

**NO. MCI-6(2)/2009-Med./****MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA**  
**New Delhi****GENERAL BODY****136<sup>th</sup> SESSION****Minutes of the General Body meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2010**

The Council met in the Council Office, Pocket – 14, Sector-8, Dwarka, New Delhi-77 on 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2010 at 11 a.m. with Dr. Ketan Desai, President, Medical Council of India in the Chair.

\*\*\* \*\*

**Present:**

1.	Dr. Ketan D. Desai	President, MCI & Prof. & Head, Deptt. of Urology, BJ Medical College, Ahmedabad, <b><u>Gujarat</u></b>
2.	Dr. P. C. Kesavankutty Nayar	Vice-President, MCI & Former Dean, Medical College, Trivandrum, <b><u>Kerala</u></b>
3.	Dr. A. K. Bardhan	Sr. Consultant Woodland Medical Centre(P)Ltd. 8/5 Alipore Road , Kolkata - 700027 <b><u>West Bengal</u></b>
4.	Dr. Ajit Kumar Chaudhary	Professor & HOD of Pathology Darbhanga Medical College Laheriasarai, Darbhanga, <b><u>Bihar</u></b>
5.	Dr. Anant Y. Kharangate	Consultant Surgeon Smt. G Niak Maternity & Surgical Hospital Opp. Aquem Post Office, Aquem Margao, <b><u>Goa</u></b>
6.	Dr. Ashwani Kumar	Professor of Microbiology, University College of Medical Sciences, Shahdara <b><u>Delhi-110095</u></b>
7.	Dr. Ashwani Kumar Sood	Add. Prof., Deptt. of Paediatrics, Indira Gandhi Medical College, <b><u>Shimla (H.P.)</u></b>
8.	Dr. B.S. Kothari	Consultant Surgeon, Kothari Hospital, Mill Para Main Road, 9-Laxmiwadi Corner Rajkot-360002, <b><u>Gujarat</u></b>

9.	Dr. Baldev Singh Aulakh	Professor of Urology & Head of Transplant Unit, Dayanand Medical College and Hospital, <b><u>Ludhiana (Punjab)</u></b>
10.	Dr. Basant Singh	Golghar Chikitsa Kendra Golghar <b><u>Patna - 800001</u></b>
11.	Dr. Bhagabati Charan Das	Principal, Kalinga Institute of Medical Sciences, Bhubaneswar, <b><u>Orissa</u></b>
12.	Dr. Bhaidas Patil	Chairman Annasaheb Chudaman Patil Memorial Medical College, Post Box No. 145, Sakri Road, Dhule-425405 <b><u>(Maharashtra)</u></b>
13.	Dr. Bhanu Prakash Dubey	Prof. and Head Dept. of Forensic Medicine, Gandhi Medical College Bhopal-462001
14.	Dr. Binoy Bhusan Bhowmik	Head of Dept of Dermatology TMC & Dr. BRAM Teaching Hospital, Agartala -799007 <b><u>Tripura</u></b>
15.	Dr. C B Shukla	Professor & HOD Deptt. of Microbiology S S Medical College, Rewa <b><u>Madhya Pradesh</u></b>
16.	Dr. C N Manjunath	Director Jayadeva Institute of Cardiovascular Sciences & Research, 9 <sup>th</sup> Block Jayanagar, Bannerghatta Road, Bangalore – 560069 <b><u>Karnataka</u></b>
17.	Dr. C. B. Tripathi	Prof. & Head Government Medical College Bhavnagar- 364002 <b><u>Gujarat</u></b>
18.	Dr. C.V. Bhirmanandham	Former Vice Chancellor , The Tamil Nadu Dr. M G R Medical University, Chennai <b><u>Tamil Nadu</u></b> 157, Habibullah Rao, T.Nagar, Chennai-17

19.	Dr. D. Baruah	Directorate of Health Services, Mizoram, Dinthal, Aizawl – 796001 <b><u>Mizoram</u></b>
20.	Dr. D.J. Borah	Principal, Jorhat Medical College, Jorhat-781007 <b><u>Assam</u></b>
21.	Dr. D.K. Sharma	Ex-Principal-cum-Dean, Muzaffar Nagar Medical College, Muzaffar Nagar <b><u>(U.P.)</u></b>
22.	Dr. D.S. Jane	Dean, Punjab Rao Deshmukh Memorial Medical College, Amaravati, <b><u>Maharashtra</u></b>
23.	Dr. Datteswar Hota	Prof. & HOD Deptt. of Urology, S C B Medical College Cuttack - 753007 <b><u>Orissa</u></b>
24.	Dr. Deelip G. Mhaisekar	Prof. & Head of TB & Respiratory Medicine, Govt. Medical College, Nanded, <b><u>Maharashtra.</u></b>
25.	Dr. Devinder Singh Rana	Chairman, Deptt. of Nephrology Sir Ganga Ram Hospital Rajender Nagar New Delhi-110060, <b><u>Delhi</u></b>
26.	Dr. G.B. Gupta	Professor & Head, Department of Medicine, Pt.J.N.M. Medical College, Raipur <b><u>Chhattisgarh</u></b>
27.	Dr. G.K. Thakur	Prof. & HOD cum Superintendent Dept. of Radiology S.K. Medical College, Muzaffarpur-842004, <b><u>Bihar</u></b>
28.	Dr. Hafeez Rehman	Chairman Sunrise Instt. of Medical Sciences Airport Road, Karranad, Kochi -682030 , <b><u>Kerala</u></b>
29.	Dr. H.P. Bhalodiya	Professor of Orthopaedics, B J Medical College & Civil Hospital, Asarwa, Ahmedabad – 16 <b><u>Gujarat</u></b>
30.	Dr. I.S. Pal	Ekta Enclave, St. No.1, Nehrugram Road, Nathanpur Jogiwala Dehradun-248001, <b><u>Uttarakhand</u></b>

31.	Dr. J L Sahni	Director Instt. of Cardiology Kanpur, <b><u>U.P.</u></b>
32.	Dr. J. N. Soni	Prof. and Head Dept. of Forensic Medicine G.R. Medical College Gwalior-474009 <b><u>Madhya Pradesh</u></b>
33.	Dr. John L Sailo	Director & Consultant Internal Medicine Bethany Hospital Non Grim Hills Shillong-793003, <b><u>Meghalaya</u></b>
34.	Dr. K.P. Mathur,	Med. Suptd. (Retd.), Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital <b><u>New Delhi</u></b>  77, Chitra Vihar Delhi - 110092
35.	Dr. Kasu Prasad Reddy	Medical Director Maxivision Eye Hospital Alladin Mansion 1-11-252/1A, Street No.3 Begumpet, Hyderabad-500016 <b><u>A.P.</u></b>
36.	Dr. L Fimate	Director, Regional Institute of Medical Sciences, <b><u>Imphal.</u></b>
37.	Dr. Laxmi Chand Sharma	Professor & Head Department of Nephrology S M S Medical College & Hospital Jaipur, <b><u>Rajasthan</u></b>
38.	Dr. M M Deka	Principal Gauhati Medical College Indrapur, Guwahati-32 <b><u>Assam</u></b>
39.	Dr. Mahendra D. Chauhan	Dean, Faculty of Medicine, South Gujarat University, Surat, <b><u>Gujarat</u></b>
40.	Dr. (Mrs.) Malti Thapar	Dr. Shyam Lal Thapar Nursing Home, G. T. Road, Moga-142001 <b><u>Punjab</u></b>
41.	Dr. Muruganathan Arumugam	A G Hospital 34 KPN Colony, 3rd Street Tirupur-641601 <b><u>Tamil Nadu</u></b>

42.	Dr. Muzaffar Ahmad	Director, Health Services, Govt. of Jammu & Kashmir, Srinagar, <b>Jammu &amp; Kashmir</b>
43.	Dr. Narendra Prasad	Ex. Prof. & Head of Surgery, Patna Medical College, Patna, 5, Doctor's Colony, Kankerbagh, Patna, <b>Bihar</b>
44.	Dr. Naveen Nahar	Consulting Surgeon, Nahar Hospital, AM-35, Deendayal Upadhyay Nagar, Sukhliya Circle, Indore – 452 010 <b>Madhya Pradesh</b>
45.	Dr. Nirbhay Shrivastava	Officer on Special Duty, Directorate of Medical Education, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal, <b>Madhya Pradesh</b>
46.	Dr. Nitin S. Vora	Director Medical Services, ESIC, <b>Gujarat</b>
47.	Dr. O.P. Tiwari	Professor & Head of Radio-Diagnosis, Mahatma Gandhi Memorial Medical College, Indore, <b>Madhya Pradesh</b>
48.	Dr. P. M. Jadhav	Med. Director & Orthopaedic Surgeon MGM Medical College, Aurangabad <b>Maharashtra</b>
49.	Dr. P. Rajan	Asso. Professor Dept of Radiodiagnosis Medical College Calicut-673008, <b>Kerala</b>
50.	Dr. P. Sukumaran	Professor of Pulmonary Medicine, P.I.M.S, <b>Kerala</b>
51.	Dr. P.K. Jain	Prof & Head of Deptt. of Medicine M L B Medical College, Jhansi-284128, <b>Uttar Pradesh</b>
52.	Dr. Prabir Kumar Sur	Professor of Radiology, Medical College 88, College Street Kolkata-700073, <b>West Bengal</b>

53.	Dr. Prasanna Kumar Das	Director of Medical Education & Training, Bhubaneswar, <b><u>Orissa</u></b>
54.	Dr. R. C. Siwach	Prof & Head, Department of Orthopaedic, Pt. B D Sharma PG Instt. of Med Sciences, Rohtak- 124001 <b><u>Haryana</u></b>
55.	Dr. Radha Madhab Tripathy	Prof. & HOD of Community Medicine, M K C G Medical College Berhampur -760004, <b><u>Orissa</u></b>
56.	Dr. Raja Babu Panwar	Principal, Prof & HOD, Controller S P Medical College Bikaner - 334003 <b><u>Rajasthan</u></b>
57.	Dr. (Mrs.) Rani Bhaskaran	Professor & Head, Department of Neurology, Dr.Somervel Memorial CSI Hospital, Trivandrum, <b><u>Kerala.</u></b>
58.	Dr. Ravi Kant	Prof. of General Surgery, Maulana Azad Medical College, New Delhi -110002, <b><u>Delhi</u></b>
59.	Dr. S Imkong Tushi Ao	Retd. DMS, Nagaland Berachah Manor Old Minister Hill, PO Box 529 <b><u>Kohima-797001</u></b>
60.	Dr. S.D. Dalvi	Prof. & Head, Department of PSM, Govt. Medical College, Aurangabad, <b><u>Maharashtra</u></b>
61.	Dr. S.L Adile	Director of Medical Education Chhatishgarh Old Nurses Hostel, D.K.S. Campus, Raipur <b><u>Chattisgarh</u></b>
62.	Dr. Sahaja Nand Pd. Singh	Deptt. of Surgery, Patna Medical College, Patna, <b><u>Bihar</u></b>
63.	Dr. Sheonarayan Chaudhury	Professor & Head Rajendra Institute of Medical Sciences Ranchi, <b><u>Jharkhand</u></b>

64.	Dr. Shirish Srivastava	Prof. & Head, Deptt. of Surgery, Pramukhswami Medical College, Karamsad, <b><u>Gujarat</u></b>
65.	Dr. Shivanand S Bhimalli	Asst. Professor, Dept. of Pediatrics, Basaveshwar Hospital, M. R. Medical College, Gulbarga Sedam Road, Gulbarga – 585105, <b><u>Karnataka</u></b>
66.	Dr. (Mrs.) Shobha Chakravorty	Retd. Head of Obst. & Gynae, Rajanedra Instt. of Medical Sciences, Ranchi, Nibedita, Bariatu Road Ranchi, <b><u>Jharkhand</u></b>
67.	Dr. (Mrs.) Uma Pradhan	Director (Health & F.W.) Department of Health F.W., Human Services and Family Welfare Govt. of Sikkim Tashiling, Gangtok, <b><u>Sikkim</u></b>
68.	Dr. Umesh Chandra Sarma	Vice Chancellor Srimanta Sankaradeva University of Health Sciences Narakasur Hill Top, Bhangagarh Guwahati-781032 <b><u>Assam</u></b>
69.	Dr. V. K. Jain	Dean Pt. B D Sharma PG Instt of Med Sc. Rohtak- 124001 <b><u>Haryana</u></b>
70.	Dr. V.C.Velayudhan Pillai	Rtd. Additional Director, Kerala Health Services, Chairman and Managing Director, Chelsa Medical Care, Kunjalummoodu, Karamana, Thiruvananthapuram-695002, <b><u>Kerala</u></b>
71.	Dr. V.N. Jindal	Dean, Goa Medical College, Bombolim-403202, <b><u>Goa.</u></b>
72.	Dr. Vasant N. Pawar	"Gautam", shushrut Hospital, New Pandit Colony, Sharanpur Road Nashik - 422002 <b><u>Maharashtra</u></b>
73.	Dr. Ved Prakash Mishra	Vice-Chancellor, Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University), Nagpur, <b><u>Maharashtra</u></b>

74.	Dr. Vijay Prakash Singh	Prof. & HOD of Gastroenterology, Patna Medical College, Patna, <b>Bihar</b>
-----	-------------------------	---

Lt.Col.(Retd.) Dr. A.R.N. Setalvad Secretary

Apologies for absence were received from the following members of the Council:-

1. Dr. Kamleshwar Agrawal
2. Dr. N.B. Singh
3. Dr. H.B. Mehta
4. Dr. M. Ramanathan
5. Dr. Suresh R. Patani
6. Prof.(Dr.) Silvano C.A. Dias Sapeco
7. Dr. Dilipkumar Baliga
8. Dr. Surender Kashyap

### **1. Notification of New Members**

The Secretary read the notification of the following new members elected/nominated as member of the Council since the last meeting of the Council held on 18.11.2009.

Sl.No.	Name	U/s	Constituency
1	Dr. Datteswar Hote	3(1)(a)	Orissa Government
2.	Dr. (Smt.) Jaishree Sharma	3(1)(a)	H.P. Government
3.	Dr. H.B. Mehta	3(1)(b)	Bhavnagar University
4.	Dr. Mhaisekar Deelip Govindrao	3(1)(e)	Central Government
5.	Dr. Asim Kumar Bardhan	3(1)(e)	Central Government
6.	Dr. K.P. Mathur	3(1)(e)	Central Government
7.	Dr. Ved Prakash Mishra	3(1)(e)	Central Government
8.	Dr. C.V. Bhirmanandam	3(1)(e)	Central Government
9.	Dr. Nitin Vora	3(1)(e)	Central Government
10.	Dr. Hafeez Rehman	3(1)(e)	Central Government
11.	Dr. (Mrs.) Rani Bhaskaran	3(1)(e)	Central Government

### **2. Minutes of the last meeting of the Council – confirmation of.**

The minutes of the last meeting of the Council held on 18.11.2009 were confirmed.

