

Alert | Antitrust Litigation & Competition Regulation



February 2023

Consumer-Facing Algorithmic Pricing Cases

Algorithmic pricing software in consumer-facing industries recently has generated a proliferation of class action lawsuits in the United States. Algorithmic pricing software relies on historic patterns and current data within a set market to make recommendations on pricing based on the end user's preferences and goals. The cases filed allege competitors' use of algorithmic pricing software in a given market violates Section 1 of the Sherman Act, claiming the competitors and software provider are engaged in a "hub and spoke" conspiracy to fix prices. Several cases have been filed, all of which are at the very early stages of litigation in federal courts around the United States.

Go-To Guide:

- Algorithmic pricing software cases on the rise
- Consumer class actions allege hub and spoke conspiracies

Both EU and U.S. regulatory bodies have addressed algorithmic pricing models. The U.S. Federal Trade Commission and Department of Justice previously stated in a [paper](#) to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that without an agreement with a competitor over the use or purpose of algorithmic pricing software, there can be no Section 1 violation. However, the agencies gave an [example of an enforcement action](#) against competitors that used algorithm-based pricing software with the express agreement to match prices. The agencies also noted:

If competing firms each entered into separate agreements with a single firm (for instance a platform) to use a particular pricing algorithm, and the evidence showed they did so with the common understanding that all of the other competitors would use the identical algorithm, that

evidence could be used to prove an agreement among the competitors that violates U.S. antitrust law. The lack of direct communication among the competitors would not be a bar to finding an unlawful conspiracy.

In 2017, the European Union also **provided** the OECD with two general principles for the treatment of pricing algorithms under EU competition law:

First, if pricing practices are illegal when implemented offline, there is a strong chance that they will be illegal as well when implemented online. Second, firms involved in illegal pricing practices cannot avoid liability on the grounds that their prices were determined by algorithms. Like an employee or an outside consultant working under a firm's "direction or control", an algorithm remains under the firm's control, and therefore the firm is liable for its actions.

The use of algorithmic pricing software is growing in both the United States and Europe across numerous industries. With the expansion of several plaintiff-oriented U.S. law firms in the UK and EU, industries in these regions may face suits similar to those filed in the United States.

Moreover, given the EU's Representative Actions Directive (RAD), which set a deadline of Dec. 25, 2022, for EU member states to have a mechanism in place for representative actions to allow consumers to litigate their collective interests, and the fact that these regulations are now coming into effect, more collective actions related to the use of algorithmic pricing software may be filed in the future.

Authors

This GT Alert was prepared by:

- **Gregory J. Casas** | +1 512.320.7238 | casasg@gtlaw.com
- **Emily Willis Collins** | +1 512.320.7274 | Emily.Collins@gtlaw.com

Albany. Amsterdam. Atlanta. Austin. Berlin.~ Boston. Charlotte. Chicago. Dallas. Delaware. Denver. Fort Lauderdale. Houston. Las Vegas. London.* Long Island. Los Angeles. Mexico City.+ Miami. Milan.» Minneapolis. New Jersey. New York. Northern Virginia. Orange County. Orlando. Philadelphia. Phoenix. Portland. Sacramento. Salt Lake City. San Diego. San Francisco. Seoul.º Shanghai. Silicon Valley. Tallahassee. Tampa. Tel Aviv.^ Tokyo.ª Warsaw.~ Washington, D.C.. West Palm Beach. Westchester County.

*This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer's legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. ~Greenberg Traurig's Berlin office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Germany, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. *Operates as a separate UK registered legal entity. +Greenberg Traurig's Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. »Greenberg Traurig's Milan office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Santa Maria, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ºOperates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. ^Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. ¢Greenberg Traurig's Tokyo Office is operated by GT Tokyo Horitsu Jimusho and Greenberg Traurig Gaikokuhojimbengoshi Jimusho, affiliates of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ~Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by GREENBERG TRAUIG Nowakowska-Zimoch Wysokiński sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in GREENBERG TRAUIG Nowakowska-Zimoch Wysokiński sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2023 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*