

Navigating the Labyrinth: An Analysis of Consumer Rights in Subscription-Based Service Models

Dr Madhu Kumar K

Assistant Professor, PES University,
Bengaluru – 560085, Karnataka, India
Email: madhukumar[at]pes.edu

Abstract: *The subscription economy has experienced explosive growth, fundamentally altering consumer-business relationships across a multitude of sectors. Projections indicate the market will reach over \$1.5 trillion by 2033, driven by consumer demand for convenience and business demand for predictable revenue (Grandview Research, n.d.). However, this paradigm shift has been accompanied by a significant erosion of consumer rights, facilitated by deceptive business practices such as "dark patterns," opaque terms, hidden fees, and intentionally difficult cancellation processes, collectively known as "subscription traps". This paper investigates the critical legal and regulatory responses to these challenges. Through a comparative legal analysis, it examines the evolving frameworks in the United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and Canada. Key regulatory interventions include the U.S. Federal Trade Commission's "Click-to-Cancel" rule, California's influential Automatic Renewal Law (ARL), the EU's Consumer Rights Directive, and the UK's proposed Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Bill. The analysis reveals a clear global trend toward strengthening consumer protections by mandating transparency, requiring express consent, and simplifying cancellation procedures. This paper concludes that these developments represent a crucial rebalancing of power in the digital marketplace, forcing businesses to move beyond mere compliance toward more ethical, consumer-centric models. The findings have profound implications for business strategy, regulatory enforcement, and the future of digital commerce.*

Keywords: Subscription Economy, Consumer Rights, Automatic Renewal, Dark Patterns, Click-to-Cancel, Consumer Protection Law, Subscription Traps

1. Introduction

The subscription-based service model has become a ubiquitous feature of the modern digital economy. From streaming entertainment and software-as-a-service (SaaS) to meal kits and curated retail boxes, businesses are increasingly adopting recurring revenue models (Apps365, 2025). The global subscription economy is not only vast but also rapidly expanding, with some projections estimating its value will grow from approximately \$30 billion in 2024 to over \$113 billion by 2033 (Business Wire, 2025). This model offers businesses the allure of predictable revenue streams and deeper customer relationships, while consumers are drawn to the convenience and perceived value (Stripe, 2023).

Despite its apparent benefits, the proliferation of subscription services has exposed significant vulnerabilities for consumers. A considerable "reality gap" exists between perceived and actual spending; one 2024 study found that consumers believed they spent an average of \$86 per month on subscriptions, when the actual figure was closer to \$219 (Scamwatchhq.com, 2025). This discrepancy is often not accidental but the result of deliberate business strategies designed to obscure costs and impede consumer autonomy. These strategies include the use of "dark patterns"-deceptive user interface designs that trick users into unintended actions-as well as "fleeceware" apps that charge exorbitant fees for basic functions, and "subscription traps" characterized by misleading free trials and labyrinthine cancellation processes (Scamwatchhq.com, 2025).

The core of the problem lies in the asymmetry of ease: signing up for a subscription is often a seamless, one-click process, while cancellation is intentionally designed to be a

frustrating, multi-step ordeal. This imbalance has prompted a wave of regulatory scrutiny and legislative action worldwide. This paper addresses the central research question: How are different legal jurisdictions globally addressing the challenges to consumer rights posed by the proliferation of subscription-based service models?

To answer this question, this article employs a comparative legal analysis of four key jurisdictions: the United States, with its dual federal-state approach and aggressive enforcement actions; the European Union, which relies on a harmonized directive to ensure consistent rights across member states; the United Kingdom, which is developing a bespoke post-Brexit regulatory regime; and Canada, where consumer protection is primarily managed at the provincial level. The analysis will focus on three critical pillars of consumer protection in the subscription context: pre-contractual disclosure, affirmative consent, and the right to cancellation. By examining landmark legislation, regulatory rules, and major enforcement cases, this paper will illuminate the converging global consensus on reining in deceptive subscription practices and restoring a measure of control to the consumer.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Architecture of the Subscription Economy

The subscription business model is defined by its central mechanism: a customer pays a recurring fee-typically on a monthly or annual basis-in exchange for continuous access to a product or service (The CFO Club, 2025). This model has evolved beyond simple magazine subscriptions to encompass a vast array of industries, supported by sophisticated subscription management software that handles complex billing logic, customer lifecycle events,

and revenue reconciliation (Stripe, 2023). For businesses, the primary advantages are revenue predictability and the potential for higher customer lifetime value (LTV). For consumers, the appeal lies in convenience, cost-effectiveness, and access to a continuous stream of goods or updates (Recurly, 2025).