### **3. Minutes of the last meeting of the Council – Action taken thereon.**

The Council noted the action taken by the office on various items included in the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 18.11.2009.



#### 4. **Address by the President.**

Dr. Ketan Desai, President delivered the presidential address through Power Point presentation and C.D. of the same was circulated to the August Body. Salient features of the presidential address are as under:-

- The President in his speech informed the members of the Council about the creative and creditable happenings during the intervening period from the last General Body meeting of the Council held on 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2009 till date which have added to the fair name, creativity and credibility of the Council.
  - The President further stated that the Council is required to tread its path towards fulfillment of its objectives through several constraints and ordeals. But then one is required to steer and navigate tiding all these limitations with a clear focus and a precise understanding.
  - The President was happy that with the help, counsel and advice that have been rendered to him by the learned members of the Council from time to time during this period, things have moved poignantly in the desired direction.
  - He was pleased to substantiate some of them with this August assembly through an appropriate power point presentation which are as under:-
- **Amendments in Regulations**
  - (i) **Postgraduate Medical Education Regulations, 2000**

##### Eligibility of PG Teacher

No teacher shall be considered as a postgraduate teacher in any other institution during the period till the postgraduate course at the institute which has been granted permission considering him as a postgraduate teacher is recognized u/s 11(2) of the IMC Act, 1956.

##### Encouragement of Research

A postgraduate student is required to present one poster presentation, to read one research paper and to present one research paper which should be published/accepted for publication/sent for publication during the period of his postgraduate studies so as to make him eligible to appear at the examination.

New courses have been introduced as under:-

- D.M. (Hepatology)
- M.Ch. (Hepato-Pancreatico-Biliary Surgery)
- M.D. (Emergency Medicine) has been permitted at two institutes in the country.

#### (ii) **Minimum Requirements for 50/100/150MBBS Admissions Annually Regulations, 1999**

##### Land Requirement

- The total land requirement has been reduced to 20 Acres of land instead of 25 Acres as of now.

- In urban area where the population is more than 25 lakhs, hilly areas, notified tribal areas, north eastern states, hill states and union territories of Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Daman & Diu & Dadra & Nagar Haveli, are permitted to have the medical college on 2 pieces of land at a distance of not more than 10 kms.
- In 4 metropolitan cities and 5 "A" class cities provisions have been made to allow a medical college based upon the total built up area required concept on the basis of permissible/FAR/ FSI in a plot of not less than 10 acres.
- The requirement of Radio-diagnosis Department has been rationalized.
- Requirement of Day Care Center & Central Hospital Pharmacy have been prescribed.

(iii) **The Opening of a New or Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) and increase of admission capacity in any course of study or training (including a postgraduate course of study or Training) Regulations 2000.**

- The upper ceiling of intake capacity for undergraduate course has been increased to 250 from 150 at present.
- Eligibility criteria for an annual intake capacity of 200 / 250 based upon teaching beds, unitary hospital, OPD strength and bed occupancy have been prescribed.
- The Essentiality Certificate and Consent of Affiliation have been made mandatory for opening a new or higher Course of Study or for increasing the annual intake.

**Pre-P.G. Inspection**

Inspection to verify the facilities of teaching faculty, residents, clinical material, hostel and other infrastructure vis-à-vis "Minimum Standard Requirement for number of students for which the college is recognized for MBBS course have been made mandatory.

- The application for starting postgraduate course shall be processed only if the college meets the minimum standard requirements.

The Time Schedule for the processing of applications for postgraduate course has been rationalized as under:

- Application receipt by the Central Govt. – 1<sup>st</sup> April to 30<sup>th</sup> April.
- Application forwarded by the Central Govt. to MCI upto 31<sup>st</sup> May.
- Recommendations of MCI to Central Govt. upto 31<sup>st</sup> January.
- Letter of Permission issued by the Central Govt. upto 28<sup>th</sup> February.

(iv) **Minimum Qualifications for Teachers in Medical Colleges Regulations, 1998**

Clarificatory amendments with regard to research publications have been issued:-

- The research publications are published/ accepted for publication in the journals of the national association/society of the respective specialities /indexed journals.
- They have to be as the first author.
- They have to be published during the tenure of Assistant Professor/ Associate Professor.

Provision of promotion/appointment during the transitory period of 5/4 years for promotion/appointment to Associate Professor/Professor as per the prevailing Regulations has also been made.

(v) **Election of students union in Medical College/ Institution/University Regulations, 2009**

In accordance with the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Council with the previous sanction of the Central Government had notified election of students union in Medical College/ Institution/University Regulations, 2009

Provisions pertain to:

- Conduction of Election in Medical College/Institution/University across the Country.
- Modes of Elections.
- Disassociation of Student Elections and Student Representation from Political Parties.
- Frequency and Duration of Election Process.
- Eligibility Criteria for Candidates.
- Election – Related Expenditure and Financial Accountability.
- Code of conduct for Candidates and Elections Administrators.
- Grievances Redressal Mechanism.
- Maintaining Law and Order on the Campus during the Election Process.
- Miscellaneous Recommendations.

(vi) **Ethics Code of Conduct Regulations**

- Code of Conduct for relationship between doctors and pharmaceutical and allied health sector industry has been prescribed.

Important provisions pertain to:-

- Gifts
- Travel facilities
- Hospitality
- Cash or Monetary grants
- Medical Research
- Maintaining Professional Autonomy
- Affiliation
- Endorsement

The President apprised the members that the action to be taken by the Council towards violation of this clause is placed before the Hon'ble members for consideration in this meeting.

**(vii) Academic Cell**

Curricula in 33 subjects have been converted into Competency based format by Medical Council of India nominated expert. The categorization of these 33 Curricula are as follows:

MD Curricula	:	12
MS Curricula	:	04
Diploma Curricula	:	17

National Faculty Development Programme for teaching faculty in medical colleges has been undertaken by the Academic Cell.

Each medical college has been asked to strengthen its medical education unit for structured institutional workshops periodically.

Convenors of Regional Centres (RCs) are conducting Basic Course in Medical Education Technologies using the module developed by Academic Cell. RCs are conducting Orientation Workshops for coordinators of MEUs.

Four RCs have also been authorized to conduct Advance Course Workshops in Medical Education Technologies.

*National Faculty Development Programme*

Two more Regional Centres have been set up by the Council which are as under -

1. Gandhi medical College, Secunderabad
2. Government medical College, Kottayam

Total 10 Regional Centres are functioning at present.

*Summary of the Workshops conducted by the Regional Centres and teachers trained are given below:*

Basic Course Workshop	:	13
Orientation Workshop	:	02
Advance Course Workshop	:	01
Institutional Workshops	:	12
Approximate number of teachers trained	:	967

Some of the medical colleges in which a number of faculty have been trained have started conducting Basic Course Workshops in Medical Education Technologies on their own, but under the supervision of the Convenor of the respective Regional Centre. 12 such Workshops have been conducted in which nearly 300 faculty members have been trained.

*Web based teaching / learning of medical subjects and seamless integration with the present modalities.*

The Academic Cell has organised two meetings (January 11, 2010 and March 02, 2010) to discuss the modalities of implementation of the Web based learning / teaching activities. The first part will relate to the National

Education Portal, which would function under the aegis of the Academic Cell of the Council. The second part will relate to the National Health Portal; the Council representative will coordinate with the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare in this regard.

*Apical centre at the medical council of India is in the process of being set up.*

The Council has sponsored 65 C.M.E. Programmes during the period November 2009 - March 2010

<i>Description</i>	<i>No. of C.M.E. Programme</i>	<i>Approved Amount</i>
With N.R.I.	21	Rs. 20,44,000/-
Without N.R.I.	44	Rs. 20,35,500/-
	<i>Total</i>	Rs. 40,79,500/-

**(viii) Workshops including National Workshop**

The Council has organized the two-day workshop on "Alternative Innovative Model of Undergraduate Medical Education" in the month of February, 2010 at New Delhi wherein participants including Health Secretaries, DMEs, Vice-Chancellors of Health Universities, Dean of all the medical colleges/institutions in the region and senior professors were invited for deliberations.

The consensus evolved at the National Workshop with regard to Bachelor of Rural Health Care (BRHC) Course was placed before the Executive Committee and upon its approval, the item was circulated to the members for consideration.

Upon approval by the members, the decision has been sent to the Central Govt. for further necessary action.

- **Nomenclature of degree - 'bachelor of rural health care' (brhc)**
- Applicants who have completed their entire schooling (primary and secondary) and passed their qualifying examination (10+2) with physics, chemistry, biology and english as subjects from a 'notified rural area' in the concerned 'district'.
- Admissions would be 'district based' as far as possible.
- **Permissible annual intake - the permissible annual intake would be 25 or 50.**
- District hospital would have bed strength of not less than 300.
- For intake of 25, it would be 150 beds

- Deficiency of a maximum of 20% of teaching beds would be compensable by additional component of clinical material in terms of more than 80% bed occupancy.
- A. Training would be 'institutional' in character and in 'three phases' of the following duration:
- B. Phase i - 1 year;
- C. Phase ii – 1 year;
- D. Phase iii- 1 ½ years.
- **Mode of teaching-** teaching would be 'modular' in character at all the 'three phases'.
- **Competencies to be acquired-** competencies required for a student to practice upon acquiring the "bachelor of rural health care (brhc)" would be clearly spelt out and notified as in the case of graduate medical education regulations for the mbbs course.
- **Nomenclature of the teaching departments**
  - Anatomy
  - Physiology + biochemistry
  - Pathology + microbiology
  - Pharmacology
  - Forensic medicine
  - Medicine and allied disciplines
  - Paediatrics
  - Surgical and allied disciplines
  - Orthopaedics
  - Obstetrics & gynaecology
  - Community medicine
  - Family medicine
- **Teaching personnel**

Each medical school will have a 'full time'

  - Principal/dean
  - Medical superintendent
  - Professor as head of the department (in case professor is not available then associate professor can be appointed as head of the department for initial period of 4 years).
  - Minimum 'one medical officer' in pre and para clinical departments like anatomy, physiology & biochemistry, pathology & microbiology, pharmacology, forensic medicine and community medicine. As assigned faculty.
  - In clinical departments like medicine and allied disciplines, paediatrics, surgery and allied disciplines, orthopedics, obstetrics and gynecology, each teaching clinical unit will have two medical officers as 'assigned faculties' except clinical unit (i), which would be headed by the head of the concerned department.
  - 'visiting faculty' (not more than 20% of the total faculty strength).
  - Eligibility for teachers in basic sciences with non-medical qualifications in the faculty of medicine.

- The 'rotating internship' will be for a period of 'six' months and will be based in rural set up either at 'primary health center' or community health center, district hospitals and tertiary health care centre'.
- **Age of superannuation**- in medical schools, teachers who have retired from existing medical colleges could be re-employed till they attain the age of 70 years.
- **Minimum standard requirements**- teachers' eligibility criteria and minimum standard requirements for brhc graduate would be spelt out through 'appropriate regulations' issued from time to time.
- **Recognition of the degree** - the 'medical schools' would be recognized for the conferment of degree by the concerned state medical council or by such authority as would be designated/created for the said purpose by the govt. Of india.

- **Graduate registering mechanism**

- A. An appropriate standing mechanism would be provided for registering brhc graduates by the states.
- B. Registration accruable would be 'temporary' on 'yearly basis' and on due and appropriate certification by the designated authority notified by the appropriate agency as the case may be to the effect that the incumbent has rendered 'one year' of rural health service would be renewed on 'year to year basis'.
- C. Upon four such renewals, 'permanent registration' would accrue at the end of 'five' years.
- D. The graduates so registered would be under the ambit and coverage of disciplinary jurisdiction of the 'code of medical ethics' prescribed by the mci.
- E. The period of utilization of these graduates thereof would be such as would be determined by the concerned state govt. From time to time.
- F. A provisional registration would be necessary for internship.

- **Manpower utilization**

The manpower so produced could be utilized in sub-centers/primary health centers in the 'notified rural areas' of the concerned 'state'.

It is recommended that the graduates after acquiring brhc degree should be employed in sub-centers/primary health centers only for first 5 years. They should not be allowed private practice during first 5 years after acquiring the degree.

- **Added incentives** - the salary component to be paid to brhc graduates when employed in phcs/sub-centres should include rural area allowance which should be tax free. This would act as a major incentive and motivating factor.

(ix) **International & National Meetings Attended On behalf of the Council**

- The President with the officials of the Council attended the meeting with the Hon'ble Health & Family Welfare minister and officials of the Central Govt. to discuss various issues related with MCI Regulations, Schedule of Entrance Examination for Postgraduate studies, incentives for doctors serving in rural and remote areas and Alternative Undergraduate Medical Education model in November 2009.
- Dr.Ved Prakash Mishra & Dr. B. P. Dubey, Members, represented the Council at the meeting on Networking of the Medical Councils of South East Asia Region of WHO held in November, 2009 at Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Dr. Ved Prakash Mishra represented the Council at the meeting convened by National Human Rights Commission to discuss the issues of illegal medical practice by fake doctors / quacks in India and lack of health care facilities in Tribal Areas in January, 2010.
- The suggestion of the Council that the Central Govt. should bring out a comprehensive the Anti-Quackery Bill for providing provisions for stringent punishment for the people indulging in medical malpractices was accepted.
- The President with the officials of the Council attended the meeting with the Secretary, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare to discuss various issues related with National Commission for Human Resources in health, requirement of health manpower in rural areas and opening of medical colleges by IIT's in February, 2010.
- President attended the Second World Health Professions Conference on Regulation (WHPCR) at Geneva on 18-19 February, 2010. The control and direction of Health Professional Regulation was debated according to the present Regulation and vis-à-vis for the future.
- Dr.Ved Prakash Mishra & Dr. A.R.N. Setalvad attended the review meeting of the Task Force convened by Ministry of Human Resources Development held on 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2010 at New Delhi.
- Council Nominee attended the meeting for review of Mental Health Programmes at Bangaluru in February 2010.
- NCFMEA has concluded that India's standards and processes for evaluating medical schools are comparable to those used in the United States & India's system remains comparable to the process used to accredit medical schools in the United States. Govt. of U.S.A. has requested that India submit its next formal report on its accreditation activities for review at the spring 2011 meeting of NCFMEA, while extending parity.

