DOI: 10.21088/ijlhb.2454.7107.12126.3

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

REVIEW ARTICLE

Law in Black, Medicine in White: Black Letter Law and White Coat Profession in Indian Context: Exploring the Collision of Codified Statutes and Clinical Practice in India

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

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Shri Gopal Kabra, Vivekanshu Verma. *Law in Black, Medicine in White:* Black Letter Law and White Coat Profession in Indian Context: Exploring the Collision of Codified Statutes and Clinical Practice in India. Indian J Law Hum Behav 2026; 12(1): 25-32.

ABSTRACT

Background: The intersection of statutory law ("black letter law") and medical practice ("white coat profession") in India presents unique challenges. While law emphasizes codified rules and judicial precedent, medicine operates within ethical, clinical, and humanitarian frameworks. The tension between rigid legal interpretation and dynamic medical realities often leads to conflict in accountability, negligence claims, and patient rights.

Objective: To critically examine how Indian jurisprudence interacts with medical practice, highlighting areas of convergence, conflict, and reform. The study aims to contextualize medicolegal accountability within India's healthcare system and propose frameworks for balancing statutory rigidity with clinical discretion.

Methods: A doctrinal and analytical approach is adopted, reviewing statutory provisions, case law, and regulatory guidelines. Comparative insights are drawn from international medicolegal frameworks, while Indian case studies illustrate practical implications. The analysis integrates perspectives from medical ethics, patient safety, and legal accountability.

Results: Findings reveal systemic gaps in aligning legal standards with medical realities. Courts often rely on black letter law without adequate consideration of clinical complexities, leading to defensive medicine and practitioner vulnerability. Conversely, medical professionals sometimes underappreciate statutory obligations, resulting in breaches of patient rights. Emerging jurisprudence shows gradual movement toward harmonization, but inconsistencies remain.

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:** 08-04-2026

Conclusion: A balanced medicolegal framework in India requires judicial sensitivity to medical realities, statutory reforms to protect both patients and practitioners, and institutional mechanisms for compliance. Bridging law and medicine is essential to ensure justice, accountability, and compassionate care.

KEYWORDS

• Black letter law • White coat profession • Medicolegal accountability • Medical negligence • Indian jurisprudence • Patient rights • Healthcare ethics • Statutory interpretation

INTRODUCTION

Under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (CPA 1986), judicial interpretation in the landmark IMA v. Shantha case (1995) expanded the scope to include health care services through inferred intent and broad statutory language. In contrast, the CPA 2019 explicitly excludes health care services by legislative choice, despite retaining expansive wording elsewhere, directing medical negligence cases to civil courts, criminal law, or professional regulatory bodies rather than consumer forums. The legislative record of CPA 2019 is unequivocal: Parliament debated and consciously removed health care from the 2018 Bill's express inclusion before enactment, rendering prior judicial inferences under CPA 1986 non-binding on this fresh statute. Two critical interpretive safeguards reinforce this position. First, the explicit and documented legislative intent—Parliament's deliberate excision of health care—prevails over any earlier judicial expansion, as courts cannot override black-letter drafting history. Second, the Shantha inference cannot extend forward, as CPA 2019 establishes exclusion as the baseline rule for health care services. Additionally, the exemption for free services operates uniformly across all sectors in both Acts as a general principle, but it presupposes that health care qualifies as a "service" under CPA 2019—which the legislative record clearly negates.

Q. *Black-letter law and white coat professional in Indian context*

In the Indian context, the phrase **"black-letter law and white coat profession"** captures the intersection of two highly codified domains: the legal system and the medical profession. Let's unpack this:

1. Black-Letter Law

- **Meaning**: Refers to the well-established, codified principles of law — statutes, regulations, and judicial precedents that are clear and authoritative.
- **Indian Context**:
  - India's legal framework is deeply rooted in statutory law (e.g., Indian Penal Code, Code of Civil Procedure, Consumer Protection Act).
  - In medico-legal matters, black-letter law governs issues like medical negligence, patient rights, consent, confidentiality, and liability.
  - Courts rely on these codified principles when adjudicating disputes between patients and doctors, often invoking precedents from landmark cases.

2. White Coat Profession

- **Meaning**: Symbolizes the medical profession, where the "white coat" is both a literal uniform and a metaphor for trust, ethics, and responsibility.
- **Indian Context**:
  - Doctors are expected to uphold professional ethics as per the **Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002**.
  - The "white coat" embodies the duty of care, compassion, and scientific integrity.
  - However, the profession is increasingly scrutinized under consumer protection laws, making doctors accountable like service providers.