2.2 "Dark Patterns" and the Manipulation of Consumer Choice

A significant body of literature has emerged around the concept of "dark patterns," which are user interface (UI) and user experience (UX) designs crafted to deliberately mislead or trick users into making choices they would not otherwise make (Scamwatchhq.com, 2025). In the context of subscriptions, these patterns are instrumental in creating "subscription traps". Examples include:

- **Forced Continuity and the "Free Trial" Trap:** Consumers are offered a free or low-cost trial, but are required to provide payment information upfront. The subscription then automatically converts to a full-price, recurring plan, often without adequate notice. The initial offer is the hook, but the hidden catch is the automatic renewal buried in fine print (Scamwatchhq.com, 2025; Canada.ca, 2017).
- **Confirm shaming:** Using guilt-inducing language to steer users away from declining an offer (e.g., a button that says, "No, I don't want Free Shipping" instead of a neutral "Decline"). The FTC's settlement with Amazon specifically targeted such practices (FTC, 2025).
- **Roach Motel / Difficult Cancellation:** This pattern describes a situation that is easy to get into but hard to get out of. Businesses may hide contact information, create endless phone menus, use unresponsive customer service channels, or require users to navigate a convoluted series of steps to cancel a service they signed up for with a single click (Scamwatchhq.com, 2025).

These manipulative designs exploit cognitive biases, turning the user's journey into a minefield where the path of least resistance leads to an unwanted financial commitment.

2.3 The Triad of Consumer Protection Failures: Disclosure, Consent, and Cancellation

The legal challenges in the subscription economy coalesce around three fundamental principles of consumer protection law, which are systematically undermined by deceptive practices.

Inadequate Disclosure: Foundational consumer protection laws mandate that businesses provide clear and conspicuous disclosure of all material terms before a consumer is financially committed. In subscription models, this often fails. Key information-such as the total cost, the fact that the subscription renews automatically, the frequency of billing, and the cancellation policy-is frequently obscured in lengthy terms and conditions, presented in small font, or hidden behind hyperlinks (Lawinfo.com, 2024).

Lack of Express, Informed Consent: Closely related to disclosure is the requirement for affirmative consent. Regulators and courts have increasingly emphasized that consent cannot be inferred from inaction or a consumer's failure to uncheck a pre-ticked box. Businesses must obtain a consumer's explicit agreement to the recurring charges after being presented with all material terms (Pearl Cohen, 2025). Dark patterns directly subvert this principle by tricking users into giving consent they never intended to provide.

Barriers to Cancellation: The right to exit a contract is a cornerstone of consumer autonomy. The "cancellation nightmare" has become a defining feature of predatory subscription models. By making cancellation difficult, businesses artificially inflate retention rates and continue to charge consumers for services they no longer want or use. This practice has become a primary target for regulators, who argue that the cancellation process should be at least as simple as the enrolment process (FTC, 2024).

3. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, comparative legal analysis to investigate the regulatory responses to consumer rights challenges in the subscription economy. This methodology is well-suited for examining the nuances of legal doctrines, legislative texts, and enforcement strategies across different jurisdictions. The research synthesizes information from a range of primary and secondary sources to construct a comprehensive picture of the evolving global regulatory landscape.

Primary sources for this analysis include:

- **Legislative and Regulatory Texts:** Key documents such as the U.S. Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) final "Click-to-Cancel" Rule, the Restore Online Shoppers' Confidence Act (ROSCA), California's Automatic Renewal Law (ARL), the European Union's Consumer Rights Directive (CRD), the United Kingdom's Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Bill, and various Canadian provincial consumer protection statutes.
- **Government and Agency Publications:** Press releases, guidance documents, and reports from regulatory bodies like the FTC, the European Commission, and the UK's Competition and Markets Authority (CMA).
- **Judicial and Enforcement Documents:** Filings and settlement agreements from major legal cases, including the FTC's settlement with Amazon and the class-action settlement involving HelloFresh in California.