(x) **Computerization**

The President informed the House that the Council Office has introduced an E-office programme, MCI online and tracking of application from 1st April, 2009.

The Council has introduced Online Application system for:-

- Registration
- Good standing
- Eligibility
- I.M.R.



The applicants can submit their applications online and can also track the progress of the application. They need not come physically to the council office either for submission of application or for tracking.

MCI Online has also been integrated with physical receipt of the applications. Such applicants who submit their applications physically are given 'application tracking number' along with the receipt. Thereafter, these applications are integrated with on-line system and the candidates can review the progress from the application tracking number allocated to them without coming physically to office.

Tracking software are being introduced for undergraduate & postgraduate courses which will enable the council to have complete information about an institute & courses handily.

Similar software is planned for ethics cases to monitor the progress of the ethics cases from receipt till disposal.

IMR data has also been analyzed through search software applications for detection of duplicate records.

Bio-metric card reader system is introduced wherein a card reader will be installed at each medical college to tag the faculty which will be linked with a server in the council. This will help in monitoring the actual working of the faculty in any medical institute

**(xi) Undergraduate Inspections**

Inspections for establishment of new medical colleges	7
Inspections for renewal of permission	83
Inspections for approval of the college	14
Pre-pg inspections	10
Periodical inspections	7
Inspections pursuant to complaints / court orders	3
Total inspections	124

**(xii) Post Graduate Inspections**

Inspections for starting/increasing of courses/seats	503
Inspections for recognition of courses	67
Total inspections	570

The President informed the House that in the last meeting, he had requested the members and particularly the representatives nominated by the State Governments to prevail upon the Deans of Government Medical Colleges in their States to provide the details about the availability of

Professors and beds and avail maximum benefit for getting the postgraduate seats increased without any further formality.

#### **Increase in Post Graduate Seats As Per Number Of Professors**

- 2777 Seats have been increased in 115 Government Medical colleges in 21 states in various courses due to change in the ratio of PG Teachers: Students.

#### **Increase in Post Graduate Seats Under Section 10A Of the Act**

- 1068 Seats have been increased in 87 Medical Colleges in 17 states in various courses under Section 10-A of the IMC Act, 1956.

#### **Increase in Post Graduate Seats**

- 3845 seats in Post graduate courses have been increased in the Academic year 2010-11 amounting nearly 30% of the total Post graduate seats sanctioned since the formal inception of postgraduate medical education till date.

The President apprised the House that the Chairman, Postgraduate Committee, Postgraduate Section of the Council and all the P.S./P.A./Stenographers had worked day & night untiringly to make it possible to send the communications to the Central Government even on Saturday/Sunday and on festival of Holi which is celebrated enthusiastically in the whole country especially in North India. He congratulated the Chairman of the Postgraduate Committee and the Postgraduate Section.

At this point of time, Dr. Ved Prakash Mishra and the whole House appreciated the employees of the Council who have rendered their services after office hours for this gigantic task. Dr. C.N. Manjunath, Bangalore informed that they have introduced some incentive scheme for the employees at their institute. At this juncture, President stated that under the chairmanship of Dr. C.N. Manjunath, a Sub-Committee be constituted for this purpose.

#### **(xiii) Legal Pronouncements**

- Master Alli Sai Deepak vs. Govt. Of A. P. & Others - writ petition no. 17162 of 2009.
- The Hon'ble High Court has upheld the graduate medical education regulation 1997 and has quashed the G.O. Issued by the State Government of Andhra Pradesh condoning the shortage of age which was contrary to the MCI Regulations.

Hon. High Court of A.P. also mentioned in the order that:

*"We express our displeasure at the way in which the state government issued G.O. No. 545 dated 23.07.2009 contrary to the rules governing the field and the factors that led to issuing of the said G.O. Rt. No. 545 are not clearly spelt out."*

- Kusum Sharma and others vs. Batra Hospital & others (civil appeal no. 1385 of 2001). The Hon'ble Supreme Court has defined medical negligence.
- 11 parameters have been listed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to decide what is medical negligence? In brief, negligence cannot be attributed to a doctor so long as he performs his duties with reasonable skill and competence. Merely because the doctor chooses one course of action in preference to the other one available, he would not be liable if the course of action chosen by him was acceptable to the Medical profession.

In Ravindra Singh's case, Hon. Delhi High Court has held:

"MCI will be justified in incorporating a pre-condition to the grant of registration that the petitioner should undergo an internship of two years under the supervision of a senior doctor with not less than 20 years standing who will assess the performance of the Petitioner during this period and certify his competence to practice as a full-fledged doctor at the end of internship. The MCI will be flexible on whether the entire internship should be with the same doctor."

The President wishes and hopes that we shall carry the mantle further in the larger interests of the medical education and public health care delivery system in this country. He also takes the pleasure of recording his sense of gratitude to all the respected members of the Council for steering him through, but for which his task would have remained unaccomplished.

Motion of thanks to the presidential address was moved by Dr. Vasant N. Pawar and seconded by the whole House.

##### **5. Representation of the Council on other bodies – Election of –**

###### **(i) Dr. Aken Kumar G. Desai Memorial Endowment Fund**

Read: To elect one member on Dr. Aken Kumar G. Desai Memorial Endowment Fund in place of Dr. Mukesh Kumar Sharma whose terms is expired as member of the Council.

Proposed by Dr. Ved Prakash Mishra and seconded by Dr. B.P. Dubey and Dr. H.P. Bhalodiya, Dr. Mahendra Dolatsinh Chauhan was declared elected unopposed as member on Dr. Aken Kumar G. Desai Memorial Endowment Fund.

##### **6. Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences University, Nagpur – Recognition of M.D.(Paediatrics) qualification in respect of students being trained at J.N. Medical College, Swangi Wardha.**

Read: The compliance together with Council inspector report (May 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at J.N. Medical College, Swangi Wardha for purpose of recognition of M.D.(Paediatrics) qualification granted by Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences University, Nagpur.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance together with Council inspector report (May 2009) and noted that Dr. P.P. Sanghvi, Associate Professor, Unit-III, does not possess prescribed academic qualification.

However, the teaching faculty complement other than the teacher mentioned above is adequate and complete; and hence decided to recommend that M.D.(Paediatrics) qualification granted by Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences University, Nagpur in respect of students being trained at J.N. Medical College, Swangi Wardha be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**7. Gujarat University – Approval of Smt. NHL Municipal Medical College, Ahmedabad for the award of MD (Forensic Medicine) qualification.**

Read: The Council Inspector's report (November, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Smt. NHL Municipal Medical College, Ahmedabad for purpose of approval of the college for the award of MD(Forensic Medicine) qualification granted by Gujarat University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector's report (November, 2009) and decided to recommend that Smt. NHL Municipal Medical College, Ahmedabad be approved for the award of MD(Forensic Medicine) qualification granted by Gujarat University restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

8. **Dr. D.Y. Patil University, Pune –Recognition of DPH qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. D.Y. Patil Medical college, Pimpri, Pune.**

Read: The Council Inspector's report (November, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Dr. D.Y. Patil Medical College, Pimpri, Pune for recognition of DPH qualification granted by Dr. D.Y. Patil University, Pune.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector's report (November, 2009) and decided to recommend that DPH qualification granted by Dr. D.Y. Patil University, Pune in respect of students being trained at Dr. D.Y. Patil Medical College, Pimpri, Pune be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year.”

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

9. **Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (General Medicine) qualifications**

Read: The Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Narayana Medical College, Nellore alongwith compliance report for approval of college for the award of MD(General Medicine) qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) and decided to recommend that Narayana Medical College, Nellore be approved for the award of MD(General Medicine) qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada restricting the number of admissions to 6(Six) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**10. Recognition of DRM course under Homi Bhabha National Institute (deemed Uni.) at the Radiation Medicine Centre BARC located in Tata Memorial Centre Mumbai.**

Read: The letter dated 18/11/2009 received from Dean, Homi Bhabha National Institute (deemed Uni.) with regard to recognition of DRM course at the Radiation Medicine Centre BARC located in Tata Memorial Centre Mumbai.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the letter dated 18/11/2009 received from Dean, Homi Bhabha National Institute (deemed Uni.) with regard to recognition of DRM course conducted at Bhabha Atomic Research Centre located in Tata Memorial Centre, Mumbai and noted that DRM qualification is already recognized under Mumbai University in respect of students being trained at Tata Memorial Centre, Mumbai and now under Homi Bhabha National Institute (deemed Uni.).

The Postgraduate Committee observed that the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 10.03.2007 while considering the matter of recognition of DRM qualification under Homi Bhabha National Institute (Deemed University) had decided as under:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the letter dt.09.11.2006 and noted that DRM qualification already stands recognized under Mumbai University and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 and now the matter is under consideration for recognition of the said qualification under Homi Bhabha National Institute (Deemed University) being the change of name of University, decided to recommend that DRM qualification granted by Homi Bhabha National Institute (Deemed University) in respect

of students being trained at Tata Memorial Centre, Mumbai be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956."

The Postgraduate Committee further observed that the Executive Committee at its meeting held in June, 1988 while considering a similar matter had decided as under:-

"No inspection is required where there is change of name and change of affiliation of the University or the college whose medical qualifications are already recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 unless the Executive Committee decides otherwise."

In view of above, the Postgraduate Committee decided that DRM qualification conducted at Bhabha Atomic Research Centre be recognized under Homi Bhabha National Institute (Deemed University) and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 and forward to the Govt. of India for appropriate notification of the same."

**11. Patna University – Recognition of MD (Forensic Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at Patna Medical College, Patna.**

Read: The Council Inspector Report (September, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Patna Medical College, Patna for purpose of recognition of MD(Forensic Medicine) qualification granted by Patna University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector Report (September, 2009) and decided to recommend that MD(Forensic Medicine) qualification granted by Patna University in respect of students being trained at Patna Medical College, Patna be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 3(Three) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....  
 6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*  
 6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
 ....."

**12. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad for the award of M.D.(Biochemistry) qualification in respect of increased intake.**

Read: The Council Inspector's report (November, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad for purpose of approval of the college for the award of M.D.(Biochemistry) qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada in respect of increased intake.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector's Report (November, 2009) and noted that Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad already stands approved for the award of M.D.(Biochemistry) qualification with 2(Two) seats and now the matter is under consideration for approval of the qualification against the increased intake from 2(Two) to 4(Four) seats; and decided to recommend that Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad be approved for the award of M.D.(Biochemistry) qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada in respect of increased intake restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) to 4(Four) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**13. University of Mumbai & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nasik – Recognition of MD (Radio-Diagnosis) qualification in respect of students being trained at Bombay Hospital Institute of Medical Sciences, Mumbai.**

Read: The Compliance Report alongwith the Council Inspector's Report (May, 2008) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Bombay Hospital Institute of Medical Sciences, Mumbai for purpose of recognition of MD(Radio-Diagnosis) qualification earlier granted by University of Mumbai and now by Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nasik.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-



"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Compliance Report alongwith the Council Inspector's Report (May, 2008) and decided to recommend that MD(Radio-Diagnosis) qualification earlier granted by University of Mumbai and now by Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nasik in respect of students being trained at Bombay Hospital Institute of Medical Sciences, Mumbai be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**14. Veer Narmed South Gujarat University – Recognition of M.S. (Orthopaedics) qualification in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat**

∴

Read: The Compliance Verification Inspection Report (Dec. 2009) together with Council Inspector's Report (May, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat for purpose of recognition of M.S. (Orthopaedics) qualification granted by Veer Narmed South Gujarat University, Surat.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Compliance Verification Inspection Report (Dec. 2009) together with Council Inspector's Report (May, 2009) and decided to recommend that M.S.(Orthopaedics) qualification granted by Veer Narmed South Gujarat University, Surat in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**15. Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University – Recognition of D.L.O. qualification in respect of students being trained at Pt. J.N.M. Medical College, Raipur.**

Read: The communications dt. 06.05.2009 received from the college authorities and the Council Inspector respectively alongwith Compliance Verification Inspection Report (May, 2007) and earlier inspection report (May, 2006) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Pt. J.N.M. Medical College, Raipur for recognition of D.L.O qualification granted by Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the communications dt. 06.05.2009 received from the college authorities and the Council Inspector respectively alongwith Compliance Verification Inspection Report (May, 2007) and earlier Inspection Report (May, 2006) and decided to recommend that D.L.O qualification granted by Pt. Ravishankar Shukla University in respect of students being trained at Pt. J.N.M. Medical College, Raipur be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided to advise the institution authorities to restrict the number of admission to 1(One) student per year prospectively from the academic year 2010-11.”

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**16. Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University) – Recognition of MD (SPM/Community Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of medical Sciences.**

Read: The compliance verification report(November, 2009) together with the Council inspector report (June, 2008) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, Srinagar for purpose of recognition of MD(SPM/Community Medicine) qualification granted by Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University), Srinagar.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report(November, 2009) togetherwith the Council inspector report (June, 2008) and decided to recommend that MD(SPM/Community Medicine) qualification granted by Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University), Srinagar in respect of students being trained at Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, Srinagar be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**17. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (Anatomy) qualification.**

Read: The compliance together with the Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Narayana Medical College, Nellore for purpose of approval of the college for the award of MD(Anatomy) qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance togetherwith the Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) and decided to recommend that Narayana Medical College, Nellore be approved for the award of MD (Anatomy) qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences,

Vijayawada restricting the number of admissions to 3(Three) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**18: Calicut University – Recognition of M.D.(Radio-Diagnosis) & DMRD qualifications in respect of students being trained at Calicut Medical College, Calicut.**

Read: The compliance together with the Council Inspector report (December, 2008) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Calicut Medical College, Calicut for purpose of recognition of M.D.(Radio-Diagnosis) & DMRD qualifications granted by Calicut University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance togetherwith the Council Inspector report (December, 2008) and decided to recommend that M.D.(Radio-Diagnosis) & DMRD qualifications granted by Calicut University in respect of students being trained at Calicut Medical College, Calicut be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule of the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students in each course per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**19. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, Eluru for the award of DDVL qualifications.**

Read: The Council Inspector's report (December, 2009) on the physical and other teaching facilities available at Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, Eluru for purpose of approval of the college for the award of DDVL qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector's report (December, 2009) and decided to recommend that Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, Eluru be approved for the award of DDVL qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....  
 6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*  
 6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
 ....."