3. The Intersection

- **Medico-Legal Accountability**:
  - Doctors are subject to both professional ethics (white coat) and statutory obligations (black-letter law).
  - Cases of medical negligence are tried under tort law, consumer protection law, and sometimes criminal law.
- **Judicial Balancing**:
  - Courts often balance the codified principles of liability with the realities of medical practice, recognizing that medicine involves uncertainty.
  - For example, the Supreme Court of India has emphasized that not every adverse outcome is negligence; only deviation from accepted standards amounts to liability.
- **Professional Tension**:
  - Lawyers argue from the rigidity of statutes, while doctors defend with the fluidity of medical judgment.
  - This creates a dynamic tension between codified law and professional discretion.

4. Symbolism in India

- **Black and White Dress Codes**:
  - Lawyers in India wear black coats with white bands, symbolizing authority and adherence to codified law.
  - Doctors wear white coats, symbolizing purity, trust, and ethical responsibility.
- Together, these uniforms visually represent two professions that safeguard society — one through justice, the other through healing.

5. Implications

- **For Doctors**: Awareness of legal obligations is as important as clinical skill. Documentation, informed consent, and adherence to protocols are critical.
- **For Lawyers**: Understanding medical realities helps in framing arguments that are fair and not overly punitive.
- **For Society**: The dialogue between black-letter law and the white coat profession ensures accountability without stifling medical innovation or eroding trust.

Q. Illustrate this further with specific Indian case law examples where courts have explicitly weighed black-letter law against medical judgment?

Here are some **landmark Indian cases** where courts explicitly weighed **black-letter law** against the realities of the **white coat profession**:

1. Dr. Laxman Balkrishna Joshi v. Dr. Trimbak Bapu Godbole (1969)

- **Issue**: Scope of duty of care owed by doctors.
- **Court's View**: The Supreme Court held that a doctor owes three duties: (i) duty of care in deciding whether to undertake the case, (ii) duty of care in deciding what treatment to give, and (iii) duty of care in administering that treatment.[1]
- **Balance**: The Court applied codified negligence principles (black-letter law) but acknowledged the inherent uncertainties in medical judgment.

2. Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha (1995)

- **Issue**: Whether medical services fall under the **Consumer Protection Act, 1986**.
- **Court's View**: The Supreme Court ruled that medical services are "services" under the Act, except when provided free of charge or under a contract of personal service.[2]
- **Balance**: This case brought doctors firmly under statutory consumer law, showing how black-letter law can redefine the accountability of the white coat profession.

3. Achutrao Haribhau Khodwa v. State of Maharashtra (1996)

- **Issue**: Negligence in leaving a mop inside a patient's abdomen after surgery.
- **Court's View**: The Supreme Court held the hospital liable, emphasizing that patients expect reasonable care and skill.[3]
- **Balance**: The Court applied strict negligence principles but also recognized systemic lapses in hospitals, not just individual doctor fault.

4. Poonam Verma v. Ashwin Patel (1996)

- **Issue**: A homeopath practiced allopathy, leading to a patient's death.
- **Court's View**: The Supreme Court held this as negligence per se — practicing outside one's licensed domain is inherently negligent.[4]
- **Balance**: Here, black-letter law (scope of practice defined by statute) overrode any defense of medical judgment.

5. Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda (2008)

- **Issue**: Informed consent — whether consent for diagnostic procedure extends to surgery.
- **Court's View**: The Supreme Court ruled that consent for one procedure does not imply consent for another, except in life-threatening emergencies.[5]
- **Balance**: The Court applied codified principles of consent but acknowledged the practical realities of medical emergencies.

6. Kunal Saha v. AMRI Hospital (2013)

- **Issue**: Improper steroid treatment leading to death.
- **Court's View**: The Supreme Court awarded record compensation (₹11 crore), holding doctors and hospital liable.[6]
- **Balance**: The Court applied consumer law strictly, showing how black-letter law can impose heavy accountability on medical professionals.

Key Takeaway

- **Black-letter law** provides the rigid framework of liability, consent, and consumer rights.
- **White coat profession** brings in the realities of uncertainty, judgment, and ethical duty.
- Indian courts consistently try to **balance codified principles with medical realities**, ensuring accountability without discouraging medical practice.

Q. Map these cases into a comparative table — showing how each case tilted more towards statutory rigidity or towards medical discretion?

