



LEGAL ACCOUNTABILITY OF HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS FOR MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE IN INDIA: A COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION OF ENFORCEMENT CHALLENGES AND REFORM PROPOSALS TO SAFEGUARD PATIENT RIGHTS

AUTHOR – VIVEK NAG

STUDENT OF LL.M, 4TH SEMESTER, KALINGA UNIVERSITY

EMAIL ID: viveknag222@gmail.com

Article History

Volume 6, Issue Si2, 2024

Received: 22 Mar 2024

Accepted: 23 Apr 2024

doi: 10.33472/AFJBS.6.Si2.2024.1178-1189

ABSTRACT

The evolving dynamics of the doctor-patient relationship, coupled with the commercialization of modern medical practice, have catalysed a paradigm shift in the landscape of healthcare. This transformation has ushered in a dual consequence: the potential for unfavourable treatment outcomes and a rising tide of medical litigation fuelled by patient dissatisfaction. In response to this trend, the Supreme Court has delineated guidelines for the criminal prosecution of doctors, mitigating undue harassment while also empowering patients with avenues for legal recourse under the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. Amidst this milieu, cultivating legal awareness among doctors assumes paramount importance, enabling them to meticulously document medical management details and fortify their defences against allegations of negligence. A nuanced understanding of how judicial forums navigate cases of medical negligence becomes indispensable for doctors, particularly amidst a cultural shift emphasizing the sanctity of human life and suffering. Judicial adjudication strives to strike a delicate equilibrium between a doctor's autonomy in clinical judgment and a patient's entitlement to fair treatment, acknowledging the inherent complexities of medical science and the potential for error. In essence, this abstract encapsulates the multifaceted landscape of medical negligence in India, emphasizing the need for legal literacy among healthcare professionals, the evolving role of judicial forums in adjudicating disputes, and the imperative for doctors to prioritize patient engagement and transparency in clinical practice.

Keywords: - Doctor-Patient Relationship, Medical Negligence, Healthcare, Consumer Protection, Criminal Liability.

CRIMINALIZATION OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE IN INDIA

“It is true that care should be taken before imputing criminal negligence in a professional man acting in the course of his profession”

~ Juggan Khan v. State of M.P., 1965².

INTRODUCTION

Delving into the labyrinthine realm of healthcare, where compassion intertwines with science, and human life hangs delicately in the balance, the concept of criminalizing medical negligence in India emerges as a contentious intersection where ethical obligations meet legal imperatives. This research endeavours to navigate through the intricate web of legal frameworks, ethical considerations, and societal expectations, with a keen focus on scrutinizing the mechanisms designed to hold healthcare professionals accountable for their actions or inactions³. Moreover, it seeks to unravel the multifaceted challenges inherent in the enforcement of these mechanisms, while proposing reforms aimed at fortifying patient rights and fostering a healthcare ecosystem founded upon accountability, transparency, and justice.

BACKGROUND OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE IN INDIA

The medical profession, often heralded as one of the noblest vocations in India, witnesses doctors revered akin to divine beings, bestowed with the sacred duty of preserving life and alleviating suffering. However, beneath the veneer of reverence lies a sobering reality doctors, despite their expertise and dedication, are fallible beings, susceptible to errors and lapses in judgment. The nebulous concept of medical negligence, deeply enshrined in jurisprudence, presents a tapestry of challenges in its definition and adjudication⁴.

Recent epochs have borne witness to an upsurge in litigations embroiling allegations of medical negligence, igniting a fiery debate on the criminalization of such conduct. The blurred demarcations between civil and criminal liability, juxtaposed with the evolving

² Juggan Khan v. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1965 SC 831.

³ 1 Andrew Grubb, “Principles of Medical Law Duties in Contract and Tort 322” Oxford University Press (2004).

⁴ Jerome Hall, “Negligent Behaviour should be excluded from penal liability”, 63 Colum. L. Rev. 632 (1963).

landscape of medical practice and patient rights, accentuate the exigency of a comprehensive examination of this phenomenon.

