

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Organisational Fault Lines in Sustainable Mobility: A Case Study of Blue Smart

Richa N Agarwal¹, Ashutosh Tripathi² and Ezendu Ariwa^{2*}

¹ITS School of Management, India

²University of Wales Trinity Saint David, UK and University of Management and Technology, Sierra Leone UK

*Corresponding author

Ezendu Ariwa, University of Wales Trinity Saint David, UK and University of Management and Technology, Sierra Leone UK.

Received: September 16, 2026; Accepted: September 24, 2026; Published: September 30, 2026

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the structural, behavioural, and governance failures leading to the collapse of Blu-Smart, once heralded as India's foremost electric vehicle (EV) ride-hailing start-up. Using theoretical frameworks from organization theory-agency, resource dependence, contingency, institutional, stakeholder, and behavioural finance-the study constructs a detailed multi-level analysis. The paper reviews the interconnectedness of business model design, governance structures, financial controls, regulatory compliance, operational resilience, leadership dynamics, and stakeholder engagement. Drawing on extensive case evidence, it demonstrates that Blu-Smart's failure was systemic, arising from foundational weaknesses and theoretical misfits, not mere operational or market factors. Conclusions consider guiding principles for sustainable entrepreneurship in high-velocity technology sectors.

Keywords: Governance, Financial Control, Ethics, Leadership

Introduction

The electric vehicle (EV) mobility revolution represents one of the boldest steps toward sustainable urban development [1]. Startups worldwide are innovating rapidly-experimenting with asset-light models, ecosystem orchestration, and technology-driven platforms [2]. Blu-Smart, founded in 2018, positioned itself at the vanguard of this movement in India, launching what it marketed as the nation's first all-electric cab fleet and raising expectations of a green-tech unicorn [3]. However, by 2025, after rapid expansion and high-profile endorsements, Blu-Smart went from a market disruptor to a case study in collapse, shocking investors, regulators, and the wider urban mobility sector.

Rationale and Scope

While rapid change and competition characterize the sector, a deep dive into BluSmart's trajectory reveals that its collapse cannot be explained by external factors alone [4]. Instead, it was the structures-the way resources were sourced, risks shared, governance instituted, controls embedded, and stakeholders engaged-that most critically shaped both the company's ascent and implosion. This study provides a rare, holistic analysis-combining organizational theory with real-world evidence from credible sources-to surface actionable insights of global relevance.

Literature Review

Power and Politics in Resource Control

Power and politics within organizations are closely tied to who controls critical resources-such as budgets, information, technology, or key relationships. French and Raven's classic framework defines managerial power bases as legitimate (formal authority), reward, coercive, expert, and referent power, each shaping how influence is exercised over subordinates and peers [5]. Managers who control important resources tend to accumulate power, because others depend on them to accomplish their goals [6]. Resource control thus becomes a political asset; actors may form coalitions, lobby for budget allocations, or manipulate information flows to gain advantage.

Research on organizational power notes that this dynamic has a significant impact not only on outcomes (e.g., project approval, promotion) but also on the methods used to achieve those outcomes. When power is concentrated in a small elite-often founders or top executives-decision processes can become highly politicized, limiting open dissent and reinforcing self-interest. Such conditions can enable the kind of informal, opaque decision-making that undermines formal governance mechanisms, especially in high-growth firms where oversight structures lag behind expansion.

Citation: Richa N Agarwal, Ashutosh Tripathi, Ezendu Ariwa. Ethical Means of Development and the Rhetoric of Social Responsibility of the Corporate Sector in Post-LPG Period in India. *J Bus Econ Stud*. 2026. 3(5): 1-11. DOI: doi.org/10.61440/JBES.2026.v3.151

Organizational Culture and Identity

Organizational culture and identity shape how members interpret power, authority, and control. Schein's model conceptualizes culture as operating at three levels: visible artefacts (symbols, processes, structures), espoused values (strategies, goals, philosophies), and basic underlying assumptions (taken-for-granted beliefs). Culture provides stability and meaning, helping groups navigate internal and external pressures, but it can also normalize problematic behaviors if underlying assumptions valorize loyalty over transparency or results over ethics [7].

Culture is tightly linked to organizational identity-how members collectively answer the question "who are we as an organization?". Identity-defining beliefs are often embedded in cultural assumptions and values, such as "we are disruptors" or "we are a family," which can be explicit (espoused values) or implicit (basic assumptions). These identity narratives can encourage cohesion and commitment, yet they may also foster denial or defensiveness when confronted with evidence of misconduct or structural failure. Comparative reviews of Schein, Hofstede, and GLOBE show that culture and identity significantly influence leadership behavior, control acceptance, and ethical climates across organizations [8].

Control Mechanisms and Corporate Governance Failures 7780720358

Internal control mechanisms and governance structures are intended to counterbalance power and politics by ensuring accountability, transparency, and alignment with stakeholders' interests. Typical mechanisms include board oversight, independent directors, audit committees, internal control systems, compliance programs, and whistleblower channels. Effective boards are expected to monitor risk management and internal control systems, regularly review their effectiveness, and oversee financial, operational, and compliance controls.

However, a growing body of research shows that governance mechanisms frequently fail in practice. A 2025 systematic review on governance and internal control failures finds that fraud and misconduct often arise from weak board oversight, lack of genuine commitment from senior management, and conflicts of interest within audit and governance committees. Overemphasis on formal regulatory compliance, without an underpinning ethical culture, further exacerbates risk, as organizations may focus on "box-ticking" instead of substantive accountability [9].

Internal governance mechanisms-such as board independence, ownership structures, and internal controls-are empirically linked to corporate misconduct. A large-sample study of public U.S. firms finds that ineffective internal mechanisms increase the likelihood of misreporting and misconduct, especially when combined with high managerial power and weak monitoring. Guidance for boards stresses that monitoring should cover all material controls, and that audit committees must rigorously review internal financial controls and risk management systems rather than relying on management assurances. When these mechanisms are compromised-by concentrated control, information suppression, or conflicts of interest-governance failures become more likely [10].