Secondary sources consist of academic articles, legal analyses from law firms, reports from consumer advocacy organizations, and articles from reputable news outlets. These materials provide essential context, expert interpretation, and data on the real-world impact of the legal frameworks under review.

The comparative analysis focuses on four jurisdictions selected for their significant economic influence and distinct regulatory models:

- 1)The United States: Characterized by a dual system of federal and state laws, leading to a complex patchwork of regulations and a highly litigious environment driven by both government enforcement and private class actions.
- 2)The European Union: Representing a harmonized, supranational approach that sets a baseline of strong consumer rights for all 27 member states through binding directives.
- 3)The United Kingdom: Illustrating a post-Brexit model that is building upon its EU-derived legal foundation with new, bespoke legislation and enhanced enforcement powers.
- 4)Canada: Showcasing a decentralized approach where consumer protection is largely governed by individual provincial and territorial laws.

By comparing these approaches, this study identifies common principles, key divergences, and the effectiveness of different strategies. The analysis is structured around three core themes: (1) requirements for pre-contractual information and disclosure, (2) standards for obtaining affirmative consent, and (3) rules governing the cancellation process.

4.A Comparative Analysis of Regulatory Frameworks

The global response to predatory subscription practices is marked by a clear convergence toward stricter regulation. However, the specific mechanisms and enforcement priorities differ significantly across jurisdictions. This section analyzes the approaches of the United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, and Canada.

4.1 The United States: A Multi-Pronged Attack via Federal Rules and State Laws

The U.S. approach is defined by a dynamic interplay between federal oversight and pioneering state legislation, reinforced by aggressive litigation from both public agencies and private plaintiffs.

4.1.1 Federal Enforcement: ROSCA and the "Click-to-Cancel" Rule

At the federal level, the primary legal tool has been the Restore Online Shoppers' Confidence Act (ROSCA). Enacted in 2010, ROSCA makes it illegal to charge consumers for online goods or services through a negative option feature unless the seller: (1) clearly and conspicuously discloses all material terms before obtaining billing information; (2) obtains the consumer's express informed consent before making the charge; and (3) provides a simple mechanism for the consumer to stop recurring charges (Lawinfo.com, 2024). The FTC has used ROSCA to pursue civil penalties against violators (Scamwatchhq.com, 2025).

Recognizing the persistence of deceptive practices, the FTC announced its final "Click-to-Cancel" rule in October 2024. This rule significantly strengthens consumer rights by mandating that businesses make it as easy for consumers to cancel a subscription as it was to sign up (FTC, 2024). This simple-cancellation mechanism must be available through

the same medium the consumer used to enroll. The rule also explicitly prohibits misrepresentations during the marketing of negative option features. The FTC's commitment to enforcement was underscored by its historic \$2.5 billion settlement with Amazon in September 2025. The agency alleged Amazon used "manipulative, coercive, or deceptive user-interface designs known as 'dark patterns' to trick consumers into enrolling in automatically renewing Prime subscriptions" and knowingly made the cancellation process difficult (FTC, 2025). The settlement included a \$1 billion civil penalty and \$1.5 billion in consumer refunds, sending a powerful message to the industry.

4.1.2 State Leadership: The California Model and Class-Action Lawsuits

Many states have enacted their own automatic renewal laws (ARLs), often with stricter requirements than federal law. California's ARL is widely considered the most influential. It requires businesses to present auto-renewal terms in a "clear and conspicuous" manner, obtain affirmative consent, and provide an easily accessible cancellation method. Crucially, if a consumer accepts an offer online, the business must allow them to terminate it exclusively online, at will (OAG.ca.gov, 2025). Recent amendments also require businesses to send a reminder notice before a free trial expires (Paul Hastings, 2025).

