IJRAR.ORG E-ISSN: 2348-1269, P-ISSN: 2349-5138

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH AND ANALYTICAL REVIEWS (IJRAR) | IJRAR.ORG

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Consumer Protection in Health Care Services: A Critical Analysis of the Indian Legal Framework

Author – Dr. Puja Paul Srivastava

Associate Professor, Centre for Legal Studies, Gitarattan International Business School, Delhi.

Abstract

The relationship between a patient and a medical practitioner in India has, over the last three decades, undergone a quiet but consequential transformation: from one governed almost entirely by professional ethics and tort principles to one increasingly scrutinised through the lens of consumer law. The landmark decision of the Supreme Court in Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha brought medical services within the fold of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, giving patients an inexpensive and relatively swift forum to seek redress against deficient treatment. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 has since replaced its predecessor, introducing product liability, e-commerce regulation, mediation, and a more robust institutional architecture. This paper critically examines the evolution, scope, and limitations of consumer protection in Indian healthcare. It evaluates the judicial reasoning that brought medical services within consumer jurisdiction, the standard used to determine medical negligence, and the practical difficulties patients continue to face, including the complexity of expert evidence, the chilling effect of defensive medicine, and the uneven applicability of the law to government hospitals and free treatment. The paper concludes that while the legal framework has substantially empowered patients, structural and procedural reforms are necessary to make the promise of accountability a lived reality.

Keywords: Consumer Protection, Medical Negligence, Healthcare Services, Consumer Protection Act 2019, Deficiency in Service.

1. Introduction

Healthcare occupies a peculiar position in the architecture of consumer law. Unlike the purchase of a television or an airline ticket or any consumer product , a patient rarely possesses the technical knowledge to assess the quality of the service being provided, and the resultant of an error are frequently irreversible. For decades, Indian law treated the doctor-patient relationship as a matter of professional ethics, regulated chiefly by the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 and the disciplinary machinery of state medical councils. Civil liability, where it existed, was pursued through the cumbersome and expensive route of a tort suit in ordinary civil

courts. This left the average patient, particularly one from a modest economic background, with little practical recourse against negligent or deficient treatment of patient.

The enactment of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, and its subsequent judicial extension to medical services, altered this landscape considerably. By treating the patient as a 'consumer' and the doctor or hospital as a 'service provider', the law opened a forum that was meant to be cheaper, faster, and less adversarial than a civil suit. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 has since modernised this framework further, introducing concepts such as product liability, unfair trade practices, and e-filing of complaints. This paper undertakes a critical analysis of this legal journey, asking not merely what the law provides on paper, but how effectively it functions in practice for the ordinary Indian patient.

2. Progression of the Consumer Protection Regime in India

The Consumer Protection Act, 1986 was enacted to provide simple, speedy, and inexpensive redressal of consumer grievances through a three-tier quasi-judicial structure: District Forums, State Commissions, and the National Commission. Its object was remedial rather than punitive, focused on compensating the aggrieved consumer rather than penalising the wrongdoer. The 1986 Act, however, did not explicitly mention healthcare or medical services within its definition of 'service', a gap that left the question of its applicability to the medical profession unresolved for nearly a decade.

That gap was filled by the Supreme Court's reasoning in Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha, where the Court held that services rendered by medical practitioners, hospitals, and nursing homes fell squarely within the definition of 'service' under Section 2(1)(o) of the 1986 Act, except where such service was rendered free of charge or under a contract of personal service. This single judicial pronouncement reshaped the accountability landscape for Indian healthcare and remains the foundational precedent on the subject even after the 1986 Act's repeal.

The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 replaced the 1986 Act with a more contemporary statute, retaining the basic three-tier structure while renaming the forums as Commissions and significantly enhancing their pecuniary jurisdiction. It introduced new concepts: product liability actions against manufacturers and sellers, the regulation of unfair trade practices in the digital marketplace, mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism, and the establishment of the Central Consumer Protection Authority to investigate systemic violations. These changes have direct, though still evolving, implications for healthcare, particularly in cases involving defective medical devices, implants, or pharmaceutical products.

