounced on:-**25.05.2026**

Copy to:-

Copy made ready on _____ :

Copy dispatched to Complainant
and Opposite parties on _____ :