

Office of the West Bengal Clinical Establishment Regulatory Commission

1st Floor, 32 B.B.D Bag, West Bengal, Kolkata – 700001.

Phone:- (033) 2262-8447 , Email: wbcerc@wb.gov.in Website: www.wbcerc.gov.in

Case Reference: WBCERC/KOL/51/2026-27

Mr. Anindya Banerjee Complainant

vs

Institute of Neurosciences Kolkata.....Respondent/ Respondents

ORDER SHEET

Office Note	Order No.	Date	Order
	1.	25/06/2026	The complaint would relate to inadequate infrastructure. The complainant has raised issue of inadequate infrastructure at the CE to give post-operative care in a case of subdural haematoma. The patient was under treatment of Dr. Hrisikesh Kumar since 2017 at INK. The patient was admitted on March 21,

2026. On that day, the surgery was done by Dr. Amit Ghosh that was uneventful. The patient was shifted to critical care unit. He was under treatment till April 1, 2026.

During post operative period the patient had other co-morbidities that was seen by other specialist doctors on call.

The patient was discharged late at night on April 1, 2026. However, by next early morning he was to be shifted to another multispeciality hospital where he breathed his last after twelve days of critical care treatment.

The complainant would contend, he has no issue with regard to the neuro-surgery



		that was done at INK. He has also no issue with the neuro treatment that the patient got for so many years.
--	--	--

He would question the discharge at a stage when he was not at all stable. The patient suffered a septic shock during his ICU stay that was not properly taken care of in absence of appropriate multispeciality care at the CE.

Dr. Ghosh, the concerned neuro surgeon, is present online. He would submit, the patient was admitted for surgery at the unispeciality hospital. Post operative care was taken by efficient critical care team. Whenever the patient needed any other



speciality support on call doctors had seen the patient and treatment was done at per their advice as would be apparent from the medical records.

Even we give full credence to what the CE would say about the treatment protocol, question still remains as to how the patient could be discharged on the ninth day of surgery from the HDU who had to be re-admitted within 12 hours with septic shock.

This question would be squarely a medical issue that would be outside our domain.

We grant liberty to the complainant to approach appropriate authority questioning

8



the discharge issue.

If he is successful therein he would be at liberty to approach us afresh for appropriate relief as against the CE.

The complainant would also raise issue with regard to a gross mistake done in the discharge summary.

The concerned cardiologist on call prescribed medicine "Corbis" 2.5 mg (Half). Accordingly, the discharge summary would also show the same medicine 2.5 mg. However, the word "half" was not printed in the discharge summary. According to the complainant, while pointed out, the concerned RMO corrected the copy that was



handed over to the complainant. We however, do not find any such correction in the record that has been shared by INK with us.

We caution the CE, they must take special care to share such medical records with us as and when asked for.

The complaint is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

The Hon'ble Chairperson

Sd/-

Prof. (Dr.) Makhan Lal Saha – Member

Sd/-

Dr. Maitrayee Banerjee – Member

Sd/-

Smt Madhabi Das – Member

Authenticated

[Signature]
Secretary
West Bengal Clinical Establishments
Regulatory Commission