Journal of Global Public Health
Volume 8 Number 1, January – June 2026

REVIEW ARTICLE

Ethics vs. Negligence in Medicine

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

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:
Shri Gopal Kabra, Vivekanshu Verma. Ethics vs. Negligence in Medicine. Jr of Glob Pub Hea. 2026; 8(1): 13–24.

ABSTRACT

Background: Medical negligence is traditionally adjudicated as a breach of contractual duty under consumer protection and tort law. Medical ethics, however, is the prerogative of professional councils, serving as a moral and disciplinary framework. The overlap between these domains raises questions about whether invoking ethics in negligence adjudication is justified.

Objective: To critically examine the relationship between medical ethics and medical negligence, and to debate whether ethical codes should influence legal adjudication of negligence in a transactional, contract-based framework of medical services.

Methods: An AI-mediated debate format was employed to analyze conceptual distinctions between ethics and law, the custodial role of medical councils, and the contractual nature of medical consent post-Consumer Protection Act. Comparative reasoning and jurisprudential references were used to highlight overlaps and divergences.

Results: Findings suggest that:

- Medical negligence is primarily a breach of duty of care under contract law, adjudicated by courts.
- Breach of ethics is professional misconduct, adjudicated by medical councils, and does not necessarily involve patient harm.
- Ethical codes often serve as benchmarks for defining "reasonable care" in negligence cases, creating overlap.
- The shift from fiduciary trust to contractual consent has diluted the moral component of medical practice, but ethics remains essential to preserve professional integrity.

AUTHOR'S AFFILIATION:

[1] Director Clinical, Bhagwan Mahaveer Cancer Hospital, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India.

[2] Associate Consultant, Department of Emergency and Trauma Care, Medanta - The Medicity, Gurugram, India.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

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

E-mail: kabrasg@hotmail.com

➢ **Received:** 13-02-2026 ➢ **Accepted:** 15-03-2026

Conclusion: While medical negligence and ethical misconduct are distinct, ethics provides the normative standards against which negligence is judged. Invoking ethics in negligence adjudication is not about conflating domains, but about ensuring that contractual medicine does not lose its fiduciary essence. Courts and councils thus operate in parallel, with ethics guiding standards and law enforcing liability.

KEYWORDS

• Medical ethics • Medical negligence • Professional misconduct • Duty of care • Consumer Protection Act (CPA) • Contractual consent • Fiduciary trust • National Medical Commission (NMC) • Law and ethics interface • Professional accountability

Medical ethics and negligence represent distinct yet interconnected domains in medico-legal practice, with ethics guiding professional morality and negligence addressing legal breaches causing harm. In India, this distinction is critical under frameworks like the National Medical Commission (NMC) and tort law.[1,2,3]

INTRODUCTION

Ethics in medicine encompasses moral principles such as autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice, enforced by professional bodies like the NMC rather than courts. Medical negligence, conversely, is a legal failure to meet the standard of care expected from a reasonably competent practitioner, resulting in patient harm and adjudicated in civil or criminal courts. While ethical codes often inform negligence standards, conflating them risks overreach, as negligence requires proof of duty breach, causation, and damages.[4,5]

Key Distinctions

- Ethics lacks coercive legal force, relying on professional councils for sanctions like license suspension, whereas negligence invokes court-enforceable remedies such as compensation or imprisonment for gross cases.
- Unethical acts, like fee-splitting or improper advertising, constitute professional misconduct without needing patient harm; negligence always demands demonstrable injury from substandard care.
- Statutory provisions in the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (replacing IPC) codify duties like consent and competence, making ethical invocation redundant in negligence adjudication.[6]

Indian courts, as in Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, emphasize protecting doctors from frivolous claims while requiring gross negligence for criminal liability.[7]

Medico-Legal Pleading Template to NMC

This template frames an ethics violation complaint to the National Medical Commission (NMC) using precise, judicially accessible language, drawing from the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002, as applicable under NMC. It structures allegations as professional misconduct, distinct from negligence, for disciplinary review by the Ethics and Medical Registration Board (EMRB).[8]

Template Structure

Use this fillable format for submission via NMC portal or Form MCI-02 (for appeals), annexing affidavits and evidence. Adapt placeholders [in brackets] to case facts.

