International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

An Analysis of Legal Framework and Judicial Trends in India with Respect to Medical Practice and Surgical Care

Ms. Ishika Gupta

ABSTRACT

The interface between medicine and law in India has evolved into one of the most dynamic and consequential domains of contemporary jurisprudence. This research paper undertakes a systematic and comprehensive examination of the legal framework governing medical practice and surgical care in India, tracing its evolution from preconstitutional statutes to modern legislative enactments and judicial pronouncements. The study analyses the multi-layered statutory architecture comprising the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956, the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and the Clinical Establishments (Registration and Regulation) Act, 2010, among other instruments, within which questions of medical accountability are adjudicated.

Special attention is devoted to the landmark jurisprudence developed by the Supreme Court of India and various High Courts, particularly through decisions such as Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha & Ors. (1996), Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab (2005), and Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda (2008), which have collectively sculpted the doctrinal landscape of medical negligence, informed consent, and vicarious liability in India. The paper also investigates contemporary challenges, including the legal status of telemedicine, liability issues arising from robotic surgery, gaps in the legal protection of whistleblowers in healthcare, and the persisting deficiencies in rural medical infrastructure accountability. The research concludes with a set of policy recommendations aimed at fostering a balanced legal regime that adequately compensates aggrieved patients without subjecting competent medical professionals to vexatious litigation.

Keywords: Medical Negligence, Surgical Care, Consumer Protection Act, Informed Consent, Bolam Test, Jacob Mathew, Vicarious Liability, Indian Medical Council, Clinical Establishments, Telemedicine, Medical Jurisprudence, Supreme Court of India.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Context

The relationship between medicine and law is one of ancient provenance, yet its contemporary complexity is uniquely a product of modern institutional development. In India, where a population exceeding 1.4 billion depends on a healthcare system operating under conditions of enormous institutional, geographic, and socioeconomic diversity, the legal regulation of medical practice carries consequences that are simultaneously individual and systemic. A patient who enters a surgical theatre places not merely physical trust but legal vulnerability in the hands of the operating surgeon and the institution that employs that professional. When that trust is betrayed through negligence, incompetence, or institutional failure, the law must provide both redress and deterrence.

The domain of medical law encompasses a diverse array of legal disciplines: tortious liability, contract law, criminal law, consumer protection, constitutional rights jurisprudence, administrative law, and increasingly, biotechnology and digital health regulation. Within this multi-dimensional legal landscape, questions of what constitutes an acceptable standard of care, what information a patient must be given before consenting to surgery, and who bears liability when outcomes are adverse are no longer merely academic inquiries. They are mattering those courts, tribunals, regulatory commissions, and legislature in India address with increasing frequency and analytical sophistication.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Despite the substantial body of judicial decisions and legislative provisions that collectively govern medical practice in India, the legal framework remains characterised by significant fragmentation, interpretive inconsistency, and institutional inadequacy. The tension between the physician's professional autonomy and the patient's right to informed decision-making continues to generate contested litigation. Consumer forums and civil courts often apply divergent standards of negligence, creating uncertainty for practitioners. The criminalisation of inadvertent medical error under Section 304-A of the Indian Penal Code has been criticised as a disproportionate response that chills conscientious medical risk-taking. Furthermore, the emergence of telemedicine, artificial intelligence-assisted diagnostics, and robotic surgery has introduced categories of liability for which the existing legal instruments are manifestly ill-equipped.

1.3 Research Questions

This paper is guided by the following primary research questions:

1. Does the current Indian legal framework adequately protect the rights of patients and the professional interests of medical practitioners?
2. To what extent do judicial pronouncements of the Supreme Court of India provide coherent and consistent doctrinal standards for the adjudication of medical negligence claims?
3. What legislative and regulatory reforms are required to address the normative and institutional gaps in the existing framework?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This research paper pursues the following primary objectives:

1. To trace the historical evolution of the legal regulation of medical practice in India, from early statutory interventions to the present-day legislative architecture.
2. To undertake a systematic analysis of the constitutional, statutory, and common law frameworks applicable to medical practitioners and surgical care providers.
3. To critically examine landmark judicial pronouncements of the Supreme Court of India and High Courts on medical negligence, informed consent, and institutional liability.
4. To identify doctrinal inconsistencies and normative gaps within the existing legal framework.
5. To offer evidence-based recommendations directed at legislative reform and judicial harmonisation.

1.5 Research Methodology

This paper employs a predominantly doctrinal research methodology, combining primary legal sources — constitutional provisions, statutes, delegated legislation, and judicial decisions — with secondary sources comprising peer-reviewed academic articles, law commission reports, regulatory agency documents, and comparative legal scholarship. The analytical framework is supplemented by an element of comparative jurisprudence, drawing upon the English law origins of the Bolam test and its subsequent evolution, as

well as developments in American and Australian medical law, to provide normative reference points for evaluating the Indian position.

1.6 Scope and Limitations

The scope of this paper extends across the constitutional, statutory, and judicial dimensions of medical law as applicable to allopathic medical practitioners and surgical care providers within India. While reference is made to traditional systems of medicine where relevant, a comprehensive treatment of AYUSH regulation lies beyond its scope. Similarly, the paper does not undertake a detailed analysis of pharmaceutical regulation, clinical trial law, or public health emergency legislation, though these areas necessarily intersect with the primary subject matter.

2. HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF MEDICAL LAW IN INDIA

2.1 Pre-Colonial and Colonial Antecedents

The regulation of medical practice in the Indian subcontinent has historical roots that predate British colonial administration. Ancient texts such as the Charaka Samhita and Sushruta Samhita articulated codes of professional medical ethics, including duties of confidentiality, prohibitions against exploiting patients, and affirmations of the physician's obligation to exercise skill and diligence. These normative frameworks, though non-juridical in the modern sense, reflect an early recognition that medical practice carries moral obligations that may be socially enforced.