Principal-Agent Conflict and Information Asymmetry

Agency theory explains why governance and control mechanisms are needed in the first place. In a principal-agent relationship, one party (the principal, e.g., shareholders) delegates decision-making authority to another (the agent, e.g., managers). Agency theory assumes individuals are self-interested and work-averse, creating the risk that agents pursue their own interests at the expense of principals whenever incentives and oversight are misaligned.

A central feature of agency relationships is information asymmetry: agents typically possess more detailed knowledge of operations and risks than principals, and principals cannot costlessly observe all actions. This informational advantage allows agents to engage in self-serving behaviors-such as shirking, earnings manipulation, or tunneling of resources-unless appropriate control procedures, contracts, and monitoring are in place. Agency theory thus emphasizes designing incentive systems, performance evaluations, and monitoring arrangements that align agent behavior with principal objectives.

Jensen and Meckling's seminal formulation integrates agency theory with property rights and finance, demonstrating how concentrated managerial ownership can reduce opportunism by aligning managerial wealth with firm value, but also noting that excessive concentration can itself become a governance risk if it weakens external discipline. Practical treatments of the principal-agent problem highlight conflicts of interest and information asymmetry as drivers of agency costs and corporate governance failures and propose solutions such as performance-based compensation, stronger board oversight, and enhanced transparency [11].

Taken together, these literatures suggest that:

- Power and politics in resource control determine who can shape decisions, what information is shared, and whether formal governance mechanisms are supported or undermined.
- Organizational culture and identity influence how power is perceived, whether control systems are embraced or resisted, and whether ethical breaches are challenged or normalized.
- Control mechanisms and corporate governance are designed to constrain power, reduce agency costs, and institutionalize accountability-but they frequently fail when boards are weak, conflicted, or culturally aligned with dominant insiders.
- Agency theory provides a foundational model of principal-agent conflict and information asymmetry, justifying the need for robust governance, monitoring, and incentive alignment [2].

In combination, these perspectives explain why organizations with concentrated resource control, politicized cultures, and symbolic rather than substantive governance are especially vulnerable to control failures and misconduct, particularly in high-growth, high-discretion environments.

Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this research are:

- To systematically analyze the organizational, structural, and behavioral roots of Blu-Smart's collapse.

- To critically apply and extend organizational and management theories to the case.
- To synthesize evidence-backed, actionable recommendations for the success of high-growth, high-risk technology startups.

Research Methodology

This research is qualitative and multi-source, leveraging academic literature on organizational structure, governance, and failure. Regulatory communications and filings (SEBI, Ministry of Corporate Affairs). In-depth investigative reporting from The Economic Times, Reuters, Bloomberg, and Business Standard. Interviews with former Blu-Smart employees (as reported in the media). Company press releases, investor briefings, and statements. Analysis uses multi-level triangulation to check facts, anchor interpretations, and draw defensible, published-research-level conclusions.

Theoretical Bases

Organizational Structure and Environmental Fit

Firm architecture-how authority, roles, and resources are apportioned-directly shapes its ability to sense and respond to change. creates a typology of configurations (simple structure, machine bureaucracy, adhocracy, etc.), each suited for different environments. Contingency theorists argue for structural “fit” Mechanistic structures work in stable industries; dynamic, high-velocity markets like EVs demand decentralized, adaptive forms.

Agency Theory, Governance, and Control

Agency theory frames the principal-agent conflict as the core risk in governance, particularly acute in founder-controlled startups. Optimal governance structures balance independence, monitoring, and incentive alignment. Contemporary work (emphasizes board oversight, internal auditing, transparent disclosures, and third-party assurance to minimize agency costs.

Resource Dependence and Network Vulnerabilities

Organizations control only some of the resources they need. Heavy dependence-especially in critical production resources, as with Blu-Smart’s lease reliance-shifts power to external parties, increasing exposure to “single-point-of-failure” risks. Transaction cost economics further stress the costs of specialized asset ties and the dangers of lock-in without redundancy.

Institutional Theory and Regulatory Compliance

For continued access to capital, legitimacy, and protection, organizations must signal conformity to laws, regulations, and societal norms. Failures in compliance, reporting, or proactive regulatory engagement increase the risk of punitive intervention-sometimes fatally for undercapitalized startups.

Stakeholder, Culture, and Psychological Safety Models

Stakeholder theory and later research have broadened focus from shareholder primacy to balancing multiple interests. Organizational culture, voice, and psychological safety are increasingly recognized as critical to resilience in volatile sectors. The lack of effective communication, inclusion, and trust in decision-making can be as fatal as financial errors.

Behavioral Biases and Startup Risk

Research in behavioral economics and management points to cognitive traps-overconfidence, groupthink, and optimism bias-that repeatedly afflict high-growth startups, especially when insulated by founder dominance.

Theoretical Frameworks of Business Model and Structural Vulnerabilities

Blu-Smart’s business model was fundamentally asset-light, relying on leasing an electric vehicle fleet from a related-party provider, Gensol Engineering. This approach aligns with trends in platform-based mobility models, focusing on operational leverage and low capital expenditure. However, from an organizational behavior and theory perspective, such dependency relationships introduce complex dynamics affecting organizational structure, resource control, and power distribution [13]. This section unpacks the structural vulnerabilities inherent in Blu-Smart’s model using key organizational behavior theories such as Resource Dependence Theory, Contingency Theory, and Transaction Cost Economics [14].

Resource Dependence Theory posits that organizations depend on critical resources controlled by external entities. Managing these dependencies strategically is essential to reduce uncertainty and maintain autonomy. Blu-Smart’s decision to outsource the entire fleet to a single supplier meant it transferred critical operational resources the vehicles to Gensol’s control. From a resource dependence perspective, Blu-Smart’s structure exhibited high dependence on Gensol, a related but separate entity, for fleet availability. It Failed to achieve resource redundancy, a buffer against supply disruption. It created a power imbalance, whereby Gensol’s financial and operational issues directly imperiled Blu-Smart’s service delivery.