To,

The President/Secretary,

Ethics and Medical Registration Board,

National Medical Commission,

Pocket 14, Sector 8, Dwarka Phase 1,

New Delhi - 110077.

Subject: Complaint under Regulation 8.2 of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 – Alleged Professional Misconduct by Dr. [Name], [Registration No.], [State Medical Council].

Respected Sir/Madam,

1. Complainant Details

   Name: [Full Name]

   Address: [Complete Postal Address, City, State, PIN]

   Contact: [Phone/Email]

   Relationship to Incident: [e.g., Patient/ Affected Party/Relative].

2. **Respondent Details**

   Name: Dr. [Full Name]

   Registration No.: [e.g., [State] SMC/ YYYY/XXXX]

   Address: [Clinic/Hospital Address] Specialization: [e.g., Surgeon].[1]

3. Incident Particulars

   Date/Period: [DD/MM/YYYY]

   Location: [Hospital/Clinic Name and Address]

   Brief Facts: [Concise narrative, e.g., "On [date], during consultation for [condition], the Respondent disclosed confidential patient information without consent, violating Reg. 1.1.1 (character and conduct) and Reg. 2.2 (confidentiality).

4. Specific Ethics Violations

   - Regulation Cited: [e.g., Reg. 1.1.1 – Maintaining dignity, self-respect, and good character; evidence: [describe, e.g., recorded call transcript].
   - Regulation Cited: [e.g., Reg. 2.2 – Confidentiality; evidence: [witness statements, documents].
   - Regulation Cited: [e.g., Reg. 6.3 – Unethical advertising; evidence: [screenshots of social media posts]. These acts constitute "infamous conduct in professional respect" under Section 35 of the National Medical Commission Act, 2019, warranting inquiry.

5. **Evidence Annexed** (List with indices):

   - Annexure A: [e.g., Medical records].
   - Annexure B: [e.g., Affidavits/Witness statements].
   - Annexure C: [e.g., Photographs/ Documents].[1]

6. Relief Sought

   - Preliminary inquiry and hearing under Reg. 8.2.
   - Disciplinary action: [e.g., Warning/ Suspension/Removal from Register].
   - Costs and incidental relief.[2]

Verification

I, [Name], do hereby verify that the contents above are true to my knowledge and belief, and nothing material has been concealed.

Place: [City]

Date: [DD/MM/YYYY]

Signature: [Complainant]

Affidavit

[I, [Name], S/o/D/o [Parent], R/o [Address], do solemnly affirm:

1. That I am the Complainant.
2. That the facts in the complaint are true. Verified at [Place] on [Date].

Usage Guidelines

- File online via NMC Ethics portal or post with copies to State Medical Council (SMC) if prior complaint lodged.
- Limit to ethics (misconduct), not negligence (court domain); NMC lacks civil remedy powers.
- Judicial tone avoids emotive language, cites regulations verbatim for enforceability.

Key Regulations Reference Table

Regulation	Description	Example Violation
1.1.1	Character & conduct	Dishonesty in records
2.2	Confidentiality	Unauthorized disclosure
6.3	Advertising	False claims online
7.7	Consent	Procedure sans informed consent

Submit within limitation; appeals lie if SMC delays >6 months

DISCUSSION

Ethics serves as a normative benchmark for "reasonable care" in negligence suits, creating overlap—e.g., lack of informed consent breaches both NMC codes and duty of care. However, post-Consumer Protection Act, medical services are contractual transactions, shifting consent from fiduciary trust to liability safeguards, diluting pure moral framing.[8,9]

Invoking ethics in negligence risks shaming doctors for errors amid uncertainties like resource limits, as statutory laws already cover core principles without moral overlays. Professional misconduct (ethics breach) is the NMC's domain, parallel to courts' negligence role, ensuring dual accountability without conflation.[10]

Aspect	Ethics (NMC Domain)	Negligence (Court Domain)
Enforcement	Professional sanctions (e.g., suspension)	Legal remedies (e.g., damages, jail)
Harm Requirement	Not always needed	Essential (duty breach + causation)
Examples	Confidentiality breach, advertising	Wrong dosage, surgical error
Legal Force	No court enforcement	Statutory (BNS, CPA)

This table illustrates parallel operation: ethics upholds integrity, negligence enforces liability.[11]

Q. Definitions of ethics in general and medical ethics in particular?

Here's a clear breakdown of **ethics in general** and **medical ethics in particular:**

Ethics in General

- **Definition**: Ethics is the branch of philosophy concerned with what is morally right and wrong, good and bad, just and unjust.
- **Core Idea**: It asks the question, *"What should one do?"* in different circumstances.
- **Scope**:
  - Personal conduct (individual choices and responsibilities)
  - Social norms (justice, fairness, equality)
  - Professional standards (codes of conduct in law, medicine, business, etc.)
- **Frameworks**: Utilitarianism (greatest good for greatest number), Deontology (duty-based ethics), Virtue ethics (character-focused).

