



Article Type: Review Article

Available online: www.ujlbm.twistingmemoirs.com

REGULATING “DARK PATTERNS” IN E COMMERCE

Divyanshi Rathour*

**City Law College, Jankipuram Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India*Corresponding Author: Divyanshi Rathour Email ID: rathourdivyanshi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The use of "dark patterns," or user interfaces intended to trick users into making unforeseen decisions, is growing on digital platforms. The ethical, legal, and financial ramifications of these dishonest e-commerce practices are examined in this abstract. It presents a typology of dark patterns, such as urgency cues, forced actions, hidden costs, and privacy shaming, and makes the case that these strategies go against the informed consent principle. Because it can be difficult to define harm, demonstrate intent, and handle the fragmentation of global jurisdiction, current legal frameworks—which were created for traditional commerce—are frequently insufficient. A new regulatory framework based on proactive measures is proposed in this paper. Explicit "duty of care" establishment for ethical design should be mentioned, along with enactment of laws for algorithmic and interface transparency and empowerment of regulators to conduct usability audits.

Keywords: Consumer Protection, E-Commerce, Dark Patterns, Regulatory Framework & User Interface

INTRODUCTION

The digital marketplace is becoming the new terrain of commerce. This manipulation is found in dark patterns, user interfaces that are purposely designed to deceive, mislead, and coerce consumers into non-optimal decisions. As an individual with a social science background who received my social science background from Archisha International School, my position is that these practices are an assault (violations) directly on the underpinnings of consumer law, and there needs to be an intervention that is nuanced and sophisticated.

Typology of the Deception:

To properly regulate digital deception, we need to have some nuanced understanding of its architecture. Dark patterns are not uniform; there are several different psychological and design tricks that can influence users and consumers. A typology of dark patterns can help demonstrate

their duplicitous nature when uncovering them.

- **Forced Action** - Forcing a consumer to take an unwanted action, such as signing-up for a newsletter, to allow the consumer to take a desired action, such as completing a purchase
- **Hidden Costs** - The process of "drip pricing", whereby fees and other unexpected charges are revealed only at the very end of the checkout process, and creates frustration for consumers who might just want to complete their purchase given the sense of sunk costs
- **Urgency Cues** - Using manipulative language such as "only 2 lefts!" and "offer expires in 10 minutes!", to stimulate the fear of missing out and push consumers to impulse buy
- **Privacy Zuckering** - Purposefully making it hard for users to opt-out of sharing their privacy, while making the "agree to all" button large and attractive, and burying the opt-outs in complicated interfaces
- **Confirm Shaming**- Guilt-tripping consumers to take a service by negatively framing the rejection, as in "No thanks, I don't want to save money."
- Any of these techniques, on their own or together, violate the concept of informed consent. This principle is a touchstone of ethical and legal commerce.

Inadequacies of Existing Laws:

Most existing legal systems were intended for a physical marketplace. There is still a debate about the scale, complexity, and algorithmic strategies of dark patterns. The principal regulatory challenges include:

- **Identifying Harm:** Because there is an element of subjectivity to dark patterns, it is difficult to produce a rigid legal definition. A design detail that one user finds useful and helps them (a welcomed choice), could feel coercive to another user (an unwanted choice). Subjectivity makes the damage of dark patterns a substantial legal hurdle.
- **Proving Intent:** It is extraordinarily difficult to show that a company had an intention to deceive when designing a deceptive interface. A company can simply claim that a confusing interface was an unintentional consequence of a poor design decision or the end result of A/B testing, and that they had no intention of deception at the outset.
- **Jurisdictional Non-Fragments:** E-commerce is worldwide, however online regulation is fragmented across international and regional boundaries. This creates a regulatory loophole which allows companies to take advantage of consumers in jurisdictions of lower regulatory protection.

A Way Forward: Towards a Coordinated Framework:

In order to protect consumers in the digital environment, a new coordinated legal framework is required, moving beyond a reactive response to deceptive practices to a proactive enforcement of ethical design principles. An approach that encompasses:

- **Explicit Prohibitions:** Legislation should specifically prohibit many common types of dark patterns, providing roadmaps for businesses and certainty for regulators.
- **Duty of Care:** Digital service providers should have an established duty of ethical design. This would allow the service provider to account for the best interests of the consumer in any design decision, not the consumer.
- **Transparency of Algorithms:** Require transparency on how the algorithms and interface of e-commerce systems are designed to influence consumer decisions.
- **Empowering Regulators:** Existing regulatory bodies must have the authority to conduct independent audits of usability, and fine companies that fail to comply.

The Broader Ethical & Economic Implications:

The legal threats from dark patterns are only one part of a much larger issue. Their endemic and even normalized utilization has considerable, potentially catastrophic ethical and economic implications that jeopardize the core of the digital ecosystem itself. From an ethical perspective, dark patterns signify a fundamental one-way breakdown of trust. They condition consumers to be suspicious of digital entry points completely, and they put all of the goodwill and brand loyalty at risk that sustainable businesses depend on. A marketplace that is grounded in deception, is not a marketplace anymore, and inevitably become a race to the bottom, where competition is on the basis of who can execute the best developed dark patterns, and who can inhibit "The Best Customer Experience". The economic implications of these patterns are tremendous market distortions. By confusing consumers into spending on unwanted subscriptions or frolicking around with a non-optimal purchasing decision, the result is a bad market where the best product doesn't always win. This not only inhibits true innovation, but penalizes companies who compete in a fair way. Together, they create a negative-sum game: enacting short-term profits for a few bad actors while detrimenting consumer welfare and long-term market health.