The relationship embeddedness between Blu-Smart and Gensol stems from founder overlap, further complicating but not alleviating the dependency. Theoretically, embedded networks can reduce transaction costs and improve cooperation. However, institutionalized governance mechanisms must accompany such embeddedness to mitigate risks, which Blu-Smart lacked structurally.

Contingency Theory and Structural Fit

Contingency Theory advocates that organizational structure must be aligned with environmental conditions. Blu-Smart’s market was highly dynamic, with nascent EV infrastructure, evolving regulations, and intense competition [15]. Blu-Smart’s centralized, lease-based fleet model introduced rigidity [16]. The company lacked structural flexibility to respond to supplier distress. A mechanistic approach constrained rapid adaptation to fleet shortages. The key contingency of environmental uncertainty was poorly matched with a low-flexibility structure, violating structural contingency fit principles. This misalignment heightened vulnerability, manifesting as operational collapse once Gensol faltered.

Transaction Cost Economics and Asset Specificity

Transaction Cost Economics underscores that organizations design governance structures to minimize the costs of transactions [17]. The structural implication was that Blu-Smart

was locked into a quasi-integrated governance form with Gensol. High transaction-specific investments (custom EVs, charging infrastructure) constrained Blu-Smart's exit or renegotiation options. The absence of market alternatives in the short term increased the risk of hold-up problems, where one party exploits the relationship [18]. The failure to build structural safeguards such as diversified suppliers or fallback leasing options represents a flawed transaction cost minimization strategy, ultimately costing the business [19].

Power and Politics in Resource Control

From an organizational behavior lens, power dynamics influence resource control, cooperation, and conflict within and across organizational boundaries [20]. The founders' dual roles concentrated power over both Blu-Smart and Gensol, centralizing resource control. Such concentration, absent balanced power distribution, enabled opportunistic behavior and weakened Blu Smart's ability to impose contractual discipline [21]. Politically, the blurred boundaries allowed self-dealing, misallocation of funds, and conspired governance lapses [2]. An equitable and formalized power structure could have reduced these risks but was structurally absent.

Organizational Culture and Identity

Organizational culture theory suggests that culture shapes organizational behavior and can influence structural stability [2]. Blu-Smart's culture, reportedly opaque and founder-driven, may have downplayed transparency and ethical accountability. Lack of institutionalized values promoting financial probity and compliance structurally eroded internal trust and organizational legitimacy. The culture of control and secrecy contrasted with emergent ecosystem norms valuing stakeholder engagement and sustainability [2]. A culture misaligned with environmental and organizational demands contributes to collapse risks. Behavioral finance provides insights into how cognitive biases and organizational culture influence financial decision-making [2]. Founders and management likely overestimated controllability of financial risks and their capacity to sustain operations through leasing models, ignoring warning signs.

The heavily centralized leadership possibly facilitated conformity pressures, discouraging dissenting views on financial management. Founder-control created misaligned incentives; without effective monitoring, managers were tempted to engage in risky financial behavior with expected private benefits.

A culture lacking ethical reinforcement and accountability normalized misuse of government subsidies and other financial deviations.

These behavioral factors structurally magnified financial risks through the interplay of cultural and cognitive dynamics within leadership [2].

Control Mechanisms and Corporate Governance Failures

The collapse of Blu-Smart cannot be fully understood without a critical analysis of its corporate governance structure. Governance acts as the system through which organizations are directed and controlled, encompassing the relationships among management, board of directors, shareholders, and other stakeholders. Particularly founder dominance and related-party

entanglements created an environment ripe for misconduct and inefficiency, ultimately contributed to leading to Blu-Smart's downfall.

Agency Theory: Principal-Agent Conflict and Information Asymmetry

Agency theory centers around the problems that arise when the goals of principals (owners/shareholders) and agents (managers/executives) diverge. The theory highlights two core issues: moral hazard (agents pursuing personal objectives at principal expense) and adverse selection (principal's difficulty in assessing agent behavior due to information asymmetry) [2].

BluSmart's founders were simultaneously majority owners and key managers within both BluSmart and Gensol Engineering. This convergence blurred traditional boundaries between principals and agents, undermining the very foundation that agency theory assumes: separation and monitoring.

The governance structure lacked transparency, impairing the ability of minority shareholders, external auditors, or regulators to monitor managerial performance accurately. This information asymmetry facilitated fund diversion and fraudulent loan documentation. Without independent directors, audit committees, or compliance officers with real authority, the governance system was structurally weak in holding executives accountable.

The core agency problem in Blu-Smart thus manifested in unchecked managerial opportunism exacerbated by non-existent or ineffective monitoring, a fundamental governance flaw that contributed to financial mismanagement and operational collapse.

Stewardship Theory: Contrasting Motivations and Structural Implications

While agency theory assumes self-interested agents, stewardship theory posits that managers can act as stewards, motivated to align with organizational goals and foster long-term success [2]. BluSmart's collapse reveals that stewardship assumptions failed due to structural design that lacked motivations for stewardship [2]. The founder-dominated governance lacked institutional incentives for transparent behavior, enabling opportunistic rather than steward-like actions. The absence of shared governance and participative decision-making hindered the development of a stewardship culture. Structurally embedding stewardship would have required governance reforms to incentivize ethical decision-making through shared ownership stakes, transparency norms, and collaborative oversight.

Board Composition and Independence: Structural Corporate Governance Deficiencies

Effective boards are critical for governance, acting as watchdogs over management. BluSmart's board structure was heavily influenced or controlled by founders with limited independent directors. The lack of external expertise and independence weakened the board's ability to identify risks and challenge management decisions.

Such structural weakness is linked with poor risk oversight and increased violations of fiduciary responsibility. Studies show that

board independence correlates positively with firm performance and ethical conduct, indicating Blu-Smart's failure to distance leadership from management was a core structural governance flaw.

Conflict of Interest and Governance Risks

Blu-Smart's dominant structural governance risk was the extensive related-party dealings with Gensol Engineering. These related-party transactions were major business activities without proper disclosure or independent approval, breaching best governance practices. This structure created a conflict of interest where founder-managers could prioritize personal or inter-company gain over shareholder or stakeholder interests. Regulatory bodies typically require stringent controls and transparency around related-party transactions to prevent fraud and self-dealing, which Blu-Smart structurally failed to implement. This lack of arm's-length governance facilitated governance arbitrage and financial opacity.

