

WHEN DISABILITY INTERRUPTS THE JOURNEY: CONSUMER RIGHTS AND ATTITUDINAL BARRIERS IN APP-BASED TRANSPORTATION

QUANDO A DEFICIÊNCIA INTERROMPE A VIAGEM: DIREITOS DO CONSUMIDOR E BARREIRAS ATITUDINAIS NO TRANSPORTE POR APLICATIVO

Artigo submetido em 15 de agosto de 2026

Artigo aprovado em 16 de agosto de 2026

Artigo publicado em 16 de agosto de 2026

Cognitio Juris

Volume 16 – Número 59 – 2026

ISSN 2236-3009

Autor:

Ricardson da Silva Dias ^[1]

Markus Samuel Leite Norat ^[2]

ABSTRACT: This article analyzes the attitudinal barriers faced by people with disabilities when using ride-hailing services, based on the articulation between Consumer Law and legal norms protecting people with disabilities. The objective is to understand to what extent the refusal, cancellation, or interruption of trips related to people with disabilities, or the needs and characteristics arising from the disability, can characterize a failure in the provision of

the service and discriminatory practice, as well as to discuss the responsibility of digital platforms in these situations. This is a qualitative research study, using bibliographic, legislative, and documentary research, as well as the analysis of concrete cases, with the main empirical reference being a judicial process involving a wheelchair-using passenger in João Pessoa/PB, in addition to episodes reported by the press and submitted to the Judiciary. The analysis demonstrates that accessibility in ride-hailing services is not limited to the technological availability of the service, requiring concrete conditions for its use with equal opportunities. It is concluded that a disability or a need directly related to it cannot, in itself, constitute a legitimate basis for not providing the service; a distinction must be made between actual operational impossibility and attitudinal barriers. In this context, consumer protection and the legal protection of persons with disabilities converge on the requirement for adequate, non-discriminatory, and accessible service provision, and platforms are responsible for adopting measures capable of preventing and addressing barriers in the execution of trips.

Keywords: person with disability; consumer rights; ride-hailing services; attitudinal barriers; accessibility.

RESUMO: O presente artigo analisa as barreiras atitudinais enfrentadas por pessoas com deficiência na utilização de serviços de transporte por aplicativo, a partir da articulação entre o Direito do Consumidor e as normas jurídicas de proteção das pessoas com deficiência. O objetivo é compreender em que medida a recusa, o cancelamento ou a interrupção de viagens relacionados à pessoas com deficiência ou as necessidades e características decorrentes da deficiência, podem caracterizar falha na prestação do serviço e prática discriminatória, bem como discutir a responsabilidade das plataformas digitais diante dessas situações. Essa é uma pesquisa de abordagem qualitativa, por meio de pesquisa bibliográfica, legislativa e documental, além de análise de casos concretos, tendo como principal referência empírica processo judicial envolvendo passageira usuária de cadeira de rodas em João Pessoa/PB, além de episódios divulgados pela imprensa e submetidos ao

Poder Judiciário. A análise demonstra que a acessibilidade no transporte por aplicativo não se limita à disponibilidade tecnológica do serviço, exigindo condições concretas para sua utilização em igualdade de oportunidades. Conclui-se que a deficiência ou necessidade diretamente relacionada a ela não pode constituir, por si só, fundamento legítimo para a não prestação do serviço, devendo-se distinguir a efetiva impossibilidade operacional da barreira atitudinal. Nesse contexto, a proteção consumerista e a tutela jurídica da pessoa com deficiência convergem na exigência de prestação adequada, não discriminatória e acessível, cabendo às plataformas adotar medidas capazes de prevenir e enfrentar barreiras na execução das viagens.

Palavras-chave: pessoa com deficiência; direito do consumidor; transporte por aplicativo; barreiras atitudinais; acessibilidade.

1. INTRODUCTION

The expansion of digital transportation platforms has changed the ways people move around in Brazilian urban centers. For people with disabilities, these services can represent more than just a convenient alternative, especially given the barriers that still exist in public transportation and urban spaces. The possibility of requesting a vehicle through an app expands opportunities for autonomy and mobility for daily activities, such as working, studying, receiving medical treatment, and participating in social life. However, technological ease does not necessarily eliminate barriers: in certain situations, it only modifies how they manifest themselves.