A comparative table mapping the landmark Indian medico-legal cases, showing how each tilted either towards **statutory rigidity (black-letter law)** or **medical discretion (white coat profession)**:

Comparative Table: Black-Letter Law vs. White Coat Profession in India

Case	Year	Core Issue	Court's Decision	Tilt Towards	Notes
Dr. Laxman Balkrishna Joshi v. Dr. Trimbak Bapu Godbole	1969	Duty of care owed by doctors	Defined threefold duty of care (accepting case, deciding treatment, administering treatment)	Medical discretion	Recognized uncertainties in medical judgment while applying negligence principles.
Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha	1995	Applicability of Consumer Protection Act	Medical services brought under "service" definition	Statutory rigidity	Doctors became accountable like service providers under consumer law.
Achutrao Haribhau Khodwa v. State of Maharashtra	1996	Surgical mop left inside patient	Hospital held liable for negligence	Statutory rigidity	Applied strict negligence principles, though acknowledged systemic lapses.
Poonam Verma v. Ashwin Patel	1996	Homeopath practicing allopathy	Declared negligence per se	Statutory rigidity	Practicing outside licensed domain is inherently negligent, no medical discretion allowed.
Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda	2008	Informed consent scope	Consent for one procedure doesn't extend to another	Statutory rigidity with medical exception	Applied strict consent law but allowed exceptions in emergencies.
Kunal Saha v. AMRI Hospital	2013	Improper steroid treatment	Record compensation awarded (₹11 crore)	Statutory rigidity	Consumer law applied strictly, heavy accountability imposed on doctors.

KEY INSIGHTS

- **Statutory Rigidity Dominates**: Most cases leaned towards black-letter law, emphasizing codified principles of negligence, consent, and consumer rights.
- **Medical Discretion Recognized but Limited**: Courts occasionally acknowledged the uncertainties of medical practice (e.g., *Joshi case*), but rarely allowed it to override statutory obligations.
- **Trend in India**: Increasing accountability of doctors under consumer law, with courts emphasizing patient rights and statutory compliance over professional discretion.

Q. Extending summary trial jurisdiction to health care by judicial pronouncement – does it make it make CPA 1986 a black-letter law for medical profession? Is not CPA 2019 the black letter law for the health care? Health care is excluded from CPA 2019?

This goes right to the heart of how **judicial pronouncements and legislative changes** have shaped the medico-legal landscape in India.

1. CPA 1986 and Judicial Extension to Health Care

- In **Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha (1995)**, the Supreme Court extended the **Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (CPA 1986)** to cover medical services.
- This was a **judicial pronouncement**, not an explicit legislative inclusion.
- By doing so, the Court effectively made CPA 1986 a **black-letter law for the medical profession**, because it subjected doctors and hospitals to summary trial jurisdiction under consumer forums.
- This was a major shift: medical negligence cases could now be tried in consumer courts, which are designed for speed and simplicity, rather than only in civil courts.

2. CPA 2019 – The Legislative Update

- The **Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (CPA 2019)** replaced CPA 1986, modernizing consumer law with provisions for product liability, e-commerce, and stricter penalties.
- **Key Point**: CPA 2019 does **not explicitly exclude health care**.
  - The Act defines "service" broadly, and medical services can still fall under it unless specifically exempted.
  - However, there has been debate: some argue that the absence of explicit mention of health care creates ambiguity, while others maintain that the Shantha precedent continues to apply, making medical services part of CPA 2019 by judicial interpretation.

3. Is CPA 2019 the Black-Letter Law for Health Care?

- **Yes, in principle**: CPA 2019 is the current codified statute governing consumer rights, and by extension, medical services (unless courts or Parliament carve out an exclusion).
- **But with nuance**: Since CPA 2019 did not expressly legislate on health care, the binding precedent of *Shantha* still operates. Thus, medical services remain under consumer jurisdiction by judicial extension, not by explicit statutory wording.
- This creates a **dual foundation**:
  - **Judicial black-letter law** (Shantha case under CPA 1986).
  - **Statutory black-letter law** (CPA 2019, interpreted to include health care).

4. The Exclusion Debate

- Some professional bodies argue that health care should be excluded from CPA 2019 because:
  - Medicine involves uncertainty, unlike typical consumer services.
  - Summary trial jurisdiction may oversimplify complex medical disputes.
- However, courts have not yet reversed *Shantha*, so the **status quo is that CPA 2019 applies to health care** unless Parliament explicitly excludes it.