Blu-Smart's financial dealings with Gensol were structurally related-party transactions involving leasing of EVs using government EV subsidy loans, movement of cash flows and financial obligations with blurred accounting and falsification of loan documentation to secure funding. Such dealings increase agency costs by embedding potential conflicts of interest, especially when transparency is compromised. BluSmart failed to implement sufficient structural governance safeguards such as independent transaction review committees or third-party audits, enabling malfeasance.

Internal Control Systems and Power Dynamics in Governance

Blu-Smart's governance system violated classical governance theory emphasizing agency cost minimization through structural segregation of duties, transparent controls, and clear accountability mechanisms. The absence of internal audit functions with autonomy structurally undermined control environments. Segregation of accounting and decision rights was blurred across entities, increasing overall agency costs. The firm's governance lacked formalized policies on ethics, compliance, and risk, resulting in cascading organizational failures [30].

The governance structure of Blu-Smart reflected centralization of power and lack of participatory governance. Bases of power (legitimate, expert, coercive, reward, referent) were heavily concentrated in founders, leading to potential abuse of power. Structural lack of empowerment of mid-level management or employees suppressed dissent and whistleblowing, critical for early detection of governance issues. This culture of power centralization may have also entrenched groupthink, reducing critical challenge to flawed decisions. Such governance behaviors structurally magnify risks of misconduct and failures of accountability.

The Committee of Sponsoring Organizations (COSO) of the Treadway Commission provides a widely accepted internal control framework comprising five integrated components: control environment, risk assessment, control activities, information and communication and monitoring activities [31].

Blu-Smart's control environment was weak. Founder-dominated leadership with poor ethical norms created an environment conducive to financial misfeasance. Blu-Smart's structure inadequately identified financial risks emerging from its related-party transactions and over-reliance on Gensol. This flawed risk assessment led to inappropriate resource allocation.

Segregation of duties, authorization processes, and reconciliations were insufficient or absent. Co-mingling of Blu-Smart and Gensol's funds violated key segregations of financial stewardship. The company lacked transparent financial reporting systems. Poor communication lines prevented effective oversight by boards and regulators. Internal and external audit functions were either non-existent or ineffective, resulting in undetected misappropriation of funds.

Structurally, Blu-Smart's internal control environment failed to achieve reasonable assurance regarding the accuracy and completeness of financial reporting, increasing vulnerability to fraud and insolvency.

Regulatory and Legal Frameworks: Structural Enforcement Failures

Good governance also depends on the external legal and regulatory environment that sets minimum standards and enforces compliance. Blu-Smart's failure to institutionalize compliance functions structurally weakened its adherence to SEBI norms and government guidelines on EV subsidies [32]. Regulatory bodies eventually intervened only after significant damage, indicating weak governance alerting and containment mechanisms. The governance system lacked structural linkages with regulatory bodies for timely reporting and remediation [33]. This disconnection contributed to delayed detection and escalation of governance failures into insolvency.

Liquidity Risks and Debt Management

Blu-Smart's financial mismanagement extended into liquidity planning and debt servicing: The company's financial structure relied heavily on short-term loans and government incentives whose misuse triggered regulatory withdrawal. Poor financial forecasting and failure to allocate cash flow prudently reflected structural weaknesses in financial planning. Delays in debt servicing from Gensol punctuated BluSmart's operational breakdown by restricting fleet leasing continuity. From an organizational behavior perspective, this points to a lack of financial discipline culture and inadequate training or incentives for responsible financial stewardship.

Regulatory Compliance and Financial Reporting Failures

Financial reporting and compliance are critical structural elements for trust and sustainability. Blu-Smart's financial reports lacked accuracy and timeliness due to internal misreporting. Non-compliance with SEBI norms and government regulations on EV subsidies and loan utilization triggered investigations [34]. This structural failure in compliance control systems invited regulatory sanctions and escalated insolvency risk [35]. Effective structural controls for regulatory compliance, including financial disclosure, whistleblower protections, and ethical reporting, were absent.

Consequences of **Financial Mismanagement** led to loss of investor confidence led to capital withdrawal, directly impacting operational funding. Creditors initiated insolvency proceedings due to liquidity crunch and default risks. Operational disruptions stemmed from inability to maintain and lease vehicles. Legal and reputational damage severely curtailed future business viability [36].

Operational Rigidity

Operational design plays a pivotal role in enabling organizations to adapt and sustain in highly dynamic environments. BluSmart's operational failure was in part due to a rigid, centralized structure that hindered its ability to respond to unforeseen disruptions. This section critically examines BluSmart's operational rigidity through the lens of Contingency Theory, Organizational Design Theory, and Organizational Behavior principles, illustrating why its structure was ill-suited to the volatile mobility sector.

Contingency Theory: Structural Alignment to Environment

Contingency Theory asserts that there is no one best way to organize; rather, organizational effectiveness depends on the alignment of structure with environmental contingencies such as uncertainty, complexity, and dynamism [37].

BluSmart operated in an environment characterized by rapid technological evolution, regulatory fluidity, and emerging consumer behavior patterns. Despite this, its operational model was mechanistic-centralized decision-making, formalized processes, and rigid procedures—typically suitable only for stable, predictable environments. This misalignment created structural rigidity, leaving the company ill-equipped to pivot when its single leasing partner, Gensol, confronted financial distress. Mechanistic systems reduce flexibility in communication and decision authority, critical in managing day-to-day operational anomalies and external shocks. Thus, BluSmart's failure exemplifies a structural contingency mismatch where mechanistic design corrupted its potential for adaptation and resilience.

Organizational Design

Mechanistic vs Organic Structures

Organizational design theory distinguishes between mechanistic and organic forms. Mechanistic structures feature hierarchical control, centralization, narrow spans of control, and standardized roles, while organic structures emphasize decentralization, flexibility, and informal communication [38].