The formal legal regulation of medicine in British India was initiated through the Madras Medical Registration Act of 1914 and the Indian Medical Degrees Act of 1916, which sought to regulate the grant of medical degrees and prevent unqualified persons from assuming medical titles. The Epidemic Diseases Act of 1897, enacted in response to the bubonic plague epidemic, conferred extraordinary powers upon provincial governments to control outbreaks, signalling an early intersection of public health governance and legal coercion.

The registration of medical practitioners in various provinces during the colonial era was governed by provincial legislation, leading to considerable variation in qualification standards, registration requirements, and disciplinary mechanisms. This fragmentation was a major impetus for post-independence legislative consolidation.

2.2 Post-Independence Legislative Consolidation

The promulgation of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956, represented the first major post-independence effort to create a uniform national framework for the regulation of medical education and professional practice. The Act established the Medical Council of India (MCI) as a statutory regulatory body vested with the power to maintain the Indian Medical Register, prescribe minimum standards for medical education, and advise the Central Government on matters of medical policy.

The Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002, framed under the 1956 Act, operationalised the substantive duties of registered medical practitioners, addressing issues ranging from the maintenance of medical records and prescribing practices to the prohibition of association with unregistered practitioners and the regulation of pharmaceutical company relationships.

2.3 Replacement of the Medical Council of India

A significant structural development occurred with the enactment of the National Medical Commission Act, 2019, which dissolved the Medical Council of India following sustained criticism for corruption, opacity, and regulatory capture. The National Medical

Commission (NMC) established thereunder comprises four autonomous boards: the Under-Graduate Medical Education Board, the Post-Graduate Medical Education Board, the Medical Assessment and Rating Board, and the Ethics and Medical Registration Board. This institutional restructuring sought to introduce greater transparency, accountability, and competency-based assessment into the regulation of medical education and professional conduct.

3. CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Right to Health as a Fundamental Right

The Constitution of India does not expressly guarantee a fundamental right to health. However, through a series of innovative constitutional interpretations, the Supreme Court has progressively read the right to health into Article 21, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty. The foundational proposition — that the right to life cannot be reduced to mere animal existence but encompasses the right to live with human dignity — was articulated in

Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi (1981) 1 SCC 608, and subsequently extended in Consumer Education and Research Centre v. Union of India (1995) 3 SCC 42, where the Court affirmed that the right to health is integral to the right to life.

In Paschim Banga Khet Mazdoor Samity v. State of West Bengal (1996) 4 SCC 37, the Supreme Court held that the failure of government hospitals to provide emergency medical treatment constituted a violation of Article 21. The Court directed the establishment of a network of primary health centres and district hospitals adequately equipped to handle emergency cases, thereby translating constitutional doctrine into positive obligations on the State.

3.2 Directive Principles of State Policy

Articles 38, 39, 41, and 47 of the Constitution, which fall within Part IV (Directive Principles of State Policy), provide the normative constitutional basis for State obligations in healthcare. Article 47 explicitly charges the State with the duty of raising the level of nutrition and the standard of living of its people and the improvement of public health. While Directive Principles are not enforceable as rights by courts, the Supreme Court has consistently held that they are fundamental to governance and must inform the interpretation of fundamental rights and the exercise of legislative and executive power.

3.3 Legislative Competence and Regulatory Authority

The constitutional distribution of legislative power between the Union and the States, as contained in the Seventh Schedule, is relevant to the regulation of medical practice. Entry 66 of the Union List empowers Parliament to legislate on the coordination and determination of standards in institutions for higher education or research and scientific and technical institutions. Entry 26 of the Concurrent List covers legal, medical, and other professions, thereby enabling both Parliament and State Legislatures to regulate medical practice, subject to the principle of parliamentary supremacy in case of repugnancy under Article 254.

3.4 Right to Informed Consent as a Constitutional Right

The Supreme Court has recognised the right of a patient to informed consent as an aspect of the right to personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21. In Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda (2008) 2 SCC 1, the Supreme Court articulated a comprehensive framework for informed consent in surgical practice, drawing upon constitutional values while also developing the common law doctrine. The foundational proposition is that a medical procedure performed upon a person without their free and informed consent constitutes a violation of bodily integrity, which is an essential element of personal liberty.

4. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK: KEY LEGISLATIONS

4.1 The National Medical Commission Act, 2019

The National Medical Commission Act, 2019 (NMCA) is the primary legislation governing the regulation of medical education and professional practice in India. It establishes the National Medical Commission as a statutory body with the overarching mandate of maintaining a high quality and high standards in medical education and training. The Ethics and Medical Registration Board, constituted under the NMCA, is specifically vested with the power to register medical practitioners, maintain the National Medical Register, and adjudicate complaints of professional misconduct.

Section 30 of the NMCA provides for the framing of a Code of Professional and Ethical Conduct for registered medical practitioners, which constitutes the regulatory baseline against which allegations of professional misconduct are assessed. The Code addresses matters of patient confidentiality, duties in emergencies, restrictions on advertisements, and prohibitions on unethical practices such as fee-splitting with diagnostic centres.

4.2 Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994

The Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994, as amended by the 2011 Amendment Act, provides a comprehensive legal framework for the removal, storage, and transplantation of human organs and tissues. The Act prohibits commercial transactions in human organs, creates the offence of trading in organs, and establishes authorisation committees for the approval of living non-related donors. It also makes provision for presumed consent in respect of unclaimed bodies in hospitals, consistent with internationally recognised principles of increasing organ availability.

