



# THE UBER PRICE-FIXING RIDE: WHAT ARE THE ANTITRUST CO-ORDINATES?

By Ahmore Burger-Smidt, Director, and Graeme Wickins, Director

## LEGAL BRIEF AUGUST 2016

During December 2015, Spencer Meyer instituted a class action lawsuit against Uber Technologies, Inc's CEO, Travis Kalanick, in the United States. The law suit is based on an allegation that Kalanick had "orchestrated and facilitated an illegal price-fixing conspiracy in violation of Section 1 of the federal Sherman Antitrust Act". Even though Kalanick attempted to have the class action lawsuit dismissed, his application was denied by Judge Jed Rakoff in the United States District Court on 31 March 2016. This litigation is ongoing.

### INTRODUCTION

As a technology company, Uber matches riders (passengers to be transported from one point to another) with drivers (drivers who operate vehicles of various specifications as quasi taxis but who generally do not accept payment directly from the passenger) through the use of an application (as an "app") used on smartphone devices. The service offers great convenience to both passengers and drivers, amongst others in relation to payment method, time saving and efficiency of use.

The Uber fare for any trip is calculated by an algorithm which adds a base fare amount plus an amount for the duration of time spent in the car plus an amount calculated based on the distance travelled. However, Uber's fare algorithm also continuously monitors the level of demand for drivers. If it detects that there is a high level of demand in a certain area, the fares for that area increase with the

activation of so called "surge pricing". According to Uber, the basis for surge pricing is to ensure that passengers can receive service within the shortest time frame possible.

It is alleged by Meyer that Kalanick, who is not only the co-founder of Uber but also an occasional driver, has conspired with other Uber drivers (who accept Uber's terms and conditions) to use Uber's pricing algorithm to set the prices charged to Uber riders, thereby restricting price competition amongst drivers. The crux of the complaint relates to the fact that drivers using the Uber app do not compete on price (both the standard fare and the surge pricing fare) and therefore riders cannot negotiate fares with drivers for rides.

The fact the Kalanick is also an occasional driver appears to be significant in the current case. It is this fact that Meyer is relying on to allege that the conspiracy perpetrated by Kalanick is horizontal in nature (i.e. as between competitors) and resulted in an agreement to fix prices amongst all competing Uber drivers.

### THE JUDGMENT

Kalanick's defence is that when the drivers agreed to Uber's terms and conditions, they did so individually and entered into an agreement solely with Uber (a vertical agreement) and not with the other drivers (a horizontal agreement). Despite this defence, previous case precedent as cited by Judge Rakoff acknowledges that –

*"where parties to vertical agreements have knowledge that other market participants are bound by identical agreements, and their participation is contingent upon that knowledge, they may be considered participants in a horizontal agreement in restraint of trade".*

It is alleged that Kalanick's actions have given rise to what is commonly referred to as a hub-and-spoke cartel. Judge Rakoff quoted in his judgment the following passage which clearly and succinctly explains a hub-and-spoke cartel –

*"[C]ourts have long recognized the existence of 'hub-and-spoke' conspiracies in which an entity at one level of the market structure, the 'hub,' coordinates an agreement among competitors at a different level, the 'spokes'. These arrangements consist of both vertical agreements between the hub and each spoke and a horizontal agreement among the spokes to adhere to the [hub's] terms, often because the spokes would not have gone along with [the vertical agreements] except on the understanding that the other [spokes] were agreeing to the same thing."*

Notwithstanding that this judgment does not fully consider the merits of the class action lawsuit, it does highlight some interesting observations in regard to innovation in rapidly developing technology markets and the potential consequences that can occur in relation to antitrust infringement. Historically hub-and-spoke cartels were often facilitated through trade associations which created a tangible platform for competitors to collude with one another. Extending the ability to coordinate conduct in the virtual world driven by technology providing a platform for cartel arrangements, presents the same risks from a competition law perspective. The co-ordinates from a competition law perspective for price fixing remain the same.

What does this judgment mean for Uber's chosen business model? Nothing, yet.