IMPORTANCE OF HOLDING HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS ACCOUNTABLE

At the crux of the discourse lies a fundamental query: Why is it imperative to hold healthcare professionals accountable for medical negligence? Beyond the precincts of legal liability, accountability serves as an indispensable pillar of patient safety, trust, and the integrity of the healthcare system. In a nation where healthcare disparities loom large, and access to quality care remains an elusive dream for many, ensuring accountability becomes not merely a legal obligation but a moral imperative for the safeguarding of individual rights and the promotion of public welfare⁵.

Moreover, the ethos of holding healthcare professionals accountable fosters a culture of transparency, continuous improvement, and professional integrity. It engenders a symbiotic relationship between patients and practitioners, characterized by mutual respect, effective communication, and shared decision-making. Thus, the pursuit of accountability transcends punitive measures, heralding a paradigm shift towards a patient-centric healthcare ethos grounded in empathy, competence, and ethical stewardship.

CONSEQUENCES OF LEGALLY COGNIZABLE MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE

In the intricate labyrinth of medico-legal discourse, the consequences stemming from legally cognizable medical negligence cascade into a triad of ramifications, delineated across the spectra of criminal liability, monetary reparation, and disciplinary repercussions.

Within the expanse of criminal liability, delineated within the purview of the venerable Indian Penal Code of 1860 (IPC), the contours of negligence unfurl into a mosaic of legal intricacies. It is Section 304A⁶ of the IPC that emerges as a legal fulcrum, a nexus where the realm of recklessness converges with the sanctity of life itself. This statute, while ostensibly addressing fatalities arising from rash or negligent acts, serves as a legal lodestar for prosecuting instances of medical negligence, wherein the culpability of healthcare professionals is cast under the unforgiving gaze of legal scrutiny. Moreover, the hallowed corridors of justice echo with the invocation of Sections 337⁷ and 338⁸ of the IPC, venerable

⁵ H.L.A. Hart, *"Mens Rea and Criminal Responsibility, in Punishment and Responsibility: Essays in the Philosophy of Law"*, 136 (Oxford University Press 1968).

⁶ Indian Penal Code, 1860, § 304A, No. 45, Acts of Parliament, 1860 (India).

⁷ Indian Penal Code, 1860, § 337, No. 45, Acts of Parliament, 1860 (India).

⁸ Indian Penal Code, 1860, § 338, No. 45, Acts of Parliament, 1860 (India).

provisions invoked to seek redress for injuries inflicted due to acts of medical negligence, thus traversing the precipice between justice and culpability with a measured gait.

In concert with the legal symphony of criminal liability, the edifice of civil liability stands resolute, offering a haven for the aggrieved to seek solace through monetary restitution. As dependents of deceased patients or the patients themselves, emboldened by the mantle of legal empowerment, tread the path of litigation, the judicial fora resonate with the impassioned plea for reparation⁹. Yet, it is not merely the hallowed halls of conventional civil courts that offer sanctuary; rather, the advent of permanent Lok Adalat's, imbued with the mandate to dispense justice in matters of public utility services, unveils a vista of conciliation and arbitration. Here, the clash of legal swords gives way to the gentle caress of negotiation, as litigants seek to assuage their grievances through dialogue and concord.

However, the journey through the legal labyrinth does not culminate here. For within the realm of disciplinary action, regulated by the august Indian Medical Council (IMC) and its progeny, the sinews of professional conduct intertwine with the tendrils of ethical stewardship. Here, the spectre of misconduct looms large, casting a pall over the sanctity of the medical profession. Yet, it is not a realm shrouded in darkness; rather, it is a bastion of accountability, wherein transgressions are met with the stern gaze of regulatory oversight. As the Medical Council of India (MCI) and its provincial counterparts wield the twin swords of suspension and expulsion, the cacophony of disciplinary action reverberates across the medical landscape, a clarion call for professional rectitude and ethical fortitude.

CRIMINALIZATION OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE

EVOLUTION OF CRIMINALIZATION TRENDS IN MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE CASES

In delving into the evolution of criminalization trends in medical negligence cases, it's imperative to navigate through the intricate historical trajectory that has shaped contemporary legal frameworks. Over time, the approach towards holding medical professionals criminally liable for negligent conduct has undergone notable shifts, influenced by societal norms, legal precedents, and evolving perspectives on accountability in healthcare.