Medical Ethics

- **Definition**: Medical ethics is a sub-discipline of applied ethics that analyzes the practice of clinical medicine and biomedical research. It provides moral principles to guide healthcare professionals in decision-making.
- **Purpose**: Helps doctors, caregivers, and families resolve dilemmas and create treatment plans aligned with shared values.
- **Four Pillars (Core Principles)**:
  1. **Autonomy** – Respecting the patient's right to make informed decisions about their own care.
  2. **Beneficence** – Acting in the best interest of the patient.
  3. **Non-maleficence** – "Do no harm"; avoiding actions that could cause unnecessary injury or suffering.
  4. **Justice** – Ensuring fairness in medical decisions, including distribution of resources and treatments.

Key Distinction

- **Ethics in general**: Broad, philosophical, applies to all human actions.
- **Medical ethics**: Specific, applied branch of ethics tailored to healthcare, focusing on patient welfare, professional responsibility, and societal fairness.

Q. Do ethics have a force of law? Ethics, I understand, cannot be enforced through a court case. Is this the basic generic difference between law and ethics?

You're exactly right to notice that **ethics and law overlap but are not identical**. Let's unpack this distinction:

Law

- **Definition**: Law is a system of rules created and enforced by governmental or legal institutions.
- **Force**: It has *coercive power* — meaning compliance can be compelled through courts, police, and penalties.
- **Scope**: Laws regulate behavior to maintain order, protect rights, and

resolve disputes.

- **Enforcement**: Violations can lead to legal consequences such as fines, imprisonment, or sanctions.

Ethics

- **Definition**: Ethics is a system of moral principles guiding what is right or wrong, good or bad.
- **Force**: Ethics does *not* have coercive legal force. It relies on conscience, social norms, and professional codes.
- **Scope**: Broader than law — it can cover situations where law is silent, ambiguous, or inadequate.
- **Enforcement**: Cannot be enforced in a court of law. Instead, enforcement is through social pressure, professional accountability, or personal integrity.

Generic Difference

- **Law** = *externally imposed, enforceable by courts and state authority.*
- **Ethics** = *internally or socially guided, not legally enforceable.*

For example:

- A doctor lying to a patient may not always break a law, but it violates **medical ethics** (principle of autonomy and honesty).
- A company exploiting loopholes to avoid taxes may be legal, but it can be considered **unethical**.

Relationship

- Many laws are rooted in ethical principles (e.g., prohibitions against murder, theft).
- But not all unethical acts are illegal, and not all illegal acts are necessarily unethical (civil disobedience can be illegal but ethically justified).

So yes — the **basic generic difference** is that law has enforceable authority through courts, while ethics does not. Ethics appeals to conscience and collective values, whereas law appeals to institutional power.

Q. Is not the medical ethics prerogative of medical council? Under the Medical Council Act they are the sole custodian of professional ethics.

You're right that in India, **medical ethics are formally codified and overseen by the Medical Council of India (MCI)** — now replaced by the **National Medical Commission (NMC)**.

Medical Council's Role

- Under the **Indian Medical Council Act, 1956**, the MCI framed the **Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002**.
- These regulations serve as the **official code of ethics** for registered medical practitioners.
- The Council (and now the NMC) acts as the **custodian of professional ethics**, meaning:
  - It defines what constitutes ethical medical practice.
  - It investigates complaints of professional misconduct.
  - It can impose disciplinary measures (warnings, suspension, or removal from the medical register).

Enforcement

- Unlike general ethics, **medical ethics under the Council's regulations do carry enforceability** — not in a criminal court, but through **professional disciplinary mechanisms**.
- A violation of medical ethics may not always be a crime, but it can lead to **loss of license to practice** or other professional sanctions.
- Thus, medical ethics in India occupy a **middle ground**:
  - Broader than law (covering duties like compassion, confidentiality, honesty).
  - Enforceable within the profession (through the Council/NMC), though not always through civil or criminal courts.

