FROM ALGORITHMS TO ACCOUNTABILITY: THE LEGAL LANDSCAPE OF DIGITAL LENDING IN INDIA

Akshat Singh[*]

ABSTRACT

The fintech revolution has profoundly transformed India's financial landscape by enhancing access to credit, particularly through the emergence of digital lending platforms. However, this rapid growth has outpaced existing regulatory structures, raising significant concerns related to consumer protection, data privacy, algorithmic bias, and regulatory evasion. This article offers a critical examination of the evolving legal and regulatory framework surrounding digital lending in India, especially in light of the Reserve Bank of India's Digital Lending Guidelines (2022) and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act (2023). It discusses the systemic challenges presented by unregulated intermediaries, ambiguous lending algorithms, and the predatory practices of certain mobile lenders. The paper further conducts a comparative analysis of global fintech regulations to propose potential frameworks that India could adopt. In conclusion, the article advocates for a balanced, technology-neutral, and consumer-centric approach that fosters both innovation and accountability within the digital lending industry.

Keywords: Data privacy, Digital, Consumer Protection, Lending, Growth.

INTRODUCTION

India's financial services sector is undergoing a significant transformation, primarily driven by the rise of financial technology, commonly known as fintech. One of the most revolutionary developments in this area is digital lending, which has expanded access to credit by removing the conventional barriers associated with banking. By utilising data analytics, mobile technology, and automated decision-making, digital lending provides instant loans, seamless user experiences, and credit opportunities for underserved populations. Millions, including gig

---

[*]BBA LLB (HONS.), THIRD YEAR, KR MANGALAM UNIVERSITY.

economy workers and small business owners, now rely on these platforms for their personal and professional financial needs. However, the growth of fintech-driven lending has uncovered a considerable regulatory void. Concerns over exploitative interest rates, aggressive recovery tactics, and privacy violations have triggered public concern, emphasising the lack of established legal guidelines governing these platforms. Unregulated apps, many owned by foreign or unknown entities, have garnered attention for taking advantage of consumers' vulnerabilities through hidden fees, data misuse, and even psychological manipulation. In response, the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) launched its Digital Lending Guidelines in 2022, and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, set important standards regarding user consent and data handling. Nonetheless, major shortcomings remain, particularly in terms of algorithmic transparency, platform accountability, and cross-border enforcement. This article provides a detailed examination of the legal framework regarding digital lending in India, analysing its strengths, weaknesses, and the reforms required. It evaluates the RBI's regulatory approach, the role of fintech intermediaries, and the interaction between India's data protection laws and lending platforms. Furthermore, the article explores international comparative models, gleaning lessons from regions like the European Union, the United States, and Singapore, while proposing a balanced approach for India that promotes both innovation and consumer protection.

UNDERSTANDING DIGITAL LENDING AND FINTECH MODELS IN INDIA

Digital lending in India represents a varied and rapidly changing segment of the fintech landscape, incorporating numerous business models and operational frameworks. In contrast to conventional banks that depend on in-person underwriting and physical paperwork, digital lending platforms utilise technology-driven solutions such as artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning (ML), big data analytics, and alternative credit scoring methods to evaluate borrower risk and provide credit. Comprehending the structure of these models is crucial for understanding the accompanying regulatory and legal challenges.

MAIN CATEGORIES OF DIGITAL LENDERS

NBFC-DLs (Non-Banking Financial Companies Digital Lenders): These are NBFCs recognised by the RBI that operate entirely online. They extend loans directly via their websites or applications while complying with regulatory standards as lending institutions. Examples include: CASHe, Money Tap, KreditBee.

Lending Service Providers (LSPs) / Fintech Platforms: These entities do not lend directly but act as intermediaries connecting borrowers with regulated organisations such as banks or NBFCs. They offer front-end services like customer acquisition, onboarding, credit evaluation, and loan management. Examples include: Paytm, Zest Money, Lazy Pay, Slice. The legal challenge with LSPs is that, even though they manage crucial parts of the lending process, they are not under direct regulation, creating ambiguous lines of accountability.

Bank-Fintech Partnerships: Many fintech applications collaborate with established banks to leverage their regulatory position while providing technology-based lending solutions. While banks assume credit risk and regulatory responsibilities, the operational oversight frequently lies with the fintech partner, which may result in compliance issues.

Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Lending Platforms: These platforms, which operate under the RBI's Master Directions for NBFC-P2P, connect individual borrowers with lenders directly. Although they are regulated, they remain relatively new in India and face restrictions on exposure limits and capital adequacy.

The operation of digital lending, most platforms follow a simplified procedure. A user downloads the app and fills out a loan request, KYC and creditworthiness assessments are performed using both traditional and alternative data sources (including bank statements, SMS history, geolocation, and device information), The loan is approved, distributed, and monitored via the app, Equated Monthly Installments (EMIs) or repayments are automatically withdrawn from the user's bank account.

Many platforms utilise automated decision-making systems, where algorithms make determinations about loan approvals, limits, and interest rates. These processes raise serious concerns regarding transparency, fairness, and discrimination, particularly when users are not informed about how their data is used.

KEY LEGAL CHALLENGES IN FINTECH LENDING MODELS

Unclear Liability: Who is responsible when a problem occurs, the lender, the platform, or both?

Consumer Consent: Are borrowers truly giving informed consent about data gathering and profiling? Lack of grievance redressal mechanisms in unregulated platforms.

Shadow Lending: Unregulated platforms engaging in loans without RBI authorisation or partnering with shell NBFCs.

Regulatory Gaps: While the RBI supervises NBFCs and P2P platforms, there is no unified regulatory structure that covers all digital lending models, particularly those where fintechs act as LSPs. The legal framework often falls behind technological progress, creating a landscape filled with risks that compromise consumer rights.

RBI'S REGULATORY FRAMEWORK AND KEY GUIDELINES

RBI's Digital Lending Guidelines of 2022: The significant turning Point was introduced in 2022 as a response to disturbing events linked to unauthorised loan applications, many of which were operated by untraceable or foreign entities. These platforms often engage in: Lending without appropriate registration with the RBI, charging exorbitant interest rates, using aggressive tactics for debt recovery, and gathering sensitive personal information without obtaining consent. To tackle these concerns, the RBI implemented several key measures:

Lending Exclusively Through Regulated Entities: where loans are usually issued and collected only by entities that are regulated by the RBI, banks, and NBFCs. The Lending Service Providers (LSPs) are not allowed to hold or manage loan funds in their accounts.

Key Fact Statement (KFS): All borrowers must receive a standardised disclosure document that specifies: The effective annual percentage rate (APR), the duration of the loan, Processing fees, penalties, and any additional charges.

Increased Transparency & Consent LSPs: These are required to obtain explicit consent from borrowers before accessing their data. Apps must transparently communicate: The purpose of collecting data, the entities with whom the data will be shared the control users have over permissions.

Grievance Redressal & Nodal Officers: Every platform must appoint designated grievance officers and visibly display their contact information. Complaints should be resolved within 30 days; if they are not, borrowers have the right to escalate the issue to the RBI's Ombudsman.

No Automatic Credit Limit Increases: Platforms are not permitted to increase credit limits without obtaining the borrower's explicit consent.

Cooling-off Period: Borrowers have a right to a minimum three-day period to withdraw from the loan agreement without facing any penalties, offering protection for first-time and vulnerable users.

THE ROLE OF THE WORKING GROUP ON DIGITAL LENDING (2021)

The recommendations put forth by the Working Group on Digital Lending, initiated by the RBI in 2021, played a crucial role in shaping the 2022 guidelines. The group identified the key risks associated with unregulated lending and suggested a verification process for loan applications (leading to the launch of the Sachet portal), Direct digital loan servicing by regulated entities (Res), Establishing a Self-Regulatory Organization (SRO) for fintech companies, and Introducing a Digital Trust Score for platforms. Although many of these ideas are still being evaluated or piloted, they reflect a growing awareness of the challenges related to unregulated fintech lending.