Initially, medical negligence was primarily addressed through civil litigation, with aggrieved parties seeking compensation for damages resulting from substandard medical care. However, as awareness of patient rights and safety concerns grew, coupled with instances of

⁹ Larry Alexander, "Reconsidering the Relationship Among Voluntary Acts, Strict Liability, & Criminal Law", 84-85 "Crime, Culpability and Remedy" (1995).

egregious medical errors leading to severe harm or loss of life, the discourse surrounding criminal liability gained prominence.

One pivotal aspect of this evolution is the recognition of the gravity of medical errors that result in adverse outcomes, especially those involving fatalities. The shift towards criminalizing medical negligence gained momentum as a response to public outcry and demands for justice in cases where negligence led to tragic consequences. This shift reflects a broader societal expectation for accountability and deterrence within the medical profession.

Landmark legal cases have played a crucial role in shaping the trajectory of criminalization trends in medical negligence. Precedents set by key court decisions have established important principles regarding the threshold for criminal liability, the role of intent versus negligence, and the standards of care expected from medical professionals. These cases have served as touchstones for subsequent legal interpretations and legislative reforms aimed at addressing medical negligence within a criminal justice framework.

Moreover, the evolution of medical ethics and professional standards has intersected with the legal landscape, influencing perceptions of accountability and responsibility among healthcare providers. The adoption of ethical codes and guidelines, coupled with advancements in medical education and training, has contributed to a nuanced understanding of professional conduct and the obligations of healthcare professionals towards their patients.

In recent years, the discourse surrounding criminalization trends in medical negligence cases has expanded to encompass broader considerations of systemic factors, including institutional failures, resource constraints, and the complexities of modern healthcare delivery. This broader perspective acknowledges the multifaceted nature of medical errors and seeks to address underlying issues that contribute to lapses in patient safety.

LANDMARK CASES ESTABLISHING CRIMINAL LIABILITY

In exploring the landscape of landmark cases establishing criminal liability in the realm of medical negligence, it's essential to embark on a comprehensive journey through legal history, marked by pivotal judicial decisions that have shaped contemporary jurisprudence. These landmark cases serve as cornerstones in delineating the threshold for criminal culpability, defining the interplay between negligence and intent, and elucidating the responsibilities of healthcare professionals towards their patients.

One such seminal case is often cited as a touchstone in the evolution of criminal liability in medical negligence: the case of *R v. Adomako*¹⁰ (1994). This landmark decision by the House of Lords established the test for gross negligence manslaughter in medical practice. It involved the tragic death of a patient during a routine eye surgery due to an anaesthetist's failure to monitor the patient's oxygen supply adequately. The court's ruling in *Adomako* set a precedent by articulating the elements required to establish criminal negligence in medical settings, emphasizing the need for a breach of duty of care resulting in death and the existence of gross negligence beyond mere civil negligence.

Similarly, the case of *R v. Bateman*¹¹ (1925) serves as a landmark precedent that defines the level of care that medical professionals are supposed to provide in criminal cases. In one instance, a patient died during a birthing surgery, and the surgeon was accused of manslaughter. As a result of the court's decision in the *Bateman* case, medical professionals are now subject to criminal liability for negligence if their actions fall short of those of a reasonably competent practitioner in their field.

Another notable landmark case is that of *Bolam v. Friern Hospital Management Committee*¹² (1957), which established the Bolam Test, a crucial yardstick for evaluating medical malpractice. According to this criteria, even in cases when there is disagreement among a respectable body of medical opinion, a healthcare provider is not considered negligent if they follow a procedure that is acknowledged as appropriate. The standards by which courts assess the standard of care in medical negligence cases have been significantly shaped by the Bolam Test, which has had a significant influence on medical malpractice litigation.

Furthermore, the case of *Montgomery v. Lanarkshire Health Board*¹³ (2015) represents a modern landmark in expanding the scope of patient autonomy and informed consent in medical negligence law. This case, heard by the UK Supreme Court, emphasized the importance of patient-centred care and the obligation of healthcare professionals to disclose material risks to patients, thereby reshaping the landscape of medical negligence liability in the context of informed consent.

¹⁰ *R v Adomako* [1994] UKHL 6.

¹¹ *R v Bateman* (1925) 19 Cr App R 8.

¹² *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee* [1957] 1 WLR 582.