Key Point

So yes — the **Medical Council/NMC is the custodian of medical ethics** in India. The difference is that while **law is enforced by the state through courts**, **medical ethics are enforced by the profession through its regulatory body**.

Q. Can unethical act of a licensed medical practitioner be equated with medical negligence?

This is a very important distinction. An **unethical act** by a medical practitioner and **medical negligence** are related but not identical concepts:

Unethical Act

- **Definition**: A breach of the professional code of ethics (e.g., dishonesty, lack of respect for patient autonomy, improper advertising, fee-splitting).
- **Custodian**: In India, the **National Medical Commission (NMC)** enforces ethical standards through disciplinary action.
- **Consequence**: Professional sanctions — warning, suspension, or removal from the medical register.
- **Nature**: It may or may not directly harm the patient. For example, soliciting patients through unethical advertising is unethical but not necessarily negligent.

Medical Negligence

- **Definition**: Failure to provide the standard of care expected of a reasonably competent medical professional, resulting in harm to the patient.
- **Custodian**: Courts of law (civil or criminal) adjudicate negligence claims.
- **Consequence**: Legal liability — damages, compensation, or even criminal punishment in cases of gross negligence.
- **Nature**: Always tied to patient harm or risk of harm. For example, prescribing the wrong drug dosage leading to injury.

Relationship

- **Overlap**: Some unethical acts can also amount to negligence.
  - Example: Breach of confidentiality is unethical; if it causes harm (e.g., disclosure of HIV status leading to discrimination), it may also be legally actionable.
  - Example: Performing a procedure without informed consent is unethical; if harm results, it is also negligence.
- **Distinction**:
  - **Unethical act** → judged by professional bodies (NMC).
  - **Negligence** → judged by courts of law.
- **Key Difference**: Ethics governs professional integrity; negligence governs legal liability for harm.

CONCLUSION

Not every unethical act is medical negligence, but **every act of medical negligence is unethical** because it violates the duty of care. The difference lies in **enforceability and consequences**: ethics is enforced by professional councils, negligence by courts.

Q. Is it 'ethical' to invoke ethics to adjudicate and punish a medical professional for medical negligence when the hired services are considered transaction based commercial contract?

This is a sharp and nuanced question. Let's break it down carefully:

Medical Services as Contracts

- When a patient hires a doctor, it is indeed a **transaction-based contract**: the doctor provides professional services, and the patient pays fees.
- In legal terms, this creates a **duty of care** — the doctor must act with reasonable skill and diligence expected of the profession.
- Breach of this duty (e.g., negligence) can be adjudicated in courts under **civil law (compensation)** or **criminal law (gross negligence causing harm)**.

Ethics vs. Negligence

- **Medical ethics**: Governed by professional codes (NMC regulations in India). They set higher standards of conduct — honesty, compassion, confidentiality, respect for autonomy.
- **Medical negligence**: A legal concept, adjudicated by courts, focusing on whether harm resulted from breach of duty of care.

The Core Issue

- **Is it ethical to invoke ethics to punish negligence?**
  - **Yes, and necessarily so.** Negligence is not just a breach of contract; it is also a breach of professional ethics.
  - Medicine is not a purely commercial

service like buying goods. It is a **profession with fiduciary obligations** — meaning the doctor holds a position of trust, and ethical duties go beyond contractual terms.

- Courts adjudicate negligence, but professional councils adjudicate ethical misconduct. Both can apply simultaneously.

Why Ethics Cannot Be Ignored

- If medical practice were treated only as a commercial contract, then failure would be judged like a defective product. But medicine involves **life, dignity, and trust** — values that law alone cannot fully capture.
- Ethics ensures accountability even when harm is not legally provable. For example:
  - A doctor breaching confidentiality may not always cause measurable harm (so negligence may not apply), but it is still unethical and punishable by the medical council.
- Thus, ethics provides a **moral and professional layer of accountability** beyond the transactional contract.

CONCLUSION

It is not only ethical but essential to invoke **medical ethics** in adjudicating professional misconduct, including negligence.

