INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – https://ijlr.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 6 and Issue 7 of 2026 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-6-and-issue-7-of-2026/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE LAWS IN INDIA - A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF LEGAL FRAMEWORK, JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS, AND CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES

AUTHOR – JISHU DAS, STUDENT AT NATIONAL LAW UNIVERSITY, TRIPURA

BEST CITATION – JISHU DAS**,** MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE LAWS IN INDIA - A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF LEGAL FRAMEWORK, JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS, AND CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 6 (7) OF 2026, PG. 721-725, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

Introduction

Medical negligence represents a critical intersection of healthcare delivery, professional accountability, and patient rights within the Indian legal system. It occurs when a healthcare professional deviates from the accepted standard of care, resulting in harm, injury, or death to a patient. Unlike ordinary negligence, medical negligence demands a nuanced evaluation due to the inherent complexities of medical science, where outcomes are not always predictable and errors of judgment may arise even in competent practice.0

In India, medical negligence is not regulated by a single comprehensive statute. Instead, it draws from multiple legal domains, including criminal law under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, civil remedies primarily through the Consumer Protection Act (CPA), 2019, principles of tort law, and disciplinary mechanisms enforced by the National Medical Commission (NMC) and State Medical Councils. This multifaceted approach aims to balance patient protection with the need to shield medical practitioners from frivolous litigation that could foster defensive medicine and undermine healthcare delivery.2

The significance of this area has grown with India's expanding healthcare sector. Reports indicate a substantial rise in litigation, with approximately 65,000 medical negligence cases filed in 2025 across various forums, including consumer commissions, high courts, and the Supreme Court. This surge highlights increasing patient awareness and expectations, alongside challenges such as inadequate documentation and the absence of consolidated national data on malpractice trends.12

This article examines the evolution, key elements, legal provisions, landmark judicial decisions, procedural aspects, and emerging issues in medical negligence law in India as of April 2026. It underscores the delicate equilibrium required between accountability and professional autonomy in a resource-constrained healthcare environment.

Evolution of Medical Negligence Law in India

The legal recognition of medical negligence in India traces its roots to colonial-era laws, particularly the Indian Penal Code (IPC), 1860, which addressed rash or negligent acts causing harm. Sections 304A, 336–338 of the IPC previously governed criminal liability for causing death or hurt by negligence. Civil remedies existed under tort principles, though access to justice was limited by procedural complexities and costs.

A pivotal shift occurred with the Supreme Court's judgment in *Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha* (1995). The Court held that medical services qualify as "services" under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (now 2019), making doctors and hospitals liable for deficiency in service. This decision democratized access to redressal by allowing

patients to approach consumer forums with lower costs, simplified procedures, and no requirement for court fees in most cases.7

The replacement of the IPC with the BNS, 2023 (effective July 1, 2024) introduced nuanced provisions for medical professionals. The National Medical Commission Act, 2020, further strengthened professional regulation by establishing a unified framework for ethics and misconduct. Recent years have witnessed ongoing debates, including Public Interest Litigations (PILs) seeking exemptions for doctors from the CPA, 2019, citing the specialized nature of medical practice and risks of defensive medicine. As of early 2026, the Supreme Court has issued notices on such pleas but has not altered the existing position that medical services remain within the CPA's ambit.15

This evolution reflects a transition from a paternalistic model of healthcare to one emphasizing informed consent, transparency, and patient-centric accountability, while judicial guidelines seek to prevent misuse of legal processes against honest practitioners.

Key Elements of Medical Negligence

To establish medical negligence, four essential elements must be proven: duty of care, breach of duty, causation, and resulting damage (the "four Ds").

1. **Duty of Care:** A doctor-patient relationship imposes a legal duty on the practitioner to exercise reasonable skill and care. This duty arises upon acceptance of the patient, whether in emergency or elective settings. Public and private hospitals alike bear vicarious liability for their staff.
2. **Breach of Duty:** The practitioner must have failed to adhere to the standard of care expected from a reasonably competent professional in that field. Indian courts predominantly apply the Bolam Test, derived from the English case *Bolam v. Friern Hospital Management Committee* (1957). A doctor is not negligent if their actions align with a practice accepted as proper by a responsible body of medical opinion, even if alternative views exist. The Supreme Court has refined this in cases such as *Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab* (2005), emphasizing that an error of judgment does not equate to negligence absent gross recklessness.26
3. **Causation**: The breach must be the proximate cause of the harm. Mere adverse outcomes or failure of treatment do not suffice; expert evidence is typically required to link the deviation to the injury.
4. **Damage**: Actual harm—physical, financial, or emotional—must result. Compensation may cover medical expenses, loss of earnings, pain and suffering, and, in rare cases, punitive damages.