**20. B.N. Mandal University - Recognition of D.Ortho qualification in respect of Mata Gujri Medical College, Kishanganj.**

Read: The compliance verification report (December, 2009) together with the Council Inspector's report (August, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Mata Gujari Medical College, Kishanganj for starting of MS (Ortho) course and recognition of D.Ortho. qualification under B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (December, 2009) together with the Council Inspector's report (August, 2009) and decided- that D.Ortho. qualification granted by B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura in respect of students being trained at Mata Gujari Medical College, Kishanganj be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

## **21. To prescribe the Eligibility Criteria for Teachers in the Broad Speciality and Super-Speciality Courses.**

Read: The Eligibility Criteria for Teachers in the Broad Speciality and Super-Speciality Courses.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee noted that the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 18.11.2009 considered the matter with regard to prescribe the Eligibility Criteria for Teachers in the Broad Speciality and Super-Speciality Courses alongwith the recommendation of the Postgraduate Committee taken at its meeting held on 13.11.2009 and decided as under:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the recommendation of the TEQ Sub-Committee for prescribing the eligibility criteria prescribe the Eligibility Criteria for Teachers in the Broad Speciality and Super-Speciality Courses and noted the Notification dated 21/07/2009 following Postgraduate Medical Qualifications have been added in the Schedule to Postgraduate Medical Education Regulation 2000:-

1. M.D. Emergency Medicine
2. M.D. Infectious Disease
3. D.M. Pulmonary Medicine
4. D.M. Rheumatology
5. D.M. Child Adolescent Psychiatry
6. D.M. (Paediatrics Gastroenterology)
7. D.M. Paediatric Cardiology
8. D.M. (Cardiac Anaesthesia)

The matter was placed before the TEQ Sub-Committee at its meeting held on 05.10.2009 to prescribe the Eligibility Criteria for Teachers in the Broad Speciality and Super-Speciality courses. The Committee decided as under: -

“The Teacher’s Eligibility Qualifications Sub-Committee considered the matter with regard to prescribing the Eligibility Criteria for Teachers in the Broad Speciality and Super-Speciality Courses and decided that a joint meeting of Chairman, Teacher’s Eligibility Qualifications Sub-Committee with Chairman, Post Graduate Committee be held on mutually agreed date

to define curriculum, syllabus and Teacher's Eligibility Qualifications for Broad Speciality and Super-Speciality Courses."

The Postgraduate Committee noted that inadvertently doctoral and postdoctoral teachers of the concerned discipline have not been mentioned in the list of eligible teachers. Hence, the Postgraduate Committee proposed the following amendments to the eligibility criteria for teachers as under:-

1.	M.D. in Emergency Medicine	MD (Emergency Medicine) M.D.(General Medicine)} with 2 years training M.S.(Genl.Surgery) } in Emergency Medicine M.D. (Resp. Medi.) } M.D.(Anaesthesia) } M.S. (Orthopaedics) }
2.	M.D. in Infectious Disease	M.D. (Infectious Disease) M.D. (Medicine) with Diploma in Tropical Medicine M.D.(Community Medicine) } with 2 years M.D. (Medicine) }special training in M.D.(Paediatrics) } Infectious Disease
3.	D.M.(Pulmonary Medicine)	D.M.(Pulmonary Medicine) M.D.(Pulmonary Medicine)}with 2 yrs. M.D.(Genl.Medicine) }special training M.D.(Paediatrics) }in Pulmonary Medicine
4.	D.M.(Rheumatology)	D.M.(Rheumatology) M.D.(Genl.Medicine) }with 2 years M.D.(Paediatrics) }special training in M.D.(PMR) }Rheumatology
5.	D.M.(Child Adolescent Psychiatry)	D.M.(Child Adolescent Psychiatry) M.D.(Psychiatry) with 2 years special training in Child Adolescent Psychiatry
6.	D.M. (Paediatric Gastroenterology)	D.M.(Paediatric Gastroenterology) D.M.(Gastroenterology) M.D.(Paediatrics) with 2 years special training in Gastroenterology
7.	D.M. (Paediatric Cardiology)	D.M.(Paediatric Cardiology) D.M.(Cardiology) M.D.(Paediatrics) with 2 years special training in Cardiology
8.	D.M. (Cardiac Anaesthesia)	D.M.(Cardiac Anaesthesia) M.D.(Anaesthesiology) with 2 years special training in Cardiac Anaesthesiology

This relaxation in academic qualifications in the respective speciality will be applicable for 10 years. After this date doctors with qualification in the concerned super speciality only will be considered as faculty members.

The Postgraduate Committee also proposed consequential changes in the "Minimum Qualifications for Teachers in Medical Institutions Regulations, 1998" may also be done accordingly."

**22. Punjab University – Recognition of MD(PSM/Community Medicine) qualification in respect of Govt. Medical College, Chandigarh.**

Read: The compliance verification report (December, 2009) together with Council inspector report (October, 2006) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Govt. Medical College, Chandigarh for purpose of recognition of M.D.(PSM/Community Medicine) qualification granted by Punjab University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (December, 2009) together with Council inspector report (October, 2006) and decided to recommend that M.D.(PSM/Community Medicine) qualification granted by Punjab University in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Chandigarh be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....  
6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*  
  
6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course. "*  
....."

**23. Rajasthan University & Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur – Approval of J.L.N. Medical College, Ajmer for the award of MD/MS (Obst. & Gynae.) qualification.**

Read: The Council Inspector Report (December, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at J.L.N. Medical College, Ajmer for purpose of approval of the college for the award of MD/MS(Obst.& Gynae.) qualification earlier granted by Rajasthan University & Now by Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector Report (December, 2009) and decided to recommend that J.L.N. Medical College, Ajmer be approved for the award of MD/MS(Obst.& Gynae.) qualification earlier granted by Rajasthan University & Now by Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur restricting the number of admissions to 8(Eight) students per year."



The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**24. Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad – Recognition of DDVL qualification in respect of students being trained at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow.**

Read: The Council Inspector Report (December, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow for purpose of recognition of DDVL qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector Report (December, 2009) and decided to recommend that DDVL qualification granted by Dr.R.M.L. Avadh University in respect of students being trained at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year.”

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**25. Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad – Recognition of DCH qualification in respect of students being trained at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow.**

Read: The Council Inspector Report (December, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Era’s Lucknow Medical

College, Lucknow for purpose of recognition of DCH qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector Report (December, 2009) and decided to recommend that DCH qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad in respect of students being trained at Era's Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**26. Osmania University, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada & NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Recognition of M.Ch.(Urology/Genito-Urinary Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at Gandhi Medical College, Hyderabad.**

Read: The compliance verification report (December 2009) together with the Council Inspector's report (June, 2001 & August 2006) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Gandhi Medical College, Hyderabad for purpose of recognition of M.Ch.(Urology/Genito-Urinary Surgery) qualification granted by Osmania University, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada & NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (December 2009) together with the Council Inspector's report (June, 2001 & August 2006) and decided to recommend that M.Ch.(Urology/Genito-Urinary Surgery) qualification granted by Osmania University, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada & NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada in respect of students being trained at Gandhi Medical College, Hyderabad be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**27. D.Y. Patil University, Kolhapur – Recognition of M.D.(General Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at D.Y.Patil Medical College, Kolhapur.**

Read: The compliance verification report (December 2009) together with the Council Inspector's report (May, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at D.Y.Patil Medical College, Kolhapur for purpose of recognition of M.D.(General Medicine) qualification granted by D.Y. Patil University, Kolhapur.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (December 2009) together with the Council Inspector's report (May, 2009) and noted that Dr. C.S. Nath, Professor, is not eligible as a faculty member being more than 65 years of age.

However, the teaching faculty complement other than the teacher mentioned above is adequate and complete; and hence decided to recommend that M.D.(General Medicine) qualification granted by D.Y. Patil University, Kolhapur in respect of students being trained at D.Y.Patil Medical College, Kolhapur be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 4(Four) students per year.”

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**28. Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, (Deemed University) – Recognition of D.M.(Cardiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Sher-I -Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, Srinagar.**

Read: The Council Inspector Report (October, 2008) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, Srinagar for purpose of recognition of D.M.(Cardiology) qualification granted by Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, (Deemed University).

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector Report (October, 2008) and decided to recommend that D.M.(Cardiology) qualification granted by Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, (Deemed University) in respect of students being trained at Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences, Srinagar be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**29. KLE University, Belgaum – Recognition of D.M.(Cardiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at J.L.N.Medical College, Belgaum.**

Read: The compliance report along with inspection report (July 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at J.L.N.Medical College, Belgaum for purpose of recognition of D.M.(Cardiology) qualification granted by KLE University, Belgaum.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance report along with Inspection Report (July 2009) and decided to recommend that D.M.(Cardiology) qualification granted by KLE University, Belgaum in respect of students being trained at J.L.N.Medical College, Belgaum be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**30. Dr. D.Y. Patil University, Pune – Recognition of M.Ch.(Neuro-Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. D.Y. Patil Medical college, Pimpri,Pune.**

Read: The Council Inspector Report (October, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Dr. D.Y. Patil Medical College, Pimpri, Pune for purpose of recognition of M.Ch.(Neuro-Surgery) qualification granted by Dr. D.Y. Patil University, Pune.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector Report (October, 2009) and decided to recommend that M.Ch.(Neuro-Surgery) qualification granted by Dr. D.Y. Patil University, Pune in respect of students being trained at Dr. D.Y. Patil Medical College, Pimpri, Pune be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**31. Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval of M.D. (Obst.& Gynae.) qualification in respect of students being trained at K.S. Hegde Medical Academy, Mangalore.**

Read: The Compliance Verification Report (December, 2009) together with Council inspector report (July, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at K.S. Hegde Medical Academy, Mangalore for

purpose of recognition of M.D. (Obst & Gynae.) qualification granted by Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Compliance Verification Report (December, 2009) together with Council inspector report (July, 2009) and decided to recommend that K.S. Hegde Medical Academy, Mangalore be approved for the award M.D. (Obst & Gynae.) qualification granted by Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....  
 6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*  
 6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
 ....."

**32. Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad – Recognition of DPM qualification in respect of students being trained at Era's Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow.**

Read: The Council Inspector Report (December, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Era's Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow for purpose of recognition of DPM qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector Report (December, 2009) and decided to recommend that DPM qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad in respect of students being trained at Era's Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**33. Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad – Recognition of DGO qualification in respect of students being trained at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow.**

Read: The Council Inspector Report (Jan., 2010) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow for purpose of recognition of DGO qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council Inspector’s report (January 2010) and decided to recommend that DGO qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad in respect of students being trained at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year.”

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**34. Pondicherry University– Approval of Mahatma Gandhi Medical College & Research Institute Puducherry for the award of D.C.H. qualification**

Read: The compliance verification report (Jan., 2010) together with Council Inspector report (July 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Mahatma Gandhi Medical & Research Institute Puducherry for purpose of approval of the college for the award of DCH qualification granted by Pondicherry University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Jan., 2010) together with Council Inspector report (July 2009) and decided to recommend that Mahatma Gandhi Medical & Research Institute Puducherry be approved for the award of DCH qualification granted by Pondicherry University restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....  
 6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*  
 6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
 ....."

**35. Pondicherry University– Approval of Mahatma Gandhi Medical College & Research Institute Puducherry for the award of D.G.O. qualification**

Read: The compliance verification report (Dec., 2009) together with the Council inspector's report (July 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Mahatma Gandhi Medical & Research Institute Puducherry for purpose of approval of the college for the award of D.G.O. qualification granted by Pondicherry University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Dec., 2009) together with the Council inspector's report (July 2009) and decided to recommend that Mahatma Gandhi Medical & Research Institute Puducherry be approved for the award of D.G.O. qualification granted by Pondicherry University restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-



- “.....
- 6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*
- 6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*
- .....”

**36. Continuance of recognition of MBBS degree granted by Vinayaka Mission University in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission Medical College, Salem.**

Read: The matter along with the compliance verification inspection report (5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> Nov., 2009) for continuance of recognition of MBBS degree granted by Vinayaka Mission University in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission Medical College, Salem.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*“The members of The Executive Committee of the Council considered the compliance verification inspection report (5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> November, 2009) along with the Council Inspectors report (16<sup>th</sup> October, 2008) and decided that the recognition of MBBS degree granted by Vinayaka Mission University in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission Medical College, Salem be continued restricting the number of admissions to 100 (One Hundred) students per year”.*

**37. Continuance of recognition of MBBS degree granted by Gujarat University in respect of students being trained at B.J. Medical College, Ahmedabad.**

Read: The Council Inspectors report (29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> Dec., 2009) for continuance of recognition of MBBS degree granted by Gujarat University in respect of students being trained at B.J. Medical College, Ahmedabad.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*“The members of the Executive Committee of the Council considered the Council Inspectors report (29<sup>th</sup> & 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2009) and decided that the recognition of MBBS degree granted by Gujarat University in respect of students being trained at B.J. Medical College, Ahmedabad be continued restricting the number of admissions to 250 (Two Hundred Fifty) students per year”.*

**38. Removal of name of Dr. Bharat Singh Naruka from the Indian Medical Register.**

Read: The matter with regard to removal of name of Dr. Bharat Singh Naruka from the Indian Medical Register - Registration No. 2702, dated 02.11.1970.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The Executive Committee of the Council noted the letter dated 11.09.2009 received from the Registrar, Rajasthan Medical Council, Jaipur intimating that Dr. Bharat Singh Naruka bearing Registration No. 2702, dated 02.11.1970 had expired on 07.09.2009 and his name has been removed from the Register of Registered Medical Practitioners. The Committee decided to remove the name of above-mentioned doctor from the Indian Medical Register and also give intimation in this regard to all the State Medical Councils in the country."

**39. Removal of name of Dr. Jagdish Prasad Sharma from the Indian Medical Register.**

Read: The matter with regard to removal of name of Dr. Jagdish Prasad Sharma from the Indian Medical Register - Registration No. 2887, dated 12.05.1971.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The Executive Committee of the Council noted the letter dated 11.09.2009 received from the Registrar, Rajasthan Medical Council, Jaipur intimating that Dr. Jagdish Prasad Sharma bearing Registration No. 2887, dated 12.05.1971 had expired on 09.09.2009 and his name has been removed from the Register of Registered Medical Practitioners. The Committee decided to remove the name of above-mentioned doctor from the Indian Medical Register and also give intimation in this regard to all the State Medical Councils in the country."*

**40. Removal of name of Dr. Mohan Lal Sharma from the Indian Medical Register – Registration No. 5906, dated 08.10.1976.**

Read: The matter with regard to removal of name of Dr. Mohan Lal Sharma from the Indian Medical Register - Registration No. 5906, dated 08.10.1976.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The Executive Committee of the Council noted the letter dated 21.07.2009 received from the Registrar, Rajasthan Medical Council, Jaipur intimating that Dr. Mohan Lal Sharma bearing Registration No. 5906, dated 08.10.1976 had expired on 19.07.2009 and his name has been removed from the Register of Registered Medical Practitioners. The Committee decided to remove the name of above-mentioned doctor from the Indian Medical Register and also give intimation in this regard to all the State Medical Councils in the country."