BluSmart's operational control over its fleet and charging infrastructure was centralized and process-heavy, a marker of mechanistic design. The company exhibited limited empowerment at lower decision levels to resolve operational disruptions independently. There was also minimal cross-functional collaboration and knowledge sharing essential for innovation and problem-solving in dynamic sectors. The lack of an organic structure inhibited BluSmart's ability to innovate and react swiftly to supply interruptions, illustrating the perils of rigid designs in high-uncertainty contexts [39].

Resource Allocation and Process Inflexibility

Organizational behavior literature underscores the vital role of adapting resource allocation and workflows to environmental changes [40].

BluSmart's vehicle leasing was structurally locked to contracts with Gensol, with no agile capacity to source alternative fleets or adjust operational hubs rapidly. The centrally standardized dispatching and vehicle management processes, while efficient, lacked contingency protocols or decentralized decision rights. These process inflexibilities intensified operational disruption when the fleet supply faltered, leading to ride cancellations and revenue loss.

The operational structure did not engage in dynamic capabilities, defined by as the organization's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies rapidly.

Communication and Decision-Making Patterns

Effective communication and decision-making are essential for organizational effectiveness, especially under uncertainty. BluSmart's centralized hierarchy inhibited rapid upward and lateral communication needed to identify and address fleet shortages proactively. Decision-making was highly centralized with low trust in mid and lower-level employees to enact quick resolutions, stifling organizational responsiveness. This behavior reflected a high power distance culture, diminishing employee empowerment and psychological safety necessary for innovation and problem-solving. Such organizational behavior patterns structurally undermine agility, particularly in startups operating in novel markets.

Impact of Structural Rigidity on Crisis Response

BluSmart's operational rigidity hampered its ability to respond to the coupled crisis of financial distress in its leasing partner and regulator-enforced suspension [41]. The absence of structural contingency planning or scenario analysis limited management's foresight and reaction options. As fleet supply diminished suddenly, BluSmart lacked structural flexibility to re-route resources or onboard temporary vehicle suppliers. The cascading failure of operations accelerated customer attrition, revenue collapse, and reputational damage. Organizations embodying structural flexibility and ambidexterity—balancing efficiency with adaptability—typically demonstrate better crisis resilience.

Regulatory and Compliance Structural Failures: An Organizational and Institutional Theory Perspective

Regulatory compliance and institutional legitimacy are foundational to the sustainability and credibility of any business, particularly in sectors leveraging government incentives and operating under evolving regulatory frameworks. BluSmart's collapse was in part due to structural deficiencies in compliance systems and regulatory engagement. This section critically assesses BluSmart's regulatory and compliance failures using organizational institutional theory and compliance behavior models to explain why weak structures precipitated regulatory intervention and operational collapse.

Organizational Institutional Theory: Legitimacy and Regulatory Expectations

Organizational institutional theory posits that organizations seek legitimacy by conforming to established social norms, rules, and regulatory frameworks [42]. Legitimacy facilitates access to resources, stakeholder trust, and market acceptance [43].

BluSmart operated in a high legitimacy-demand environment with stringent government subsidies and SEBI oversight [44]. However, its organizational structure lacked formalized compliance systems, policies, and ethical standards to ensure adherence. As a result, BluSmart's legitimacy was structurally compromised when government investigations uncovered misuse of subsidy funds and regulatory breaches.

The absence of institutionalized compliance mechanisms betrayed the company's failure to embed regulatory expectations into its core structural processes, undermining external legitimacy and inviting punitive interventions.

Compliance Behavior and Structural Deficiencies

Theories of compliance behavior emphasize the role of organizational fairness, trust, and procedural justice in fostering voluntary compliance [45]. BluSmart's governance and culture reportedly fostered distrust internally and externally. Without transparent, fair, and participatory compliance frameworks, the structural mechanisms for encouraging voluntary adherence to regulations were weak. This created a spiraling effect where violations became normalized and less likely to be self-corrected. Thus, structurally imposed compliance controls were inadequate to build internal and external trust required for sustained regulatory compliance.

Compliance Systems: Absence of Embedded Controls and Auditing

Blu-Smart's structural failings in compliance included no clear compliance department or function with authority and resources. Lack of ongoing monitoring, risk assessment, and whistleblower channels. Financial controls and reporting systems were unfit to meet regulatory scrutiny on subsidy usage.

According to organizational control theory, formal control systems must be embedded structurally within organizations to ensure accountability and corrective action. BluSmart's failure to implement these controls structurally allowed breaches to escalate undetected.

Regulatory Enforcement and Structural Implications

The regulatory bodies, particularly SEBI, enacted enforcement as a response to systemic governance and compliance failures [46]. Structural lack of real-time compliance reporting delayed detection. Regulatory action included suspending operations, barring founders, and insolvency proceedings, illustrating the severe consequences of structural compliance failures.

This reinforced the institutional theory assertion that regulatory environments act as coercive isomorphisms, compelling organizations to conform structurally. BluSmart's inability to structurally adapt to these coercive pressures magnified its decline.

Impact on Stakeholder Confidence

From a stakeholder theory perspective, regulatory failures erode the trust and engagement of customers, investors, employees, and partners. Regulatory sanctions structurally damaged BluSmart's reputation and trustworthiness. The company's failure to honor regulatory and ethical standards led to loss of investor

and customer confidence, impairing resource acquisition and operational continuity.

Leadership and Crisis Management Failures

Leadership is pivotal in steering organizations through growth and adversity. BluSmart's downfall illuminates how leadership and crisis management shortcomings, compounded by structural flaws, impair organizational resilience. This section delves into BluSmart's leadership failures with reference to organizational behavior and leadership theories including transformational leadership, situational leadership, and psychological safety, explaining how these lapses contributed to the company's inability to navigate crisis.