The Act imposes specific obligations on hospitals registered as transplant centres, including the maintenance of transplant registries, the submission of regular returns to the authorities, and the display of information regarding organ donation in hospital premises. Violations of the Act attract significant criminal penalties, including imprisonment of up to ten years and fines.

4.3 Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994

The PCPNDT Act, 1994, as amended in 2003, prohibits the use of genetic technologies for the purpose of sex determination and sex-selective abortion. The Act mandates the registration of all genetic counselling centres, genetic laboratories, genetic clinics, ultrasound clinics, and imaging centres, and imposes record-keeping obligations designed to facilitate regulatory oversight. Medical practitioners who perform sex determination tests face criminal liability under the Act, including imprisonment of up to three years for a first offence and up to five years for subsequent offences.

4.4 The Clinical Establishments (Registration and Regulation) Act, 2010

The Clinical Establishments Act, 2010, establishes a framework for the registration and regulation of clinical establishments throughout India, with the objective of prescribing minimum standards of facilities and services. The Act defines a clinical establishment broadly to include hospitals, maternity homes, nursing homes, dispensaries, clinics, sanatoriums, and institutions connected with medicine. The failure of an establishment to maintain the prescribed minimum standards may constitute prima facie evidence of negligence in litigation arising from adverse patient outcomes.

4.5 The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017

The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, represents a paradigm shift in the legal treatment of persons with mental illness, moving from a custodial and paternalistic model to one grounded in rights, dignity, and the principle of minimum restriction. The Act recognises the right of every person to make decisions about their mental health treatment, including the right to give and withdraw consent for any treatment, subject

only to specified exceptions. It also affirms that persons with mental illness retain all rights equal to those of other persons, and prohibits the use of electroconvulsive therapy without anaesthesia.

5. CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT AND MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE

5.1 The Landmark Decision in V.P. Shantha (1996)

The single most consequential judicial determination in the domain of Indian medical consumer law is the Supreme Court's decision in Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha & Ors. AIR 1996 SC 550. Prior to this decision, there existed judicial disagreement as to whether medical services constituted a 'service' within the meaning of Section 2(1)(o) of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. The IMA contended that medicine was a profession and not a commercial service, and therefore fell outside the ambit of the consumer protection legislation.

The Supreme Court, in an authoritative three-judge bench decision, held that medical services rendered for payment are squarely within the definition of 'service' under the Act. The Court distinguished between services rendered free of charge — held to be outside the Act's ambit — and services rendered for a fee or charge, which were held to constitute deficiency in service if rendered negligently. This distinction subsequently gave rise to considerable litigation concerning the treatment of partially subsidised services.

5.2 Structure of the Consumer Redressal Mechanism

The Consumer Protection Act, 2019, which repealed and replaced the 1986 Act, maintains the three-tier consumer redressal structure consisting of District Commissions, State Commissions, and the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (NCDRC). Under the revised pecuniary jurisdiction introduced by the 2019 Act, District Commissions hear complaints involving claims up to Rs. 1 crore, State Commissions hear claims between Rs. 1 crore and Rs. 10 crore, and the NCDRC exercises original jurisdiction over complaints exceeding Rs. 10 crore.

The 2019 Act also introduced the concept of mediation as a primary dispute resolution mechanism, with Mediation Cells established at each level of the consumer forum structure. In medical negligence matters, where the complexity of technical evidence frequently makes adversarial litigation protracted and expensive, the availability of mediation as an alternative is a significant procedural development.

5.3 Standard of Proof and Expert Evidence

In consumer negligence proceedings, the standard of proof is that of preponderance of probabilities rather than the more demanding criminal standard of proof beyond reasonable doubt. The NCDRC has consistently held that expert medical evidence is essential in medical negligence cases. The leading decision in Kusum Sharma & Ors. v. Batra Hospital & Medical Research Centre (2010) 3 SCC 480 affirmed that a mere adverse outcome does not constitute negligence, and that the mere fact that a doctor took a different course from that which another might have taken does not in itself constitute negligence.

6. CRIMINAL LIABILITY IN MEDICAL PRACTICE

6.1 Section 304-A of the Indian Penal Code

Section 304-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, which prescribes criminal punishment for causing death by a rash or negligent act not amounting to culpable homicide, constitutes the primary instrument through which criminal liability has been sought to be imposed on medical practitioners in India. The section, which provides for imprisonment of up to two years or a fine or both, was originally enacted in a general context and was not specifically designed to address medical negligence.

The application of Section 304-A to medical practice has been deeply controversial. Critics argue that equ-

ating inadvertent medical error with criminal rashness or negligence imposes a disproportionate legal burden on practitioners engaged in inherently uncertain and risk-laden professional activities, and that the spectre of criminal prosecution deters practitioners from documenting adverse outcomes or performing high-risk procedures necessary to save lives.

6.2 The Jacob Mathew Standard

The definitive judicial articulation of the standard required for criminal liability in medical cases is found in the Supreme Court's five-judge bench decision in Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab & Anr. (2005) 6 SCC 1. The decision represents the most comprehensive exposition of the criminal liability of medical practitioners in Indian law and remains the governing authority in this area.

The Court held that a medical professional is not criminally liable merely because they chose a course of treatment that subsequently proved to be ineffective. To establish criminal negligence under Section 304-A IPC, it must be shown that the accused was guilty of such a degree of negligence as went beyond a mere matter of compensation — involving gross and culpable neglect or failure to exercise reasonable and proper care. The Court further directed that before arresting a medical practitioner for alleged negligence, the police are required to obtain an independent and credible medical opinion confirming prima facie negligence, and that registration of a criminal case against a doctor should not be a routine or casual exercise.