3. Healthcare as a 'Service': The V.P. Shantha Framework

The Supreme Court in V.P. Shantha drew several important distinctions that continue to shape litigation today. First, it held that medical services rendered for consideration, whether paid by the patient directly or by an insurer or employer on the patient's behalf, attract consumer jurisdiction. Second, it carved out an exception for services rendered free of charge to all patients, reasoning that such services lack the element of consideration necessary to constitute a transaction under the Act. Third, and most contentiously, it held that

where a hospital provides free treatment to some patients and paid treatment to others, even the free treatment would fall within the Act's ambit, since the hospital's overall commercial character justified treating all its patients alike.

This last proposition has generated considerable debate, particularly regarding government hospitals that provide largely or entirely free treatment funded through public revenue. Critics argue that extending consumer jurisdiction to such institutions blurs the line between a welfare obligation of the State and a commercial transaction, while supporters contend that excluding government hospitals would leave the poorest patients, who are most dependent on public healthcare, without an effective remedy.

4. Deficiency in Service and the Standard of Medical Negligence

Central to any complaint against a medical practitioner is the concept of 'deficiency in service', defined under the 2019 Act as any fault, imperfection, shortcoming, or inadequacy in the quality, nature, and manner of performance required to be maintained under any law or contract. Applying this definition to medicine requires courts to determine what standard of care a reasonably competent practitioner, in the same field and circumstances, would have exercised.

Indian courts have largely adopted the Bolam test, originally formulated by English courts, which holds that a doctor is not negligent if their conduct conforms to a practice accepted as proper by a responsible body of medical opinion, even if other practitioners might have adopted a different approach. The Supreme Court applied and refined this standard in Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, cautioning against treating every medical mishap as negligence and emphasising that an error of judgment, made in good faith, does not by itself amount to actionable negligence. This cautious approach reflects a deliberate judicial balancing act: protecting patients from genuine carelessness while shielding conscientious doctors from frivolous litigation that could otherwise encourage defensive medicine.

At the same time, courts have not hesitated to award substantial compensation in cases of clear and gross negligence. In Spring Meadows Hospital v. Harjol Ahluwalia, the Supreme Court held a hospital liable for the negligence of its nursing staff in administering an incorrect injection, resulting in irreversible harm to a child, and awarded significant compensation, recognising both the child's suffering and the parents' independent right to claim damages for mental agony.

5. Institutional and Procedural Realities

On paper, the consumer forums offer patients a faster and more accessible alternative to civil litigation. In practice, several structural difficulties persist. Medical negligence cases are technically complex, and adjudicating bodies, despite their quasi-judicial character, often lack in-house medical expertise, making them heavily reliant on expert opinion that can be slow to obtain and is sometimes coloured by professional solidarity among doctors. The backlog of cases before the National and State Commissions has grown substantially, undermining the original promise of speedy redressal and pushing the effective resolution time for many complaints to several years.

A further difficulty lies in the burden of proof. Although consumer fora are meant to follow a relatively relaxed procedure, the complainant must still establish negligence with reasonable medical evidence, a task that is inherently difficult for a layperson without access to hospital records, treatment protocols, or independent expert testimony. The asymmetry of information between doctor and patient, present at the outset of the relationship, persists and often intensifies at the litigation stage.

The fear of an expanding liability regime has also generated concerns about defensive medicine, where practitioners order excessive tests or avoid high-risk but necessary procedures purely to insulate themselves from potential litigation. While the judiciary has sought to discourage such anxiety through cautious articulation of the negligence standard, the perception of vulnerability among practitioners, particularly in specialities such as obstetrics and surgery, remains a live concern within the medical community.

6. Product Liability and Emerging Issues under the 2019 Act

The introduction of a dedicated product liability chapter under the 2019 Act has practical significance for healthcare, given the increasing use of implants, prosthetics, diagnostic devices, and pharmaceutical products. Patients harmed by defective medical devices or contaminated drugs can now pursue manufacturers and sellers directly, in addition to or independent of any claim against the treating doctor or hospital. This represents a meaningful expansion of the patient's remedial options, particularly relevant in light of past controversies involving defective hip implants and substandard pharmaceutical batches that affected patients across the country.

