

**Case Reference: INT/KOL/2022/128**

Mr. Suvam Das ..... Complainant

vs

Institute of Neuroscience, Kolkata & Charnock Hospital ..... Respondent/  
Respondents

**ORDER SHEET**

Office Note	Order No.	Date	Order
	1.	04/07/2022	<p>We have heard the complainant in detail. We have also heard the first establishment being INK against whom the allegations have been made.</p> <p>The complaint would reveal, the patient Smt. Soma Das aged about 64 years was admitted in INK on March 3, 2022. According to the complainant, the patient was never physically examined by the treating doctor. There was no proper dialogue between the physician and the patient. The discharge summary prescribed host of medicines that too, were not properly explained by any doctor. A nurse casually explained the same. Finding no improvement, she was taken to the second CE being</p>



  
Secretary  
West Bengal Clinical Establishment  
Regulatory Commission

		<p>Charnock.</p> <p>At the hearing, the complainant would admit, the patient improved a lot at Charnock. Yet, they took the patient out of the State for appropriate treatment and got her cured to a substantial extent.</p> <p>While making this complaint, the complainant has criticised the entire medical <b>fraternity</b> of the State and compared them with their counterpart in the other part of the country. We express our strong displeasure as to the way such criticism has been made in the complaint and we have conveyed a piece of our mind at the time of hearing. The complainant would however, feel sorry for the same. He would contend, he was swayed away by emotion, that's why, such criticism.</p> <p>At the end of the day the complainant would seriously insist, there had been medical negligence on the part of the treating doctor.</p> <p>Dr. Sidharth Anand is present online. He has categorically denied that the patient was not physically</p>
--	--	---

*Bas*

*72*  
 Secretary  
 West Bengal Clinical Establishment  
 Regulatory Commission



examined. He has explained the treatment protocol that is however, beyond our domain. The complainant is free to approach the appropriate authority to question the treatment protocol. If he is successful therein he would be at liberty to approach us afresh as against INK for appropriate relief.

Before parting with we feel, it would be prudent for INK to express unqualified regret to the patient. There was no previous enmity the patient or the patient family is having with INK or the treating doctor. The complainant would also admit, the patient improved a lot at the second establishment that is situated well within the State. He is satisfied with the treatment that the patient had outside the State. It is his perception. We have nothing to say. However, we feel, there must be something for which this complaint has been made. We leave it to the wisdom of the INK whether to express sorry for the incident or not.

We find from the bill, medical and consumable discount have not been given. INK would assure, a sum

*Bal*

*[Signature]*

of Rs. 3,890/- would be payable on this count and the money would be transferred to the complainant at the earliest on sharing of his bank details.

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/-

Smt Madhabi Das – Member

*Authenticated*  
*[Signature]*

Secretary  
West Bengal Clinical Establishment  
Regulatory Commission