The strength of California's ARL has fueled a surge in consumer class-action lawsuits. In recent years, dozens of such lawsuits have been filed against e-commerce retailers (Beneschlaw.com, 2025). A notable example is the \$7.5 million settlement reached with HelloFresh, which was accused of charging customers for subscription renewals without their consent in violation of the ARL (Top Class Actions, n.d.). These lawsuits serve as a powerful parallel enforcement mechanism, creating significant financial and reputational risks for non-compliant businesses.

4.2 The European Union: Harmonization through the Consumer Rights Directive

The EU has adopted a harmonized approach to ensure a high level of consumer protection across all member states. The cornerstone of this framework is the Consumer Rights Directive (CRD), which has been updated by the Better Enforcement and Modernisation Directive (European Commission, n.d.). The CRD establishes several key rights relevant to subscriptions:

- Right of Withdrawal: For most goods and services purchased remotely (including online), consumers have a 14-day "cooling-off period" during which they can withdraw from the contract without penalty or justification (Europe-consommateurs.eu, 2025).
- Pre-contractual Information: The directive mandates that traders provide comprehensive information before the contract is concluded, including the total price, contract duration, and conditions for termination.
- Prohibition on Pre-Ticked Boxes: The CRD explicitly forbids the use of pre-ticked boxes for charging consumers for extra payments, reinforcing the principle of affirmative consent (European Commission, n.d.).

More recently, the EU has moved to align its rules with the "easy cancellation" principle seen in the U.S. In the name of "digital fairness," new rules are being implemented that will require businesses to offer a simple and accessible way for customers to cancel contracts, often through a dedicated "cancel contract" button (Jdsupra.com, 2025; EUTechAlliance.eu, 2025).

4.3 The United Kingdom: A New Bespoke Regime with Stronger Enforcement

Following its departure from the EU, the UK is developing its own enhanced consumer protection framework. While existing rules under The Consumer Contracts Regulations 2013 provide a baseline of protection, the proposed Digital Markets, Competition and Consumers Bill introduce specific and stringent rules for subscription contracts (legislation.gov.uk, 2013). Key provisions of the bill include:

- **Specific Pre-contractual Information:** A standalone set of disclosure requirements for subscriptions, which must be provided in a way that the consumer does not need to take extra steps (like clicking a link) to read them.
- **Mandatory Reminder Notices:** Businesses must send reminders to consumers before their subscription renews for the first time and every six months thereafter.
- **New Cooling-Off Periods:** The bill introduces a new 14-day "renewal cooling-off period" that applies after a free trial ends or when a contract renews for a term of 12 months or more.
- **"Single Communication" Cancellation:** Businesses must allow consumers to end their subscription in a single communication without facing unnecessary steps (Orrick, 2023).

Crucially, the bill grants the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) direct enforcement powers, including the ability to impose fines of up to 10% of a business's global turnover for breaches. This marks a significant shift from the previous system, where the CMA had to go through the courts to enforce consumer law (Orrick, 2023).

4.4 Canada: A Decentralized, Provincially-Led Approach

In Canada, consumer protection is primarily a matter of provincial and territorial jurisdiction. While automatic renewals and subscription services are permitted, they are regulated by specific provincial laws (Osler, 2023). For example, the Ontario Consumer Protection Act contains rules regarding the delivery of goods and consumer rights (Ontario.ca, 2014). These laws generally require that renewal terms be structured appropriately and that consumers are not locked into contracts with prohibited terms (Lexology, 2025). Consumers who encounter issues, such as misleading free trials that convert into paid subscriptions, are typically advised to file complaints with their provincial consumer protection agency (Canada.ca, 2017). This decentralized approach can lead to a varied landscape of rights and enforcement across the country.

5. Conclusion

The rapid expansion of the subscription economy has created a battleground for consumer rights. The analysis of regulatory frameworks in the United States, European Union, United Kingdom, and Canada reveals a powerful global convergence toward reining in deceptive and manipulative business practices. The era of exploiting consumer inertia through opaque terms and convoluted cancellation processes is drawing to a close, as regulators and legislators move decisively to reassert consumer sovereignty in the digital marketplace.