**41. Removal of name of Dr. Bharat Bhushan Chachan from the Indian Medical Register.**

Read: The matter with regard to removal of name of Dr. Bharat Bhushan Chachan from the Indian Medical Register - Registration No. 17713.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The Executive Committee of the Council noted the letter dated 31.08.2009 received from the President, Rajasthan Medical Council, Jaipur intimating that Dr. Bharat Bhushan Chachan bearing Registration No. 17713 is restrained from practicing medicine for a period of six months or till the enquiry is completed whichever is earlier.

In view of above, the Committee decided to remove the name of above-mentioned doctor for a period of six months or till the enquiry is completed whichever is earlier from the Indian Medical Register and also give intimation in this regard to all the State Medical Councils in the country."

**42. Complaint against Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar as alleged by Mr. Puran Singh.**

Read: The following recommendations of the Ethics Committee duly approved by the Executive Committee regarding Complaint against Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar as alleged by Mr. Puran Singh.

The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 5.01.2007 and it was decided as under :-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar as alleged by Mr. Puran Singh and decided to call Mr. Puran Singh complainant before the Ethics Committee in its next meeting at 3.30 p.m."*

*As per above decision, Mr. Puran Singh was requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 19.02.2007 at 3.30 p.m vide Council's letter dated 29.01.2007.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 19.02.2007 which reads as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the complaint against Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar as alleged by Mr. Puran Singh and noted that Mr. Puran Singh appeared before the Ethics Committee on 19.2.2007 at 3.30 p.m. and explained before the Hon'ble members of the Ethics Committee. The reason for his complaint and also categorically stated that Dr. Anil K. Sagar has issued false medical certificate to Shri N.K. Singh who happens to his Brother-in-law in the letter head of Sagar Nursing Home, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi-92 which does not exist at all and never existed. In favour of that the local police of PS Preet Vihar has submitted relevant documents from Director Health Services, Govt. of NCT, Delhi.*

*In view of above, Ethics Committee decided to call Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar in its next meeting at 12.00 noon.*

*As per above decision, Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar was requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 19.03.2007 at 12.00 Noon vide Council's letter dated 26.02.2007. In response to above, Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar has sent a letter dated 16.03.2007.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 19.03.2007 which reads as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar as alleged by Mr. Puran Singh and noted that Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar was requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 19.03.2007 at 12.00 noon but he did not appear.*

*In view of the above, the Ethics Committee decided to ask him to appear before the Ethics Committee in its second next meeting at 3.00 p.m. alongwith all the relevant papers, failing which the Ethics Committee will be constrained to take ex-parte decision in this particular case."*

*As per above decision, Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar was requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 14.05.2007 at 3.00 p.m vide Council's letter dated 23.04.2007.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2007 which reads as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar as alleged by Mr. Puran Singh and decided that Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar should be given a last chance to appear before the Ethics Committee in its next meeting, failing which the Ethics Committee will be constrained to take ex-parte decision in this case."*

*As per above decision, Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar was requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 18.06.2007 at 10.30 a.m failing which the Ethics Committee will be constrained to take ex-part decision vide Council's letter dated 9.06.2007.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 18.06.2007 which reads as under :-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar as alleged by Mr. Puran Singh and noted that Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar has appeared before the Ethics Committee and his statement is as under:-*

#### STATEMENT OF DR. ANIL KUMAR SAGAR

*I Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar did my MBBS from University College of Medical Sciences, Delhi in the year 1992 and M.D. (Community Health Administration) from National Institute of Health & F.W., Munirka, New Delhi in the year 2002. My Date of Birth is 12.2.1970. My registration number is 11582 of MCI.*

*Regarding this case, I would like to submit a written statement which explains my position. This is just a false case to harass me and I am not a party to any of the case.*

*Q. Is this certificate given by you?*

*Ans. Yes Sir.*

*Q. Is your nursing home was existing at that time?*

*Ans. It was existing and started on trial basis.*

*Q. How you have given the certificate?*

*Ans. He was diagnosed earlier and he was under my supervision.*

*Q. How did you arrive at the diagnosis lumber spondylites?*

*Ans. He was diagnosed earlier from another nursing home in a different city i.e. Agra for lumber spondylites.*

*Q. Have you got the records?*

*Ans. The records are with Mr. N.K. Singh.*

*Q. It appears that you have issued a certificate using the letter head of a nursing home which was not registered at that time and the certificate was also not in the proper format. Further, the nursing home did not obtained registration at any point of time and thus subsequently closed. Further you have been unable to provide any medical records pertaining to the diagnosis of Mr. N.K. Singh to whom you have issued the certificate. What are your final comments to this?*

*Ans. I am harassed for whatever I have done and I assure that such thing will not occur in the future. Regarding non-availability of medical records I wanted to put on records that all the medical records have been taken from my brother in-law by Mr. Puran Singh, the complainant.*

*Sd/-  
(DR. ANIL KUMAR SAGAR)  
18<sup>th</sup> June, 2007*

*The Ethics Committee went through all the documents pertaining to this complaint. The Committee also gone through the statement given by Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar and observed that Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar issued a certificate using the letter-head of Sagar Nursing Home which was neither registered at that time nor registration was obtained subsequently. Moreover, he has given a certificate in an incorrect format. Dr. Sagar has failed to provide any medical record or documentary proof in support of diagnosis given in the certificate. He has however, given some reasons for not being doing so.*

*Considering the above facts, the Ethics Committee after thorough discussion has decided unanimously to issue a warning to Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar not to issue such certificates in future and to strictly follow the guidelines/provisions laid down in Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette & Ethics) Regulations, 2004. This fact may be recorded in the Indian Medical Register.”*

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11.03.2010 decided that Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar has issued a certificate on the letter head of Sagar Nursing Home which was not registered at that time and the certificate was given in incorrect format and he has failed to provide any medical record or documentary proof in support of the diagnosis given in the certificate and further decided to issue warning to Dr. Anil Kumar Sagar not to issue such certificates in future and to strictly follow the guidelines/provisions laid down in Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette & Ethics) Regulations, 2002. This fact may be recorded in the Indian Medical Register.

**43. Approval of Minutes of the Finance Committee held on 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2009.**

Read: The minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2009.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*The Executive Committee of the Council approved the minutes of Finance Committee meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2009 except in the matter of Item No. 7 - "Reimbursement of Mobile Telephone Charges to all the drivers of the Council".*

**44. Information about the decision taken by the members of the Council by circulation after the last meeting of the General Body of the Council dated 18.11.2009 and the same were circulated to the Members of the General Body of the Council for approval.**

Read: The decisions on the matters circulated to the members of the General Body of the Council after the meeting of the last General Body dated 18/11/2009.

The members of the General Body noted that the following items have been approved by the members by circulation after the last General Body of the Council meeting as under:-

S.No.	Subject	Date of Executive Committee	Date of Circulation	Date of sending decision to Central Govt. with letter No.
1.	Amendments in Minimum Standard Requirements for the Medical College for 50/10/150 Admissions Annually Regulations, 1999 – Requirement in the Department of Radio-Diagnosis.	01.12.2009	03.12.2009	MCI-34(41)/2009-Med./62022, dated 06.01.2010

2.	Minimum Standard Requirements for the Medical College for 50/10/150 Admissions Annually Regulations, 1999 – Further proposed amendments in Clause A.1.1 and B.1.8 in the said Regulations.	15.12.2009	16.12.2009	MCI-34(41)/2009-Med./62021, dated 06.01.2010
3.	Upgradation of the posts of Deputy Director (Academic Cell).	12.01.2010	29.01.2010	_____
4.	Amendments to the Establishment of Medical College Regulations, 1999.	05.02.2010	08.02.2010	MCI-34(41)/2009-Med./75079, dated 19.02.2010
5.	Rural Model of Undergraduate Medical Education.	05.02.2010	12.02.2010	MCI-5(2)/2009-Med./76333, dated 25.02.2010

45. **To consider the letter dated 01.12.2009 received from the Registrar, Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University) Nagpur – Inclusion of the name of Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University) Nagpur, in the schedule first of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 – Thereby recognition of all the academic courses conducted by J.N. Medical College Swangi, Wardha. .**

Read: The letter dated 01.12.2009 received from the Registrar, Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University) Nagpur – Inclusion of the name of Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University) Nagpur, in the schedule first of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 – Thereby recognition of all the academic courses conducted by J.N. Medical College Swangi, Wardha.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*“The members of the Executive Committee of the Council considered the letter dated 01.12.2009 received from the Registrar, Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University), Nagpur informing as under and requested that necessary changes in the schedule, be made as the MBBS Degree to the above students shall be awarded by Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University):-*

*“.....*

1. *Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences has been granted “Deemed University” status vide notification issued by Govt. of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi No. F.9-48/2004-U.3 dated 24<sup>th</sup> May 2005.*
2. *Jawaharlal Nehru Medical College is one of the constituent colleges under the above named Deemed University.*
3. *The first batch of 150 students was admitted and enrolled under this University from the session 2005-2006 and is now appearing for the Final*

*M.B.B.S. (Part-II) examination, which is being conducted during the period 16<sup>th</sup> November 2009 to 12<sup>th</sup> December 2009.*

*The members of the Executive Committee of the Council further observed that at its meeting held in June, 1988, the Executive Committee had decided as under:-*

*"No inspection is required where there is change of name and change of affiliation of the University or the college whose medical qualifications are already recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 unless the Executive Committee decides otherwise."*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided that recognition/approval of M.B.B.S. qualification be granted in respect of Datta Meghe Instt. of Medical Sciences (Deemed University) was recognized/approved when granted by Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik in respect of students being trained at J.N. Medical College, Swangi, Wardha."*

**46. Approval of Bharti Vidyapeeth Deemed University Medical College & Hospital, Sangli, Maharashtra for the award of MBBS degree granted by Bharti Vidyapeeth University, Pune.**

Read: The Council Inspectors report (21<sup>st</sup>, & 22<sup>nd</sup> & 23<sup>rd</sup> January, 2010) for approval of Bharti Vidyapeeth Deemed University Medical College & Hospital, Sangli, Maharashtra for the award of MBBS degree granted by Bharti Vidyapeeth University, Pune.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council considered the Council Inspectors report (21<sup>st</sup>, & 22<sup>nd</sup> & 23<sup>rd</sup> January, 2010) and decided to recommend that Bharti Vidyapeeth Deemed University Medical College & Hospital, Sangli, Maharashtra be approved for the award of MBBS degree granted by Bharti Vidyapeeth University, Pune with an annual intake of 100 (One Hundred) students per year."*

- 47. (I) Appeal by Dr. Pramod Batra against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council.**  
**(II) Appeal by Dr. Archana Kothari against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council.**  
**(III) Appeal by Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council.**

Read: The matter with regards to appeal by Dr. Pramod Batra, Dr. Archana Kothari & Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda respectively against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council.



The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The Executive Committee of the Council observed the following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> July, 2009 as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the ongoing matter of appeals by Dr. Pramod Batra, Dr. Archana Kothari and Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda received at different times but now clubbed together against the same, single order dt. 04.02.2009 of Delhi Medical Council and observed that Mr. Sandeep Gupta, the original complainant in Delhi Medical Council had been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee at its today's meeting i.e. 29<sup>th</sup> July, 2009 but he has again failed to appear; and therefore the Committee decided to proceed further with the consideration of the matter and noted:-*

I. The following decisions of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2008:

(i) *"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to appeal by Dr. Pramod Batra against order dt. 4.2.08 of Delhi Medical Council and noted that Dr. Pramod Batra was asked to appear before the Ethics Committee and he has attended today. The Ethics Committee gave a patient hearing to Dr. Batra's narrations/version. Dr. Batra also promised to make available all supporting evidence in his support within 15 days. His brief statement is as under:*

*"Statement of Dr. Pramod Batra*

*I Dr. Pramod Batra did my MBBS from LLRM Medical College, Meerut in the year 1979 and I have done DMRD from the same institute in 1986. My registration no. is 14856 of Delhi Medical Council. My date of birth is 10.04.1956.*

*I hereby undertaking to provide telephonic call records and other supporting evidence in the form of affidavit in my defense and also a written statement.*

*Sd/-  
(Dr. Pramod Batra)  
12.12.2008"*

*The Ethics Committee decided that Dr. Pramod Batra should make available his documents including telephonic call records and other supporting evidence in the form of affidavit and also his written statement within 15 days."*

(ii) *"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to appeal by Dr. Archana Kothari against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council. The Ethics Committee allowed Dr. M.C. Gupta to appear on behalf of Dr. Archana Kothari. He has submitted a written statement with annexures which Ethics Committee accepted. The Hon'ble Members of the Ethics Committee held a wide ranging discussion with the representative Dr. M.C. Gupta and found that he is unable to answer many queries regarding the treatment of this particular case. Therefore, the Ethics Committee felt that it is*

*necessary to call Dr. Archana Kothari to be present in person in one of its next meetings before the Ethics Committee to answer these queries.*

*Dr. M.C. Gupta has been given 15 days time to submit any another material, if he so desires, in this case."*

- (iii) *"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to appeal by Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council.*

*The Ethics Committee noted that Dr. M.C. Gupta brought out an authority letter from Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda representing him in this particular case. He has not submitted any written statement on behalf of Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda. The Ethics Committee allowed him to submit a written statement on behalf of Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda which he has claimed he would be giving.*

*The Ethics Committee felt that Dr. M.C. Gupta was unable to answer many points regarding the management of this case. Therefore, the Ethics Committee felt that it will be necessary to call Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda to appear before the Ethics Committee in person in one of its next meetings to reply to these queries. Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda may be called to appear before the Ethics Committee alongwith (i) the original and certified copies of records of this patient. (ii) Registers maintained in Krishna Medical Centre, New Delhi in original (iii) certified copies of reports given to the related authorities under PNDT Act (iv) admission register and other related documents to this case.*

*The Ethics Committee also decided to request Sh. Sandeep Gupta, husband of the deceased, to appear before the Ethics Committee at one of its next meetings."*

- II. The following decisions of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2009:-

- (i) *"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to appeal by Dr. Archana Kothari against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council and noted that Dr. Archana Kothari has been asked to appear before the Ethics Committee on 21.05.2009. She has submitted her oral as well as written deposition before the Ethics Committee which is as under:-*