NBFCS AND FINTECH PARTNERSHIPS

Regulatory uncertainty, a substantial amount of digital lending is carried out by fintech applications in collaboration with NBFCs. While NBFCs are governed by the RBI, their technology partners often lack oversight. This two-tier system creates a transparency issue, where the platform handles customer interactions, onboarding, and data management. The NBFC provides regulatory approval and funds. This division of roles raises important legal issues, particularly when loans default or borrowers face harassment, there are obstacles in enforcement & compliance despite the new regulations, implementation challenges remain, smaller platforms disregard KFS or fail to meet data transparency requirements. Borrowers frequently lack knowledge regarding their rights or options for grievance redressal. Foreign-backed applications repeatedly emerge under new identities with limited scrutiny. Law enforcement and the RBI have restricted authority over cross-border applications hosted on foreign servers. Evaluation of the regulatory framework, while the RBI's approach represents a risk-based, technology-neutral perspective, critics argue that the guidelines heavily depend on self-regulation by platforms. There is no single legislative framework for digital lending, leading to overlapping jurisdictions among the RBI, the IT Ministry, and the Consumer Affairs. Enforcement is inconsistent and primarily reactive. The absence of a dedicated Fintech Law or Digital Lending Act leaves many issues, particularly those related to data protection, AI-driven credit assessments, and borrower discrimination, unaddressed.

DATA PRIVACY AND CONSENT RISKS IN DIGITAL MONEY LENDING

As digital lending platforms depend significantly on user information and algorithm-driven decision-making, issues related to privacy, consent, and transparency emerge as primary legal and ethical challenges. Millions of financial choices are now influenced by automated systems, often without adequate disclosure of the criteria involved. Additionally, intrusive data collection and profiling methods, particularly by unregulated or foreign-controlled applications, have resulted in extensive privacy breaches, exploitation of personal data, and even harassment of borrowers.

The Data Issue: What FinTechs Gather Numerous digital lenders collect far more than just the essential KYC information, including:

- SMS records (for verifying transactions).
- Contact lists and call history.
- Geolocation and storage of data from devices.
- Social media interactions and activity.
- Web browsing habits and applications installed.

Such information is frequently utilised to create alternative credit ratings, especially for first-time borrowers who do not have conventional credit histories. However, users are seldom informed about how this information is processed, shared, or retained, raising significant concerns regarding violations of both constitutional and statutory rights.

Legal Protections: The DPDP Act, 2023 The Digital Personal Data Protection (DPDP) Act, 2023, represents a significant advancement in India's privacy framework. It applies to all organisations, both domestic and foreign, that handle personal data of individuals within India. Important provisions relevant to digital lending. Consent must be given freely, be informed, specific, and unequivocal. Data fiduciaries (i.e., lending platforms) are required to ensure that personal data is. Utilised solely for the explicit purpose for which it was collected. Protected securely and removed upon user request or after its purpose has been fulfilled. Users are entitled to access, amend, and delete their data. Platforms must inform users of any data breaches.

While it appears promising on paper, actual enforcement remains difficult, particularly for smaller fintechs and foreign-owned lending applications that frequently function outside India's effective jurisdiction.

Consent or Coercion: Numerous loan applications employ misleading or coercive tactics to obtain data access. Users are often compelled to grant extensive permissions to continue with loan applications. Opt-out options may be absent or ineffective. Terms & Conditions are lengthy, legally complicated, and generally overlooked by users. Such practices contravene the essence of consent under both Indian law and international data protection standards. Courts have consistently underscored the principle of informed consent, particularly noted in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India (2017),* which affirmed that privacy is a basic right and any encroachment must satisfy the criteria of necessity and proportionality.

The Harassment Crisis: An Issue of Human Rights includes,

- Numerous complaints have emerged concerning digital lenders.
- Accessing borrowers' contact lists to scare or publicly embarrass them.
- Sending threatening messages or manipulated images to friends and family.
- Utilising recovery agents who are untrained and lack accountability under the law.

This has caused considerable mental anguish and, in some instances, has resulted in borrower suicides. Courts have recognised the problem, yet the absence of strict laws addressing digital harassment in lending continues to be a major deficiency.

ENFORCEMENT TRENDS AND JUDICIAL RESPONSES IN INDIA

As digital lending platforms drew scrutiny for predatory practices, fraudulent operations, and borrower harassment, India saw an increase in judicial and administrative actions. However, enforcement has frequently been more reactive rather than proactive, and while some prominent cases have brought attention to the risks tied to digital lending, there has been little ongoing regulation through legal measures.

