



September 29, 2025

Board of Directors
Uber Technologies, Inc.
c/o Corporate Secretary
1725 3rd Street
San Francisco, California 94158

Re: Shareholder Concerns Regarding Disability Discrimination Litigation and Policies

Dear Members of the Board:

We the undersigned are writing you on behalf of the National Center for Public Policy Research, a shareholder of Uber Technologies, Inc. We have serious concerns regarding recent reports and litigation involving Uber's treatment of riders with disabilities. The U.S. Department of Justice has again filed suit against Uber (the first time being 2021) alleging systemic violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, including routine refusals of service to individuals who use service animals and mobility devices, the imposition of improper surcharges, and the denial of equal access to Uber's services.

I. Background

All the following is to the best of our knowledge based on research of publicly available documents. Please advise if you see any material errors or omissions.

A. The 2025 Lawsuit

Previously, in 2021, Uber reached a settlement with the government after federal officials accused the company of violating the Americans with Disabilities Act. Uber was forced to pay millions for overcharging people with disabilities and said it would modify its wait time fee policy to prevent future discrimination. (More on this below.)

On September 11, 2025, the DOJ filed another suit against Uber Technologies for denying rides to those who use service dogs or use mobility devices such as a wheelchairs.

The lawsuit seeks \$125 million for people who have been subject to discrimination and previously submitted complaints to Uber or the DOJ.

The DOJ alleges that:

- Uber drivers "insult and demean people with disabilities or ask them inappropriate questions."

- “despite the importance of its services to people with disabilities, Uber denies people with disabilities full and equal enjoyment of its services in several critical ways;”
- drivers “routinely refuse” disabled passengers, including those with service animals;
- “Uber and its drivers also impose impermissible surcharges by:
 - charging cleaning fees related to service animals, and
 - charging cancellation fees to riders after unlawfully denying service.

The DOJ complaint describes Uber’s alleged mistreatment of 17 individuals including J.E., a 7-year-old amputee from the Bronx, New York, who was allegedly denied a ride home from his brother’s birthday party in Pelham Bay Park after an Uber driver looked at his wheelchair and asked, “Is that coming?”

Another was Jason Ludwig, a Gulf War veteran with a service dog, who was allegedly denied a ride to the Norfolk, Virginia, airport from Newport News, missed his flight, and with his wife had to drive 16 hours home to Yarmouth Port, Massachusetts.

A third rider, Jeff Clark of Mount Laurel, New Jersey, allegedly had four drivers in Philadelphia cancel rides in a 17-minute period after he told them he was blind and used a guide dog.

The lawsuit seeks a court order to force Uber to:

- stop discriminating against people with disabilities,
- modify its policies to comply with the ADA,
- train its staff and drivers on the ADA, and
- award monetary damages as civil penalty to compensate victims of Uber’s alleged discrimination.

Uber “fundamentally disagrees” with the DOJ’s allegations, saying that: “*Riders who use guide dogs or other assistive devices deserve a safe, respectful, and welcoming experience on Uber—full stop. We have a clear zero-tolerance policy for confirmed service denials, and we fundamentally disagree with the DOJ’s allegations.*” The company told CBS News they invest in technology, training and dedicated reporting channels, including a 24/7 service

animal denial hotline, so riders can make a complaint on the spot. If a driver does indeed deny a rider, Uber says they deactivate the driver's account.

Uber further noted that last year, it distributed a service animal education video to all U.S. drivers, developed with input from blind and service animal advocacy groups. The video explains the importance of service animals, offers transport tips, and reinforces that denying rides due to service animals is both against Uber policy and illegal. It is available to all drivers in the Driver Learning Center within the app.

B. The 2021 Lawsuit

As noted above, this isn't the first time the DOJ has gone after Uber for similar issues. In November 2021, the DOJ sued Uber, also alleging the company violated the ADA focused on its "wait time fee" policy.

The policy charged riders who took more than two minutes to enter a vehicle, even when the delay was due to a disability. Affected passengers included those using wheelchairs, walkers, or passengers who are visually impaired. The DOJ claimed Uber often refused to refund these fees, despite knowing the delays were disability-related.

Uber initially denied that its wait time fee policy violated the ADA, arguing that the fees were designed to compensate drivers for their time, not to punish riders who needed more time to board due to a disability. The company claimed the policy was not discriminatory, as the charges only applied after a set waiting period.

While Uber sometimes refunded wait time fees to disabled riders who complained, the DOJ held that the company also denied some refund requests, even when the delays were clearly related to a disability. This inconsistency led to further scrutiny and legal action.

In July 2022, Uber settled with the DOJ. As part of the agreement, the company committed to waiving wait time fees for riders who certify that they, or someone they frequently travel with, need extra time to board due to a disability. The settlement also required Uber to make refunds available to those who had been charged unfairly but were not part of the waiver program.

II. Request for Information

Previously, Uber reached a settlement with the Justice Department to pay more than \$2 million to thousands of riders over allegations of charging discriminatory fees to people with disabilities and \$500,000 to "other harmed individuals identified by the Department of Justice."

Given the reputational, legal, and financial risks posed by these recurring issues, we request that the Board provide transparency and accountability to Uber's shareholders on Uber's disability-related policies, training, and enforcement mechanisms. Specifically, we ask the Board to address the following:

1. Driver Training on Disability Issues

- What does Uber's disability training for drivers currently involve in detail?
- Who develops and provides this training?
- How frequently are drivers required to undergo such training?
- During training, do any drivers refuse to agree to accept service or guide dogs in their vehicles, and if so, are such individuals immediately disqualified from driving for Uber?

2. Dedicated Disability Executive Leadership

- Does Uber currently employ an executive with specific responsibility for disability policy and accessibility oversight?
- If not, why has Uber not established such a position, especially given that many peer corporations have already done so?

3. Policy Enforcement and Accountability

- How many drivers have been terminated for violations of Uber's disability-related policies in the last five years?
- How does Uber track and report violations, and why is there not greater transparency in these figures given the recurring DOJ litigation?

4. Measuring Effectiveness of Disability Policies

- What concrete metrics does Uber use to demonstrate that its disability-related training, policies, and enforcement mechanisms are effective?
- How are these metrics reviewed by the Board, and how are they communicated to shareholders and the public?

This is not a matter of minor operational concern. Disability access goes directly to Uber's compliance with federal law, the trust of its customers, and its ability to safeguard shareholder value against reputational damage and costly litigation. While Uber has stated



that it maintains a “zero-tolerance policy” and has invested in training and reporting channels, the ongoing lawsuits strongly suggest that implementation and accountability remain insufficient.

We request that the Board provide written responses to these questions and outline what additional steps Uber intends to take to ensure compliance with the ADA and restore public confidence in its disability policies.

We are happy to engage with you further on any of the foregoing.

Sincerely,

/s/ David A. Ridenour

David A. Ridenour
Chairman
National Center for Public Policy
Research

/s/ Rachel K. Barkley

Rachel K. Barkley
Director
Able Americans
National Center for Public Policy
Research

/s/ Stefan J. Padfield

Stefan J. Padfield, JD
Executive Director
Free Enterprise Project
National Center for Public Policy
Research

/s/ Mark P. Mostert

Mark P. Mostert, PhD
Senior Researcher
Able Americans
National Center for Public Policy
Research