Three overarching trends emerge from this comparative analysis. First is the universal adoption of the "symmetry principle" for cancellation—the process of unsubscribing must be as simple as the process of subscribing. The U.S. FTC's "Click-to-Cancel" rule and the UK's "single communication" requirement are prime examples of this principle in action. Second, there is a renewed emphasis on meaningful transparency and consent. Regulators are no longer tolerating material terms buried in fine print or consent inferred from pre-checked boxes. Instead, they demand clear, upfront disclosure and explicit, affirmative agreement from the consumer. Third, enforcement is being armed with sharper teeth. The FTC's multi-billion-dollar settlement with Amazon and the UK's move to grant the CMA the power to levy fines of up to 10% of global turnover signal a new era of accountability with severe financial consequences for non-compliance.

For businesses, the implications are profound. The path forward requires a fundamental shift from a compliance-focused mindset to one that is genuinely consumer-centric. Best practices now include implementing centralized subscription management systems to track renewals and usage, proactively communicating with customers through renewal reminders, and designing clear, honest user interfaces that eschew dark patterns (Gartner, 2024; Stripe, 2023). Investing in a transparent and fair customer experience is no longer just an ethical choice but a strategic necessity to minimize churn and avoid costly legal entanglements.

Looking ahead, the regulatory landscape will continue to evolve. The increasing use of artificial intelligence and advanced data analytics to create "hyper-personalized" subscriptions will undoubtedly raise new questions about pricing fairness, data privacy, and consumer choice (Subscribe, 2025). As technology advances, legal frameworks must remain adaptive. The ongoing struggle against deceptive digital practices is a continuous process, but the current wave of regulation marks a critical victory in ensuring that the convenience of the subscription economy does not come at the cost of fundamental consumer rights.

References

- [1] Apps365. (2025). Subscription Business Model: A Complete Breakdown [2025]. Retrieved from <https://www.apps365.com/blog/subscription-business-model/>

