DOI: 10.21088/ijlhb.2454.7107.12126.2

Indian Journal of Law and Human Behavior
Volume 12 Number 1 / January - June 2026

REVIEW ARTICLE

Fast-Track Justice for Medical Negligence: Lessons from Summary Trials Condensed Justice or Compromised Fairness? Medical Negligence under CPA

Shri Gopal Kabra[1], Vivekanshu Verma[2]

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Shri Gopal Kabra, Vivekanshu Verma. Fast-Track Justice for Medical Negligence: Lessons from Summary Trials Condensed Justice or Compromised Fairness? Medical Negligence under CPA. Indian J Law Hum Behav 2026; 12(1): 19-24.

ABSTRACT

Background: Medical negligence cases in India are increasingly adjudicated under the Consumer Protection Act (CPA), which provides for summary trial mechanisms. While these forums aim to deliver swift justice, concerns remain about procedural fairness, evidentiary rigor, and the balance between patient rights and practitioner protections.

Objective: To critically examine the implications of summary trial verdicts in medical negligence cases under the CPA, highlighting their impact on healthcare accountability, judicial efficiency, and medico-legal safeguards.

Methods: A doctrinal analysis of statutory provisions, judicial precedents, and procedural frameworks was conducted. Comparative insights were drawn from consumer forum practices and conventional civil trial processes. Case law examples were reviewed to illustrate recurring patterns and challenges.

Results: Findings suggest that summary trials under the CPA expedite resolution but often compromise detailed evidentiary examination. This creates tension between the goals of consumer protection and the principles of natural justice. The study identifies procedural gaps, risks of practitioner vulnerability, and inconsistencies in verdicts across forums.

Conclusion: While the CPA's summary trial model enhances access to justice for patients, it requires recalibration to safeguard medical practitioners against undue liability. Strengthening procedural safeguards, ensuring expert testimony, and harmonizing consumer forum practices with civil jurisprudence are essential for balanced medico-legal accountability.

AUTHOR'S AFFILIATION:

[1] Director Clinical, Bhagwan Mahaveer Cancer Hospital, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.
[2] Associate Consultant, Medanta-The Medicity, Gurugram, Haryana, India.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Shri **Gopal Kabra,** Director Clinical, Bhagwan Mahaveer Cancer Hospital, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

E-mail: kabrasg@hotmail.com

Received: 03-03-2026 **Accepted:** 07-04-2026

KEYWORDS

• Medical negligence • Consumer Protection Act (CPA) • Summary trial Procedural justice • Patient rights • Practitioner protection • Quasi-judicial forums • Access to justice • Evidentiary standards • Healthcare accountability

INTRODUCTION

Adjudication of alleged death (homicide) by medical negligence, in Consumer Forums under CPA, for redressal by compensation, has been made possible by the Judicial pronouncement in IMA Vs V P Shantha (1995).[1] Exercising arbitrary powers under the Summary Trial procedure, it is sufficient for the lay presiding officer, to reach to a subjective impression, based in on whatever evidence is placed before the forum (it's a quasi judicial body and not a regular court), that there was deficiency/negligence, to hold a physician guilty of causing death by negligence and award liberal penal compensation. The lay subjective analysis and interpretation based on his knowledge (or lack of it), to understand complex medical matter (causing death by negligence has to be very serious and complex condition), invariably leads to gross injustice. No physician will do anything during the treatment to intentionally inflict fatal injury to his patient.

Consider a case of common gall bladder surgery. The surgeon did the surgery but injured the large bowel to cause its perforation, leading to fecal peritonitis, septicemia and death. The surgeon was 'obviously' negligent, infers the presiding officer. Res ipso loquitur – thing speaks for itself; so logical. The surgeon was reckless to cause perforation of large gut in a simple gall bladder operation. Homicide 'guilty!, guilty!, guilty!' pronounced like in Triple Talaq.[2] The surgeon and the hospital to pay Rs ** lakh as a penal award to redress loss, suffering, refund of fees charged and litigation fee.

Medical facts: The hepatic flexure part of the colon is situated immediately below the gall bladder; it is, as anatomist describe, the bed of the gall bladder. Because of its intimate relationship, when the gall bladder is acutely infected and inflamed, it involves that part of the colon. With antibiotic therapy the infection stops and the inflammation heals. The process results into adhesion of the gall bladder to the colon by fibrous tissue. The surgeon in this case had to cut through the fibrous adhesion to separate and isolate the gall bladder. This is what was done by the surgeon as was documented in operation note. The rest of the removal operation was uneventful. There was no visible injury to the colon. The patient was shifted to ICU for a day and then shifted to ward with stable vitals. In the night of day two the patient suddenly developed acute pain abdomen with vomiting, rapid pulse, fall in BP and rise of temperature. On examination there were signs of acute peritonitis (infection of the peritoneum). There appeared fecal discharge in the drainage tube. X-ray abdomen and Catscan confirmed the diagnosis of colon perforation with fecal peritonitis. Emergency operation of exploratory laparoscopy with perforation repair was planned. The patient was critical. Risks explained. The attendants were reluctant to consent and wanted to invite a surgeon for consultation. Patient deteriorated fast. Intensive care measures failed, patient died.