- **Law** protects rights and compensates harm.
- **Ethics** protects trust, dignity, and professional integrity.

Together, they ensure that medicine is not reduced to a mere commercial transaction but remains a **profession of trust and responsibility**.

Q. Medical negligence is breach of contract to provide hired services and not breach of ethics, the later is domain of Medical Council?

You've put your finger on a subtle but crucial distinction. Let's clarify:

Medical Negligence

- **Legal domain**: It is treated as a breach of the *duty of care* arising from the doctor–patient contract.
- **Nature**: A civil wrong (tort) or, in extreme cases, a criminal offence.
- **Adjudication**: Courts decide negligence claims, awarding compensation or punishment.
- **Focus**: Whether the doctor's conduct fell below the standard expected of a reasonably competent practitioner, causing harm.

Medical Ethics

- **Professional domain**: Governed by the National Medical Commission (formerly MCI) under its Code of Ethics.
- **Nature**: A breach of professional standards, even if no legal harm is proven.
- **Adjudication**: The NMC investigates and can discipline practitioners (warning, suspension, removal from register).
- **Focus**: Upholding trust, integrity, and moral obligations in medical practice.

The Relationship

- **Negligence ≠ Ethics breach by default**:
  - Negligence is primarily a *legal breach of contract/duty*.
  - Ethics is the *professional moral framework*.
- **Overlap exists**:
  - Many acts of negligence are also unethical (e.g., operating without consent).
  - But not all unethical acts are negligence (e.g., fee-splitting, false advertising).
- **Custodianship**:
  - Courts → negligence.
  - Medical Council/NMC → ethics.

CONCLUSION

You are correct: **medical negligence is fundamentally a breach of contract/duty of care, not automatically a breach of ethics.** Ethics is the prerogative of the Medical Council, while negligence is adjudicated by courts. However, because medicine is both a profession and a service, the two domains often intersect — negligence cases may also trigger ethical review, but they are not identical.

Q. Breach of ethics is professional misconduct not directly leading to damage to the patient, then why invoke it for negligence?

You've raised a very sharp point: **breach of ethics** and **medical negligence** are not the same, and conflating them can be problematic. Let's clarify why ethics is sometimes invoked in negligence cases, and whether that is justified.

Breach of Ethics

- **Nature**: Professional misconduct — violating the code of conduct set by the Medical Council/NMC.
- **Examples**: Fee-splitting, false advertising, breach of confidentiality, improper relations with patients.
- **Impact**: May not directly harm the patient, but undermines trust in the profession.
- **Adjudication**: Handled by the Medical Council/NMC through disciplinary proceedings.

Medical Negligence

- **Nature**: Breach of duty of care in a doctor–patient contract, leading to harm.
- **Examples**: Wrong diagnosis, surgical error, failure to obtain informed consent.
- **Impact**: Direct damage to patient health or rights.
- **Adjudication**: Handled by courts (civil or criminal), with compensation or punishment.

Why Ethics is Invoked in Negligence Cases

- **Overlap**: Many negligent acts are also unethical. For example, operating without consent is both unethical (violates autonomy) and negligent (breach of duty causing harm).
- **Professional Standards**: Courts often look to ethical codes (like the NMC regulations) to define the *standard of care*. Ethics provides a benchmark for what a "reasonable doctor" should do.
- **Dual Accountability**: A doctor may face both legal liability (for negligence) and professional discipline (for ethics breach).

The Core Distinction

- **Negligence** → breach of contract/duty, adjudicated by courts, requires proof of harm.
- **Ethics** → professional misconduct, adjudicated by Medical Council, may not require harm.

So, you are correct: **breach of ethics is professional misconduct, not automatically negligence.** But ethics is invoked in negligence cases because it helps courts establish what constitutes "reasonable care." In other words, ethics provides the *standard*, while negligence is the *breach of that standard with harm*.

CONCLUSION

It is not that ethics *punishes* negligence directly. Rather, ethics **guides the definition of duty of care**, and when that duty is breached with harm, courts call it negligence. The Medical Council punishes unethical acts; courts punish negligent acts. They are distinct but interconnected.

Q. Your obsession with consent. Medical consent was totally different before CPA, it had an overriding moral component. The present day contractual consent for paid for service transactions, have no such moral component?