Leadership Structure: Founder-Centric and Centralized Control

BluSmart exhibited a centralized, founder-centric leadership structure where key decisions were concentrated among a small group of executives [47]. While common in startups, this approach carries inherent risks. Concentration of decision-making limits diversity of ideas and discourages input from other levels of the organization. Centralized leadership can suppress dissent and alternative viewpoints, potentially perpetuating blind spots during critical decision points. This centralization structurally diminishes distributed accountability and weakens crisis response capacities. Organizational behavior literature emphasizes that effective leadership structures balance strong vision with inclusive decision-making for adaptive success.

Transformational Leadership and Organizational Inspiration

Transformational leadership theory posits that leaders who inspire, challenge, and support followers foster adaptability and organizational commitment [48]. Blu-Smart's leadership reportedly lacked aspects of transformational leadership such as inspiring vision, individualized consideration, or intellectual stimulation. This gap limited employee engagement, motivation, and resilience during periods of distress and uncertainty. Without transformational qualities, organizations are vulnerable to disengagement and passivity amid crises. Structurally, this leadership deficit was coupled with dense hierarchical control, stifling innovation and problem-solving.

Situational Leadership and Adaptive Response

Situational leadership theory stresses leadership flexibility depending on follower readiness and external conditions. BluSmart's leaders did not exhibit the adaptive flexibility necessary to tailor leadership styles to the unfolding financial and operational crises. The leadership approach remained rigid and autocratic even as the company required openness, employee empowerment, and decentralized problem-solving. This mismatch handicapped the firm's ability to mobilize resources and coordinate rapid response across functional teams. Situational leadership theory underscores the importance of structural flexibility in leadership styles congruent with organizational needs.

Psychological Safety and Communication Culture

Organizational behavior research shows psychological safety-the shared belief that the work environment is safe for interpersonal

risk-taking-is essential for learning and crisis navigation [49]. BluSmart's founder-dominated leadership and opaque governance deterred open communication and whistleblowing, suppressing early detection of financial misconduct [50]. Limited psychological safety structurally weakens organizational learning, error reporting, and innovation, crucial in turnaround scenarios. The lack of mechanisms to encourage employee voice exacerbated risk concealment. Psychological safety is thus a critical leadership structural element absent in Blu-Smart's culture.

Crisis Management: Lack of Preparedness and Succession Planning

Effective crisis management relies on preparedness, clear communication, and succession capabilities. Blu-Smart's leadership showed no evidence of proactive crisis planning or scenario analysis, traits vital in volatile startup environments. Resignations of key executives during escalating investigations created a leadership vacuum. The absence of succession planning structurally impaired strategic continuity and stakeholder confidence. Leadership theories emphasize the necessity of structural resilience and contingency plans to absorb shocks and maintain organizational stability.

Leadership Behavioral Patterns and Consequences

From an organizational behavior standpoint, BluSmart's leadership displayed high power distance and authoritarian behaviors limiting upward feedback [51]. Absence of ethical leadership practices fostering transparency and integrity. Inadequate emotional intelligence and empathy critical for managing stakeholder expectations in distress. These behavioral patterns structurally compromised the company's agility and crisis navigation.

Stakeholder Impact and Structural Implications: A Stakeholder Theory and Organizational Behavior Analysis

An organization's structural decisions profoundly influence its relationships with a broad spectrum of stakeholders-customers, employees, investors, regulators, and the community. BluSmart's structural and governance failures rippled outward, triggering cascading effects on these constituencies. This section evaluates BluSmart's stakeholder impacts through the lens of stakeholder theory and organizational behavior, identifying how structural deficiencies compromised value creation and risk management across stakeholder groups [52].

Stakeholder Theory: Balancing Interests and Organizational Sustainability

Stakeholder theory insists organizations must create value for all stakeholders to ensure long-term viability rather than solely maximizing shareholder wealth [53]. BluSmart's structural design prioritized founder and investor interests but lacked balanced mechanisms to address the needs and rights of customers, employees, creditors, and regulators. The failure to integrate stakeholder engagement frameworks structurally led to alienation and loss of trust across multiple constituencies when operational and financial crises unfolded. Structural absence of formal stakeholder communication and feedback loops impeded rapid problem resolution and trust rebuilding. BluSmart's neglect of broader stakeholder concerns violated

foundational stakeholder theory principles, reducing legitimacy and sustainability.

Customer Impact: Service Disruptions and Brand Erosion

Customers are primary stakeholders in ride-hailing businesses. Fleet shortages due to disrupted leasing impaired service availability, directly harming customer experience. BluSmart's suspension of operations in key cities generated dissatisfaction, leading to migration toward competitors [54]. Structurally, there was no provision for customer crisis communication or alternative service arrangements.

In organizational behavior terms, the failure in external stakeholder management reflected the company's rigid operational and communication structures, which lacked flexibility and customer-centric governance.

Employee Impact: Job Insecurity and Morale Decline

Employees form the backbone of operational delivery. The governance and financial turmoil caused organizational instability, layoffs, and pay uncertainties. Structural leadership opacity and lack of psychological safety limited employee voice and involvement in solution-finding. Such conditions precipitated low morale, disengagement, and talent attrition. Organizational behavior research shows employee well-being and engagement are critical for organizational resilience, underscoring structural gaps in BluSmart's human resource and communication policies [55].

Investor and Creditor Impact: Financial Loss and Credibility Damage

Investors and creditors provide capital essential for growth. Financial mismanagement and regulatory investigations eroded investor confidence. Insolvency filings resulted in loss of capital and delayed returns. Absence of strong corporate governance and financial controls increased perceived investment risks. Structurally, inadequate transparency and risk management practices drove stakeholder distrust and resource withdrawal, worsening company viability.

Regulator and Government Impact: Trust and Market Integrity

BluSmart operated under government EV incentive schemes and regulatory oversight [56].

Misuse of government subsidies led to investigations and sanctions. Regulatory enforcement actions, including management bans and insolvency proceedings, aimed to restore market integrity. BluSmart's structural non-compliance reflected governance failures requiring judicial intervention. This dynamic illustrates the regulatory stakeholder's role in enforcing normative frameworks to protect public and market interests.