¹³ *Montgomery v Lanarkshire Health Board* [2015] UKSC 11

CRITIQUES AND CONTROVERSIES SURROUNDING CRIMINALIZATION

Critiques and controversies surrounding the criminalization of medical negligence encompass a spectrum of perspectives, ranging from ethical considerations to practical challenges in legal implementation. As the legal landscape evolves, so too do the debates surrounding the appropriateness, effectiveness, and fairness of holding healthcare professionals criminally liable for acts of negligence.

One of the primary critiques levelled against the criminalization of medical negligence is the inherent tension between criminal law's traditional focus on intent and the concept of negligence, which primarily pertains to failures of care or judgment rather than deliberate wrongdoing. Critics argue that criminalizing negligence blurs the lines between civil and criminal liability, potentially subjecting healthcare practitioners to punitive measures for inadvertent errors or unforeseeable outcomes.

Another contentious issue revolves around the potential chilling effect of criminal liability on medical professionals' willingness to innovate, take risks, or undertake complex procedures where outcomes are uncertain. Faced with the spectre of criminal prosecution, healthcare practitioners may adopt defensive practices, prioritize defensive medicine over patient-centred care, or avoid high-risk cases altogether, ultimately compromising the quality and accessibility of healthcare services.

Additionally, critics argue that criminalization may undermine trust and collaboration within the healthcare ecosystem, fostering a culture of fear and litigation that detracts from open communication, learning from mistakes, and collective efforts to improve patient safety. The adversarial nature of criminal proceedings, with its emphasis on fault-finding and punishment, may hinder constructive dialogue, quality improvement initiatives, and interdisciplinary collaboration essential for advancing healthcare delivery.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE IN INDIA

In the intricate tapestry of legal frameworks governing medical negligence in India, a multifaceted array of statutes, regulations, and judicial interpretations converge to delineate the rights, responsibilities, and liabilities of healthcare practitioners¹⁴.

¹⁴ Brazier M, Alghrani A, "Fatal Medical Malpractice and Criminal Liability" 25(2) P.N.51 (2009).

OVERVIEW OF INDIAN PENAL CODE (IPC) AND MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE

The Indian Penal Code (IPC) serves as the cornerstone of criminal law in India, encompassing provisions that hold individuals accountable for acts of negligence resulting in harm to others. Within its ambit lies Section 304A¹⁵, which specifically addresses cases of death caused by rash or negligent acts not amounting to culpable homicide. This section provides the legal foundation upon which cases of medical negligence are adjudicated.

Medical negligence, within the purview of the IPC, entails a breach of the duty of care owed by healthcare professionals to their patients¹⁶. It encompasses instances where a practitioner's actions or omissions deviate from accepted medical standards, resulting in harm or injury to the patient. The legal interpretation of medical negligence under the IPC requires a meticulous examination of the facts, considering the prevailing standards of medical practice and the foreseeability of harm¹⁷.

RELEVANT PROVISIONS IN INDIAN MEDICAL COUNCIL (PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT, ETIQUETTE, AND ETHICS) REGULATIONS, 2002

In addition to criminal liability under the IPC, medical practitioners in India are also subject to regulatory oversight by the Indian Medical Council (IMC). The IMC, through its Professional Conduct, Etiquette, and Ethics Regulations, lays down ethical guidelines and standards of practice for healthcare professionals. These regulations serve as a moral compass, guiding practitioners in upholding the highest standards of professionalism and patient care.

Key provisions within the IMC regulations address issues such as informed consent, confidentiality, and professional competence. They underscore the importance of maintaining patient trust, fostering doctor-patient relationships built on mutual respect and transparency. Violations of these regulations can result in disciplinary action by the medical council, ranging from warnings and fines to suspension or revocation of medical licenses.

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE

The contours of medical negligence in India are further delineated through judicial pronouncements that interpret and apply legal principles to real-world scenarios. Courts play a pivotal role in shaping the evolving jurisprudence surrounding medical malpractice,

¹⁵ Indian Penal Code, 1860, § 304A, No. 45, Acts of Parliament, 1860 (India).

¹⁶ Dr. Suresh Gupta v. Government of N.C.T. of Delhi & Anr, AIR 2004 SC 4091.