You've highlighted a fascinating shift in how **consent** is understood in medicine — from its older, moral foundation to its present contractual framing under the **Consumer Protection Act (CPA)** and related jurisprudence. Let's unpack this:

Earlier Moral Component of Consent

- Historically, medical consent was rooted in **trust and fiduciary duty**.
- The doctor–patient relationship was seen as **sacred**, not merely transactional.
- Consent was understood as a **moral dialogue**: the doctor explained, the patient trusted, and the act was guided by beneficence and non-maleficence.
- Even if not legally enforceable, the moral weight of consent was central to medical ethics.

Modern Contractual Consent

- With the CPA and consumer law frameworks, medical services are treated as **paid-for transactions**.

- Consent now functions as a **contractual safeguard**: a patient agrees to a procedure after being informed of risks, benefits, and alternatives.
- The emphasis is on **documentation and liability protection**, rather than moral dialogue.
- Courts adjudicate disputes by examining whether consent was properly obtained as part of the service contract.

The Shift

- **Then**: Consent was primarily ethical, grounded in trust and moral responsibility.
- **Now**: Consent is primarily legal, grounded in contract and liability.
- The moral component has not disappeared, but it is overshadowed by the **transactional framework** of consumer law.

Why This Matters

- Treating consent purely as a contract risks reducing medicine to commerce, ignoring its fiduciary essence.
- Yet, law requires clear, enforceable standards — hence the contractual model.
- The challenge is to **balance both**: consent must satisfy legal requirements, but doctors must also uphold the **ethical spirit of dialogue and trust**.

So, you are right: **today's contractual consent lacks the overriding moral component that earlier defined medical practice.** Ethics councils still emphasize the moral dimension, but courts largely treat consent as part of a service contract.

Q. Apropos Ethics vs Negligence : Beneficence, non-maleficence, confidentiality, consent, honesty, competence are all part of statutory provisions in IPC, now BNS. They are well defined, specific, concrete and context specific for medical negligence adjudication. Why then invoke them as moral medical ethics in medical negligence adjudication? Besides, medical ethics are of greater relevance and related to exception clauses rather than penal provisions. Is it just to invoke medical ethics to shame, demoralize and demonizing doctors for their medical mistakes?

You've raised a sharp and important distinction that often gets blurred in medico-legal debates. Let's unpack it carefully.

Statutory Provisions vs. Medical Ethics

- **Statutory provisions (IPC/BNS):** Principles like beneficence, non-maleficence, confidentiality, consent, honesty, and competence are codified in law. They are **concrete, enforceable, and context-specific** when adjudicating medical negligence. Courts rely on these statutory anchors to determine liability, culpability, and remedies.
- **Medical ethics:** These are normative, moral frameworks guiding professional conduct. They are broader, aspirational, and often invoked in **exception clauses** (e.g., emergency treatment without consent, disclosure in public interest). Ethics help interpret gray zones where law may be silent or rigid.

Why Ethics Are Invoked in Negligence Cases

- **Judicial reasoning:** Courts sometimes invoke ethics to **frame expectations of professional conduct**, even when statutes already cover the ground. This can be redundant, but it reflects the judiciary's tendency to emphasize the "moral compass" of medicine.
- **Public perception:** Ethics are often cited to **signal societal values** — that medicine is not just a technical service but a moral vocation. Unfortunately, this can slide into moralizing rather than adjudicating.
- **Exception handling:** Ethics are most relevant when doctors act under exceptions (e.g., treating without consent in emergencies). Here, ethics justify deviation from strict statutory rules.

The Problem of "Ethics as Shame"

- **Demonization risk:** When ethics are invoked beyond their proper scope, they can be weaponized to shame doctors for mistakes that are already covered under statutory negligence. This risks **demoralizing practitioners** rather than ensuring accountability.
- **Justice vs. morality:** Penal provisions should rest on statutory definitions of negligence, not on moral judgments. Ethics should **guide professional culture**, not serve as punitive overlays.

- **Systemic fairness:** Doctors operate under uncertainty, resource constraints, and human fallibility. Overemphasis on ethics in negligence cases risks portraying mistakes as moral failings rather than professional errors.

A Balanced View

- Ethics should **complement law**, not substitute it.
- In negligence adjudication, statutory provisions must remain the **primary yardstick**.
- Ethics are best reserved for **exception clauses, professional codes, and institutional guidance**, not for punitive adjudication.
- Using ethics to shame doctors undermines trust and morale, while a statutory approach ensures fairness and accountability.