Telemedicine and e-pharmacy platforms, both of which expanded rapidly following regulatory recognition during the COVID-19 pandemic, present newer challenges that the existing framework has not yet fully addressed. Questions concerning jurisdiction, the applicability of the 'deficiency in service' standard to algorithmic or remote diagnosis, and accountability for prescriptions issued through digital platforms remain areas where statutory clarity is still developing.

7. Critical Assessment

The Indian consumer protection framework has undeniably strengthened the position of the patient relative to the pre-1995 era, when civil litigation was the only meaningful avenue of redress. It has created a culture of accountability within the medical profession and given patients, at least in principle, a forum that does not require the formality or expense of a civil court. Yet several gaps temper this achievement.

First, the continuing ambiguity over the treatment of government and charitable hospitals creates inconsistent outcomes depending on the nature of the institution and the specific terms on which treatment was rendered, leaving many of the poorest patients in a position of uncertain legal protection. Second, the heavy reliance on expert medical opinion, often drawn from within the same professional fraternity as the alleged wrongdoer, raises legitimate questions about the objectivity of such evidence. Third, the considerable delay in disposal of cases, despite the statutory emphasis on speed, undermines the foundational purpose of the consumer forum

system. Fourth, awareness of consumer rights in healthcare remains low among large sections of the population, particularly in rural areas, limiting the framework's practical reach.

Comparatively, jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom rely on a combination of tort litigation, the National Health Service complaints mechanism, and professional regulatory bodies, while several US states have adopted specialised medical malpractice tribunals with capped damages to balance patient protection against the risk of runaway litigation costs. India's hybrid approach, combining consumer law with ordinary tort remedies and professional disciplinary proceedings, offers patients multiple but uncoordinated avenues, which can lead to forum-shopping and inconsistent outcomes across different proceedings arising from the same facts.

8. Recommendations

A more effective framework would benefit from several reforms. Establishing dedicated medical benches or panels with permanent access to independent medical assessors would reduce delays associated with obtaining expert opinion and improve the quality of adjudication. Clearer statutory guidance on the applicability of consumer law to government and charitable hospitals would resolve persistent ambiguity and ensure uniform protection regardless of the nature of the treating institution. Strengthening legal aid and public awareness campaigns, particularly in rural and semi-urban areas, would help bridge the information gap that currently limits access to existing remedies. Finally, closer coordination between consumer forums, medical councils, and civil courts, possibly through a unified grievance redressal protocol, would reduce duplication and inconsistency across parallel proceedings.

9. Conclusion

Consumer protection law has fundamentally reshaped the doctor-patient relationship in India, transforming a once largely unregulated professional interaction into a legally accountable transaction. The journey from V.P. Shantha to the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 reflects an evolving judicial and legislative commitment to patient rights, expanding the available remedies to include product liability and ushering in a more modern institutional structure. Yet the promise of this framework is only partially realised in practice. Delay, evidentiary difficulty, institutional ambiguity, and uneven awareness continue to limit the law's protective reach, particularly for the most vulnerable patients who most need it. A truly effective consumer protection regime for healthcare requires not merely the existence of rights on paper, but the institutional capacity, procedural efficiency, and public awareness necessary to make those rights meaningful in practice.

References

Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (No. 68 of 1986).

Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (No. 35 of 2019).

Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (No. 102 of 1956).

Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha, (1995) 6 SCC 651.

Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, (2005) 6 SCC 1.

Spring Meadows Hospital v. Harjol Ahluwalia, (1998) 4 SCC 39.

Bolam v. Friern Hospital Management Committee, [1957] 1 WLR 582 (QB).

Bolitho v. City and Hackney Health Authority, [1998] AC 232 (HL).

Achutrao Haribhau Khodwa v. State of Maharashtra, (1996) 2 SCC 634.

Kusum, Medical Negligence and the Law (Oxford University Press, 2nd edn, 2013).

Law Commission of India, 201st Report on Medical Negligence and Compensation (2006).

Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, Government of India, Consumer Protection Act, 2019: An Overview (2020).