6.3 Subsequent Judicial Developments

Following the Jacob Mathew decision, the Supreme Court in Martin F. D'Souza v. Mohd. Ishfaq (2009) 3 SCC 1 reiterated that consumer forums, civil courts, and criminal courts should all be guided by a higher threshold when evaluating the conduct of medical professionals. The Court controversially suggested that all medical negligence complaints be first referred to expert medical committees before courts take cognisance — a proposition subsequently qualified in V. Kishan Rao v. Nikhil Super Speciality Hospital (2010) 5 SCC 513.

6.4 Section 304 and Other IPC Provisions

Beyond Section 304-A, other provisions of the IPC may have application in extreme cases of medical wrongdoing. Section 304 (culpable homicide not amounting to murder) may be applicable where the element of knowledge of the likelihood of death is established. Section 338 (causing grievous hurt by an act endangering life) may be relevant in cases of surgical harm, while Section 340 (wrongful confinement) and Section 351 (assault) have been invoked in cases of non-consensual procedures.

7. JUDICIAL TRENDS: LANDMARK DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT

7.1 Formative Period: 1993–2000

The formative period of Supreme Court jurisprudence on medical negligence was characterised by the initial judicial grappling with the appropriate doctrinal framework for evaluating healthcare professional conduct. In Dr. Laxman Balkrishna Joshi v. Dr. Trimbak Bapu Godbole AIR 1969 SC 128, the Supreme Court formulated the proposition that a doctor who undertakes medical treatment impliedly contracts with the patient to possess a reasonable degree of skill and knowledge, and to exercise a reasonable degree of care, and that breach of these duties is actionable.

The V.P. Shantha decision of 1996 fundamentally restructured the procedural landscape by opening consumer forums as accessible venues for medical negligence redressal. The practical consequence was a significant increase in medical negligence complaints, as the consumer forum structure was designed to be more accessible, speedier, and less expensive than conventional civil litigation.

7.2 Consolidation Period: 2000–2010

7.2.1 Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab (2005)

As discussed in the preceding chapter, the Jacob Mathew decision is the most consequential single pronouncement in Indian medical law. Its significance extends beyond the specific question of criminal liability to its comprehensive reformulation of the relationship between legal standards and medical professional judgment. The Court's adoption of the Bolam test from English law, coupled with explicit guidance regarding the prosecution of medical practitioners, sought to balance the interests of patients in legal redressal with those of practitioners in freedom from vexatious prosecution.

7.2.2 Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda (2008)

In Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda (2008) 2 SCC 1, the Supreme Court undertook its most sustained engagement with the doctrine of informed consent. The facts involved a laparoscopic procedure performed to investigate infertility, during which the surgeon — without obtaining prior consent — proceeded to perform a hysterectomy and bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy upon discovering fibroids, cysts, and evidence of endometriosis.

The Court held that the doctrine of informed consent requires a medical practitioner to disclose to the patient all information that a reasonable person in the patient's position would want to know before deciding whether to undergo a proposed procedure, including the diagnosis, the proposed procedure, its benefits and risks, and the available alternatives. The Court specified that consent obtained for one procedure does not authorise an attendant or related procedure, however medically indicated such a procedure may be.

7.2.3 Spring Meadows Hospital v. Harjol Ahluwalia (1998)

In Spring Meadows Hospital & Anr. v. Harjol Ahluwalia (1998) 4 SCC 39, the Supreme Court confirmed that a hospital can be held vicariously liable for the negligence of doctors and nurses in its employ. This decision significantly expanded the scope of institutional liability and created a strong incentive for hospitals to implement quality assurance mechanisms and adequate supervision protocols.

7.3 Contemporary Period: 2010–Present

7.3.1 V. Kishan Rao v. Nikhil Super Speciality Hospital (2010)

In V. Kishan Rao v. Nikhil Super Speciality Hospital & Anr. (2010) 5 SCC 513, the Supreme Court held that the requirement of expert evidence is not absolute, and that consumer forums retain the jurisdiction and competence to decide cases where the evidence adduced by the parties is sufficient to enable a determination. This decision restored the operational autonomy of consumer forums in medical negligence adjudication.

7.3.2 Nizam Institute of Medical Sciences v. Prasanth S. Dhananka (2009)

In Nizam Institute of Medical Sciences v. Prasanth S. Dhananka & Ors. (2009) 6 SCC 1, involving surgical negligence resulting in permanent paraplegia, the Supreme Court awarded compensation exceeding Rs. 1 crore — one of the largest medical negligence awards in India at that time. The decision introduced a structured approach to the computation of damages, taking into account future medical expenses, loss of earning capacity, the cost of attendant care, and pain and suffering.

7.3.3 Malay Kumar Ganguly v. Sukumar Mukherjee (2009)

In Malay Kumar Ganguly v. Sukumar Mukherjee (2009) 9 SCC 221, the Supreme Court imposed liability on four of the five defendant doctors whose negligent treatment of a patient suffering from Toxic Epidermal Necrolysis had resulted in her death. The Court noted that the failure to identify and properly

treat a known serious adverse drug reaction constituted a departure from the standard of care. The decision demonstrates that where negligence is established through robust expert evidence, courts will not hesitate to impose substantial awards.

8. STANDARD OF CARE AND THE BOLAM–BOLITHO TEST IN INDIA

8.1 The Bolam Test: Origins and Content

The Bolam test originates from the English decision in Bolam v. Friern Hospital Management Committee [1957] 1 WLR 582, in which McNair J. directed the jury that a doctor is not negligent if he acts in accordance with a practice accepted as proper by a responsible body of medical men skilled in that particular art, even if there is a body of medical opinion that takes a contrary view. In India, the Bolam test was explicitly adopted in the Jacob Mathew decision and has since constituted the foundational criterion for determining whether a medical practitioner's conduct meets the required standard of care.