Courts distinguish between ordinary and gross negligence. Criminal liability requires a higher threshold of "gross" or "criminal" negligence, indicating reckless disregard for patient safety. Civil and consumer cases operate on the balance of probabilities, whereas criminal prosecutions demand proof beyond reasonable doubt.

Informed consent forms a cornerstone. The Supreme Court in *Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda* (2008) mandated explicit informed consent for non-emergency procedures, outlining the information that must be disclosed regarding risks, benefits, and alternatives. Failure to obtain valid consent may itself constitute negligence.26

Criminal Liability under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023

Criminal proceedings for medical negligence are reserved for egregious cases and are governed by the BNS, 2023.

- Section 106(1) BNS: This provision addresses causing death by rash or negligent act not amounting to culpable

homicide. In general cases, punishment extends to imprisonment of up to five years and a fine. However, for a registered medical practitioner performing a medical procedure, the imprisonment is capped at two years, with a mandatory fine. This differentiation acknowledges the unique pressures and complexities faced by doctors.36

- Sections 125 and 126 BNS (replacing former IPC Sections 337 and 338): These cover rash or negligent acts causing hurt or grievous hurt, with punishments ranging from fines to imprisonment up to three years, depending on severity.

The Supreme Court in *Jacob Mathew* laid down safeguards against arbitrary prosecutions. Police must obtain an independent medical opinion from a government doctor or expert board before registering an FIR. Private complaints require prima facie expert evidence. These guidelines aim to prevent harassment and arrest of doctors for bona fide clinical decisions.11

Prosecution remains relatively infrequent, as courts recognize that medicine is not an exact science. Recent data and judicial observations indicate that while complaints have risen, convictions for honest errors are rare. Hospitals may face joint liability, as affirmed in cases where institutions failed to supervise or provide adequate infrastructure.6

Civil Liability and the Consumer Protection Act, 2019

The CPA, 2019, provides the most accessible avenue for patients seeking compensation. Medical services constitute "service" under Section 2(42), encompassing paid services rendered by doctors and hospitals. Free services in government settings may still attract liability if similar paid services exist in the same institution.21

Complaints are adjudicated by a three-tier Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission system:

- District Commission: For claims up to ₹50 lakh.
- State Commission: For higher amounts or appeals.
- National Commission: For substantial claims and further appeals.

Proceedings are summary in nature, intended to be expeditious and cost-effective. Remedies include compensation for pecuniary and non-pecuniary losses, refund of charges, and corrective measures. Joint and several liability applies to hospitals and treating doctors.

A notable development is the ongoing PIL filed by the Association of Healthcare Providers (India) and others, seeking exclusion of qualified medical professionals from the CPA's definition of "service." The petitioners argue that consumer forums lack medical expertise, leading to inconsistent decisions and encouraging defensive practices. The Supreme Court issued notices to the Union Ministries of Health and Consumer Affairs in February 2026; the matter remains pending, and the existing framework continues to apply.15

Parallel civil suits under tort law in regular courts remain available but are less common due to higher costs and delays.

Professional and Disciplinary Mechanisms

Independent of civil or criminal proceedings, complaints of professional misconduct may be filed with the Ethics and Medical Registration Board under the NMC or State Medical Councils. The NMC Registered Medical Practitioner (Professional Conduct) Regulations, 2023, outline duties, including maintenance of records, display of registration numbers, adherence to ethical standards, and avoidance of advertising or improper conduct.48

Misconduct includes violation of regulations, failure to maintain records for the prescribed period, conviction for moral turpitude, or acts

such as prescribing without indication or breaching confidentiality. Penalties range from warnings to suspension or permanent removal from the medical register. The NMC has streamlined inquiry processes, designating forensic medicine departments as nodal points and reducing timelines for faster resolution.9

Landmark Judicial Precedents

Indian courts have shaped medical negligence jurisprudence through several key decisions:

- Bolam Test Adoption: Reinforced in multiple rulings, it protects doctors acting per accepted medical practice.
- Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab (2005): Established guidelines for criminal prosecution, emphasizing the need for expert opinion and distinguishing gross negligence.
- Kusum Sharma v. Batra Hospital (2010): Reiterated principles for determining negligence and cautioned against hindsight bias.
- Paramanand Katara v. Union of India (1989): Mandated emergency care for all, regardless of payment ability.
- Recent trends show the Supreme Court reversing some consumer forum orders where no clear departure from standard care was proven, reinforcing that unsuccessful treatment alone does not imply negligence.27

Compensation awards vary widely, from lakhs to exceptional multi-crore sums in cases involving severe disability or death of young professionals, calculated based on loss of earning capacity, medical costs, and other factors.

Contemporary Challenges and Emerging Issues

Several challenges persist in 2026. The absence of comprehensive national data on medical negligence cases hinders policy formulation. Litigation surges, partly attributed to poor documentation and communication gaps, strain the system. Doctors report increased defensive medicine—ordering unnecessary tests to mitigate legal risks—which escalates healthcare costs.

Violence against healthcare workers and low doctor-patient ratios exacerbate tensions. The BNS provision capping punishment for doctors at two years has been viewed positively by the medical community, yet calls for further statutory safeguards continue.

The pending PIL on CPA applicability raises fundamental questions about whether specialized medical tribunals or expert panels should adjudicate such disputes to ensure informed decision-making.

Hospitals bear increasing vicarious liability, prompting demands for robust indemnity insurance and better risk management protocols.

Recommendations and Conclusion

To mitigate risks, healthcare providers should prioritize detailed clinical documentation, obtain explicit informed consent, engage in continuous professional development, and maintain adequate professional indemnity coverage. Patients alleging negligence must preserve records and seek expert opinions where feasible.

Policymakers could consider statutory guidelines for criminal prosecutions, integration of mediation in consumer disputes, and investment in healthcare infrastructure to reduce errors stemming from systemic deficiencies.

Medical negligence law in India embodies a progressive yet cautious framework that seeks justice for patients while safeguarding the medical profession's ability to function without undue fear. As societal expectations evolve and technology transforms healthcare, continued judicial and legislative refinement will be essential to uphold the highest standards of care and ethical practice.

In conclusion, while the current regime provides multiple redressal avenues, its effectiveness depends on balanced application. Striking the right equilibrium remains vital for a resilient healthcare ecosystem that serves both patients and practitioners equitably.

References

1. CoverYou Blog. (2026, April 28). Medical Negligence Laws in India Explained (2026 Doctor's Guide). https://www.coveryou.in/blog/medical-negligence-laws-india-explained-doctor-guide/
2. Verdictly. (2025). Medical Negligence and Healthcare Laws in India (2026). https://www.verdictly.in/articles/med-negligence-india-2026
3. The Academic. (2026). Medical Negligence in India: Law, Liability and Judicial Approach. https://theacademic.in/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/76.pdf
4. Indian Express. (2026, February 8). 65,000 medical negligence cases filed in 2025. https://indianexpress.com/article/legal-news/medical-negligence-cases-india-2025-hospital-paperwork-digital-evidence-ncdrc-data-10521097/
5. Economic Times Legal. (2026). SC issues notice on PIL to exclude doctors from Consumer Protection Act. https://legal.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/litigation/supreme-court-reviews-pil-to-exclude-doctors-from-consumer-protection-act/128157443
6. Medical Dialogues. (2025). SC to decide on Statutory framework for criminal prosecution of doctors in medical negligence cases.
7. National Medical Commission. (2023). Registered Medical Practitioner (Professional Conduct) Regulations.
8. Supreme Court of India Judgments: *Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab* (2005), *Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha* (1995), and related cases as referenced in legal analyses.
9. Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (official text and analyses).
10. Additional sources from peer-reviewed journals and legal commentaries on Bolam Test application and consumer forum trends (2024–2026).

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

(Managed by L TO J LAW ASSOCIATES)

NO. 08, ARUL NAGAR, SEERA THOPPU,
MARUDHAANDA KURICHI, SRIRANGAM - 620102,
TAMILNADU, INDIA.

ISSN 2583-2344