There are numerous news reports detailing situations of rights violations against people with disabilities who seek to use ride-hailing services and end up encountering the attitudinal barrier of the drivers, who, upon realizing that the passenger is a person in a wheelchair, refuse to make the trip, or interrupt the trip before the final destination, because they do not know how to deal with the behaviors of neurodivergent people. [3]

An incident that occurred in João Pessoa, Paraíba, provides a concrete visualization of the problem. In March 2026, Carolina Vieira dos Santos, a person with a physical disability and wheelchair user, requested transportation through the Uber platform to attend a social gathering. Upon the vehicle's arrival, a dispute arose regarding the accommodation of her wheelchair. According to evidence later presented in court, the trunk was partially occupied by a speaker belonging to the driver, and one of the documents included in the case file indicates that the wheelchair could have been accommodated if that object had not been in the compartment. The ride was not completed, and the conflict ended up at a police station. As the case is still pending judgment, these facts are considered in this study based on the versions and documentary evidence presented by the parties, and not as judicially established conclusions.

This case is not isolated. Episodes involving people with disabilities and ride-hailing services have reached the press and the judiciary in different Brazilian locations, involving refusal or interruption of trips related to wheelchair transport, the presence of a guide dog, or behaviors associated with autism spectrum disorder. In João Pessoa, in July 2026, a mother reported being removed from a vehicle along with her nine-year-old autistic daughter while the child was traveling to a therapy session, after a conflict related to the sound she was hearing, despite the driver having been informed of her condition.

Although they present distinct circumstances, these situations raise a common question: to what extent can the driver's autonomy to refuse, cancel, or interrupt a trip be exercised when the non-provision of the service is related to the consumer's disability? The question also extends to digital platforms, which organize the service, establish rules of use and standards of behavior, institute evaluation and control mechanisms, and develop their own accessibility and non-discrimination policies.

The problem lies in the joint application and interpretation of Consumer Law and the legal system for the protection of people with disabilities. The Consumer Protection Code ensures

the adequate provision of services and protection against abusive practices, while the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Brazilian Inclusion Law establish equal opportunities, accessibility, and non-discrimination, recognizing that exclusion can result from the interaction between a person's impairment and existing societal barriers.

From this perspective, a person with a disability who requests a ride is not the recipient of a favor or a welfare policy: they are a consumer of a service placed on the market, accumulating the protection arising from this condition with that specifically guaranteed to people with disabilities.

This article aims to analyze the attitudinal barriers faced by people with disabilities when using ride-hailing services, investigating to what extent the refusal, cancellation, or interruption of trips can constitute a failure in service provision and discriminatory practices, as well as the responsibility of the platforms in these situations. It starts from the understanding that a disability, or a need directly related to it, cannot, in itself, constitute a legitimate basis for excluding other consumers from a service offered to them.

A qualitative approach is adopted, through bibliographic, legislative and documentary research and analysis of specific cases. The case involving Carolina Vieira constitutes the main empirical reference, comparatively accompanied by episodes reported in the press and cases submitted to the Judiciary. The analysis articulates the doctrine of Consumer Law with studies on the social model of disability, ableism, accessibility and attitudinal barriers.

More than discussing whether a particular wheelchair fit in a car trunk or whether certain behavior justified interrupting a ride, it is important to understand whether a service offered indiscriminately to the market is effectively prepared to be used, under equal conditions, by consumers with disabilities. It is from this question that we intend to examine the limits between a legitimate operational difficulty and the construction of a barrier that prevents travel precisely because of the disability.

- **Disability, Mobility and Attitudinal Barriers**

The modern understanding of disability goes beyond the strictly biomedical perspective, which focused on individual impairment as the explanation for the difficulties experienced by a person. The development of the social model has shifted part of this analysis to the social conditions that transform bodily, sensory, intellectual, or mental differences into restrictions on participation. Diniz, Barbosa, and Santos (2009) highlight that this change has made it possible to understand disability not only through bodily impairment, but also through the structures that produce inequality and exclusion.

This concept was incorporated into the Brazilian legal system by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which defines persons with disabilities considering the interaction between long-term impairments and barriers capable of obstructing their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others (BRAZIL, 2009). The Brazilian Inclusion Law reproduces this perspective in its Article 2 and, in defining the different types of barriers, expressly recognizes attitudinal barriers as attitudes or behaviors that prevent or hinder the social participation of persons with disabilities on an equal basis with others (BRAZIL, 2015).

