

Case Reference:INT/KOL/2025/007

Ms. Sabita Banik..... Complainant

vs

Lakhotia Diagnostic, Serampore.....Respondent/ Respondents

ORDER SHEET

Office Note	Order No.	Date	Order
	1.	02/05/2025	<p>The complaint would relate to wrong Ultrasound Report.</p> <p>The patient had pain abdomen. She was advised to undergo USG of whole abdomen. On November 19, 2024 Dr. Pramanik did the Ultrasound at the CE where the report would inter-alia state as follows :-</p> <p><i>“ normal in size, shape and position with regular wall. Lumen appear clear. No intra luminal calculus, sludge or mass lesion is visualized. No pericholecystic collection is seen”.</i></p> <p>The Son-in-Law of the complainant is present on line. On a query made by us, he would submit, the patient was never asked as to the history of any surgery.</p>



Dr. Pramanik would however contend, he was not informed about the Gallbladder surgery done in 2015 at the time of USG examination.

Both the contentions are verbal. We can not take one as sacrosanct against the other.

The fact remains, the Gallbladder was operated upon in 2015 as contended by the complainant and confirmed by the second report dated on November 26, 2024.

From the complaint, it appears, after going through the first report the physician advised retest. The complainant approached the CE when CE management misbehaved and threatened them with dire consequence. Disturbed by such act, the patient was compelled to undergo another Ultrasonography at a different diagnostic centre that revealed "the Gallbladder could not be visualised".

In response, the CE would contend, when they were told about the defective report they wanted to have



the retest done that the complainant refused.

The complainant would contend, they were threatened with dire consequence by Mr Samanta.

Mr Samanta, on the contrary, would assert, the son-in-law Mr Banik is his friend from childhood. When he came with the grievance Mr. Samanta wanted to do the retest however, Mr Banik threatened him with dire consequence being accompanied by 15 to 16 anti-socials.

From the rival contentions, the unpleasant incident is proved.

Fact remains, the first report was wrong. The CE in paragraph 4 of the response would try to justify the report by contending that there might be "residual Gallbladder stump" which could be mistaken as gallbladder.

Even if the take it as correct that could not be, "normal in size, shape and position with regular wall". Moreover it went on to observe, "lumen appears to be clear; no intra luminal calculus, sludge or mass lesion is





visualised.” Such definite observation would obviously exclude the possibility of existence of the stump which could be mistaken as Gallbladder.

We direct refund of the fees taken by the centre for the ultrasound as well as reimbursement of the actual expense of the second one done at a different CE.

In addition, we impose a penalty of Rs. 5,000/- to be paid to the complainant on sharing of her bank details.

The complaint is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

The Hon'ble Chairperson

Sd/-

Prof. (Dr.) Sukumar Mukherjee – Member

Sd/-

Dr. Maitrayee Banerjee – Member

Sd/-

Smt Madhabi Das – Member

Authenticated
[Signature]
Secretary
West Bengal Clinical Establishment
Regulatory Commission

[Signature]