

Case Reference: INT/HGY/2025/030

Mr. Kamal Chakraborty Complainant

vs

Vitadeal Clinic, Saltlake.....Respondent/ Respondents

ORDER SHEET

Office Note	Order No.	Date	Order
	1.	28/07/2025	<p>The complaint would relate to very very serious issue that have surfaced in course of hearing.</p> <p>The complainant, being attracted by a public advertisement in media, went to the clinic for his varicose vein treatment. Dr. Venu Gopal Kulkarni examined him and advised him to go for surgery.</p> <p>Pertinent to note, Dr. Kulkarni, vascular surgeon, practicing in Hyderabad, does not have any registration with West Bengal Medical Council. The clinic did not think it fit to abide by</p>

15

the laws of the land. No local surgeon registered under West Bengal Medical Council was present at the time of the surgery as would appear from the submissions made on behalf of the clinic.

The complainant would contend, he was under impression, his both legs would be taken care of however, at the end of the surgery he would find that only his left leg was operated though lesser surgery.

The CE would contend, since he is having other co-morbidities the anaesthetist did not agree to have the surgery done at a time particularly when he was on a tablet "Warfarin". The complainant would inform, he was advised to stop taking the said medicine for a week prior to surgery.

At the post operative check-up doctor

B

Case Reference: INT/HGY/2025/030



examined the patient and agreed to do the surgery of the right leg however, he cautioned the patient that it would have tremendous pain that the patient could hardly bare.

According to the complainant, even after the surgery there was no improvement. He is doubtful whether the surgery was at all performed or not.

Patient had shared post surgery photograph of his left leg. We are deprived of the pre operative photograph of the patient's left leg. It would be difficult to comment on the treatment in absence of the pre operative photograph.

The situation is really alarming. The CE is holding license under the West Bengal Clinical Establishments (Registration, Regulation and Transparency) Act 2017 fulfilling the conditions



Case Reference: INT/HGY/2025/030



imposed therein. There should be at least a local surgeon to be present at the time of surgery. The complainant cannot approach appropriate authority to examine the medical issues as Dr. Kulkarni is beyond our reach.

We impose a penalty of Rs. 50,000/- on the CE for not following the laws of the land.

We request HOD, Vascular Surgery, IPGMER to examine the patient and his medical records and treat him accordingly.

The CE is directed to share all medical records including OT note and the Anaesthesia note with the complainant so that he could produce the same before the medical expert appointed by us.

The medical expert would submit a report to us after examining the patient that would be



shared with the Director, West Bengal Health Service to take appropriate action against the CE.

The complainant is directed to share his bank details with the CE so that the amount of penalty be transferred to him.

The complaint is disposed of.

Sd/-

The Hon'ble Chairperson

Sd/-

Prof. (Dr.) Sukumar Mukherjee – Member

Sd/-

Dr. Maitrayee Banerjee – Member

Sd/-

Prof. (Dr.) Makhan Lal Saha – Member

Sd/-

Sri. Sutirtha Bhattacharya, IAS (Retd)- Member

Sd/-

Smt Madhabi Das – Member

Authenticated
[Signature]
Secretary
West Bengal Clinical Establishment
Regulatory Commission

[Signature]

Case Reference: INT/HGY/2025/030