Change is particularly relevant to mobility. If disability also results from the interaction between impairment and the barriers encountered, accessibility cannot be reduced to the physical characteristics of spaces or means of transport. A service may be formally available and the vehicle may have the material conditions to carry out a certain journey, but the service may become inaccessible due to the attitude of the person performing it. It is in this sense that the barrier ceases to be necessarily in the structure and can arise in human behavior.

The discussion approaches the concept of ableism [4], understood from the valorization of certain body and ability standards as references of normality. Mello (2016) draws attention to

the need to incorporate this category into Brazilian studies on disability, allowing the identification of forms of hierarchization and exclusion produced from the expectation of individuals conforming to socially established body and functional standards. In app-based transportation, this reflection allows us to question the implicit existence of a passenger considered standard: the one who enters the vehicle alone, does not require any adaptation and does not need to carry equipment related to their autonomy.

The need for assistance or a reasonable modification in the usual way the service is provided, however, does not transform a person with a disability into an exceptional passenger. The Convention includes in the concept of discrimination on the basis of disability the differentiation, exclusion or restriction that has the purpose or effect of preventing the exercise of rights under equal conditions, encompassing the refusal of reasonable accommodation (BRAZIL, 2009). Similarly, Article 4 of the Brazilian Inclusion Law ensures equal opportunities and considers discriminatory any distinction, restriction or exclusion, by action or omission, capable of harming or preventing the exercise of the rights of a person with a disability, including the refusal of reasonable accommodations (BRAZIL, 2015).

The importance of these standards for ride-hailing services can be seen in Uber's own institutional guidelines. In the *Uber Partner Guide*, produced with consulting from Egalit , the platform instructs its drivers to ask the person with a physical disability if they need help and acknowledges that assistive equipment, including wheelchairs, may require assistance for placement inside the vehicle or in the trunk (UBER, [n.d.], p. 5). The document also contemplates the possibility of accommodating the wheelchair in the back seat and provides for reimbursement to the driver of any cleaning fee resulting from this form of transportation (UBER, [n.d.], p. 6).

Institutional policy goes beyond guidance on how to provide assistance. When addressing the role of the platform and partner drivers in inclusion, the same guide states that it is unacceptable to refuse service based on a person's disability, as well as discrimination or

negative evaluation due to this condition (UBER, [n.d.], p. 12). There is, therefore, convergence between the legal duty of non-discrimination and the guidance established by the platform itself for those responsible for the actual execution of the trips.

This does not mean that every difficulty in carrying out a trip involving a person with a disability automatically constitutes discrimination. The distinction between material impossibility and attitudinal barrier is indispensable. There may be situations in which a particular adaptation is effectively unfeasible, imposes a risk, or represents a disproportionate burden. The problem arises when the trip would be materially possible with a reasonable solution, but fails to occur because a characteristic, behavior, or piece of equipment directly related to the disability is treated as a sufficient obstacle to the provision of the service.

In this sense, wheelchairs, guide dogs, or manifestations related to autism spectrum disorder do not, in themselves, constitute barriers to mobility. The barrier can arise when these characteristics justify the exclusion of a service offered to other users. In ride-hailing services, therefore, accessibility is not limited to the technological possibility of requesting a ride: it presupposes the concrete possibility of carrying it out under equal conditions. It is precisely at this point that the protection of people with disabilities intersects with Consumer Law, because those who face the barrier are not only entitled to accessibility rights, but also consumers of a service placed on the market.

- **People with disabilities as consumers: vulnerability and responsibility in service provision.**

The use of transportation platforms by people with disabilities must also be understood from the perspective of the regulations governing consumer relations. When requesting a ride through an app, the user acts as the recipient of a service available on the market, thus falling under the protection afforded by the Consumer Protection Code. The fact of having a

disability does not alter this legal position; on the contrary, it creates a coexistence of two protective systems: one aimed at the consumer and the other specifically focused on equality, accessibility, and non-discrimination for people with disabilities.

Vulnerability is a central element of this protection. In historically reconstructing the formation of Consumer Law, Norat (2011) observes that the massification of production and market relations broke the old direct contact between producer and consumer and expanded the supplier's power in defining the terms of the contract, placing the consumer in a vulnerable position. This structural inequality explains the need for a specific legal system of protection and finds express recognition in Article 4, I, of the Consumer Protection Code, which establishes as a principle of the National Policy on Consumer Relations the recognition of consumer vulnerability in the market. In the case of people with disabilities, this vulnerability inherent in the consumer relationship may coexist with additional obstacles related to accessibility. This is not about presuming incapacity or fragility due to disability, but about recognizing that certain characteristics of market organization may place this consumer before barriers not experienced by other users. In ride-hailing services, this occurs when access to the service depends not only on the availability of a vehicle, but also on the provider's willingness and preparedness to transport a wheelchair, accommodate a guide dog, or adequately address disability-related needs.