This class action lawsuit has been instituted against Uber's CEO and not Uber itself. Accordingly, no order or remedy will ultimately be made

against Uber directly (assuming the matter proceeds to trial). However, should the courts conclude that the conspiracy, allegedly orchestrated and facilitated by Kalanick, has given rise to a horizontal price-fixing arrangement amongst Uber drivers which contravenes antitrust laws, Uber would have to closely consider whether changes should be made to its app and, by implication, its existing business model to address the potential antitrust violation which may not be limited to just the United States of America.

## CONCLUSION

Whatever the outcome of this case (assuming it proceeds to trial), it is sure to have a significant impact on the way in which companies should consider antitrust implications in rapidly developing technology markets. It should set an interesting precedent in regard to the way in which the creators and operators of IT platforms that are used to create a marketplace are treated from a competition law perspective.

The case highlights the fact that in considering innovative technology solutions, competition law and the competition law cartel "co-ordinates" must be taken into account in order to find a business model that is robust and can withstand scrutiny by competition law regulators.

It remains to be seen if the same issues will be considered in South Africa taking into account that eight regional taxi companies and 150 individual members of the South African Meter Taxi Association filed a complaint during November 2015 with the Competition Commission alleging that Uber is engaging in anti-competitive behaviour. This investigation is on going.

Legal notice: Nothing in this publication should be construed as legal advice from any lawyer or this firm. Readers are advised to consult professional legal advisors for guidance on legislation which may affect their businesses.

© 2016 Werksmans Incorporated trading as Werksmans Attorneys. All rights reserved.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS



AHMOE  
BURGER-  
SMIDT

Title: Director, Werksmans Advisory Services (Pty) Ltd.  
Office: Johannesburg  
Direct line: +27 (0)11 535 8462  
Email: [aburgersmidt@werksmans.com](mailto:aburgersmidt@werksmans.com)

Ahmore Burger-Smidt specialises in Competition Law and Data Privacy. She has extensively advised clients in relation to both competition law as well as data privacy-related matters; including clients in numerous African countries. She advises on all aspects of competition law including applications for leniency and for exemption from the Competition Act.

She has significant expertise in the competition-related aspects of mergers and takeovers and in dealing with complaints of alleged anti-competitive conduct. She also undertakes compliance audits and programmes and is the principle driver of the Werksmans' competition law risk assessment and e-Learning tools. Prior to joining private practice, Ahmore was Deputy Commissioner and headed the Enforcement and Exemptions Division of the South African Competition Commission. She assists clients in relation to data privacy compliance programme development and implementation.



GRAEME  
WICKENS

Title: Director  
Office: Johannesburg  
Direct line: +27 (0)11 535 8279  
Email: [gwickens@werksmans.com](mailto:gwickens@werksmans.com)

Graeme Wickens joined Werksmans Attorneys as a senior associate in 2012 and was appointed director in 2016.

His areas of speciality include Competition, Media & Communications and Financial Services Regulation. Graeme graduated with an LLB from the University of Johannesburg.

## > Keep us close

The Corporate & Commercial Law Firm

[www.werksmans.com](http://www.werksmans.com)

*A member of the LEX Africa Alliance*

## ABOUT WERKSMANS ATTORNEYS

Established in the early 1900s, Werksmans Attorneys is a leading South African corporate and commercial law firm, serving multinationals, listed companies, financial institutions, entrepreneurs and government.

Operating in Gauteng and the Western Cape, the firm is connected to an extensive African legal alliance through LEX Africa.

LEX Africa was established in 1993 as the first and largest African legal alliance and offers huge potential for Werksmans' clients seeking to do business on the continent by providing a gateway to Africa.

With a formidable track record in mergers and acquisitions, banking and finance, and commercial litigation and dispute resolution, Werksmans is distinguished by the people, clients and work that it attracts and retains.

Werksmans' more than 200 lawyers are a powerful team of independent-minded individuals who share a common service ethos. The firm's success is built on a solid foundation of insightful and innovative deal structuring and legal advice, a keen ability to understand business and economic imperatives and a strong focus on achieving the best legal outcome for clients.

