

Case Reference: INT/PUB/2023/022

Bani Debnath **Complainant**

vs

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

ORDER SHEET

Office Note	Order No.	Date	Order
	1.	27/02/2023	<p>The complaint would relate to hospital negligence.</p> <p>We must appreciate the stand of the complaint when we find, at the outset, the complainant would admit, all his problems have already been addressed by the CE. However, for future guidance not only for his patient but also the patients in general visiting the establishment, he has pointed out six issues that are set out here under :-</p> <p><i>“(i) OPD patients may be allowed to have medical tests followed by collection of reports from the same unit where the specialists are consulted.</i></p> <p><i>(ii) Only registered information available with Patient ID (PID) may be mapped for all the investigations including machine driven like</i></p>

ECHO, MRI, NCV, DEXA etc.

(iii) Only authentic reports (including graphs), duly ink-signed (If not digital signature) & stamped clearly showing name & registration no. of the verifier/expert, may be issued to the patients/ parties.

(iv) Unethical practice of attaching scanned image (s) of signature (s) on the reports and treating them as digital signature (s) may be stopped immediately and appropriate digital signatures accompanied by the name & registration no. of the verifier/expert may be practiced for authentication.

(v) Unethical practice of treatment by in-house doctors based on unauthentic reports may be stopped immediately.

(vi) Threshold limit for free reporting may be extended till one month in case of multiple investigations/ exceptional situations.”

We have heard the complainant as well as the CE in detail.

The issue No. 2 to 5 would relate to



		<p>investigations reports. The complainant would insist, each and every report must be signed by the concerned doctor along with his registration number. This would possibly be an onerous job that we do not intend to foist upon the CEs. With the advent of technology, reports are now available online that would need no signature. When the reports are generated at the CE CE would be responsible for such reports. In case any irregularity is found CE would definitely be liable for the same.</p> <p>In case any of the patients would demand hard copy that, in our view, should be signed by the concerned doctor however, his registration number is not required to be given when he is acting on behalf of the CE and CE would responsible for the same. The issues raised being item No. 2 to 5 are accordingly addressed.</p>
--	--	--



We however, are in full agreement on principle with the complainant in respect of issue no. 1 and 6.

With regard to issue No. 1 we appreciate the difficulty of the particular CE that they do not have sufficient space to house all departments under one umbrella.

We cannot overlook the fact that throughout the State only two full flaged Uni Speciality Neurological set ups are available. One is Bangur Institute of Neurology being fully managed by the Government and the other one is Institute of Neuro Science under public private partnership. Hence, the foot fall is too much in the INK and their main building is not sufficient to cater the need of the hour. Hence, they have arranged for two other set-ups in the near vicinity.

It is their own problem for which the patient



must not suffer. Once the OPD patients would attend OPD at a different building it would be the responsibility of the CE to make it hassle free including delivery of reports at the OPD itself.

The CE would contend, they have already started sending reports through Whatsapp as well as mail that would not absolve them from the responsibility of sharing hard copy reports. In case any of the patients would need a hard copy report that must be delivered at the OPD as and when he would demand. This would address issue no. 1.

The issue no. 6 would relate to second visit to the doctor when the patient would consult the doctor on the investigation reports.

This is a problem not only with I.N.K but also many other corporate hospitals who would insist charges for fresh consultation on expiry of one



week period.

This is most unethical. If a doctor would advise multiple investigations on the first visit and ask the patient to come back with the reports he should be given at least fifteen days time to report back for which he must not be charged for a fresh consultation. This would solve the sixth issue.

The complaint is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-

The Hon'ble Chairperson

Sd/-

Prof. (Dr.) Sukumar Mukherjee – Member

Sd/-

Prof. (Dr.) Makhan Lal Saha – Member

Sd/-

Dr.Maitrayee Banerjee – Member

Sd/-

Sri. Sutirtha Bhattacharya, IAS (Retd)- Member

Sd/-

Sri S. K. Thade, IAS (Retd) – Member

Sd/-

Smt Madhabi Das – Member

Authenticated

[Signature]

Secretary
West Bengal Clinical Establishment
Regulatory Commission

[Handwritten mark]