8.2 The Bolitho Qualification

The English House of Lords in Bolitho v. City and Hackney Health Authority [1998] AC 232 introduced an important qualification to the Bolam test, holding that the body of medical opinion relied upon by the defendant must itself be capable of withstanding logical analysis. The logical basis of the opinion must be demonstrable and must not have been reached without properly weighing the risks against the benefits. The Bolitho qualification prevents the Bolam test from being used as an absolute shield against liability wherever the defendant can identify some medical practitioners who would have acted in the same manner. Indian courts have been inconsistent in the application of the Bolitho qualification. While some High Court decisions have explicitly applied the Bolitho reasoning, the Supreme Court has not yet provided a definitive ruling on the extent to which the Bolitho qualification modifies the Bolam test as adopted in India. This represents a significant area of doctrinal uncertainty.

8.3 Res Ipsa Loquitur in Medical Cases

The doctrine of res ipsa loquitur ('the thing speaks for itself') permits an inference of negligence to be drawn from the circumstances of an accident or injury, in cases where the very occurrence of the injury implies negligence, such as where a surgical instrument is left inside a patient following an operation.

The leading Indian decision on this doctrine in the medical context is Achutrao Haribhau Khodwa & Ors. v. State of Maharashtra & Ors. (1996) 2 SCC 634, in which the Supreme Court applied the doctrine in a case where a mop had been left in the abdomen of a patient following a tubectomy operation, resulting in peritonitis and death. The Court held that the presence of the mop in the patient's body was itself sufficient evidence of negligence, and that the burden accordingly shifted to the defendants to explain how the outcome could have occurred without negligence on their part.

9. DOCTRINE OF INFORMED CONSENT IN SURGICAL PRACTICE

9.1 Conceptual Foundations

The doctrine of informed consent rests upon two foundational principles of biomedical ethics: respect for patient autonomy and the avoidance of harm through non-disclosure. In the surgical context, the doctrine demands that before a patient submits to a significant procedure, the operating surgeon must ensure that the patient has received, understood, and freely accepted the information necessary to make a voluntary and rational decision regarding the proposed intervention.

The concept of informed consent represents the convergence of several legal doctrines. From the law of battery, it derives the principle that any touching of a person without consent is unlawful. From the law of

negligence, it derives the standard of reasonable disclosure. From constitutional law, it derives the principle that bodily integrity is an aspect of personal liberty under Article 21.

9.2 Elements of Valid Consent

For consent to constitute a valid legal authorisation for a medical procedure, three elements must be present: the patient must have the capacity to make the relevant decision; the consent must be voluntary, free from coercion or undue influence; and the patient must have received sufficient information about the procedure to constitute informed agreement.

The question of capacity is particularly significant in the surgical context, as patients are often in pain, under sedation, or emotionally distressed at the point at which consent must be obtained. The law requires that capacity be evaluated on a decision-specific basis: a patient may have the capacity to consent to a minor procedure while lacking the capacity to consent to a more complex intervention with far-reaching consequences.

9.3 Emergency Exception and Extension of Procedure

The principle that consent obtained for one procedure does not authorise an extension to a further procedure admits of a recognised exception in genuine surgical emergencies. Where, in the course of performing a consented procedure, the surgeon discovers a condition that poses an immediate and life-threatening risk, and where the patient is under anaesthesia and cannot be consulted, the surgeon is permitted to extend the operation to address the emergent condition without prior specific consent.

The conditions for the valid exercise of the emergency exception were examined in the Samira Kohli case. The Court held that the exception requires a genuine emergency — not merely medical desirability — that the patient's life or serious physical harm must be immediately at risk, and that the extension of the procedure must be the least invasive means of addressing the emergency. The Court specifically held that the finding of nonlife-threatening fibroids and ovarian cysts did not satisfy these conditions, and that the performance of a hysterectomy and bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy in those circumstances constituted battery.

9.4 Consent in Paediatric and Mentally Ill Patients

Special rules govern the obtaining of consent in respect of patients who are legally or factually incapable of giving valid consent. In the case of minor patients, consent is ordinarily obtained from the parent or legal guardian, though courts have recognised the developing autonomy of mature minors and required that their assent, if not technically valid consent, be sought. The Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, provides a structured framework for the treatment of persons with mental illness, including provisions for advance directives and the constitution of nominated representatives.

10. VICARIOUS LIABILITY OF HOSPITALS AND HEALTHCARE INSTITUTIONS

10.1 The Doctrine and Its Application in Healthcare

The doctrine of vicarious liability, which imposes legal responsibility upon an employer for the torts committed by an employee in the course of employment, has profound implications for the organisation of healthcare delivery. In the context of hospitals and multi-disciplinary healthcare institutions, where complex procedures involve coordinated teams of surgeons, anaesthetists, nurses, and paramedical staff, the identification of the responsible party for an adverse outcome is frequently a contested legal question.

The general principle, as affirmed by the Supreme Court in Spring Meadows Hospital (1998) and subsequent decisions, is that a hospital is vicariously liable for the negligent acts of doctors and other healthcare workers employed by it in the course of their employment. The hospital's liability is not merely

secondary or dependent upon the primary liability of the individual practitioner; it is a direct liability founded upon the employment relationship and the non-delegable duty of care owed by the institution to its patients.

10.2 Independent Contractors and Visiting Physicians

A significant doctrinal complication arises in the common Indian healthcare arrangement under which surgeons, specialists, and consultants practise at hospitals on a visiting or fee-sharing basis, without formal employment contracts. Indian courts have generally taken a functional rather than formalistic approach to this question, focusing on whether the hospital held itself out to the patient as the provider of the service, whether the hospital determined the fee, and whether the patient would reasonably have understood themselves to be engaging the hospital rather than the individual practitioner. Where these factors are present, hospitals have been held vicariously liable notwithstanding the absence of formal employment contracts with the treating practitioners.