RBI Actions and App Removals: In 2021 and 2022, the RBI, along with various central and state law enforcement entities, implemented actions against unauthorised lending applications operating beyond regulatory oversight. Notable measures included: Publishing directories of sanctioned NBFCs and warning the public against borrowing from unregistered lenders. Mandating app stores (especially Google Play) to remove non-compliant lending applications. Introducing the Sachet Portal, which allows consumers to report unregulated financial firms and activities

In one coordinated operation, over 600 lending applications were flagged for investigation, with many linked to offshore shell firms, particularly those from China. Furthermore, the RBI initiated discussions about creating a public whitelist of legitimate lending applications, assisting users in recognising compliant platforms.

Enforcement Directorate (ED) and Cybercrime Units: The Enforcement Directorate (ED) and state cybercrime divisions have initiated investigations into money laundering and data breaches involving various digital lending platforms. In 2022, the ED froze assets exceeding ₹100 crore belonging to operators of illegal lending applications associated with Chinese entities. Cybercrime units have focused on platforms involved in extortion, data breaches, and impersonation. Nonetheless, enforcement efforts have faced technical and jurisdictional challenges. Many servers are based overseas. App developers often hide their identities or operate through proxy directors. The absence of a centralised fintech regulator leads to overlaps in financial and technological oversight.

Judiciary's Role: Gradual but Promising: Indian courts have started to tackle the digital lending issue, especially concerning fundamental rights and criminal responsibility.

PILs and High Court Actions: In 2022, the Bombay High Court took Suo moto cognisance of a borrower's suicide linked to pressure from recovery agents tied to a digital lending application. The Court emphasised the need for mental health protections and regulatory measures against coercive recovery practices.

The Telangana High Court mandated the state police to investigate over 30 digital lending applications for violating consumer and cyber laws.

Supreme Court on Privacy and Consent: While not directly addressing lending, the Puttaswamy judgment (2017) has provided a legal foundation for challenging exploitative data practices. It established that. Consent must be informed, meaningful, and freely given. It cannot merely be a formality in digital interactions. This principle supports legal challenges against platforms that misuse personal data under vague terms.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 2019 AND DIGITAL LENDING

The Consumer Protection Act, 2019, introduces new avenues for borrowers to dispute exploitative practices, including:

- Filing complaints in consumer courts regarding unfair terms or harassment.

- Leveraging provisions against unfair trade practices and inadequate service.

- However, many borrowers remain unaware of these options, and most digital lending disputes tend to fall outside consumer forums due to their complex tech-finance hybrid nature.

LIMITATIONS IN INSTITUTIONAL REDRESS

Despite achieving some enforcement successes, India still lacks A dedicated redressal framework for fintech users beyond banking ombudsmen. A regulatory sandbox for grievance assessment in digital finance. Coordinated public awareness initiatives regarding rights in digital lending. The fragmented enforcement landscape shared among the RBI, police, ED, and IT Ministry results in disjointed actions, particularly in cases involving international entities or decentralised ownership.

NAVIGATING THE FUTURE: ESTABLISHING A RESPONSIBLE FINTECH LENDING FRAMEWORK IN INDIA

India stands at a crucial juncture in its digital financial ecosystem. The swift expansion of digital lending, while a sign of innovation and broader access to finance, has underscored significant regulatory, ethical, and infrastructural deficiencies. To ensure that digital credit supports users rather than exploits them, India must proactively create a framework that is transparent, accountable, consumer-centric, and flexible enough to adapt to technological changes.

Developing a Tailored Law for Digital Lending: There is an urgent need for a comprehensive legal framework specifically tailored for digital lending, rather than having oversight scattered across the RBI, IT Ministry, and consumer protection agencies. This should include: Mandatory registration and licensing for all digital lending services, regardless of whether they are linked to NBFCs or operate independently. Uniform disclosures concerning loan conditions, interest rates, penalties, and grievance resolution processes before onboarding. The establishment of a primary regulatory authority or a specific division within the RBI focused exclusively on fintech compliance.