I'd argue that the real challenge is **judicial overreach into moral terrain**. Courts should resist conflating ethics with enforceable negligence standards. Instead, ethics should remain a **shield in exceptions**, not a **sword in penalties**.

Q. Draft a structured medico-legal argument that clearly separates statutory negligence from ethical expectations

Here's a structured medico-legal argument that clearly separates **statutory negligence** from **ethical expectations**—framed in a way that can be used for advocacy, publication, or judicial submissions:

Structured Medico-Legal Argument: Statutory Negligence vs. Medical Ethics

I. Introduction

Medical negligence adjudication must rest on statutory provisions under the Indian Penal Code (IPC) and now the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS). While medical ethics provide aspirational guidance, conflating them with enforceable negligence standards risks injustice, demoralization of practitioners, and distortion of legal accountability.

II. Statutory Foundations of Medical Negligence

- **Codified Duties:** Beneficence, non-maleficence, confidentiality, consent, honesty, and competence are **statutorily defined** obligations under IPC/BNS.
- **Concrete Standards:** These duties are **specific, context-bound, and enforceable** in negligence adjudication.
- **Legal Thresholds:** Liability arises when a doctor's conduct falls below the legally recognized standard of care, not merely when ethical ideals are unmet.

III. Role of Medical Ethics

- **Normative Guidance:** Ethics articulate the **moral compass** of medicine, shaping professional culture and patient trust.
- **Exception Clauses:** Ethics are most relevant in **exceptions**—e.g., treating without consent in emergencies, breaching confidentiality in public interest.
- **Non-Penal Function:** Ethics are **not penal provisions**; they are interpretive aids where law is silent or rigid.

IV. Risks of Invoking Ethics in Negligence Adjudication

- **Redundancy:** Statutory provisions already codify the duties; invoking ethics adds no legal clarity.
- **Moral Overreach:** Courts risk **moralizing mistakes** as ethical failures rather than adjudicating them as professional errors.
- **Demonization:** Overuse of ethics in negligence cases can **shame, demoralize, and demonize doctors**, undermining morale and public trust in the profession.
- **Systemic Blindness:** It ignores systemic constraints (resources, uncertainty, human fallibility) and unfairly personalizes blame.

V. Principle of Justice

- **Fair Attribution:** Justice demands liability be determined by **statutory negligence standards**, not moral expectations.
- **Ethics as Shield, Not Sword:** Ethics should **shield doctors in exceptions** (e.g., emergency care) but not serve as punitive overlays.
- **Balanced Accountability:** Doctors must be accountable under law, but not subjected to moral condemnation for professional mistakes.

VI. CONCLUSION

Medical ethics and statutory negligence must remain **distinct domains**.

- **Statutory law**: The enforceable yardstick for negligence adjudication.
- **Medical ethics**: A professional compass, relevant primarily in exceptions and institutional guidance.

Invoking ethics as punitive standards risks injustice, erodes practitioner morale, and distorts medico-legal accountability. Courts must resist conflating ethics with negligence, ensuring that justice remains grounded in statutory law.

How to cite specific ethics code violations in pleading

To cite specific ethics code violations in an NMC pleading, reference the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 (as amended, applicable under NMC) by chapter, section number, and verbatim clause phrasing, linking facts to "professional misconduct" under Section 30 (2) of the National Medical Commission Act, 2019.[12]

Citation Method

Use this formula in the pleading's "Specific Ethics Violations" section: "Violation of [Reg. X.Y.Z]: [Quote clause verbatim]. Facts: [Link to evidence, e.g., 'Respondent disclosed HIV status sans consent, as per Annexure A transcript']." This mirrors judicial precision, aiding EMRB inquiry under Reg. 8.2.

- Quote exactly from official text to avoid dilution.
- Cite multiple if overlapping (e.g., advertising + rebates).
- Annex NMC Ethics Regulations PDF as proof.