10.3 Institutional Negligence as a Separate Head

Beyond vicarious liability for the acts of individual employees, courts have increasingly recognised the concept of institutional or systemic negligence, under which a hospital may be held directly liable for failures of system, process, and infrastructure that contribute to patient harm, regardless of whether individual practitioners were personally at fault. This includes failures of sterilisation of surgical instruments, inadequate maintenance of equipment, deficiencies in nursing staff-to-patient ratios, failures of supervision and credentialing, and the maintenance of environments conducive to hospital-acquired infections.

11. CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES: TELEMEDICINE, ROBOTIC SURGERY, AND AI

11.1 Telemedicine and Remote Medical Care

The Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020, issued by the Board of Governors in supersession of the Medical Council of India, constituted India's first formal legal framework for the practice of telemedicine. The Guidelines permit registered medical practitioners to provide consultations through various communication technologies, including video calls, voice calls, text messages, and email.

The legal challenges unique to telemedicine include the determination of the standard of care applicable to remote consultations, where the practitioner is unable to conduct a physical examination; the jurisdictional question of where a telemedicine consultation occurs for the purposes of legal proceedings; the privacy and data protection obligations arising from the transmission of clinical information through digital channels; and the liability of the technology platform through which the consultation is mediated.

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, enacted in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's recognition of the right to privacy as a fundamental right in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India (2017) 10 SCC 1, provides a regulatory framework for the processing of personal data, including health data, with significant implications for telemedicine platforms.

11.2 Robotic and Computer-Assisted Surgery

Robotic and computer-assisted surgery systems have been in clinical use in India since the early 2010s, primarily in tertiary care centres and private hospitals in metropolitan areas. These systems present novel questions of liability that the existing tort and consumer protection frameworks are ill-equipped to address. The attribution of responsibility for harm arising in the course of robotic surgery may involve the treating surgeon, the hospital, the manufacturer of the robotic system, the software developer whose algorithms guide the system's responses, and the maintenance contractor responsible for the system's mechanical

integrity. The application of products liability doctrine, professional negligence doctrine, and vicarious liability doctrine all require integration within a coherent analytical framework that Indian law has not yet provided.

11.3 Artificial Intelligence in Diagnostics and Treatment

Artificial intelligence systems are increasingly deployed in the analysis of radiological images, pathological specimens, and genomic data in Indian healthcare settings. The legal challenges presented by AI-assisted diagnostics include the question of liability allocation when an AI system provides an erroneous diagnostic recommendation that is acted upon by a physician to the patient's detriment. Is the physician negligent for relying upon the AI recommendation? Is the hospital negligent for deploying the AI system without adequate validation? Is the AI developer liable under products liability doctrine? These questions remain largely unanswered in Indian law.

11.4 Right to Medical Records and Data Privacy

The right of patients to access their medical records has been recognised by Indian courts as an aspect of the right to information and the right to personal liberty under Article 21. The Supreme Court in Mohinder Singh Chawla v. State of Punjab (1997) held that hospitals may not unreasonably withhold records from patients or their authorised representatives. This principle has been reinforced by the obligations imposed by the MCI Ethics Regulations, 2002, which require practitioners to maintain accurate medical records and make them available to patients.

12. COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

12.1 England and Wales

The English law of medical negligence, from which Indian law has drawn most significantly through the Bolam and Bolitho decisions, has continued to evolve. The Montgomery v. Lanarkshire Health Board [2015] AC 1430 decision effected a fundamental shift in the informed consent standard, replacing the practitioner-oriented Bolam test with a patient-centred standard under which the test for disclosure of risk is what the particular patient, in their specific circumstances, would want to know. The Montgomery standard represents a more expansive protection for patient autonomy than the Indian position as currently articulated.

12.2 United States

The United States does not possess a uniform national framework for medical malpractice law, which is primarily a matter of state common law and statute. The Canterbury v. Spence 464 F.2d 772 (D.C. Cir. 1972) decision established a patient-centred standard of informed consent disclosure similar in conception to the Montgomery standard. American law is also characterised by the extensive use of expert witnesses, the availability of punitive damages in cases of egregious negligence, and the significant influence of tort reform legislation enacted in several states, which have introduced caps on non-economic damages in medical malpractice cases.

12.3 Australia

The High Court of Australia in Rogers v. Whitaker (1992) 175 CLR 479 departed from the Bolam test in the context of informed consent, adopting a standard of what a reasonable patient in the plaintiff's position would want to know. The subsequent enactments of Civil Liability Acts in various Australian states introduced structural tort reforms, including limitations on personal injury damages, Good Samaritan provisions protecting emergency assistance providers, and proportionate liability rules relevant to multi-defendant medical cases.

12.4 Lessons for India

The comparative analysis reveals several significant lessons for the development of Indian medical law. First, the movement toward patient-centred standards of informed consent disclosure suggests that India's current Samira Kohli framework, while progressive, may benefit from further refinement. Second, the American experience with tort reform highlights the tension between access to compensation and the containment of defensive medical practice. Third, the Australian proportionate liability model offers a potential framework for resolving complex multi-party liability questions presented by robotic surgery and AI-assisted diagnosis.

13. CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND GAPS IN THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

13.1 Fragmentation and Institutional Inconsistency

The most fundamental structural deficiency of the Indian legal framework for medical liability is its fragmentation across multiple institutional and normative domains. A single episode of medical negligence may simultaneously give rise to a consumer complaint before the NCDRC, a criminal prosecution under Section 304-A IPC, a disciplinary complaint before the Ethics and Medical Registration Board of the NMC, a civil suit in the High Court, and proceedings before the relevant State Human Rights Commission. Each of these forums applies different standards, follows different procedures, and may reach different conclusions on substantially identical facts.