Promoting Accountability in Algorithms and AI Management: As AI and machine learning increasingly play a role in lending decisions, India needs to introduce algorithmic evaluations

and enforce the right to an explanation. Borrowers must be informed about the reasons for their loan approval, rejection, or the specific interest rates given. Discrimination safeguards: Measures should be implemented to prevent bias based on gender, caste, religion, or socio-economic factors. Independent oversight: Set up third-party review mechanisms to ensure fairness in automated decision processes. This approach aligns with the principles laid out in the Supreme Court's Puttaswamy judgment and global standards for responsible AI practices.

Strengthening Data Protection and Consent Protocols: Although the DPDP Act, 2023 shows advancements, its implementation should include. Explicit opt-in requirements for data collection, no loan should require intrusive permissions as a condition, A dedicated data code for fintech that regulates what data can be accessed, its intended use, and the duration of access, Mandates for data localization for fintech companies with international operations, especially those with unclear ownership structures, Digital borrowing must honor privacy, dignity, and individual autonomy.

Empowering Borrowers and Improving Grievance Resolution: Borrowers should be viewed not merely as customers but as rights holders. This necessitates creating a centralised platform for digital lending complaints to enable swift resolutions. Launching public awareness initiatives in local languages about rights in digital lending. Integrating fintech-related grievances into the Consumer Protection framework with simplified filing procedures. Informed and educated consumers serve as the first line of defence against predatory practices.

Promoting Ethical Development in Fintech: The fintech revolution should not be suppressed; rather, it should be guided responsibly. Regulators should expand regulatory sandboxes to foster safe innovation within an oversight framework. Offer incentives for ethical compliance, such as tax benefits or preferential listings for platforms that adhere to best practices. Encourage collaboration among fintech companies, civil society, academia, and regulators to create techno-legal standards. A responsible ecosystem will cultivate trust, enhance scalability, and ensure that Indian fintech remains competitive on a global scale.

CONCLUSION

The rise of digital lending platforms in India has changed how easily credit can be obtained, especially for first-time borrowers and those in underserved financial groups. Nonetheless, this shift has brought significant challenges regulatory deficiencies, violations of data privacy, algorithmic discrimination, and borrower harassment have emerged as serious legal and ethical

issues. Currently, the fragmented regulatory environment, although improving, does not sufficiently address the intricate risks tied to fintech lending. This article has examined the regulatory shortcomings, consumer vulnerabilities, and enforcement challenges impacting the digital lending sector. It has also evaluated the responses from regulatory bodies like the RBI, how courts have interpreted borrower rights, and the steps India needs to take to ensure the progression of fintech aligns with constitutional and legal safeguards. In summary, for India to fully harness the advantages of fintech while safeguarding public interest, it must pursue more than just gradual reforms. A comprehensive legal framework that adapts to new technologies is crucial, one that prioritises algorithmic accountability, strong data protection, thorough regulatory oversight, and consumer empowerment. Only in this way can digital lending evolve from a primarily profit-driven mechanism to an instrument of genuine financial inclusion.

REFERENCES

- Personal Data Protection Act 2023, Consumer Protection Act 2019 (India) https://ncdrc.nic.in/bare_acts/CPA2019.pdf.

- https://indiankanoon.org/doc/91938676/.

- Information Technology Act 2000 (India), ss 43A, 72A https://www.indiacode.nic.in/bitstream/123456789/13116/1/it_act_2000_updated.pdf.

- https://www.rbi.org.in/CommonPerson/english/Scripts/Notification.aspx?Id=1572

- https://www.rbi.org.in/Scripts/NotificationUser.aspx

- https://enforcementdirectorate.gov.in/

- Reserve Bank of India, 'Report of the Working Group on Digital Lending including Lending through Online Platforms and Mobile Apps' (2021) https://www.rbi.org.in/commonperson/english/Scripts/PressReleases.aspx.

- Digital Lending: Between Convenience and Exploitation' The Hindu (2023). https://www.thehindu.com/archive/web/2025/06/13/.

- https://nualslawjournal.com/2024/08/09/navigating-the-digital-lending-boom-in-india-balancing-innovation-and-regulation/.

- https://www.barandbench.com/news/litigation/civil-suit-cant-be-filed-on-mere-apprehension-of-legal-action-bombay-high-court