Community and Environmental Impact

Although BluSmart promoted environmentally sustainable transport, operational failure limited its ecological contribution. Service cessation stalled progress on emission reductions promised by EV adoption. Lack of transparent environmental reporting diminished community trust and corporate social responsibility credibility.

Structural Stakeholder Engagement and Communication Failures

BluSmart lacked structured stakeholder engagement policies. Absence of formal communication channels with customers during crises. No employee involvement mechanisms to empower grievance reporting and crisis management. Silence towards investors and regulators until punitive action enforced transparency. Organizational behavior theories stress the role of participative governance and open communication in building trust and mitigating conflict.

Conclusion and Critical Lessons: A Synthesis with Organizational Theory and Research Implications

BluSmart's dramatic collapse offers a rich case study illustrating how structural design, governance, financial controls, operational flexibility, compliance, leadership and stakeholder engagement interrelate in shaping organizational success or failure. This concluding section synthesizes the preceding detailed analyses into critical lessons, integrates organizational theory to deepen understanding and outlines key implications for future research and practice.

Synthesis of Structural Failures Through Organizational Theories

BluSmart's failure represents a complex interaction of theoretical and practical issues. Resource Dependence Theory highlighted the peril of disproportionate reliance on a related-party supplier causing systemic operational vulnerability [57]. Agency Theory illustrated how founder dominance and lack of independent governance facilitated opportunistic behavior and financial mismanagement. Contingency Theory exposed the mismatch between BluSmart's mechanistic structure and the dynamic, uncertain EV mobility sector [58].

Organizational Behavior lenses shed light on the negative effects of centralized power, poor communication, low psychological safety, and limited leadership adaptability [59]. Institutional Theory explained BluSmart's loss of legitimacy due to structural regulatory non-compliance and governance opacity. Stakeholder Theory emphasized the consequences of neglecting balanced stakeholder engagement, resulting in cascading loss of trust and operational collapse.

Together, these perspectives expose the interdependent weaknesses embedded structurally across BluSmart's business, magnifying risk and accelerating decline.

Critical Lessons for Practice

- **Diversify Resource Dependencies:** Relying on single or related-party suppliers exposes firms to catastrophic operational risks. Structural redundancy and alternative resource access are essential in uncertain industries.
- **Implement Robust, Independent Governance:** Founder-centric control must be balanced by independent boards, audit functions, and transparent processes aligned with agency and stewardship theories. Clear conflict-of-interest policies and related-party transaction oversight are crucial.
- **Align Organizational Structure to Environment:** Adopt organic, flexible structures suited to rapidly evolving markets per contingency theory. Enable decentralized

decision-making and cross-functional collaboration to enhance agility.

- **Embed Strong Financial Controls and Ethical Culture:** COSO internal control frameworks should be fully integrated. Behavioral finance insights advocate for ethics training and transparent reporting to mitigate cognitive biases and fraud risk.
- **Institutionalize Regulatory Compliance:** Structural compliance systems must be proactive, embedding fairness and procedural justice principles. Close collaboration with regulators and prompt transparency sustain legitimacy.
- **Develop Adaptive, Transformational Leadership:** Leadership must foster psychological safety, encourage innovation, and lead through crisis with situational awareness. Structured succession and crisis management planning increase resilience.
- **Prioritize Stakeholder Engagement and Communication:** Systematic, participatory mechanisms increase trust and promote sustainability. Responsive communication preserves brand equity and facilitates smoother crisis navigation.

Research Implications and Future Directions

BluSmart's case offers fertile ground for research in several domains [60]. Startup Governance Models: Exploring mechanisms balancing founder control with transparency and stakeholder interests. Resource Dependency Management: Investigating diversification strategies in platform-based and asset-light business models. Organizational Design Adaptation: Empirical studies testing contingency theory in high-velocity technology sectors. Behavioral Influences on Financial Governance: Examining how cognitive biases and culture modify financial decision-making.

Regulatory Compliance and Institutional Legitimacy. Understanding structural enablers and barriers to effective compliance. Leadership in Crisis. Evaluating adaptive leadership styles and psychological safety in startup failure contexts. Stakeholder Theory Application: Assessing multi-stakeholder impact and engagement practices in emergent industries.

Final Thoughts

BluSmart's failure is emblematic of how suboptimal structural design across governance, finance, operations, and leadership can intertwine to undermine nascent technology ventures. Effective application of established organizational theories not only explains these failures but also provides a blueprint for constructing adaptive, transparent, and stakeholder-conscious firms.

For practitioners, investors, and regulators aiming to foster sustainable electric mobility ecosystems, BluSmart serves as a cautionary tale reinforcing the imperative of deliberate and theory-driven structural design [61].

References

1. The Economic Times. "India's EV Revolution Slows Down?" <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/industry/auto/auto-news/indias-ev-revolution-slows-down/articleshow/102382626.cms>. 2025.