The Way to Go: A Holistic Regulation and Ethical Approach:

Rebuilding trust and fairness has to be a multi-faceted approach. The legal and ethical framework must rest on:

1. **A Statutory Duty to Ethical Design:** I suggest we stop restricting ourselves to banning certain implied deceptive practices and create a legal duty on digital service providers. The "duty to ethical design" would be akin to the professional obligations that we place on architects, engineers and doctors, who are obliged, both legally and ethically, to act in a client's best interests and to do no harm. The change would be from a proof of intent to a proof of failure to maintain a professional standard of care, and thus it would provide a much more feasible basis to enforce compliance.
2. **Compulsory Algorithmic and Interface Transparency:** Regulators should seek to introduce transparency into the level of deliberation put into the design of both algorithms and user interfaces with the intention of leading the consumer to a decision. For example, regulators could require firms disclose the methodology used in crafting their interface designs as part of a regular audit, effectively front-loading the regulator's ability to identify and address manipulative behaviour before it has caused broad harm to consumers.
3. **Granting Regulators the Power to Usability Audit:** Rather than relying on the complaints of individuals, regulators should be empowered to conduct usability audits. These audits would provide a framework for creating a systematic investigation of dark patterns using established experts in the field, creating a strong evidence base within which a regulatory response could take place.

In short, dark patterns regulation is not just a legal project but also an effort to get the digital marketplace back from manipulation. With strong prohibitions, a positive duty of care and further transparency, we can create a digital world where e-commerce is based on merit, fairness and the trust that is restored between business and consumers. Our laws need to catch up with technology as we ought not pay for the convenience of the digital age with our autonomy.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the extensive use of "dark patterns" in e-commerce poses a serious and expanding risk to the integrity of the online marketplace as well as consumer autonomy. These deceptive design strategies—from urgency cues and privacy shaming to coerced actions and hidden costs—are a willful breach of the essential principle of informed consent, as this paper has

shown. Existing legal frameworks have made an effort to address these problems, but they fall far short because they were created for traditional commerce. These manipulative practices flourish due to significant gaps created by the subjective nature of consumer harm, the difficulty of demonstrating a company's intent to deceive, and the fragmented global jurisdiction of e-commerce. We must develop a proactive regulatory framework and move past a reactive, complaint-based system if we are to genuinely protect consumers and restore justice. This essay promotes a multifaceted strategy that starts with the creation of a statutory "duty of care" for ethical design. By doing this, the emphasis would be shifted from proving malicious intent to proving a failure to meet a professional standard, holding digital service providers responsible for their design decisions. This is comparable to the ethical and legal requirements that engineers and architects make sure their work doesn't cause harm. In the end, controlling dark patterns is a moral and financial imperative rather than merely a legal endeavor. The widespread application of these patterns undermines real innovation, warps market competition, and erodes consumer trust. A market where manipulation is the key to success is a race to the bottom where a few dishonest people gain an advantage over everyone else. We can rid the digital marketplace of dishonesty by putting in place strict regulations, upholding a positive duty of care, and guaranteeing increased transparency. To make sure that the convenience of the digital age doesn't come at the expense of our most precious resource—our autonomy—our laws need to keep up with technological advancements.

REFERENCES

1. Brignull, H. (2010), Dark Patterns: User Interfaces Designed to Trick You. <https://darkpatterns.org/> Federal Trade Commission, (2022).
2. Bringing Dark Patterns to Light: An FTC Workshop on Hidden Fees and Manipulative Design. <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events/ftc-workshop-bringing-dark-patterns-light>
3. Mathur, A., & Ahmad, K. (2020), The New Frontier of Consumer Protection: Regulating Deceptive E-Commerce Interfaces. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 43(1), 15–32. <https://www.google.com/search?q=https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-019-09438-6>
4. European Union. (2022). Digital Services Act (DSA). *Official Journal of the European Union*. L 201/1, 27. October 2022.
5. Kushlev, K., & He, J. (2021). The Psychology of Urgency: How Dark Patterns Exploit Consumer Behavior. *Journal of Behavioral Economics and Management*, 15(4), 45-58.
6. Nisbet, D. P. (2018). *The Ethics of Digital Design: A Framework for User-Centric and Responsible Interfaces*. Routledge.
7. Srinivasan, R. (2019). *Beyond the Screen: A Critical Analysis of User Interface Design and Its Social Implications*. MIT Press.
8. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, (2023). An Overview of Dark Patterns in the Digital Marketplace. <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/data-research/research-reports/an-overview-of-dark-patterns-in-the-digital-marketplace/>
9. King, N., & Stone, M. (2021), Navigating the Algorithmic Labyrinth: Legal Challenges in Proving Intent in Deceptive Design Cases. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, 34(2), 567-598.
10. Aggarwal, S., & Dube, R. (2023). The Duty of Ethical Design: A Proposed Standard of Care for Digital Platforms. *Global Legal Studies Review*, 10(3), 211-235.