*Statement of Dr. Archana Kothari*

*I Dr. Archana Kothari passed MBBS from L.L.R.M Medical College, Meerut in 1996 and done D.G.O from King George Medical College, Lucknow in 1999. My Registration no. 16936 registered with Delhi Medical Council.*

*Patient namely Mrs. Mamta (21) visited in emergency at 2.10 pm with complaints of excessive bleeding p/v since half an hour on 14.05.07. The patient didn't complied with the directions given on 12.05.07. When she came with history of bleeding p/v off and on since two months with preceding three months amenorrhoea after consuming abortifecient purchased from the local chemist two months back. On examination, her*

*vitals were normal. P/A lower abdomen tenderness present. On P/V clots were present in the vagina os opened one fingure product of conception felt through open os. She was diagnosed as inevitable abortion and need immediate removal of product of conception. Thereafter the patient was shifted to Krishna Medical Centre. She was advised for ultrasound guided emergency D&C under sedation. Procedure was finished around 4.00 pm. The patient was shifted to recovery room by 4.05 pm well conditioned. The patient was regularly monitored and was found to be doing well as recorded in the case sheet recorded from time to time. In view of her satisfactory condition, it was decided to discharge her from the hospital at 7.30 pm. While the patient was coming out from the corridor of the hospital she fainted at 8.10 pm. On examination, she was found to be critical, gasping and had laborious breathing and was cyanosed. Her lungs were full of crepts. Pulse was not palpable, BP was not recordable and she could not be revived and was declared dead at 8.40 pm.*

*Therefore, I would like to state that condition of the patient at the time of discharge was well oriented and conscious and pulse rate 78/ min, BP 110/70 and there was no bleeding p/v. Abdomen soft. Chest was clear. There was sudden occurrence of gasping and laborious breathing accompanied by cyanosis and lungs full of crepts, suggests some sudden catastrophic event and not a gradual development of hemorrhagic shock. It is not possible to comment on the nature of such sudden catastrophic event. Possible causes might be pulmonary embolism and airways obstruction.*

*As explained above, the procedure was performed after taking due care as the Radiologist was associated with the procedure. The radiologist had examined the patient before the start of the procedure, was monitoring the patient throughout the procedure and also at the end of the procedure. Since, the radiologist had indicated that the products of conception were removed from the uterus and there was no fluid/blood in the POD, it was assumed that everything was alright. Even during the procedure, there was no indication to suggest that anything abnormal happened during the procedure. The patient was shifted to the recovery room and was examined by me. The condition of the patient was alright and nothing alarming was detected. After having satisfied myself about the condition of the patient I left for Krishna Hospital which was nearby to attend OPD. I again visited the patient, Mamta at 5.00 pm and examined her condition. Her vitals were sound and the patient was not suffering from any adverse condition. There was also no bleeding p/v.*

*I also instructed the staff at Krishna Medical Centre to regularly examine the patient and communicate the condition to me on telephone as I had to leave for Faizi Charitable Hospital for an emergency. I was regularly informed by the staff at KMC about the condition of the patient which suggested that the patient was doing fine as all her vitals were normal. At around 7.00 pm, I advised Dr. Kharbanda at KMC to discharge the patient as she was examined by him and reportedly in good condition. AS per records of the hospital, the patient was discharged at 7.30 pm on 14.05.07. I was only informed by the hospital at around 9.30 pm that the patient after being discharged died at 8.40 pm.*

*I would like to mention that seeing the condition of the patient when she had reported to me with excessive bleeding p/v, I had taken all precautions*

*to do my best to help the patient. Since the patient had a large haematoma and was bleeding, I decided to associate radiologist so that the procedure is conducted in the best possible manner. Also the medical centre was a recognized centre by the Delhi Govt. and had the right facilities for the procedure. As mentioned above, the radiologist was associated throughout the procedure who stated that the patient was fine after the procedure was over. I examined the patient after the procedure and also at around 5 pm. The staff at KMC and Dr. Kharbanda, the owner of the centre were regularly monitoring the patient and informing me about the condition of the patient. As stated above, I advised to discharge the patient only after it was reported to me that the patient was fine and was well even after 3 hours after the procedure.*

*I would like to mention that I had taken all the precautions like associating a radiologist with the procedure, having the procedure done at a recognized medical centre and also the patient was monitored by Dr. Kharbanda and his staff.*

*I would like to bring out that I have adequate experience as a Gynaecologist as after completing my DGO, I was Sr. Resident in Sanjay Gandhi Memorial Hospital, Mangolpuri, New Delhi for 3 years and thereafter served in different nursing homes.*

*It is also stated that the Husband of the patient Mamata who had lodged a complaint has subsequently withdrawn his complaint and has stated in his statement that he has no complaint against the doctors who performed the procedure on his wife Mamata. A copy of the withdrawal letter by the complainant Sandeep Gupta to the SHO, Police Station is enclosed please.*

*I had also consulted my senior colleagues about this particular case and discussed with them about the procedure adopted by me to treat the patient Mamata who had reported to me in a bad condition. I am enclosing a letter by Dr. Vijay Kumar Kadam, Sr. Specialist (Gyne.) & Medical Superintendent, Mother & Child Hospital, GNCTD, Nasirpur, Delhi which also states that there is no evidence of medical negligence in this case and the death of the patient did not occur due to continued bleeding over several hours as a consequence of the D & C but rather it was a sudden, unavoidable catastrophic event unrelated to the surgical procedure, for which no one can be blamed.*

*In view of above, I would like to say that, I did my best to treat the patient Mamata. Whatever happened which lead to the death of the patient may not be attributed to negligence as I followed all the steps required. It was an unfortunate happening which has also saddened me.*

*I pray to the members of the Ethics Committee to sympathetically consider in view of the explanation submitted by me.*

**Q:** Did you see the patient at the time of discharge?

**A:** *I was involved in an emergency procedure and could not personally see the patient at the time of discharge. However, the condition of the patient was communicated to me by Dr. Kharbanda and his staff regularly and when they informed me around 7.00 pm that the patient had normal vitals from the time of the ending of the*

*procedure at 4.00 pm till 7.00 pm I advised the KMC Staff to discharge the patient.*

*Q: Was the patient died in the same hospital where she was treated?*

*A: Yes.*

*Q: Is it not a routine practice to see the patients before discharging?*

*A: Yes, it is a routine practice to see the patients before discharging. However, there are circumstances on certain occasions when other patients report in emergency and have to be treated. In this particular case, I was called at Faizi Charitable Medical Centre for an emergency procedure and I had to rush there. Also the patient was being regularly monitored by Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda and his staff. The patient was discharged only after the condition of the patient was stated to be normal.*

*Q: If you say that the patient is stable then how the patient collapsed?*

*A: This fact was discussed by me with Dr. G.S. Vats, MD, Consultant Physician, Rajiv Gandhi Cancer Institute & Research Centre, Rohini who has brought out two possibilities for the same: -*

*(1) Pulmonary Embolism*

*(2) Aspiration.*

*Opinion of Dr. G.S. Vats is also enclosed, please.*

*Q: Do you agree that you failed to detect the uterine perforation?*

*A: During the procedure, there was no indication to suggest that the Uterine perforation had taken place. Generally when uterine perforation does take place, there are some indications to suggest the same. May be since the reported perforation did not cause significant bleeding this did not come to notice. However, to rule out perforation during procedure which may occur in 3 to 4% of the cases in the hands of competent surgeons as the literature of the subject suggests, I had associated Dr. Pramod Batra, Radiologist during the entire procedure. As brought out by Dr. Batra in his notes which have been submitted earlier (Copy enclosed) he has stated that after the procedure the cavity was empty and no fluid/blood in POD. Also during the procedure, it was never brought out by Dr. Batra that perforation had taken place. Only on these aspects as I did not notice any adverse incident during the procedure and also as reported by Dr. Batra in his findings, it was concluded that the procedure was rightly done and no perforation or any adverse incident had happened.*

*Q: Do you think that proper medical monitoring would have saved the life of the patient?*

*A: In this case, I monitored the patient after the procedure around 4 pm and also at 5 pm. Since I had to proceed for an emergency the patient was monitored by Dr. Kharbanda who is a very senior doctor and his staff. There is no indication to suggest that effective monitoring was not carried out. I and the staff of the hospital regularly monitored the patient.*

*Q: How the post mortem findings says that the patient died due to hemorrhagic shock caused due to the large perforation of the Uterus. How this perforation of uterus is caused according to you?*

*A: I would not like to contest the findings of post mortem report. However, I would like to bring out that the large amount of blood found in abdomen at autopsy could have been a leftover of haematoma which was detected by USG on 09.05.2007. Copy of USG report enclosed. This has also been brought out by Dr. G.S. Vats in his opinion which is also enclosed with this statement.*

*Sd/-*

*(Dr. Archana Kothari)*

*The Ethics Committee considered the matter and decided that the final decision would be considered in its next meeting after considering the matter of all appeal(s) filed by other doctors in this very case and which have been taken up separately as agenda items time to time. Accordingly, all agenda items pertaining to this particular case may be clubbed for arriving at a considered decision."*

*(ii) "The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to appeal by Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council and decided to give Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda and the complainant Mr. Sandeep Gupta one last and final chance to appear before the Ethics Committee in its next meeting failing which the Ethics Committee will be constrained to take ex-parte decision in this case."*

*(iii) While considering the matter of appeal against the order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council by Dr. Archana Kothari noted that other doctors in the same matter of order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council have also filed appeals at different times and the same are under consideration separately vide different agenda item(s) and therefore decided as under:*

*"..... The Ethics Committee considered the matter and decided that the final decision would be considered in its next meeting after considering the matter of all appeal(s) filed by other doctors in this very case and which have been taken up separately as agenda items time to time. Accordingly, all agenda items pertaining to this particular case may be clubbed for arriving at a considered decision."*

*III. The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> & 09<sup>th</sup> July, 2009:-*

*"The Ethics Committee noted that Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda had been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee and he has appeared today before the Ethics Committee and has conveyed that he is interested to submit his written statement which was permitted by the Ethics Committee and the same is as under:-*

Statement of Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda

*"It is respectfully submitted that I attended the meeting of the Ethics Committee today, the 8<sup>th</sup> of July, 2009 as required. I hereby submit the following summary submissions as desired:*

*1--That I, Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda, passed MBBS from Meerut University, Meerut, in 1979. I had done my residency in Kasturba Hospital, Delhi, and Moolchand hospital, Delhi, for 2 years. Thereafter, in 1983, I started private practice as a family physician at 5/76, DDA Flats, Madangir, New Delhi-110062 at the ground floor. In the year 2004, I started on the first and second floor of the same building an MTP centre duly registered with the authorities. I am registered with the Delhi Medical Council vide Registration no. 9082. I have closed the above centre after the incident in question occurred.*

*2—That the present inquiry was initiated by the Delhi Medical Council on the complaint of the deceased patient's husband. The inquiry was held against the following: Myself as owner of the nursing home; Dr. Batra, the ultrasonologist and Dr. Archana, the gynaecologist. The Delhi Medical Council held vide its order dated 4-2-08 that all the three doctors were guilty and suspended their licence to practice for 3 months.*

*3—It is submitted with respect that I am an MBBS doctor only and have nothing to do with this case except that I provided the facilities for the gynecological procedure and certified the patient as dead when she suddenly collapsed and could not be revived. I had no role to play in the gynecological procedure itself. There was no lapse on my part of any nature.*

*4—That my detailed appeal against the order of the Delhi Medical Council has already been submitted to the MCI. The present submissions are in addition to the same by way of summary and humble request.*

*5—That in the circumstances, there is no reason for holding me guilty of medical negligence since I did not provide any specific medical care in the first place. It appears that the patient collapsed some time after the operating surgeon had left the hospital. The ultimate responsibility for carrying out the surgery and anticipating and avoiding complications lies with the surgeon.*

*6—In the circumstances, it is requested that the finding of medical negligence against me as determined by the Delhi Medical Council may kindly be set aside and the punishment awarded to me may likewise be set aside. I shall be ever grateful for this act of kindness.*

*7—It is submitted that the complainant has already withdrawn the complaint from the Delhi Medical Council as well as the Police / FIR.. The copies of the same are enclosed.*

*A copy of the present submissions is being enclosed in the form of a CD also as desired."*

*Dated: 8 July 2009*

*Sd/-*

*DR. PRADEEP KHARBANDA  
APPELLANT  
5/76, DDA Flats  
Madangir, New Delhi 110062*

The Committee further noted that the complainant Mr. Sandeep Gupta had also been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee but has failed to do so. The Committee, therefore, decided to give one final chance to Sh.Sandeep Gupta to appear before the Ethics Committee failing which ex-parte decision will be considered."