2. Bloomberg NEF. "EV Outlook" <https://about.bnef.com/electric-vehicle-outlook/>. 2024.
3. Business Standard. "BluSmart: India's Pioneering All-Electric Ride Hailing Startup" https://www.business-standard.com/article/companies/blusmart-a-story-of-ambition-120013000368_1.html. 2020.
4. Financial Times. "Governance Lessons from India's Startup Busts". 2025.
5. French JRP, Raven B. The bases of social power. In D Cartwright (Ed), *Studies in social power*. Institute for Social Research. Summarized in *Organizational Power in Perspective*, ASCE Journal of Leadership and Management. 2009. 9: 150-167.
6. Indira Gandhi National Open University. Unit 8: Power and politics. E Gyan Kosh. <https://egyankosh.ac.in>. 2020.
7. Software Dominos. Organisational culture: The Edgar Schein model. <https://softwaredominos.com>. 2017.
8. Foundations of organizational culture: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Business, Economics and Management*. 2024.
9. Muslim M. The failure of governance and internal controls in preventing fraud: A systematic literature review. *Advances in Management and Applied Research*. 2025. 3: 15-29.
10. Eugster N. Internal governance mechanisms and corporate misconduct. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions & Money*. 2024. 92: 103109.
11. Baiman S. Agency research in managerial accounting: A survey. *Journal of Accounting Literature*. (Synthesized in *A Conceptual Review of Agency Models of Performance Evaluation*, *International Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 2014. 1994. 9: 154-213.
12. Jensen MC, Meckling WH. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*. 1976. 3: 305-360.
13. Pfeffer J, Salancik G R. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper & Row. 1985. 969-970.
14. Granovetter M. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness" *American Journal of Sociology*. 1985. 91: 481-510.
15. Burns T, Stalker G M. *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock Publications. 1961. <https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=2996533>.
16. Lawrence PR, Lorsch JW. *Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press. 1967.
17. Williamson O E. *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications*. New York: Free Press. 1975.
18. Sheffi Y. *The Resilient Enterprise: Overcoming Vulnerability for Competitive Advantage*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 2005.
19. Granlund M, Malmi T. "Moderate Impact of ERPS on Management Accounting: A Lag or Permanent Outcome?" *Management Accounting Research*. 2002. 13: 299-321.
20. French JR, Raven B. "The Bases of Social Power." In D Cartwright (Ed), *Studies in Social Power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research. 1959. 150-167.
21. Schein EH. *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (4th ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 2010. 33: 421-423.
22. Kahneman D, Tversky A. "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk." *Econometrica*. 1979. 47: 263-291.
23. Bloomberg. "BluSmart's Dependency and Governance Issues Exposed" <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-04-15/blusmart-raises-flags-over-governance-and-fleet-dependence>. 2025.
24. Reuters. "Indian e-cab service BluSmart halts operations amid financial probe," <https://www.reuters.com/world/india/indian-electric-cab-service-blusmart-suspends-operations-2025-04-16/>. 2025.
25. Hersh Shefrin, *Beyond Greed and Fear: Understanding Behavioral Finance and the Psychology of Investing* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2002).
26. Daniel Kahneman, Amos Tversky. "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk," *Econometrica*. 1979. 47: 263-291.
27. Michael C Jensen, William H Meckling. "Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure". *Journal of Financial Economics* 3.1976 4: 305-360.
28. John H Davis, F. David Schoorman et al. "Toward a Stewardship Theory of Management". *Academy of Management Review* 22. 1979. 1: 20-47.
29. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). *OECD Principles of Corporate Governance*. <https://www.oecd.org/corporate/principles-corporate-governance.htm>. 2015.
30. The Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). "Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements Regulations". <https://www.sebi.gov.in/legal/regulations/jul-2015/>. 2015.
31. Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO). *Internal Control-Integrated Framework*. <https://www.coso.org>. 2013.
32. Bloomberg. "Founders at the Helm: Governance Challenges in India's Startup Ecosystem". 2025.
33. Harbir Singh, Jeffrey A Sonnenfeld. "Creating Value Through Governance". *MIT Sloan Management Review*. Winter. 2016.
34. Reuters. "SEBI Charges BluSmart Founders with Financial Irregularities". <https://www.reuters.com/world/india/sebi-charges-blusmart-founders-financial-irregularities-2025-07-29/>. 2025.
35. Institute of Internal Auditors. "The Three Lines of Defense in Effective Risk Management and Control". <https://na.theiia.org/standards-guidance/Public Documents/Three-Lines-of-Defense-Model-Updated.pdf>. 2013.
36. McKinsey, Company. "Better Internal Controls for Growing Startups". <https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/risk/our-insights/better-internal-controls-for-growing-startups>. 2013.
37. Tom Burns, GM Stalker. *The Management of Innovation* (London: Tavistock Publications. 1961.
38. Henry Mintzberg. *Structure in Fives: Designing Effective Organizations* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 1983.
39. David J Teece, Gary Pisano, Amy Shuen. "Dynamic Capabilities and Strategic Management". *Strategic Management Journal* 18. 1997. 7: 509-533.
40. McKinsey, IFC. "Urban Transport in India: Opportunities and Risks". <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/>

- automotive-and-assembly/our-insights/urban-transport-in-india-opportunities-and-risks. 2024.
41. Quartz India. "BluSmart's Field Teams Speak Out". <https://qz.com/india>. 2025
 42. John W Meyer, Brian Rowan. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony". *American Journal of Sociology* 83. 1977. 2: 340-363.
 43. Paul J DiMaggio, Walter W Powell. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields". *American Sociological Review* 48. 1983. 2: 147-160.
 44. Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI). "SEBI Regulatory Guidance and Orders". 2025.
 45. Tom R Tyler. *Why People Obey the Law* (New Haven: Yale University Press). 1990.
 46. John Braithwaite. *Defiance in Taxation and Governance* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar). 2002.
 47. Bernard M Bass. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations* (New York: Free Press). 1985.
 48. Paul Hersey, Kenneth H Blanchard. "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership". *Training and Development Journal*. 1969.
 49. Amy C Edmondson. "Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams". *Administrative Science Quarterly* 44. 1999. 2: 350-383.
 50. Michael Gruber. "Entrepreneurial Failure and Founder Rigidity". *Journal of Business Venturing* 25. 2010. 6: 641-658.
 51. Tech Circle. "Inside BluSmart's Leadership Crisis". 2025.
 52. R Edward Freeman. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach* (Boston: Pitman). 1984.
 53. Mitchell RK, Agle BR, Wood D J. "Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts". *Academy of Management Review* 22. 1997. 4: 853-886.
 54. NDTV. "Customers Left Stranded After BluSmart Halt". <https://www.ndtv.com/india-news>. 2025.
 55. Bloomberg. "BluSmart Investors Pull Back Amid Crisis". <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-07-29>. 2025.
 56. The Economic Times. "Environmental Impact of Mobility Service Disruptions". <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com>. 2025.
 57. Jeffrey Pfeffer, Gerald R Salancik. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. 1978.
 58. Michael C Jensen, William H Meckling. "Theory of the Firm". 1976.
 59. Tom Burns, GM Stalker. *The Management of Innovation*. 1961.
 60. John W Meyer, Brian Rowan. "Institutionalized Organizations". 1977.
 61. R Edward Freeman. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. 1984.