News

Amazon and the vendor are ordered by a consumer court to reimburse the customer ?4.68 lakh for...

The e-commerce platform and its vendor were found guilty by the Commission of unfair trade practices and service deficiencies.

lawread



Call center for Amazon

In **Soloman Lepcha v. Amazon Seller Services Private Ltd. & Anr.**, the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission in Darjeeling recently ordered Amazon and a seller who

listed a camera on the online platform to pay ?4.68 lakh compensation and refund to a customer who was refused a refund even after returning an incorrectly delivered product.
President Tikendra Narayan Pradhan and Member Bhawana Thakuri held Amazon and its seller accountable for unfair trade practices and deficiencies in service for shipping the incorrect camera model and refusing to reimburse the customer even after the item was returned.

The Commission held, "We are of the view that the complainants have been able to make out their case against the O.Ps (Amazon Seller Services Private Limited and its seller) and they are entitled to get the relief as prayed for," after observing that the e-commerce platform and its seller did not appear or contest the proceedings, leaving the complainant's version and evidence uncontested.
After approving the case, the Commission ordered the opposing parties to reimburse the camera's cost of ?1.43 lakh in addition to compensation under several different categories.
Within 45 days of the date of this ruling, **"the O.ps (Amazon, its seller) are also directed to pay a sum of Rs 2,00,000/-for mental harassment and agony and further the sum of Rs 1,00,000/-for negligence and deficiency of service and Rs 25,000/-**for litigation cost."
Additionally, the Commission mandated that interest be applied to the full sum at a rate of 9% annually from the moment the complaint was filed until it was realized.

The disagreement started when the complainant used Amazon's marketplace to purchase a Fujifilm X-T5 digital camera from a listed seller for ?1.43 lakh. He discovered that the merchandise was a different **model—a Fujifilm X-T50—when it was delivered on February 10, 2025.**
After contacting customer service right away, the complainant was told to return the item and assured that a refund will be issued.
The vendor received the product after collecting it from the complainant. But when he looked at the refund status, he saw that the returned item was "incorrect," therefore the claim could not be processed.
This stance was reaffirmed in later correspondence, including emails, which even categorized the problem as being a "used or damaged item" instead of recognizing it as an incorrect delivery.

The complainant persisted in pursuing the issue, including emails and photographic proof of disparities in packing labels, including dual tags that indicated distinct models. In spite of this,

Lawread

neither the refund nor the returned item were sent back.

The consumer approached the Commission after a legal notice sent to the parties failed to settle the disagreement.

Amazon defended themselves by arguing that the Information Technology Act of 2000 only required it to act as an intermediary. However, the complainant contended that the platform had substantial control over transactions, including listings, payments, delivery logistics, and returns, and that it was unable to avoid accountability in these situations.

The Commission noted, "There is nothing to disbelieve the unchallenged testimony of the complainant," emphasizing that the evidence on file remained uncontested because neither Amazon nor the seller had produced a written version or appeared. Additionally, since the complainant's documents have not been contested, there is no reason to doubt them.

Sunam Sharma, Pallav Sharma, and Suraj Mohanta were the customer's advocates (complaint).

Lawread