The very identification of a consumer relationship requires the presence of the subjects and the object legally defined by the Consumer Protection Code. Norat (2012), when examining the concept of consumer, argues that the legal consumer relationship involves subjective, objective, and finalistic elements: consumer and supplier occupy the poles of the relationship, while the product or service constitutes its object, and the final destination foreseen by article 2 of the CDC must also be considered. In transportation requested for personal travel, the passenger uses the service as the final recipient, thus fitting the legal definition of consumer (NORAT, 2012, pp. 80-95).

The application of the consumer protection system, however, is not limited to the formal identification of the parties involved in the relationship. Article 6 of the Consumer Protection Code (CDC) ensures, among other basic rights, protection against abusive practices and the effective prevention and reparation of patrimonial and moral damages. Article 20, in turn, governs liability for quality defects that render services unfit for consumption or diminish their value, while Article 39 establishes limits on the practices adopted by suppliers in the market, including the prohibition of unjustified refusal to provide services to those willing to acquire them through prompt payment (BRAZIL, 1990).

In app-based transportation, these provisions must be interpreted in conjunction with legislation protecting people with disabilities. A refusal related to disability does not necessarily represent only a frustrated trip. Depending on the specific circumstances, it may simultaneously signify inadequate consumer service and restricted access to the service under equal conditions. It is precisely the combination of these systems that allows us to distinguish a legitimate operational impossibility from a refusal based on a barrier incompatible with the duties imposed on the provider.

In this context, the responsibility arising from the provision of the service assumes special relevance. Article 14 of the Consumer Protection Code establishes the objective liability of the supplier for damages caused by defects related to the provision of services, regardless of the existence of fault. The provision considers a service defective if it does not offer the safety that is legitimately expected of it, considering the relevant circumstances of its provision (BRAZIL, 1990). The consumerist logic, therefore, shifts the analysis from individual fault to the quality and safety of the service placed on the market.

Applying this regime to digital platforms leads to a particularly sensitive issue: the attempt to legally distinguish the technological activity performed by the platform from the concrete execution of the transport carried out by the partner driver. In the case involving Carolina Vieira, for example, Uber argues that its activity consists of technological intermediation

between users and independent drivers, arguing that it does not directly provide transportation and that any illicit behavior by the driver could not be automatically attributed to the company.

This understanding, however, needs to be confronted with the way the service itself is organized. The platform establishes conditions of use, defines standards of conduct, creates evaluation mechanisms, receives complaints, produces guidelines for drivers, and provides consequences for behaviors considered incompatible with its policies. In the specific field of disability, as demonstrated earlier, Uber itself has institutional material guiding its partners on how to assist passengers and prohibiting the refusal to provide the service based on disability (UBER, [n.d.], pp. 5-6; 12).

Thus, a significant tension arises between the autonomy granted to the driver and the platform's role in organizing the service. Recognizing that the driver has independence in carrying out trips does not, in itself, eliminate the need to investigate the company's position in the supply chain or the duties arising from its economic activity. For Consumer Law, the central issue is not simply identifying who was behind the wheel, but verifying how the service was placed on the market, what legitimate expectations were created for the consumer, and which agents participate in its organization and provision.

This analysis becomes especially important when the user is a person with a disability. If the platform offers the service to the market, establishes inclusion policies, and guides its partners on how to serve this audience, the effectiveness of these guidelines cannot be examined solely on a formal level. The legal challenge lies in verifying whether the service delivery structure is capable of transforming these rules into concrete access to the service and, when this does not occur, identifying to what extent the failure constitutes a risk inherent in the economic activity itself.

Consumer protection and the protection of people with disabilities therefore converge on a

fundamental point: access to services under conditions of equality is not a favor granted by the supplier, but an expression of the duties arising from the legal relationship established with the consumer. Defining when operational difficulty exceeds this limit and becomes a service failure or discriminatory practice requires, however, observing the specific circumstances of each occurrence. It is this confrontation between norm, institutional policy, and the reality of service provision that the cases analyzed below allow us to carry out.