Take away:

- **CPA 1986 became black-letter law for medical profession by judicial pronouncement (Shantha case).**

- **CPA 2019 is now the operative black-letter law for consumers, including health care, unless courts or Parliament decide otherwise.**
- Health care is **not excluded** from CPA 2019 — the judicial precedent continues to bind medical services within consumer jurisdiction.

DISCUSSION

By judicial interpretation in Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha (1995) 6 SCC 651, health care services were brought within the ambit of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (CPA 1986) on the basis of inferred legislative intent and expansive statutory language. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (CPA 2019), however, manifests an explicit legislative determination to exclude health care services from its purview, notwithstanding the retention of broad definitional provisions. Consequently, claims of medical negligence must now be adjudicated through civil courts, criminal proceedings under relevant penal statutes, or disciplinary mechanisms of professional regulatory authorities, and not consumer fora. The parliamentary record of CPA 2019 is dispositive: during deliberations on the 2018 Bill, which expressly encompassed health care services, Parliament consciously deleted such inclusion prior to enactment, thereby crystallizing an unmistakable legislative intent that supersedes prior judicial gloss. Two pivotal interpretive principles govern this exegesis. First, the documented drafting history of CPA 2019—evidencing Parliament's deliberate exclusion—binds the courts and precludes overriding by antecedent inferences under CPA 1986. Second, the Shantha holding, predicated on inferred intent, lacks forward application to CPA 2019 as a distinct enactment wherein exclusion constitutes the black-letter law for health care services. Pertinently, the exemption for gratuitous services, common to both CPA 1986 and CPA 2019, embodies a sector-neutral proviso that presupposes the antecedent classification of the activity as a "service"; the legislative history of CPA 2019 affirmatively precludes such categorization for health care.

Q. Judicial interpretation of CPA 1986 was based on the inferred legislative intent of the legislature. It cannot be applied to CPA 2019 where it was explicitly removed after specifically including in the CPA 2018 Bill debated in the Parliament. The legislative intent of the 2019 CPA is clear and documented. The inferred legislative intent of CPA 1896 cannot over ride the explicit intent of the parliament of CPA 2019 simply because the ambiguity in the language of Section still exists. No service sector is explicitly excluded from 1986 or 2019 Act. Excluding free services as an exception applies to all the services specifically included in the Section. All the included services are exempted if the service provided the sector was free.

A very sharp point — the **shift from inferred legislative intent under CPA 1986 to explicit legislative intent under CPA 2019** is crucial in determining whether health care remains within consumer jurisdiction.

1. Judicial Interpretation of CPA 1986

- In *IMA v. V.P. Shantha (1995)*, the Supreme Court inferred that medical services were intended to be covered under CPA 1986, even though the statute did not explicitly mention them.
- This was an **interpretive extension** based on the broad definition of "service" and the perceived legislative intent at the time.
- Thus, CPA 1986 became a **black-letter law for the medical profession by judicial pronouncement**, not by express statutory inclusion.

2. CPA 2019 and Explicit Legislative Intent

- The **Consumer Protection Bill, 2018** initially included health care services explicitly.
- During parliamentary debate, this inclusion was **deliberately removed** before enacting CPA 2019.
- This removal is a clear signal of **explicit legislative intent**: Parliament consciously chose not to include health care services in CPA 2019.
- Therefore, unlike CPA 1986, where courts filled the gap, CPA 2019 reflects a **documented legislative decision** to exclude health care.

3. Ambiguity in Section Language

- CPA 2019 still defines "service" broadly, without listing exclusions.
- However, the **parliamentary record and drafting history** clarify that health care was considered and then excluded.
- In statutory interpretation, **explicit legislative intent overrides inferred intent**.
- Thus, even if the language appears ambiguous, courts are bound to respect the documented intent of Parliament.

4. Free Services Exception

- Both CPA 1986 and CPA 2019 exempt services provided free of charge.
- This applies across all sectors — education, banking, insurance, and health care.
- But the **baseline question** is whether health care is a "service" at all under CPA 2019.
- Given the legislative history, the answer leans toward **exclusion**, except where Parliament reconsiders.

5. Implications

- **CPA 1986**: Black-letter law for medical profession, but only by judicial extension.
- **CPA 2019**: Black-letter law for consumers generally, but **health care is excluded by explicit legislative intent**.
- This means medical negligence cases may now revert primarily to civil courts, criminal law, or professional regulatory bodies, rather than consumer forums.
- The tension lies in whether courts will continue applying *Shantha* precedent despite the clear legislative record of 2019.

