

Case Reference: INT/SPG/2022/061

Mr. Suvra Sarathi Ghosh Complainant

vs

1. Satyarani Memorial Nursing Home 2. TRA General Hospital 3. Desun Hospital..... Respondent/ Respondents

ORDER SHEET

Office Note	Order No.	Date	Order
	1.	11/03/2022	This complaint would relate to covid treatment. The complainant would reveal, the patient Subrata Kumar Ghosh aged about 69 years old was having covid symptom who was advised admission at CE no.1 (satyarani). Facts reveal, the concerned CE was practically run by Dr. Sarkar. The staff representing the CE, would also admit so. The patient was admitted on October 21, 2020 under Dr. Sarkar at the CE till October 28, 2020 when he was transferred to TRA hospital. The complainant would contend that for those seven days the concerned doctor always assured that the patient was not having any problem. In fact, on October 23, 2020, the complainant was informed that the patient was



		<p>determined covid negative. On October 25, 2020 the complainant got a message from the Government portal that the patient was covid positive. The complaint would contend, the CE did not have proper infrastructure to deal with covid patient, even then, the concerned doctor continued to assure the complainant that the patient would be alright and would be discharged after treatment. When the condition deteriorated Dr. Sarkar suggested transfer to higher set up. On his suggestion, the patient was transferred to TRA hospital where the patient was admitted under Dr. Guha till October 3, 2020 when he was transferred to the 3rd CE, Desun, where he died.</p>
--	--	---

The complainant would contend, the second CE did not have proper infrastructure to treat the covid patient and the concerned doctor Dr. Guha was not attending the patient to the extent required.

As against the third CE, the complainant would also contend, there had been lack of transparency and lack of communication. The nursing and para medical staff were not competent to do the routine procedures including

administering injection and doing other procedure normally done by para medical staff and Nursing Staff.

The patient died after five days of the treatment at the third CE on November 4, 2020. Pertinent to note, the complainant himself was also admitted for covid treatment. He was with the patient at the first and third CE.

So far the first CE is concerned, they would contend, the complainant did not pay for the treatment save and except the medicine bill and the pathology laboratory bill to the extent of Rs. 8,796/- and Rs. 26,000/- respectively. The concerned representative would admit, medicine and consumable have not been discounted as per our advisory. On that score, the CE would refund Rs.1,319/- on sharing of the bank details by the complainant.

On the hospital bill, the representative would contend, the patient party was known to Dr. Sarkar. So far they are aware of, Dr Sarkar agreed to treat the patient for a sum of Rs. 50,000/- (lump sum). Dr. Sarkar is now critically ill, hence they are not in a position to address

the issue further in detail.

No bill was formally raised by the first CE hence we do not wish to deliberate on the issue save as except directing medicine and consumable discount as recorded above.

So far the TRA is concerned, Mr. Subhro Pradhan the administrative staff, would deny allegations made against the CE. According to him, Dr. Sarkar, the concerned physician, made frantic calls for accommodation of patient since the first CE did not have any critical care support. On his request, Mr. Pradhan accommodated the patient. Dr. Guha treated the patient during his stay at the CE. Initially, the patient was given oxygen support through NRBN. Ultimately, he was transferred to HFNC and the said treatment was continued till discharge. CE billed a sum of Rs. 40,000/- and on the request of the complainant's elder brother, CE discounted Rs. 2,200/- and ultimately Rs. 38,000/- was paid in full and final settlement.

On behalf of Desun, Dr. Sen would contend,



regular video call was made with the complainant's elder brother. The complainant was also being treated at the CE. The patient came at a very critical stage and despite best efforts given, the patient died.

We have considered the rival contentions. Save and except directing refund of Rs. 1,319/- in case of Satyarani, we do not find any scope of interference.

This order would however create no fetter for the complainant to approach the appropriate authority questioning the treatment protocol if he so desires.

The complaint is disposed of.

Sd/-

The Hon'ble Chairperson

Sd/-

Prof. (Dr.) Madhusudan Banerjee – Member

Sd/-

Dr. Maitrayee Banerjee – Member

Sd/-

Smt Madhabi Das – Member