• **WHEN DISABILITY INTERRUPTS THE JOURNEY: FROM THE CAROLINA CASE TO THE RECURRENCE OF BARRIERS**

The distinction between material impossibility and attitudinal barrier becomes concrete when applied to the case of Carolina Vieira. According to the documents presented in the lawsuit, the controversy began due to the difficulty of accommodating her wheelchair in the vehicle requested through the Uber platform. Among the evidence presented is a record in which the driver himself states that the wheelchair could have been transported if a speaker box occupying the trunk had not been in that space. The ride was not completed, and the episode culminated in the parties going to a police station. As there is still no definitive judicial decision on the facts, the intention is not to anticipate a conclusion regarding the responsibility of the parties, but to use the documented elements in the process to examine the legal problem that emerges from them.

The situation allows us to formulate a question that goes beyond that individual conflict: when does an operational difficulty cease to be a legitimate impossibility and become a barrier to access to the service for a person with a disability? In the case analyzed, the question becomes especially relevant because the wheelchair is not accessory baggage, but essential equipment for the passenger's mobility and autonomy. Furthermore, Uber's own *Partner Guide* provides assistance for accommodating assistive equipment in the vehicle or trunk and expressly contemplates the possibility of transporting the wheelchair in the back seat (UBER, [n.d.], pp. 5-6). The same document considers it unacceptable to refuse service

based on the user's disability (UBER, [n.d.], p. 12).

This does not mean that every car, under any circumstances, is materially capable of transporting any wheelchair. It means that impossibility cannot be presumed simply from the presence of the equipment or the passenger's differentiated needs. When reasonable accommodation alternatives exist, refusing to consider them shifts the discussion from the physical limitations of the vehicle to the conduct adopted during the service provision. It is precisely at this point that the attitudinal barrier discussed in the previous section and the duties arising from the consumer relationship examined earlier are found.

The relevance of Carolina's case increases when observed alongside other recent episodes. In July 2026, in João Pessoa, a nine-year-old child with autism spectrum disorder, level 3 support, was traveling with her mother to a therapy session in a vehicle requested through an app. According to the mother's account released to the press, during the journey the child increased the volume of the music she was listening to, the driver decided to interrupt the trip and, even after being informed about the girl's condition, ordered the mother and daughter to leave the car while it was raining. A police car later took them to the treatment location. The mother filed a police report and reported the incident to the platform (JORNAL DA PARAÍBA, 2026).

Although this episode presents distinct circumstances from the Carolina case, the similarity between them is relevant. In the first, the controversy relates to equipment essential for physical mobility; in the second, to a behavioral manifestation attributed by the mother to the condition of an autistic child. In both, however, the need arises to investigate whether a characteristic directly related to the disability was converted into a reason to prevent or interrupt access to the service.

The recurring problem also finds judicial response outside of Paraíba. In March 2026, the Federal District Court ordered Uber to pay R\$ 12,000 in moral damages to an athlete from

the Brazilian Paracanoeing Team who had her ride refused after the driver realized she was using a wheelchair. According to information released about the decision, the chair was foldable and compatible with the vehicle. The incident occurred when the passenger intended to travel from her residence to Brasília Airport (CNN BRASIL, 2026).

In Santa Catarina, the discussion involved another resource indispensable to autonomy. In May 2026, the Santa Catarina Court of Justice upheld the conviction of a transportation platform to pay R\$ 15,000 to a visually impaired passenger who had rides repeatedly refused after informing drivers that he was accompanied by a guide dog. The Court recognized a failure in the provision of the service and the discriminatory nature of the conduct, highlighting that the platform is part of the supply chain and is responsible for the actions of its partner drivers within the scope of the service provided to the consumer (SANTA CATARINA, 2026).

The case has a relevant peculiarity: the obligation to transport a person accompanied by a guide dog does not stem solely from company policy. Law No. 11.126/2005 guarantees visually impaired persons accompanied by guide dogs the right to enter and remain with the animal on means of transport. Uber itself maintains a specific policy informing drivers that refusal in this situation violates the law and may result in the deactivation of the partner's account (UBER, 2023).

These incidents do not justify stating that every interruption or cancellation of a ride involving a person with a disability is discriminatory. However, they reveal a pattern that deserves legal attention: in different situations, the disability or a need directly related to it appears as a determining factor in the non-provision of a service normally available to other consumers. What varies is the concrete manifestation of the barrier, whether due to a wheelchair, a guide dog, or a behavioral need related to autism.