13.2 The Defensive Medicine Problem

The combination of criminal liability under Section 304-A IPC, expanding consumer forum jurisdiction, and large-scale media coverage of medical negligence cases has contributed to a significant culture of defensive medicine in India. Physicians order diagnostic tests beyond what clinical judgment requires, avoid performing high-risk procedures for which they are technically competent, decline to treat indigent patients who are less likely to have access to legal redress, and maintain excessive documentation primarily for litigation risk management purposes. The social costs of defensive medicine — in unnecessary expenditure, delayed care, and reduced access for vulnerable populations — are difficult to quantify but widely acknowledged.

13.3 Access to Justice for Patients

Notwithstanding the expansion of consumer forum jurisdiction and the reduction in formal barriers to medical negligence complaints, the ability of aggrieved patients to meaningfully access legal remedies remains severely constrained. The cost of obtaining expert medical opinion necessary to substantiate a negligence claim, the complexity of medical evidence, the reluctance of medical professionals to testify against colleagues, the length of proceedings, and the absence of any mechanism for conditional fee arrangements collectively limit access to justice for the majority of affected patients.

13.4 Rural Healthcare and Regulatory Gaps

The legal framework for medical accountability operates primarily within a metropolitan and urban institutional context. The provision of medical services in rural India — by village-level practitioners, auxiliary nurse midwives, ASHAs, and practitioners of traditional medicine — operates largely outside the ambit of the legal framework described in this paper. The extension of effective legal accountability to this significant dimension of Indian healthcare delivery remains an unaddressed challenge of considerable social importance.

14. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

14.1 Legislative Recommendations

On the basis of the foregoing analysis, the following legislative reforms are recommended:

- Enact a comprehensive Medical Negligence Act providing a unified substantive and procedural framework for the adjudication of medical liability claims, specifying the applicable standard of care, the requirements of informed consent, the rules of evidence, and the bases for compensation.
- Amend Section 304-A of the Indian Penal Code to introduce a specific provision applicable to medical practitioners, requiring the establishment of gross negligence as a condition of criminal liability, and incorporating the procedural safeguards articulated in Jacob Mathew as statutory requirements.
- Develop a dedicated Medical Accidents and Compensation Act providing nofault compensation for serious adverse medical events, funded through a combination of practitioner levies and public health contributions.
- Introduce mandatory notification requirements for adverse surgical events, with whistleblower protections for healthcare workers who report adverse outcomes in good faith.
- Amend the Clinical Establishments Act, 2010, to prescribe explicit minimum standards for the obtainment and documentation of informed consent, the management of surgical complications, and the investigation of adverse events.

14.2 Judicial and Regulatory Recommendations

- The Supreme Court should, in an appropriate case, expressly pronounce upon the applicability of the Bolitho qualification to the Bolam test as adopted in India, providing clear guidance to lower courts and consumer forums.
- The Supreme Court should revisit the informed consent standard in light of the Montgomery decision, with a view to adopting a patient-centred disclosure standard that better reflects the constitutional commitment to individual autonomy.
- The National Medical Commission should establish a transparent and expeditious disciplinary procedure before the Ethics and Medical Registration Board, with clearly defined grounds for professional misconduct and a graduated scale of sanctions.
- Consumer forums should develop a roster of empanelled medical experts in each specialty, available to be appointed as assessors in complex medical negligence cases, to improve the quality and consistency of technical fact-finding.

14.3 Recommendations for Emerging Technologies

- Develop a specific regulatory and liability framework for AI-assisted medical devices and diagnostic systems, drawing upon the European Union's AI Act and the US FDA's regulatory pathway for Software as a Medical Device as comparative reference points.
- Extend the Telemedicine Practice Guidelines to address the specific liability issues of asynchronous telemedicine, cross-border telemedicine, and AImediated triage systems.
- Enact implementing regulations under the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, specifically addressing health data processed in the context of telemedicine and electronic health records.

14.4 Conclusion

This paper has undertaken a comprehensive analysis of the legal framework and judicial trends governing medical practice and surgical care in India. The analysis reveals a legal landscape of considerable richness and doctrinal sophistication, shaped by landmark judicial decisions, a diverse body of legislation, and an

increasingly engaged regulatory structure, but also characterised by significant fragmentation, institutional inconsistency, and normative gaps that have yet to be adequately addressed.

The foundational tension of Indian medical law — between the legitimate interests of patients in effective legal redressal for preventable harm and the equally legitimate interests of practitioners in freedom from vexatious, disproportionate, or criminalising legal exposure — is one that no single legislative instrument or judicial doctrine can resolve. It requires continuous institutional attention, collaborative engagement between the medical and legal professions, and a willingness to learn from both domestic experience and international comparative developments.

The emergence of telemedicine, robotic surgery, and artificial intelligence in diagnostics and treatment has introduced a new dimension of urgency to the project of legal reform. The legal framework that applies to contemporary medical practice in India was largely designed for a pre-digital institutional context, and requires systematic modernisation if it is to provide adequate protection for patients, clarity for practitioners, and accountability for institutions in an era of rapidly evolving healthcare technology.

The ultimate measure of any legal framework for medical practice is not the sophistication of its doctrinal architecture but the degree to which it succeeds in promoting patient safety, enabling access to justice for those who suffer harm, and fostering the conditions in which competent, conscientious medical practitioners can exercise their professional judgment without the paralysis of excessive legal anxiety. India's medical law has made substantial progress toward these objectives; the distance that remains to be traversed is, however, no less substantial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: Constitutional Provisions

1. Constitution of India, 1950, Articles 14, 19, 21, 23, 24, 38, 39, 41, 47; Seventh Schedule — Union List Entry 66, Concurrent List Entry 26.