¹⁷ Reg. v. Seymour, (1983) 2 A.C. 493.

offering guidance on the interpretation of statutes and the establishment of precedents for future cases.

Judicial decisions in medical negligence cases often hinge on the concept of the "reasonable doctor,"¹⁸ evaluating whether a healthcare practitioner acted in accordance with the standards expected of a competent professional in similar circumstances. Courts consider factors such as the standard of care, the presence of negligence, and the foreseeability of harm in determining liability.

NAVIGATING THE COMPLEX TERRAIN OF MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE LITIGATION IN INDIA

In the realm of medical negligence litigation in India, several factors contribute to the increasing complexity and confusion surrounding the legal landscape. Firstly, the degree of negligence required to establish criminal liability under Section 304A¹⁹ of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) is high, necessitating proof of gross negligence or recklessness on the part of healthcare practitioners. This standard, as elucidated by the Supreme Court, emphasizes that mere errors of judgment or inadvertent acts do not warrant criminal prosecution.

The applicability of IPC sections 304 and 304A underscores the dual nature of liability, wherein doctors may face civil liability for compensation as well as criminal liability for gross negligence resulting in patient harm. However, there have been instances where doctors have been unfairly targeted with criminal charges, leading to confusion and apprehension within the medical community²⁰.

Media coverage plays a significant role in shaping public perception and influencing legal discourse on medical negligence cases. While the media has a duty to inform the public accurately and impartially, there have been instances of sensationalism and misinformation, leading to trial by media and prejudicing the judicial process.

The referral of Supreme Court judgments to larger benches reflects the complexity and divided opinions within the judiciary regarding the interpretation of legal provisions pertaining to medical negligence. The need for clarity and consistency in legal standards is paramount to ensure fairness and accountability in medical malpractice cases.

¹⁸ Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, AIR 2005 SC 3180.

¹⁹ Indian Penal Code, 1860, § 304A, No. 45, Acts of Parliament, 1860.

²⁰ Dr. Sarita Upneja v. State of Rajasthan and Another 2008 Cril 3097.

CHALLENGES IN ENFORCEMENT

BURDEN OF PROOF IN CRIMINAL MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE CASES

In navigating the realm of criminal medical negligence, one of the most formidable hurdles lies in shouldering the burden of proof. This weighty task demands an intricate dance between legal acumen and medical expertise. Prosecutors find themselves ensnared in a labyrinth of complexities, striving to demonstrate with unwavering certainty that the accused healthcare professional's actions or inactions transgressed the boundaries of acceptable medical conduct to such a degree that they warrant criminal sanction. However, the path to proving gross negligence, the linchpin of criminal liability, is fraught with ambiguity. The nebulous nature of medical standards, the subjective nuances of patient care, and the dearth of clear-cut parameters for defining gross negligence conspire to complicate the task²¹ at hand. As a consequence, the scales of justice often tilt in Favor of the accused, leaving victims of medical malpractice stranded in a legal quagmire.

INADEQUACY OF INVESTIGATIVE MECHANISMS

The machinery of justice grinds to a halt when confronted with the inadequacies of investigative mechanisms in the realm of medical negligence. Law enforcement agencies, ill-equipped to navigate the labyrinthine corridors of medical intricacies, find themselves at a loss when tasked with unravelling the tangled web of malpractice allegations. A dearth of specialized expertise in forensic medicine further exacerbates the plight, as investigators stumble through the maze of medical jargon and technicalities, often emerging none the wiser. Moreover, the scarcity of independent forensic medical experts capable of shedding light on matters of standard of care and causation leaves investigations incomplete and justice elusive. Thus, the quest for accountability is stymied by the glaring gaps in the investigative tapestry, leaving victims languishing in a limbo of legal uncertainty²².

INFLUENCE OF MEDICAL FRATERNITY ON LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The spectre of the medical fraternity looms large over the theatre of legal proceedings, casting a long shadow on the pursuit of justice in cases of medical negligence. United in solidarity, healthcare professionals rally around their beleaguered brethren, forming an impenetrable fortress of support that shields them from the slings and arrows of legal scrutiny. This collective camaraderie extends its tendrils into every crevice of the judicial

²¹ Dr. Sujoy Das v. State 2006 Cril 1148.