The legal response, therefore, should not be limited to the subsequent reparation of the

damage. Prevention is an integral part of the discussion about the quality and adequacy of the service. In the case of digital platforms, this involves information, driver training, clear protocols for situations related to disability, accessible reporting channels, and mechanisms capable of transforming institutional inclusion policies into effective practices during trips. The existence of manuals and internal rules is a relevant measure, but its purpose is only achieved when these guidelines reach the concrete execution of the service.

In this respect, the case in Paraíba takes on additional importance. State Law No. 14.063/2025, invoked in the case involving Carolina Vieira, established an obligation to provide training to app drivers for adequate service to passengers with disabilities or neuroatypical individuals. In the proceedings, Uber argues that its guidance initiatives and accessibility guide demonstrate compliance with this obligation. The controversy, however, allows us to formulate a question that goes beyond the merely formal fulfillment of the law: is the provision of training material sufficient when the actual provision of the service continues to produce barriers that the institutional guidance itself intends to eliminate?

Analysis of the cases suggests that accessibility in ride-hailing services requires more than simply allowing a person with a disability to install the app, request a vehicle, and be identified by the system like any other user. It requires that the infrastructure responsible for providing the service be prepared so that the trip actually takes place. When a need arising from a disability is transformed, without sufficient material justification, into a reason to refuse or interrupt the service, the problem ceases to be merely operational and simultaneously affects equality, accessibility, and the rights guaranteed to the consumer.

• **FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The expansion of ride-hailing services has broadened the possibilities for urban mobility and, for many people with disabilities, represents an important instrument of autonomy. However, the analysis developed in this article demonstrates that the technological availability of the

service does not, in itself, guarantee its accessibility. Between requesting a ride and arriving at the destination, barriers may arise that are not necessarily in the vehicle or infrastructure, but in the attitudes adopted during the service provision.

Contemporary understanding of disability allows us to shift the analysis from individual impairment to its interaction with social barriers. In ride-hailing services, this shift is especially relevant: wheelchairs, guide dogs, or needs related to autism spectrum disorder do not, in themselves, constitute obstacles to service provision. The barrier can arise when these characteristics or resources are transformed, without sufficient material justification, into reasons to refuse, cancel, or interrupt a trip.

From a consumer protection perspective, a person with a disability requesting a ride occupies the legal position of a consumer and must receive adequate, safe service that is compatible with the rights guaranteed by the Consumer Protection Code. The specific protection conferred by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Brazilian Inclusion Law does not replace this protection, but complements it. The same situation may, therefore, simultaneously involve a failure in the provision of service, a violation of consumer rights, and discrimination based on disability.

The cases examined also demonstrate the need to distinguish between actual operational impossibility and attitudinal barriers. It cannot be concluded that every difficulty involving a passenger with a disability constitutes a discriminatory act. There are material limitations, risk situations, and adaptations that may prove unfeasible or disproportionate. However, when the service is possible through a reasonable solution and the trip fails to take place precisely because of the disability or a need directly related to it, a purely operational justification becomes insufficient.

This distinction takes on special significance in the Carolina Vieira case. Without anticipating the judgment of the controversy still submitted to the Judiciary, the elements present in the

records demonstrate the relevance of the question that guided this study: faced with a wheelchair that needs to be transported and alternatives provided in the platform's own guidelines, where does the material impossibility end and the attitudinal barrier begin? The repetition of similar conflicts involving other people with disabilities demonstrates that the issue transcends the limits of an individual process.

It also doesn't seem sufficient to limit the legal response to the subsequent compensation of affected consumers. Platforms participate in the organization of the service, establish behavioral standards, produce guidelines, maintain evaluation systems, and have instruments to react to non-compliance with their policies. The existence of these structures reinforces the importance of preventive measures capable of ensuring that institutional commitments to accessibility and non-discrimination achieve the concrete execution of travel.

Training drivers, establishing appropriate protocols, providing accessible reporting mechanisms, and monitoring compliance with inclusion policies should not only represent strategies for conflict reduction or corporate responsibility. They are measures related to the very quality of the service offered to the market. An accessibility guide only fully fulfills its purpose when its instructions can transcend the app screen and reach the passenger at the moment they need to make the trip.

In the end, the expression that titles this article requires a necessary inversion. It is not the disability that interrupts the journey. Disability is part of human diversity. What can interrupt it is the barrier built in front of it. Recognizing this difference is essential so that the mobility provided by digital platforms does not reproduce, in new forms, old practices of exclusion, and so that the right to request a ride effectively corresponds to the right to reach the destination.