Primary Sources: Statutes

1. Epidemic Diseases Act, 1897 (Act 3 of 1897).
2. Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Act 45 of 1860), Sections 304, 304-A, 338, 340, 351.
3. Indian Medical Degrees Act, 1916 (Act 1 of 1916).
4. Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (Act 23 of 1940).
5. Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (Act 102 of 1956).
6. Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues Act, 1994 (Act 42 of 1994), as amended by the Transplantation of Human Organs and Tissues (Amendment) Act, 2011.
7. Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques Act, 1994 (Act 57 of 1994), as amended in 2003.
8. Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (Act 68 of 1986) [repealed].
9. Clinical Establishments (Registration and Regulation) Act, 2010 (Act 23 of 2010).
10. Mental Healthcare Act, 2017 (Act 10 of 2017).
11. National Medical Commission Act, 2019 (Act 30 of 2019).
12. Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (Act 35 of 2019).
13. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (Act 22 of 2023).

Primary Sources: Delegated Legislation and Guidelines

1. Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002.
2. Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020 (Board of Governors, MCI).

Primary Sources: Cases — Supreme Court of India

1. Dr. Laxman Balkrishna Joshi v. Dr. Trimbak Bapu Godbole & Anr., AIR 1969 SC 128.
2. Francis Coralie Mullin v. Administrator, Union Territory of Delhi, (1981) 1 SCC 608.
3. Consumer Education and Research Centre v. Union of India, (1995) 3 SCC 42.
4. Achutrao Haribhau Khodwa & Ors. v. State of Maharashtra, (1996) 2 SCC 634.
5. Paschim Banga Khet Mazdoor Samity v. State of West Bengal, (1996) 4 SCC 37.
6. Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha & Ors., AIR 1996 SC 550.
7. Spring Meadows Hospital & Anr. v. Harjol Ahluwalia, (1998) 4 SCC 39.
8. Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab & Anr., (2005) 6 SCC 1.
9. Nizam Institute of Medical Sciences v. Prasanth S. Dhananka & Ors., (2009) 6 SCC 1.
10. Malay Kumar Ganguly v. Sukumar Mukherjee, (2009) 9 SCC 221.
11. Martin F. D'Souza v. Mohd. Ishfaq, (2009) 3 SCC 1.
12. V. Kishan Rao v. Nikhil Super Speciality Hospital & Anr., (2010) 5 SCC 513.
13. Kusum Sharma & Ors. v. Batra Hospital & Medical Research Centre, (2010) 3 SCC 480.
14. Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda & Anr., (2008) 2 SCC 1.
15. Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India, (2017) 10 SCC 1.

Primary Sources: Foreign Cases

1. Bolam v. Friern Hospital Management Committee [1957] 1 WLR 582 (Queen's Bench Division, England).
2. Bolitho v. City and Hackney Health Authority [1998] AC 232 (House of Lords, England).
3. Montgomery v. Lanarkshire Health Board [2015] AC 1430 (UK Supreme Court).
4. Rogers v. Whitaker (1992) 175 CLR 479 (High Court of Australia).
5. Canterbury v. Spence, 464 F.2d 772 (D.C. Circuit, 1972) (United States Court of Appeals).

Secondary Sources: Books and Treatises

1. Malik, R., Medical Jurisprudence and Toxicology (26th ed., Eastern Book Company, Lucknow, 2021).
2. Diwan, P., Medical Negligence and Compensation (3rd ed., Bharat Law House, New Delhi, 2019).
3. Mandhayan, M., Medico-Legal Aspects of Medical Practice in India (2nd ed., University Book House, Jaipur, 2018).
4. Grubb, A., Principles of Medical Law (3rd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010).
5. Kennedy, I. and Grubb, A., Medical Law: Text with Materials (2nd ed., Butterworths, London, 1994).
6. Winfield & Jolowicz on Tort (Ed. W.V.H. Rogers, 18th ed., Sweet & Maxwell, London, 2010).

Secondary Sources: Journal Articles

1. Bhan, A., 'Medical Negligence in India: Problems and Prospects' (2019) 62(4) Journal of the Indian Medical Association 241.
2. Choudhury, D.K., 'Consumer Protection Act and Medical Services: A Critical Review' (2020) 17(2) Indian Journal of Medical Ethics 88.
3. Garg, P. and Garg, R., 'Medico-legal Aspects of Informed Consent in Surgical Practice in India' (2021) 45(3) Medicine, Science and the Law 189.
4. Bhatt, A., 'The Bolam Standard in Indian Medical Law: Time for Bolitho?' (2018) 14(1) Socio-Legal Review (ILI) 55.
5. Sharma, A. and Mehta, M., 'Criminal Liability of Medical Practitioners in India: An Assessment of Jacob Mathew' (2017) 59(2) Journal of the Indian Law Institute 164.

6. Iyer, V., 'Telemedicine and Medical Liability in India' (2022) 8(1) Indian Journal of Medical Informatics & eHealth 22.

Reports and Official Documents

1. Law Commission of India, 'Report No. 201: Medical Treatment to Terminally Ill Patients' (Government of India, 2006).
2. Law Commission of India, 'Report No. 237: Wrongful Prosecution' (Government of India, 2012).
3. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, 'National Health Policy' (2017).
4. National Medical Commission, 'Annual Report 2023–2024' (National Medical Commission, 2024).
5. World Health Organisation, 'Global Patient Safety Action Plan 2021–2030' (WHO, Geneva, 2021).