The delayed perforation of the colon was, as is known, due to a avascular necrosis of a tiny area of the colon; the microscopic blood vessels left in the cut fibrous adhesion were not adequate to supply blood. Normally the plexus of microscopic vessels surrounding the area takes over, this did not occur in this case.

What was negligent on part of the surgeon? Which act of the surgeon was reckless? Medical procedures are all very complicated and require in depth expert analysis to deny the good faith of a duly qualified, licensed and experienced practicing surgeon who has done that particular operation in scores of patients. Summary trial is virtually to give a person a bad name to hang him.

DISCUSSION

Analyze, elaborate and substantiate.

Very important medicolegal issue: the adjudication of alleged death by medical negligence in consumer forums under the **Consumer Protection Act (CPA)**,[3] particularly

after the landmark case *Indian Medical Association vs. V.P. Shantha* (1995). Let's break down the problem and analyze it in the context of your gall bladder surgery example.

1. Nature of Consumer Forums under CPA

- **Quasijudicial bodies**: Consumer forums are not regular courts; they operate under summary trial procedures.
- **Lay adjudication**: Presiding officers are not medically trained, yet they are empowered to decide complex medical negligence cases.
- **Subjective inference**: Decisions rest on impressions rather than rigorous expert analysis, leading to potential injustice.

2. The Doctrine of *Res Ipsa Loquitur*

- This principle means "**the thing speaks for itself**." It allows negligence to be inferred when the outcome seems obviously linked to an act.
- In medicine, however, outcomes are not always straightforward. Complications can arise despite due care.
- Applying *res ipsa loquitur* simplistically to surgical complications risks equating adverse outcomes with negligence, which is medically unsound.

3. The Gall Bladder Surgery Case

Presiding Officer's View

- Colon perforation during gall bladder surgery = "obvious negligence."
- Recklessness inferred → penal compensation awarded.

Medical Reality

- **Anatomical proximity**: The hepatic flexure of the colon lies directly beneath the gall bladder.
- **Pathological changes**: Acute infection leads to adhesions between gall bladder and colon.
- **Surgical necessity**: Surgeon must cut through fibrous adhesions to isolate the gall bladder.
- **Delayed perforation mechanism**: Avascular necrosis due to inadequate microscopic blood supply, not visible at the time of surgery.
- **Clinical course**: Patient initially stable, perforation manifested later, despite appropriate ICU care.

Key Point

- The perforation was a **recognized complication**, not a reckless act. The surgeon acted in good faith, documented the procedure, and responded appropriately when complications arose.

4. What Constitutes Negligence?

- Negligence requires breach of duty + causation + damage.
- In medical practice, negligence is established when:
  - The standard of care is not followed.
  - The act is something no reasonable, competent professional would do.
  - There is evidence of recklessness or disregard for patient safety.

Here:

- The surgeon followed accepted practice.
- The complication was rare, delayed, and biologically explainable.
- No reckless act was documented.

Thus, negligence is **not substantiated**.

5. The Problem with Summary Trials

- Complex medical causation cannot be reduced to lay impressions.
- Penal compensation based on subjective inference undermines professional integrity.
- Physicians are unfairly branded "killers" when complications occur despite due care.
- Justice requires **expert medical testimony**, not lay adjudication.

6. Substantiation

- **Judicial pronouncements**: Courts (e.g., *Jacob Mathew vs. State of Punjab*, 2005),[4] have clarified that medical negligence must be judged by the standard of a reasonably competent professional, not by hindsight or lay logic.
- **Ethical principle**: No physician intends harm; complications are part of medical risk.
- **Legal safeguard**: Summary forums should seek expert opinion before attributing negligence.

Conclusion: In the gall bladder surgery example, the surgeon's actions were medically justified and within the standard of care. The perforation was a known but rare complication due to avascular necrosis, not recklessness. Summary trial adjudication by consumer forums, based on lay interpretation of medical record, without expert medical input, risks grave injustice by equating adverse outcomes with negligence. True negligence requires proof of breach of duty, not mere occurrence of complication.

Q. ***Does the presiding officer in a consumer forum, while adjudicating a medical negligence homicide, have a corresponding duty to care? Like the licensed physician, should not they demonstrate competence to adjudicate a specific medical case? Are they justified to presume a medical negligence case as simple, to apply 'thing speaks for itself doctrine' to hold him guilty?***

This is a sharp and necessary question. Let's unpack it carefully.

1. Duty of Care of the Presiding Officer

- **Physicians' duty of care**: A licensed doctor must demonstrate competence, skill, and diligence in treating patients.
- **Judicial duty of care**: By analogy, a presiding officer in a consumer forum also has a duty of care when adjudicating complex medical negligence cases.
  - Their decisions directly affect reputations, livelihoods, and compensation awards.
  - A careless or uninformed judgment can cause irreparable harm to both patients' families and medical professionals.

Thus, while not medically trained, presiding officers are expected to exercise judicial prudence, which includes seeking expert medical opinion before concluding negligence.