REFERENCES

ARAUJO, Ana Gabriela Rocha; SILVA, Mônia Aparecida da; ZANON, Regina Basso. Autismo, neurodiversidade e estigma: perspectivas políticas e de inclusão. *Psicologia Escolar e Educacional*, v. 27, e247367, 2023. DOI: 10.1590/2175-35392023-247367. Disponível em: [SciELO – texto integral do artigo](#). Acesso em: 15 ago. 2026.

BRASIL. **Decreto nº 6.949, de 25 de agosto de 2009**. Promulga a Convenção Internacional sobre os Direitos das Pessoas com Deficiência e seu Protocolo Facultativo, assinados em Nova York, em 30 de março de 2007. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2009. Disponível em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2007-2010/2009/decreto/d6949.htm. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 8.078, de 11 de setembro de 1990**. Dispõe sobre a proteção do consumidor e dá outras providências. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 1990. Disponível em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l8078compilado.htm. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 11.126, de 27 de junho de 2005**. Dispõe sobre o direito da pessoa com deficiência visual de ingressar e permanecer em ambientes de uso coletivo acompanhada de cão-guia. Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2005. Disponível em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2004-2006/2005/lei/l11126.htm. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

BRASIL. **Lei nº 13.146, de 6 de julho de 2015**. Institui a Lei Brasileira de Inclusão da Pessoa com Deficiência (Estatuto da Pessoa com Deficiência). Brasília, DF: Presidência da República, 2015. Disponível em: https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2015/lei/l13146.htm. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

DINIZ, Debora; BARBOSA, Lívia; SANTOS, Wederson Rufino dos. Deficiência, direitos humanos e justiça. *Sur: Revista Internacional de Direitos Humanos*, São Paulo, v. 6, n. 11, p. 64-77,

dez. 2009. DOI: 10.1590/S1806-64452009000200004. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/sur/a/fPMZfn9hbjYM7SzN9bwzysb/>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

JORNAL DA PARAÍBA. Criança autista e mãe são expulsas de carro por aplicativo durante corrida em João Pessoa. *Jornal da Paraíba*, João Pessoa, 24 jul. 2026. Disponível em: <https://jornaldaparaiba.com.br/cotidiano/crianca-autista-e-mae-sao-expulsas-de-carro-por-aplicativo-durante-corrida-em-joao-pessoa>. Acesso em: 08 ago. 2026.

MELLO, Anahi Guedes de. Deficiência, incapacidade e vulnerabilidade: do capacitismo ou a preeminência capacitista e biomédica do Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa da UFSC. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 21, n. 10, p. 3265-3276, 2016. DOI: 10.1590/1413-812320152110.07792016. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/csc/a/J959p5hgv5TYZgWbKvspRtF/>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

NORAT, Markus Samuel Leite. Evolução histórica do direito do consumidor. *Cognitio Juris*, João Pessoa, ano I, n. 2, ago. 2011. ISSN 2236-3009. Disponível em: <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/3711062.pdf>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

NORAT, Markus Samuel Leite. O conceito de consumidor no direito: uma comparação entre as teorias finalista, maximalista e mista. *Cognitio Juris*, João Pessoa, ano II, n. 4, p. 80-95, abr. 2012. ISSN 2236-3009. Disponível em: <https://cognitiojuris.com.br/o-conceito-de-consumidor-no-direito-uma-comparacao-entre-as-teorias-finalista-maximalista-e-mista/>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

PARAÍBA. **Lei nº 14.063, de 1º de novembro de 2025**. Dispõe sobre a obrigatoriedade de oferta de capacitação aos motoristas de transporte por aplicativo para atendimento de passageiros com deficiência ou neuroatípicos, no Estado da Paraíba. João Pessoa: Governo do Estado da Paraíba, 2025. Disponível em: <https://www.al.pb.leg.br/elegispb/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/Coletanea-PCD-com-capa.pdf>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

PARAÍBA. Tribunal de Justiça do Estado da Paraíba. 7º Juizado Especial Cível da Capital e de Cabedelo. **Processo nº 0827583-36.2026.8.15.2001**. Carolina Vieira dos Santos versus Uber do Brasil Tecnologia Ltda. e outro. João Pessoa, 2026. Processo em tramitação. Autos judiciais consultados pelo autor.