*The Ethics Committee deliberated in the matter in length and noting the above decided as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee directs the removal of names of Dr. Archana Kothari (DMC registration No.16936), Dr. Pramod Batra (DMC registration No.14856) and that of Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda (DMC Registration No.9082) for a period of three months from the State Medical register. Restoration of the name of Dr. Archana Kothari, Dr. Pramod Batra and Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda in the State Medical Register will be subject to their attending Continued Medical Education programme in the field of their speciality, within the period of suspension and submitting a compliance report in this regard, to the Council".*

*The Executive Committee of the Council observed that there is nothing on record available before the Committee which would indicate the negligence by Dr. Pramod Batra who had carried out ultra-sonography on the patient Ms. Mamta.*

*In view of above, the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> November, 2009 and decided to defer the matter for its next meeting.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 17/11/2009 and the decision was as under:*

*"The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee with regards to appeal by Dr. Pramod Batra, Dr. Archana Kothari, Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council and noted the following:-*

*a) Brief summary of the Case:*

- (I) Appeal by Dr. Pramod Batra against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council.*
- (II) Appeal by Dr. Archana Kothari against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council.*
- (III) Appeal by Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council.*
- iv) Mr. Sandeep Gupta, the original complainant – Accused above three doctors.*
- v) Negligence in the duty causing the death of Mrs. Mamta, 21 years when she had to undergo D&C for inevitable abortion.*



- vi) *Perforation of the Uterus*
- vii) *Haemorrhagic Shock*
- viii) *Death of 21 year Mrs. Mamta.*

b) *Allegations by her husband Mr. Sandeep Gupta:*

- i) *Negligence causing death of the patient.*

c) *Decision of Delhi Medical Council:*

*Delhi Medical Council has passed an Order dated 4.2.2008 for temporary removal of the name of above three doctors for a period of three months and to attend continued medical education programme in the field of their specialty within the period of their suspension and submitting compliance report in this regard.*

d) *Defence Statement by Dr. Archana Kothari:*

- i) *It is a case of inevitable abortion with off & on bleeding PV since two months with three months ammenorrhoe after consuming abortifacient.*
- ii) *Emergency D&C was done under sedation on 12.5.2007 at 4.00 p.m.*
- iii) *Patient was progressing well till 7.30 p.m. and was discharged.*
- iv) *While coming out from corridor of the hospital she fainted at 8.10 p.m. and died at 8.40 p.m.*
- v) *The cause of death could be pulmonary embolism and air way obstruction.*
- vi) *Perforation can occur in three to four percent of cases.*

*Defence Statement by Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda:*

- i) *I regularly monitor the patient and her condition was normal.*
- ii) *I did not provide any specific medical care.*
- iii) *Ultimate responsibility for carrying out surgery and anticipating and avoiding complication lies with the Surgeon.*

*Defence Statement by Dr. Pramod Batra*

- i) *I have done the ultrasound during D&C.*
- ii) *No product of consumption were in uterine cavity after D&C.*
- iii) *I never performed any ultrasound examination again.*
- iv) *The case facts noted in the records are totally false. Whole story is cooked and written in a planned manner just to misguide the law and members of the Disciplinary Committee.*
- v) *Dr. Archana Kothari was in so much of hurry that she left the OT and Nursing Home even before I could remove my machine from OT and after that she never saw the face of the patient.*
- vi) *Delhi Medical Council has passed an Order dated 4.2.2008 for temporary removal of the name of above three doctors for a period of three months and to attend continued medical education programme in the field of their specialty within the period of their suspension and submitting compliance report in this regard.*

*The Members of the Ethics Committee has considered all the material available before them and also the statements made by all the three doctors and observed the following:-*

1. *A 21 year young lady who came for inevitable abortion for D&C. The D&C was done under the guidance of ultrasound.*
2. *The patient was not followed by the doctor who did D&C till the time of discharge which was 07:30 p.m.*
3. *The patient died in the veranda of the hospital due to haemorrhagic shock which was a preventable cause of death.*
4. *The doctor who had done the D&C had not seen the patient before discharge.*
5. *The owner of the nursing home cannot shrug his responsibility in taking care of the patient when she was admitted in his hospital.*
6. *Dr. Pramod Batra made the statement, indicating that all the case facts noted in the records are totally false, whole story is cooked and written in a planned manner, just to misguide the law and members of Disciplinary Committee.*
7. *The Delhi Medical Council is observed that ultrasound was done only once that to during D&C procedure but there are two findings of ultrasound one at 3:30 p.m. and another one at 04:00 p.m. for which no satisfactory explanation was given by Dr. Pramod Batra.*
8. *Dr. Archana Kothari conducted D&C procedure with the use of suction cannula and not with ovum forceps as claimed by Dr. Archana Kothari.*
9. *Post mortem revealed that there was perforation of uterus with blood collection in the abdomen.*

*The Members of the Ethics Committee unanimously decided that there has been a gross medical negligence on the part of Dr. Archana Kothari and Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda. Their names may be removed from the Indian Medical Register temporary for a period of six months for their medical negligence and has to go for continuing medical education in his speciality during that period under intimation to this Council.*

*Dr. Pramod Batra's name has also to be removed from the Indian Medical Register temporary for a period three months for falsifying the records as observed by the Delhi Medical Council."*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to approve the decision of the Ethics Committee in the matter with regard to (I) Appeal by Dr. Pramod Batra against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council, (II) Appeal by Dr. Archana Kothari against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council and (III) Appeal by Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda against order dated 04/02/2008 of Delhi Medical Council that there has been medical negligence on the part of Dr. Archana Kothari and Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda whose names may be removed from the Indian Medical Register temporarily for a period of six months and to remove the name of Dr. Pramod Batra from the Indian Medical Register temporarily for a period three months for falsifying the records as observed by the Delhi Medical Council and affirmed by the Ethics Committee of the Council."*

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11/03/2010 and decided that the patient was not followed by the doctor who did D & C till the time of discharge and patient died in the veranda of the hospital due to haemorrhagic shock which was a preventable cause of death & the owner of the Nursing Home cannot shrug his responsibility in taking care of the patient when she was admitted in his hospital. It was further decided that Dr. Archana Kothari and Dr. Pradeep Kharbanda whose names may be removed from the Indian Medical Register temporarily for a period of six months and to remove the name of Dr. Pramod Batra from the Indian Medical Register temporarily for a period three months for falsifying the records as observed by the Delhi Medical Council and affirmed by the Ethics Committee of the Council.

**48. Appeal by Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija against order dated 02.01.2009 of Delhi Medical Council.**

Read: The matter with regards to appeal vide letter dated nil from Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija against order dt. 02.01.09 of Delhi Medical Council.

The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The Ethics Committee considered the ongoing matter of appeal vide letter dated nil from Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija against order dt. 02.01.09 of Delhi Medical Council and noted –*

*"i) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> March & 01<sup>st</sup> April, 2009:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to appeal by Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija against order dated 02.01.2009 of Delhi Medical Council and decided to request to the authorities of Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi to supply the details of registration particulars of the concerned doctors; the information regarding appointment of Nephrologist and the comments from the authorities of Hospital on the appeal by complainant, Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija. The complainant may be called in one of its next meetings."*

*ii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> & 09<sup>th</sup> July, 2009:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the appeal against order dated 02.01.2009 of Delhi Medical Council by Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija and noted that the complainant has come today as requested for appearing before the Ethics Committee. His statement is as under:-*

**STATEMENT OF Mr. M.R. DHAMIJA**

*I, Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija (complainant) state some points as under:-*

- 1. I was admitted in the Jaipur Golden Hospital on 25<sup>th</sup> December, 2006 for Kidney Transplant Operation.*
- 2. The date of operation was given without tissue match report.*

3. *My case was handled under the team of four doctors i.e. Dr.U.C.D.Nautiyal, Nephrologist, Jaipur Golden Hospital, Dr.R.K. Saxena, Surgeon, Dr.Rajesh Seth, Ultrasound specialist, Dr.N.K. Arora, Ultrasound specialist & Dr.D.K.Baluja, Medical Superintendent.*
4. *Zenapax injection which was purchased on the advise of doctor to be injected at the time of operation were already dead because of the negligence of the hospital as these injections were not kept in Refrigerator. It was kept near the heater. In spite of the knowledge of the doctors these injections were dead they gave the injection to the patient.*
5. *After the transplantation of the Kidney, Dr.U.C.D.Nautiyal conveyed that the operation is OK whereas Ultrasound report had categorically and explicitly showed that no blood was passing through the Kidney as the operation was not properly done and the transplanted Kidney did not work. (see page No.67 & 73 – doctors report).*
6. *On 8.1.2007, the stitches done after the operation were broken and which were 12 number and to rectify that they restitched on the bed without OT & without anaesthesia by a very junior doctor.*
7. *In order to conceal that the operation had totally failed and the Kidney was not working, they made the fictitious report of urine when the complainant requested to have second opinion of some other doctor so that the other doctor can very easily be woodvined and will give the opinion as if the kidney is in proper order.*
8. *Because of the wrong statement as stated above at number 6 they manipulated the entire record of urine intake and output and accordingly all documents related to these were changed (e.g. page No.1,2,3100,108,115,127 etc.)*
9. *These reports were manipulated at one time with one pen which is obviously established the facts at these were not written on day to day basis.*
10. *All urine reports were changed/manipulated but other corresponding and related facts were left unchanged unconvincingly which are contrary and are paradoxical as these goes against the factual position already recorded like weight etc.(page number 1- output increasing every date & weight is also increasing every day which is contradictory).*
11. *It is also evident from the record of the urine that on 28.12.2006 out put is 5735 ml but on the next day the intake was 2750 and on 30.12.2006 the intake was 460. Actually when the output is increasing why the intake was decreased on the proceeding dates whereas it is advised more and more intake after transplantation.*
12. *That as per the manipulated and false record if the urine was already more why the dose of lesix injection was increased whereas lesix dose is increased for release of more urine. so it automatically proves that the report of urine has been manipulated.*
13. *Fistula was made without consent of the complainant.*

14. *Again operation was carried out on 15.1.2007 why the dead kidney was not removed. This willful negligence could the complainant in great pain and anguish and financial loss as the dead kidney has to be removed subsequently because of the acute pain in Chennai.*
15. *My humble request to the Ethics Committee is to give us a chance to submit a report from senior and well known nephrologists before the Committee after going through all these facts as enumerated above to establish the truth of the case and to reveal unethical and immoral conduct of the doctors.*
16. *We also request you to please allow us to submit a report from the documents experts to establish that the documents pertaining to this case have been forged and manipulated in accordance with the advise of the respondents.*

*Sd/-  
(Mr.Mulakh Raj Dhamija)*

*The Ethics Committee while deliberating in the matter noted that the authorities of Jaipur Golden Hospital, Delhi had been requested to supply certain information in terms of the decision of Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 31.03.09 and 01.04.2009. The required information is not yet received. The Ethics Committee decided that authorities of Jaipur Golden Hospital, Delhi should be requested to supply the required information in this matter at an early date."*

*The Ethics Committee further noted that at its today's meeting i.e. on 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> September, 2009, Dr. U.C.D.Nautiyal, Dr. R.K. Saxena, Dr. Rajesh Seth, Dr. N.K. Arora and the Medical Supdt. Dr. D.K.Baluja had been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee at its meeting on 16.09.09 and they all have come to individually appear before the Committee. Their statements are as under:-*

*Statement of Dr. D.K. Baluja*

*I Dr. D.K. Baluja passed MBBS in 1997 from Maulana Azad Medical College, Delhi. My Registration no. 23183 registered with Delhi Medical Council.*

*Q: Did your institution was registered for transplantation for that moment of time?*

*A: We were registered under the T.H.O. (Transplant of Human Organ) of 1994 with the Director General of Health Services vide Registration number S. 12015/12/95-M.G. II.*

*Q: Do you oversee the patient?*

*A: No.*

*Q: Do you have any personal involvement with the patient?*

*A: No. I am the Administrative Head and deals with providing the facilities for the doctors to conduct their operations.*

*Q: Do you have any person/co-ordination team to oversee the various people working together?*

A: *Nephrologists is the Head of the team responsible for the medical care, surgical care.*

Q: *Do you possess the valid licence from the government on the day of surgery?*

A: *Yes it was valid legally and technically at that time. It was again granted in January 2009.*

Q: *When the first permission was given, the duration for which it stands valid was mentioned therein or not?*

A: *That particular permission was upto August 2006 with the provision for renewal.*

Q: *Do you informed the government at the time of renewal that you are doing the transplant?*

A: *It was very much in the knowledge of the government. I am also enclosing herewith the relevant documents in defence of my statement in this questionnaire.*

Sd/-  
(Dr. D.K. Baluja)

Statement of Dr. R. K. Saxena

*I, Dr. R. K. Saxena, did my MBBS from AIIMS, New Delhi in the year 1979 & MS also from the same institution in 1984 and DNB in 1986. My date of Birth is 01.04.1958. I am registered with Delhi Medical Council vide Registration No. 11204 & MCI vide Registration No. 2029 in the year 1980.*

*Presently, I am working in Jaipur Golden Hospital as a Chief Consultant Kidney Transplant Surgeon.*

*The patient had a smooth operation both in the recipient and the donor. The kidney made urine immediately after transplanting and continue to do so in the post operative period, however, Bun and creatinine were rising and therefore an ultrasound and dopler examination was done on 29.12.2006, then the kidney was found to have normal blood flow in the renal artery. We had no reason to suspect renal artery thrombosis at that time.*

Q1. *What operation you have done in this case?*

A.1 *I have done the kidney transplant on this patient.*

Q2. *What is time the time taken after removing the kidney and doing the kidney transplant?*

A.2 *Immediately after removing the kidney, it is cooled with ice-cold Renograf solution and placed in saline ice. The kidney after perfusion is taken and transplanted in the recipient immediately.*

Q.3. *How much time you were taken before transplant the kidney in the recipient?*

A3. *The time taken and perfusing the kidney and cooling it is approximately 5 minutes.*

Q.4 *Was there any vascular injury during the operation?*

A.4 *There was no vascular injury during the surgery, the kidney had a single renal artery and single renal vein and the entire procedure went on smoothly.*

Q.5 *Normally, after how many days after transplant of kidney, do you do an ultrasound examination?*

A.5. *An ultrasound examination is done only if the kidney is not producing urine or the patient has fever. In most cases, where the recovery is smooth an ultrasound is not required at all.*

Q.6 *What was the serum urea and cratinine after surgery?*

A6. *On 27.12.2006 Bun was 40, Creatinine 7.1*

*On 28.12.2006 Bun was 45, Creatinine 7.8*

*On 29.12.2006 Bun was 57, Creatinine 8.9*

*Thanking you,*

*Sd/-  
(Dr. R. K. Saxena)*

*Statement of Dr. Narender Kumar Arora*

*I, Dr. Narender Kumar Arora, did my MBBS from Maulana Azad Medical College, Delhi in the year 1984 & MD in Radio-diagnosis from Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, New Delhi in the year 1990. My date of Birth is 18.12.1962. I am registered with Delhi Medical Council vide Registration No. 16527.*

*Presently, I am working in Jaipur Golden Hospital as a Radiologist.*

Q1. *You are concerned with the Radio-diagnosis?*

A.1 *Yes, I am concerned with the Radio-diagnosis.*

Q2. *What is your involvement with this patient?*

A.2 *I did ultrasound of this patient.*

Q.3. *Did you do ultrasound of this patient pre-operatively?*

A3. *No.*

Q.4. *Did you do ultrasound of this patient post-operatively?*

A4. *Yes.*

Q.5 *What was your observation when you had done ultrasound of this patient?*

A.5 *On 8.1.2007, there was no flow of the Blood in the transplanted kidney. On ultrasound examination transplanted kidney appeared normal in size shape and ecotexture.*

Q.6. *You have not look the other kidney?*

A.6 *No*

Q.7. *Did you make a note of it?*

A.7. *No*

Q.8. *What was your kidney report?*

A.8. *On ultrasound examination transplanted kidney appeared normal in size shape and ecotexture. On dopler examination no flow of blood was seen in it.*

*Thanking you,*

*Sd/-  
(Dr. Narender Kumar Arora)*

STATEMENT OF DR. UMESH C.D. NAUTIYAL

*I, Dr. Umesh Nautiyal, did my MBBS from Maulana Azad Medical College in the year 1979. I did my MD (Medicine) in the year 1985 from Maulana Azad Medical College and DM Nephrology in the year 1992 from CMC&H Vellore and DNB Nephrology in 1992 from National Board of Examination, Delhi and my registration no. is DMC 3884.*