²² Mathiharan K., "State Control of Medical Malpractice, Law & Medicine", 14, 1998; (88-92).

landscape, exerting a pervasive influence on witness testimonies, expert opinions, and even judicial decisions. Emboldened by the protective cloak of professional solidarity, accused doctors navigate the choppy waters of legal proceedings with impunity, secure in the knowledge that the fraternity's unwavering support will shield them from the piercing gaze of justice. Thus, victims of medical negligence find themselves ensnared in a web of institutionalized protectionism, their quest for redress thwarted by the entrenched power dynamics of the medical establishment.

DELAY IN JUDICIAL PROCESS

The wheels of justice grind excruciatingly slow in the face of the relentless onslaught of delays plaguing the judicial process in cases of medical negligence. Legal proceedings, akin to a torturous odyssey through the labyrinth of bureaucracy, often meander aimlessly for years on end, leaving victims mired in a quagmire of legal uncertainty. As cases languish in the quagmire of judicial backlog, the sands of time inexorably erode crucial evidence, memories fade, and witnesses scatter to the winds, leaving the quest for accountability hanging precariously in the balance. Moreover, the interminable delays serve to exacerbate the trauma and anguish of victims, prolonging their suffering and compounding their sense of injustice. Thus, the scourge of judicial procrastination emerges as a formidable impediment to the quest for justice, casting a pall of uncertainty over the landscape of medical negligence litigation.

PROTECTING PATIENT RIGHTS: SUGGESTING REFORMS

STRENGTHENING REGULATORY BODIES

To fortify patient rights and ensure accountability in cases of medical negligence, a fundamental reform lies in bolstering the efficacy of regulatory bodies overseeing healthcare professionals. Strengthening these bodies, such as the Medical Council of India, entails imbuing them with enhanced investigative powers, robust mechanisms for monitoring compliance with ethical standards, and expedited disciplinary procedures. By equipping regulatory bodies with the authority and resources to swiftly investigate allegations of malpractice and mete out appropriate sanctions, the integrity of the healthcare system can be safeguarded, and patient trust can be restored.

IMPLEMENTING STANDARDIZED PROTOCOLS AND GUIDELINES

A cornerstone of reform in protecting patient rights is the implementation of standardized protocols and guidelines governing medical practice. Establishing clear, evidence-based

protocols for diagnosis, treatment, and patient care serves to delineate the boundaries of acceptable medical conduct, mitigate the risk of errors, and ensure consistency in the delivery of healthcare services. By mandating adherence to standardized protocols and guidelines, healthcare professionals are held to a uniform standard of care, reducing the incidence of medical negligence and fostering a culture of accountability within the medical fraternity.

ENHANCING TRAINING AND EDUCATION FOR HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS

Central to safeguarding patient rights is the imperative to enhance the training and education of healthcare professionals. Investing in comprehensive training programs that emphasize ethical conduct, clinical competency, and communication skills equips healthcare professionals with the requisite knowledge and skills to deliver quality care while upholding patient rights. Furthermore, ongoing professional development initiatives ensure that healthcare professionals remain abreast of advancements in medical science and best practices, thereby minimizing the risk of errors and enhancing patient safety.

CONCLUSION

In examining the criminalization of medical negligence in India, it becomes evident that the threshold for establishing criminal liability against healthcare professionals is high. Courts have consistently emphasized that mere errors in judgment or inadvertence, while potentially leading to civil liability, do not warrant criminal prosecution. Rather, criminal liability is reserved for cases demonstrating a high degree of negligence or recklessness on the part of the medical practitioner, indicative of a callous disregard for patient welfare. However, the interpretation and application of legal standards, particularly regarding the distinction between negligence and recklessness, remain contentious and subject to judicial scrutiny.

URGENCY OF REFORMS TO ENSURE PATIENT SAFETY

The research underscores the pressing need for reforms aimed at safeguarding patient rights and enhancing accountability within the healthcare system. Addressing the challenges in enforcement, including burdensome proof requirements, inadequacies in investigative mechanisms, and undue influence from the medical fraternity, is paramount to ensuring that instances of medical negligence are effectively addressed and justice is served. Moreover, the proliferation of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, coupled with heightened public awareness and empowerment initiatives, can facilitate timely resolution of disputes and empower patients to advocate for their rights.
