

Case Reference: INT/KOL/2024/129

Ms. Manidipa Das Talukdar **Complainant**

vs

Apollo Clinic, Beliaghat.....**Respondent/ Respondents**

ORDER SHEET

Office Note	Order No.	Date	Order
	1.	26/09/2024	<p>The complaint would relate to complication in a case of cosmetic treatment.</p> <p>The patient had pigmentation on her face after her first delivery. She approached the Clinic when she was advised to consult Dr. Rik Goswami, MBBS, MD, Dermatology, who prescribed chemical filling.</p> <p>Accordingly, she approached the Clinic for appointment. Three sessions were held. According to the complainant, it was done by Esthetician. However, no doctor was present. The clinic would however, strenuously dispute so. We further understand when Dr. Goswami was consulted after the complication he feigned ignorance about the treatment and severed all relationship</p>

BS

WR

with the Clinic, as contended by the complainant.

The CE would also admit, Dr. Goswami is no more associated with the Clinic.

We have examined the treatment sheet where we find signature of the Esthetician and not the doctor that would inspire our confidence to belief the complainant version.

Our esteemed medical member Dr. M L Saha evaluated the records and have opined as under :-

“ Chemical peeling is one of the standard treatment for acne. Patients treatment is prescribed by the dermatologist. The chemical peeling is procedure of local application of some chemical which some pre peeling and post peeling treatment. This chemical peeling should be done under the supervision of the dermatologist. In some centres this chemical peeling is done by technicians but in case of any complications has to be seen by dermatologist.

The average charge for such chemical peeling is Rs. 2500/- to 3000/- per session.

Skin arythema and pigmentation are known complications of such peeling which is also written in the consent form signed by the patient. These are mostly reversible.

However, as this treatment was not effective and was done by technician in absence of dermatologist charges may be refunded and the CE should take responsibility of further treatment to reverse the complications that has happened.”

We have also considered the reply given by Mr. Subhrodip Purokraisto Advocate on behalf of the Clinic.

Mr. Purokraisto has termed the complaint as “baseless” and “no locus standi”.

We fail to appreciate how this complaint could be baseless even after acknowledgement of the complication by the CE that we find from the screen shot of the whatsapp messages annexed to the complaint.

We direct refund of the cost of the failed procedure being Rs. 15,000/- to the complainant on sharing of the bank details.

The complainant would assure, she would withdraw of all her complaints pending before other forums.

The complaint is disposed of.

Sd/-

The Hon'ble Chairperson

Sd/-

Prof. (Dr.) Sukumar Mukherjee – Member

Sd/-

Prof. (Dr.) Makhan Lal Saha – Member

Sd/-

Dr. Maitrayee Banerjee – Member

Sd/-

Sri. Sutirtha Bhattacharya, IAS (Retd)- Member

Sd/-

Smt Madhabi Das – Member

Authenticated
[Signature]

Secretary
West Bengal Clinical Establishment
Regulatory Commission

[Handwritten mark]