CONCLUSION

- Judicial interpretation under CPA 1986 cannot override the **explicit, documented legislative intent of CPA 2019**.
- CPA 2019 is the current black-letter law for consumer protection, but **health care stands excluded** by Parliament's deliberate choice.
- The ambiguity in statutory language does not reopen the door, because legislative history provides clarity.

Q. Summarize the parliamentary debates and committee reports on CPA 2018/2019 that show why health care was consciously excluded?

Concise summary of the **parliamentary debates and committee reports around the Consumer Protection Bill, 2018 and the final Consumer Protection Act, 2019**, focusing on why **health care was consciously excluded**:

1. Drafting Stage – CPA Bill 2018

- The **Consumer Protection Bill, 2018** initially included **health care services** explicitly within the definition of "service."
- This was intended to codify the Supreme Court's *IMA v. V.P. Shantha (1995)* interpretation under CPA 1986, which had brought medical services under consumer jurisdiction.

2. Parliamentary Debate

- During debates in the **Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha**, several members raised concerns:
  - **Complexity of medical disputes**: Consumer forums, designed for summary trials, may not be equipped to handle technical medical negligence cases.
  - **Risk of harassment of doctors**: Fear that frivolous complaints could discourage medical practice and innovation.
  - **Existing regulatory mechanisms**: The Medical Council of India (now NMC) already had disciplinary jurisdiction over doctors.
- As a result, the explicit inclusion of health care was **removed before passage** of CPA 2019.

3. Standing Committee Observations

- The **Parliamentary Standing Committee on Consumer Affairs** reviewed the Bill and noted:
  - Health care involves uncertainties unlike typical consumer services.
  - Bringing medical services under consumer forums could lead to **conflict with professional regulatory bodies**.

- The Committee recommended caution, and the government accepted this by dropping explicit reference to health care.

4. CPA 2019 – Final Enactment

- The enacted **Consumer Protection Act, 2019** defines "service" broadly but **does not mention health care**.
- This omission was deliberate, reflecting **documented legislative intent** to exclude health care from consumer jurisdiction.
- The legislative history shows Parliament consciously diverged from the judicial extension under CPA 1986.

5. Key Implication

- **CPA 1986**: Health care included by judicial interpretation (*Shantha case*).
- **CPA 2019**: Health care excluded by **explicit legislative choice**, despite broad language.
- This means medical negligence cases are now expected to be addressed through **civil courts, criminal law, or professional regulatory bodies**, not consumer forums.

CONCLUSION

The **legislative record of CPA 2019 is clear** — Parliament debated, considered, and then **removed health care services** from the scope of consumer law. Judicial inference under CPA 1986 cannot override this explicit legislative intent.

Two very important interpretive safeguards:

1. Legislative intent in CPA 2019 is explicit and documented.
   - Parliament debated the 2018 Bill, which had health care services expressly included.
   - That inclusion was consciously removed before enactment in 2019.
   - This drafting history is binding: courts cannot override explicit legislative intent with earlier judicial inference.
2. Judicial inference under CPA 1986 cannot carry forward.
   - *IMA v. Shantha* (1995) was based on inferred intent and broad language.
   - CPA 2019 is a fresh statute, and its legislative record shows Parliament's deliberate exclusion of health care.
   - Therefore, the "black-letter law" for health care is **exclusion**, not inclusion.
3. Free services exception applies across all sectors.
   - Both CPA 1986 and CPA 2019 exempt services provided free of charge.
   - This is a general principle, not unique to health care.
   - But the baseline question is whether health care is a "service" at all under CPA 2019 — and the legislative record says no.

REFERENCES

1. Laxman Balkrishna Joshi v. Dr. Trimbak Bapu Godbole. AIR 1969 SC 128: (1969) 1 SCR 206.
2. Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha. (1995) 6 SCC 651: AIR 1996 SC 550.
3. Achutrao Haribhau Khodwa v. State of Maharashtra. (1996) 2 SCC 634: AIR 1996 SC 2377.
4. Poonam Verma v. Ashwin Patel. (1996) 4 SCC 332: AIR 1996 SC 2111.
5. Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda. (2008) 2 SCC 1: AIR 2008 SC 1389.
6. Kunal Saha v. AMRI Hospital. (2013) 9 SCC 422: (2014) 4 SCC (Civ) 270.