SANTA CATARINA. Tribunal de Justiça do Estado de Santa Catarina. Aplicativo indenizará deficiente visual ao recusar corridas por causa de cão-guia. Florianópolis, 22 maio 2026. Apelação nº 5015263-39.2023.8.24.0033. Disponível em: <https://www.tjsc.jus.br/web/imprensa/-/aplicativo-indenizara-deficiente-visual-ao-recusar-corridas-por-causa-de-cao-guia->. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

SOUZA, Beto; LOPES, Bruna. Uber é condenada após episódio de discriminação contra atleta PCD. *CNN Brasil*, São Paulo, 10 mar. 2026. Disponível em: <https://www.cnnbrasil.com.br/nacional/centro-oeste/df/uber-e-condenada-apos-episodio-de-discriminacao-contr-atleta-pcd/>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

UBER. *Guia para parceiros e parceiras Uber*. [S. l.]: Uber, [s. d.]. 14 p. Elaborado com consultoria da Egalitê. Documento institucional consultado nos autos do Processo nº 0827583-36.2026.8.15.2001.

UBER. **Política de Cão-Guia (Brasil)**. [S. l.]: Uber, 2023. Última alteração em: 11 abr. 2023. Disponível em: <https://www.uber.com/legal/pt-br/document/?country=brazil&lang=pt-br&name=service-animal-policy>. Acesso em: 07 ago. 2026.

[1] Graduated in Law from UFPB; Postgraduate student in Civil Law and Civil Procedure at UNIPE JP; Master in Human Rights, Citizenship and Public Policies from UFPB; Lawyer; Vice-President of the Commission for the Defense of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities of the

OAB/PB.

[2] PhD candidate in Legal and Social Sciences. Master's degree in Law and Sustainable Development. Specialization in Pedagogical Coordination. Specialization in Tutoring in Distance Education and Higher Education Teaching. Specialization in Social Security Law and Social Security Practice. Specialization in Extrajudicial Advocacy. Specialization in Child, Youth and Elderly Law. Specialization in Educational Law. Specialization in Consumer Law. Specialization in Civil Law, Civil Procedure and Consumer Law. Specialization in Labor Law and Labor Procedure. Specialization in Environmental Law. Specialization in Web Application Development. Specialization in Digital Game Development. Specialization in Religious Education. Specialization in Teaching in Biological Sciences. Specialization in Teaching History and Geography. Specialization in Teaching Art and History. Specialization in Teaching Physical Education. Bachelor's degree in Geography. Bachelor's degree in Biological Sciences. Bachelor's degree in History. Bachelor's Degree in Portuguese Language and Literature. Bachelor's Degree in Religious Studies. Bachelor's Degree in Physical Education. Bachelor's Degree in Arts. Bachelor's Degree in Social Sciences. Bachelor's Degree in Philosophy. Bachelor's Degree in Law. Editor of Books, Magazines, and Websites. Lawyer specializing in Consumer Law. Pedagogical Coordinator and Professor in the Postgraduate Law Department at the João Pessoa University Center UNIPÊ; Guest Professor at the National School of Consumer Protection of the Ministry of Justice; Professor in the Law Undergraduate Program at the João Pessoa University Center UNIPÊ; Professor in the Law Undergraduate Program at the Cidade Viva International Faculty FICV; Editorial Coordinator of Legal Books at Edijur Publishing House (São Paulo); General and Editorial Director of the following Scientific Journals: Scientia et Ratio; Brazilian Journal of Consumer Law; Brazilian Journal of Civil Law and Procedure; Brazilian Journal of Real Estate Law; Brazilian Journal of Criminal Law; Scientific Legal Journal Cognitio Juris, ISSN 2236-3009; and Legal Science; Member of the Editorial Board of the Luso-Brazilian Journal of Consumer Law, ISSN 2237-1168; Author of more than 90 legal books and several scientific articles.

[3] Neurodivergent is an expression used to designate people whose neurological functioning or development diverges from what is considered socially typical. The term relates to the neurodiversity perspective, according to which neurological differences, such as those present in autism spectrum disorder, are part of human diversity and should not be understood exclusively from a pathologizing perspective (ARAUJO; SILVA; ZANON, 2023).

[4] **Ableism** refers to forms of discrimination and social hierarchy based on standards of ability and bodily normality, whereby people with disabilities are perceived based on assumptions of inferiority, incapacity or inadequacy. In the Brazilian debate, Mello relates ableism to body normativity and the social production of abilities considered normal or desirable (MELLO, 2016, p. 3272).