- [2] Benesch. (2025). A Dozen New Lawsuits and Two \$7.5M Settlements Signal a New Era for Automatic Renewal Compliance. Retrieved from <https://www.beneschlaw.com/resources/a-dozen-new-lawsuits-and-two-dollar75m-settlements-signal-a-new-era-for-automatic-renewal-compliance.html>
- [3] Business Wire. (2025). Subscription Box Market Report 2025 | Consumer Trends & Forecast 2024-2033. Retrieved from <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20250912803109/en/Subscription-Box-Market-Report-2025-Consumer-Trends-Forecast-2024-2033---Rising-Demand-for-Personalization-and-Convenience-Growth-into-Diversified-Product-Categories---ResearchAndMarkets.com>
- [4] Canada.ca. (2017). Free trial that turns out to be a monthly subscription: it's a trap. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/en/competition-bureau/news/2017/09/free_trial_that_turnsouttobeamonthlysubscriptionitsatrap.html
- [5] European Commission. (n.d.). Consumer rights directive. Retrieved from https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-topic/consumer-protection-law/consumer-contract-law/consumer-rights-directive_en
- [6] Europe-consommateurs.eu. (2025). Subscription and "premium" option. Retrieved from <https://www.europe-consommateurs.eu/en/shopping-internet/subscription-and-premium-option.html>
- [7] EUTechAlliance.eu. (2025). Subscription Cancellations: Enforce the Rules, Don't Rewrite Them. Retrieved from <https://eutechalliance.eu/subscription-cancellations-enforce-the-rules-dont-rewrite-them/>
- [8] Federal Trade Commission (FTC). (2024). Federal Trade Commission Announces Final "Click-to-Cancel" Rule Making It Easier for Consumers to End Recurring Subscriptions and Memberships. Retrieved from <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2024/10/federal-trade-commission-announces-final-click-cancel-rule-making-it-easier-consumers-end-recurring>
- [9] Federal Trade Commission (FTC). (2025). FTC Secures Historic \$2.5 Billion Settlement Against Amazon. Retrieved from <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2025/09/ftc-secures-historic-25-billion-settlement-against-amazon>
- [10] Gartner. (2024). What are the best practices for subscription businesses? Retrieved from <https://www.gartner.com/peer-community/post/best-practices-subscription-business>
- [11] Grandview Research. (n.d.). Subscription Economy Market Size | Industry Report, 2033. Retrieved from <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/subscription-economy-market-report>
- [12] Jdsupra.com. (2025). New EU Rule Requires Easy "Cancel Contract" Button for.... Retrieved from <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/new-eu-rule-requires-easy-cancel-4333652/>
- [13] K-L Gates. (2025). Key Changes to Consumer Protection Laws and Subscription Contracts in the United Kingdom That You Need to Know. Retrieved from <https://www.klgates.com/Key-Changes-to-Consumer-Protection-Laws-and-Subscription-Contracts-in-the-United-Kingdom-That-You-Need-to-Know-1-2-2025>
- [14] Lawinfo.com. (2024). Navigating the Legalities of Subscription Services and Automatic Renewals. Retrieved from <https://www.lawinfo.com/resources/consumer-protection/navigating-the-legalities-of-subscription-services-and-automatic-renewals.html>
- [15] Legislation.gov.uk. (2013). The Consumer Contracts (Information, Cancellation and Additional Charges) Regulations 2013. Retrieved from <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2013/3134/contents>
- [16] Lexology. (2025). Evolving consumer protection laws will affect suppliers. Retrieved from <https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=572c829e-5d14-46f3-a3e5-b3145387d128>
- [17] Office of the Attorney General California (OAG.ca.gov). (2025). Attorney General Bonta Issues Consumer Alert on California's Automatic Renewal Law. Retrieved from <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-issues-consumer-alert-california%E2%80%99s-automatic-renewal-law>
- [18] Ontario.ca. (2014). Your rights under the Consumer Protection Act. Retrieved from <http://www.ontario.ca/page/your-rights-under-consumer-protection-act>
- [19] Orrick. (2023). The UK's Proposed Laws to Tackle Consumer Subscription Traps: 5 Things You Need to Know. Retrieved from <https://www.orrick.com/en/Insights/2023/05/The-UKs-Proposed-Laws-to-Tackle-Consumer-Subscription-Traps-5-Things-You-Need-to-Know>
- [20] Osler. (2023). Automatic renewals in Canadian consumer protection law. Retrieved from <https://www.osler.com/en/insights/updates/automatic-renewals-in-canadian-consumer-protection-law/>
- [21] Paul Hastings. (2025). Updated California and FTC Auto-Renewal Regulations Take Effect. Retrieved from <https://www.paulhastings.com/insights/client-alerts/updated-california-and-ftc-auto-renewal-regulations-take-effect>
- [22] Pearl Cohen. (2025). Important Developments in Subscription Auto-Renewal Rules Across the U.S.. Retrieved from <https://www.pearlcohen.com/important-developments-in-subscription-auto-renewal-rules-across-the-u-s/>
- [23] Recurly. (2025). Subscription Model Best Practices & Examples. Retrieved from <https://recurly.com/blog/five-subscription-management-best-practices-for-every-type-of-business-model/>
- [24] Scamwatchhq.com. (2025). The Subscription Scam Maze: How Hidden Fees and Fake Cancellations Are Draining \$2.8 Billion Annually. Retrieved from <https://www.scamwatchhq.com/the-subscription-scam-maze-how-hidden-fees-and-fake-cancellations-are-draining-2-8-billion-annually/>
- [25] Stripe. (2023). Subscription management 101 for businesses. Retrieved from <https://stripe.com/resources/more/subscription-management-101>

- [26] Subscrybe. (2025). Here are six important subscription trends to watch in 2025. Retrieved from <https://subscrybe.com/subscription-trends-2025/>
- [27] The CFO Club. (2025). Subscription Business Models: How & Why They Work In.... Retrieved from <https://thecfoclub.com/fpa/subscription-model/>
- [28] Top Class Actions. (n.d.). \$7.5M HelloFresh class action settlement over automatic renewals. Retrieved from <https://topclassactions.com/lawsuit-settlements/open-lawsuit-settlements/7-5m-hellofresh-class-action-settlement-over-automatic-renewals/>