2. Competence in Adjudication

- **Legal competence**: Presiding officers are competent in law, procedure, and consumer rights.
- **Medical competence**: They are not trained to interpret complex medical facts.
- **Corresponding duty**: When adjudicating medical negligence, to understand the specific medical condition, they must rely on expert testimony, informed interpretation of medical records, and professional standards. Failure to do so risks breaching their duty of care.

3. Misuse of *Res Ipsa Loquitur*

- The doctrine is intended for situations where negligence is obvious (e.g., operating on wrong person, or wrong organ or leaving a surgical instrument inside a patient).
- In complex medical cases, outcomes may result from recognized complications rather than negligence.
- Presuming negligence simply because "the thing speaks for itself" is unjustified when the matter requires specialized medical understanding.
- Courts like the Supreme Court in *Jacob Mathew vs. State of Punjab* (2005) have explicitly warned against equating adverse outcomes with negligence.

4. Are They Justified?

- **No.** Presiding officers are not justified in presuming medical negligence as "simple."
- Medical negligence cases are inherently complex, involving anatomy, pathology, surgical technique, and postoperative risks.
- To apply *res ipsa loquitur* without expert input is a breach of judicial duty of care. It reduces nuanced medical science to lay logic, which is inadequate and unfair.

5. Substantiation

- **Judicial precedent**: *Jacob Mathew* clarified that negligence must be judged against the standard of a reasonably competent professional, not lay inference.
- **Ethical principle**: Physicians act in good faith; complications are part of medical risk.
- **Legal safeguard**: Consumer forums should appoint medical experts or commissions to assist in adjudication. Without this, their judgments risk arbitrariness.

Conclusion: Yes, presiding officers in consumer forums have a corresponding duty of care when adjudicating medical negligence cases. They must demonstrate competence by seeking expert medical input. Presuming negligence as "simple" and applying *res ipsa loquitur* in complex medical matters is unjustified and breaches their duty. Medical negligence adjudication requires careful, expertguided analysis, not lay impressions.

Draft of structured medicolegal argument that frames this as a duty of care of adjudicators

Medico Legal Argument: Duty of Care of Adjudicators

1. Foundational Principle

- **Duty of Care** is a cornerstone of both medical ethics and legal accountability.
- In adjudication, this principle extends to judges, tribunals, and quasijudicial bodies whose decisions directly affect rights, welfare, and sometimes survival of individuals.
- The adjudicator's role is not passive; it carries an affirmative obligation to safeguard fairness, dignity, and protection from foreseeable harm.

2. Legal Basis

- **Common Law Doctrine**: Courts have long recognized that those in positions of authority owe a duty to act reasonably to prevent harm.
- **Statutory Frameworks**: Procedural law and constitutional guarantees (e.g., right to life, equality before law, exception clauses) implicitly impose standards of care on adjudicators.
- **Precedent**: Judicial pronouncements emphasize that failure to apply mind, delay in decision, or disregard of evidence can amount to breach of duty.

3. MedicoLegal Context

- In medical negligence cases, adjudicators are entrusted with balancing technical evidence against human suffering.
- A lapse in adjudicatory diligence—such as ignoring expert testimony, misapplying standards of care, or delaying urgent relief—can itself cause harm equivalent to medical negligence.
- Thus, adjudicators must exercise heightened care, recognizing the **causal link between their decisions and patient outcomes**.

4. Scope of Duty

- **Procedural Fairness**: Ensuring hearings are timely, evidence is properly weighed, and parties are given equal opportunity.
- **Substantive Justice**: Applying medical standards accurately, recognizing the vulnerability of patients, and preventing secondary victimization.
- **Protective Oversight**: Anticipating foreseeable harm from delay or misjudgment, especially in lifethreatening conditions.

5. Breach and Liability

- Breach occurs when adjudicators act with disregard for established medical standards, fail to provide timely remedies, or neglect their responsibility to prevent foreseeable harm.
- Liability may be conceptualized not as personal fault but as **institutional accountability**, ensuring systemic safeguards against adjudicatory negligence.

6. Policy Implications

- Recognizing adjudicators' duty of care strengthens medicolegal jurisprudence by:
  - Embedding accountability in judicial processes.
  - Protecting vulnerable patients from procedural harm.
  - Reinforcing trust in the justice system as a partner in healthcare equity.

CONCLUSION

- Adjudicators are not neutral arbiters alone; they are custodians of justice whose decisions carry lifealtering consequences.
- Framing their role as a **duty of care** ensures that adjudication itself becomes a protective mechanism rather than a source of harm.
- This approach aligns medicolegal accountability with broader principles

of fairness, human dignity, and constitutional justice.

REFERENCES

1. *Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha. (1995) 6 SCC 651: AIR 1996 SC 550.*
2. *Shayara Bano v. Union of India. (2017) 9 SCC 1: AIR 2017 SC 4609.*
3. *Consumer Protection Act (CPA), 1986.*
4. *Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab. (2005) 6 SCC 1: AIR 2005 SC 3180.*