Common Examples

Violation Type	Regulation Citation	Pleading Phrasing Example
Confidentiality	Reg. 2.2: "*Confidences... should never be revealed unless... required by the laws.*"	"Reg. 2.2 violated: *Unauthorized disclosure to third party* (Annexure B audio)."
Advertising	Reg. 6.1.1: "*Soliciting... is unethical...* [no boasting of cures]."	"Reg. 6.1.1 breached: *Social media post claiming '100% cure'* (Annexure C screenshot)."
Rebates/Commission	Reg. 6.4.1: "*Shall not give, solicit... commission... for referring.*"	"Reg. 6.4.1 contravened: *Fee-splitting evidence* (Annexure D ledger)."
Records/Refusal	Reg. 1.3.2: "*Documents shall be issued within... 72 hours.*"	"Reg. 1.3.2 ignored: *Records withheld post-request* (Annexure E email)."
Consent	Reg. 7.16: "*Before performing... obtain... consent in writing.*"	"Reg. 7.16 flouted: *Surgery sans documented consent* (Annexure F records)."

Best Practices

Frame as "infamous conduct" for erasure risk, distinct from negligence harm-proof. NMC decisions (e.g., via e-book cases) uphold precise citations for swift action. Verify via NMC portal; amendments (e.g., 6.8 pharma ties) carry graded penalties.

CONCLUSION

Distinguishing ethics from negligence preserves fairness—ethics as a professional compass for exceptions and culture, negligence as statutory accountability for harm. Courts should prioritize legal thresholds over ethical moralizing to avoid demoralizing practitioners, balancing patient rights with professional viability.[13]

Conflict of Interest: Nil

REFERENCES

1. Nandimath, OV. Thomas, Alexander. HC, Arpitha. Health Law And Ethics Thomson Reuters, 2022.
2. NMC Code of Medical Ethics Regulations, 2002 https://www.nmc.org.in/rules-regulations/code-of-medical-ethics-regulations-2002/
3. Medical Negligence – Judicial Approach by Indian Courts https://asiindia.org/medical-negligence-the-judicial-approach-by-indian-courts/
4. Pandit MS, Pandit S. Medical negligence: Coverage of the profession, duties, ethics, case law, and enlightened defense - A legal perspective. Indian J Urol. 2009 Jul;25(3):372-8.

doi: 10.4103/0970-1591.56206. PMID: 19881134; PMCID: PMC2779963. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2779963/

5. https://simonlawpc.com/blog/medical-malpractice/malpractice-vs-negligence/
6. Subrahmanyam BV. Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, the judgment stipulates the guidelines to be followed before launching a prosecution against a doctor for negligence. J Neurosci Rural Pract. 2013 Jan;4(1):99-100. doi: 10.4103/0976-3147.105639. PMID: 23546375; PMCID: PMC3579074. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3579074/
7. Kabra, SG. Verma, V. Medical Negligence & Judicial Overreach. Redflower. 2025. In Medical Practice, Ethics & Laws. Chapter 21, p. 247-64.
8. Proforma For Submitting Appeal Cases Under Section 8.7 & 8.8 Of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette And Ethics) Regulations, 2002.
9. https://www.nmc.org.in/MCIRest/open/getDocument?path=%2FDocuments%2FPublic%2FPortal%2FApplicationForm%2FPdf%2Fethics.pdf
10. Varghese, AM, Vaswani, VR. Kumar, BR. Shenoy, Venkatkrishna. Awareness and Attitude of Medical Negligence and Medical Ethics among Interns and Resident Doctors. Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci (2016) 5(11): 532-535. https://www.ijcmas.com/5-11-2016/Alex. M. Varghese, *et al*.pdf
11. Malik, Y. Nag, VL, Singh, SP. Professional Conduct Review by Ethics & Medical Registration Board. NMC E- Book. Vol-1, Publication Division, National Medical Commission 2023. https://drugscontrol.org/pdf/nmc_e-book.pdf
12. Gajbhiye, S. Patond, S. Medico-Legal Aspects of Medical Negligence amongst Medical Students, J Res Med Dent Sci, 2022, 10 (7): 226-230 https://www.jrmds.in/articles/medicolegal-aspects-of-medical-negligence-amongst-medical-students-93752.html
13. Section 30 (2). National Medical Commission (NMC) Act, 2019.
14. Prasad, KK. Supreme Court and Medical Negligence: Necessary Protection or License to Kill. Manuputra. 2026. https://articles.manupatra.com/article-details/Supreme-Court-and-Medical-Negligence-Necessary-Protection-or-License-to-Kill