*Q.1. Are you aware of the allegations made by Sh. Mulakh Raj Dhamija against the doctors of Jaipur Golden Hospital?*

*Ans. I am aware of the allegations made through copy of the submissions that filed by the complainant to the MCI which was sent to me.*

*Q.2. When the patient was admitted in your hospital?*

*Ans. 25<sup>th</sup> December, 2006.*

*Q.3. Harvesting is done by whom?*

*Ans. Operation on the donor is done by Dr. Subodh Gupta and Dr. Rajesh Sharma but at the time of harvesting the kidney the main surgeon is Dr. R.K.Saxena, to cut the donor vessels.*

*Q.4. Who were in the team of Doctors?*

*Ans. Myself as Nephrologist – Dr. Umesh C.D. Nautiyal, Dr.R.K. Saxena, Surgeon and his teams i.e. Dr. Subodh Gupta & Dr. Rajesh Sharma.*

*Q.5. What was the diagnosis of the patient when you took the patient to the surgery?*

*Ans.: At the time of surgery he came to us he was having END Stage renal disease on maintenance haemodialysis.*

*Q.6. How old was the patient?*

*Ans.: Aged about 47 years.*

*Q.7. Was the patient suffers from hypertension and diabetics?*

*Ans.: He was suffered from hypertension, but not diabetic.*

*Q.8. Did you complete all pre-transplant investigation?*

*Ans.: Yes, every investigation was done and the reports are available in the file.*

*Q.9. What was the ultrasound report of the patient's kidney, pre-operative?*

*Ans. He had small kidney size of each kidney 8.4 cms, increase cortical echogenicity and loss of cortico mediullary differentiation.*

*Q.10. Was operation done in general anesthesia?*

*Ans. Yes, in general anesthesia.*

*Q.10. How long patient was discharge?*

*Ans.: Patient was discharged on 20 / 21 January, 2007.*

*Q.11. What is the cause of the transplant kidney problem?*

*Ans.: Schemic injury to the kidney, later it has been found that there was problems of thrombosis in the vessels.*



Sd/-  
(DR. UMESH C.D. NAUTIYAL)

*The Ethics Committee noting the above and on perusal of the available records, felt that various deficiencies have been observed. The same are as under:-*

- (1) *Ultrasound was not done on the subsequent few days to note the status of the blood flow in the transplanted Kindney.*
- (2) *On the day, the surgery was done, there was no valid license for transplantation procedure for that hospital.*
- (3) *The team consisting of the Nephrologist and the Surgeon ought to have verified whether the institute has possessed the valid license before doing the surgery.*
- (4) *The success rate in such kind of kidney transplant cases with the unmatched donor (wife donated for the husband) had not been recorded in the case file.*

*The Ethics Committee deliberated in the matter and decided that:-*

- i) *the doctors who were part of the team namely Dr.R.K. Saxena, Urologist and Dr.Umesh C.D. Nautiyal, Nephrologist should be warned for not recording the success rate of the surgery to the patient and getting the consent of the same.*
- ii) *The names of Dr.D.K. Baluja, the Administrative Head of the Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi, Dr.R.K. Saxena, Urologist and Dr.Umesh C.D. Nautiyal, Nephrologist, should be temporarily erased from the Indian Medical Register for a period of two weeks for contemplating surgery in an institution which did not possess any valid license."*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 17/11/2009 and the decision was as under:-*

*"The Executive Committee of the Council observed that although the Ethics Committee in its report had stated that "On the day, the surgery was done, there was no valid license for transplantation procedure for that hospital" no such finding has been recorded in the statements of Dr. D.K.Baluja, Medical Superintendent, Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi or Dr. R.K. Saxena, Kidney Transplant Surgeon & Dr. Umesh C.D. Nautiyal, Nephrologist, Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi.*

*It was further observed that in the statement dated 8<sup>th</sup> & 9<sup>th</sup> July,2009 filed by Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija, all the grievances raised by him were pertaining to the treatment of the patient and manipulation of records by the hospital and none to the performance of operation in a hospital not permitted by the authorities.*

*In view of above, the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 and the decision was as under:*

"a) Appeal by Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija against order dated 02.01.2009 of Delhi Medical Council.

b) Mr. M.R. Dhamija was called on 09/07/2009 before the Ethics Committee and he has submitted his statement.

Dr. U.C.D. Nautiyal, Dr. R.K. Saxena, Dr. Rajesh Seth, Dr. NK Arora and Dr. D.K. Baluja, Medical Superintendent, Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi and they submitted their statements. Dr. Rajesh Seth has not appeared before the Ethics Committee.

c) Delhi Medical Council has passed an Order dated 02.01.2009 in the above matter. The operative part of the decision is as under:

"..... In light of the findings made hereinabove, it is the decision of the Delhi Medical Council that no medical negligence can be attributed on the part of respondent No. 1 to 5 in the treatment administered to the complainant at Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi.

It is, however observed that even though the Respondents 1, 2 & 5 claim in their written statement that they have discussed/counseled the complainant about possibility of nephrectomy; this prognosis has not been documented anywhere in the medical records of the said Hospital not even in the discharge summary dated 20.01.2007. there seems to be communication gap between the complainant and Respondents, which has led complainant to believe that he was misled regarding his medical condition.

Complaint stands disposed."

d) The Ethics Committee after due deliberations in the matter decided that the:-

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to appeal by Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija against order dated 02.01.2009 of Delhi Medical Council and found that these doctors – Dr.D.K. Baluja, Administrative Head, Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi, Dr.R.K. Saxena, Urologist and Dr. Umesh C.D. Nautiyal, Nephrologist have performed the surgery in an institution where there was no valid license for contemplating surgery at that time. Hence, the Ethics Committee feels that this type of practice should be condemned strongly and recommends their names to be removed from the Indian Medical Register for a period of one month.

The matter may be placed before the Executive Committee."

It is further stated that the Council office vide dated 21/12/2009 has been served with the W.P. (C) 43/2010 filed by Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi at the hearing on 07/01/2010, the Hon'ble Delhi High Court has passed a order. The operative part of which is as under:

".....

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioners states that they were able to download the above decision of the Ethics Committee from the website of the MCI. The said decision is yet to be formally communicated to the Petitioners.

10. As regards the prayer concerning the quashing of the decision of the Ethics Committee of the MCI, this court is of the considered view that it involves highly disputed questions of the fact which cannot be decided in these proceedings. It is sought to be contended that against the decision of the Ethics Committee, there is no efficacious remedy except approaching this court in a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. This Court does not agree with the submission. There is no provision in the Indian Medical Council Act 1956 excluding the jurisdiction of the Civil Court vis-?-vis the decision of the Ethics Committee of MCI. The correctness of findings rendered by the Ethics Committee cannot possibly be examined without evidence being led. It would also involve appreciation of technical aspects concerning medical science. The proceedings under Article 226 are wholly inappropriate for this purpose. It is, however, clarified that the Petitioners are at liberty to seek any other appropriate remedy as available to them in law. The prayer for costs and damages is consequential upon the Petitioners succeeding in their challenge to the decision of the Ethics Committee. Consequently, that prayer also cannot be entertained in this proceeding. This Court finds no merit in the prayer for stay of the order dated 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> September 2009 of the Ethics Committee. The application for stay CM No. 93 of 2010 is rejected.

11. Notice in the petition is accordingly confined to prayers (a) and (b) and made returnable on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2010. Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of Respondents 3 and 4."

The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 had decided as under:-

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to appeal by Mr. Mulakh Raj Dhamija against order dated 02.01.2009 of Delhi Medical Council and found that these doctors – Dr.D.K. Baluja, Administrative Head, Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi, Dr.R.K. Saxena, Urologist and Dr. Umesh C.D. Nautiyal, Nephrologist have performed the surgery in an institution where there was no valid license for contemplating surgery at that time. Hence, the Ethics Committee feels that this type of practice should be condemned strongly and recommends their names to be removed from the Indian Medical Register for a period of one month."

The members of the Executive Committee of the Council further observed that the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi vide its order dated 17.01.2010 in Writ Petition (C) No. 43/2010 filed by Jaipur Golden Hospital has passed the following order –

".....

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioners states that they were able to download the above decision of the Ethics Committee from the website of the MCI. The said decision is yet to be formally communicated to the Petitioners.

10. As regards the prayer concerning the quashing of the decision of the Ethics Committee of the MCI, this court is of the considered view that it

*involves highly disputed questions of the fact which cannot be decided in these proceedings. It is sought to be contended that against the decision of the Ethics Committee, there is no efficacious remedy except approaching this court in a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. This Court does not agree with the submission. There is no provision in the Indian Medical Council Act 1956 excluding the jurisdiction of the Civil Court vis-?-vis the decision of the Ethics Committee of MCI. The correctness of findings rendered by the Ethics Committee cannot possibly be examined without evidence being led. It would also involve appreciation of technical aspects concerning medical science. The proceedings under Article 226 are wholly inappropriate for this purpose. It is, however, clarified that the Petitioners are at liberty to seek any other appropriate remedy as available to them in law. The prayer for costs and damages is consequential upon the Petitioners succeeding in their challenge to the decision of the Ethics Committee. Consequently, that prayer also cannot be entertained in this proceeding. This Court finds no merit in the prayer for stay of the order dated 16<sup>th</sup>/17<sup>th</sup> September 2009 of the Ethics Committee. The application for stay CM No. 93 of 2010 is rejected.*

*11. Notice in the petition is accordingly confined to prayers (a) and (b) and made returnable on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2010. Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of Respondents 3 and 4."*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to approve the decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 to remove the names of Dr.D.K. Baluja, Administrative Head, Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi, Dr.R.K. Saxena, Urologist and Dr. Umesh C.D. Nautiyal, Nephrologist from the Indian Medical Register for a period of one month."*

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11/03/2010 decided that these doctors – Dr. D.K. Baluja, Administrative Head, Jaipur Golden Hospital, New Delhi, Dr.R.K. Saxena, Urologist and Dr. Umesh C.D. Nautiyal, Nephrologist have performed the surgery in an institution where there was no valid license for contemplating surgery at that time and this type of practice should be condemned strongly and decided that their names to be removed from the Indian Medical Register for a period of one month.

**49. Consideration for grant of registration of additional qualification u/s 26(1) of the IMC Act, 1956 – reg.**

Read: The matter with regard to grant of registration to the candidates having D.M.(Paediatric Neurology) and other broad speciality and super-speciality qualifications awarded by All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, u/s 26(1) of the IMC Act, 1956 which are not included in the schedule to the IMC Act, 1956.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The Registration & Equivalence Committee considered the matter with regard to grant of registration to the candidates having D.M.(Paediatric Neurology) and other broad speciality and super-speciality qualifications awarded by All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, u/s 26(1) of*

*the IMC Act, 1956 which are not included in the schedule to the IMC Act, 1956.*

*The Committee also noted the provision prescribed by All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi in their guidelines for Academic Courses, Awards and Orations as under:-*

*"By virtue of the Act, the Institute grants its own medical degrees and other academic distinction. The degrees granted by the Institute under the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Act are recognized medical qualifications for the purpose of the Indian Medical Council Act and, notwithstanding anything contained therein, are deemed to be included in the First Schedule of that Act, entitling the holders to the same privileges as those attached to the equivalent awards from the recognized Universities of India."*

*In view of the above, the Registration & Equivalence Committee decided that the candidates having broad speciality and super-speciality qualifications awarded by All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi (AIIMS) in terms of governing guidelines for academic courses of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi are recognized medical qualifications for the purpose of Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 and are deemed to be included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule appended to it. Resultantly, the holders of the said qualifications are entitled to the same privileges as those attached to the equivalent awards from the recognized universities of India. Accordingly, the holders of D.M. (Paediatric Neurology) awarded by AIIMS possess recognized super-speciality qualifications deemed to have included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule appended to the IMC Act, 1956. This will hold true for all the Super-Speciality qualifications conferred by All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi."*

**50. Approval of Minutes of the Postgraduate Medical Education Committee held on 09.10.2009, 30.10.2009, 06.11.2009, 13.11.2009, 01.12.2009, 15.12.2009, 29.12.2009, 12.01.2010, 25.01.2010 and 05.02.2010.**

Read: The minutes of the Postgraduate Medical Education Committee meetings held on 09.10.2009, 30.10.2009, 06.11.2009, 13.11.2009, 01.12.2009, 15.12.2009, 29.12.2009, 12.01.2010, 25.01.2010 and 05.02.2010.

The Council approved the minutes of the Postgraduate Medical Education Committee meetings held on 09.10.2009, 30.10.2009, 06.11.2009, 13.11.2009, 01.12.2009, 15.12.2009, 29.12.2009, 12.01.2010, 25.01.2010 and 05.02.2010.

**51. Programme for Basic and Advance Course in Medical Education technologies with representatives for Medical Education Units in the Medical Institution.**

Read: The matter with regard to Programme for Basic and Advance Course in Medical Education technologies with representatives for Medical Education Units in the Medical Institutions.

The Council noted the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*".....The Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Academic Cell at its meeting held on 24th December, 2008 while considering the matter of development of programme for conducting the basic course workshop on Medical Education Technologies developed by the Study Group had decided as under:-*

*"...the programme for conducting the Basic Course Workshop on Medical Education technologies developed by the Study Group will be sent to the Executive Committee of MCI for further action." It was further decided that this programme be put into implementation with immediate effect at all the nodal centers namely (1) Maulana Azad Medical College, New Delhi; (2) Christian Medical College, Ludhiana; (3) Kalinga University, Bhubaneswar; (4) Jawaharlal Nehru Medical College, Swangi, Wardha; (5) Seth G.S. Medical College & KEM Hospital; (6) Smt. NHL Municipal Medical College, Ahmedabad; (7) Sri Ramachandra University, Chennai and (8) St. John's Medical College, Bangalore with the request to organize the first such workshop during the period 1st -3rd July, 2009."*

It is further stated that the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 08.10.2009 consideration the recommendations of the Expert Group with regard to Nodal Center in the Eastern Region the Committee decided as under:-

*"The Executive Committee of the Council perused the recommendations of the Expert Group for development of the activities of the Regional/Nodal centres and observed that Kalinga Institute of Medical Sciences, Bhubaneswar, which was designated as a nodal centre has not been able to develop a full fledged Medical Education Unit and thus it would not be feasible to establish a nodal / regional centre at this institute. It was also observed that at present there is no institute in the Eastern region which has a MEU which can be developed into a Nodal / Regional centre."*

## **52. Recommendations of the Academic Cell**

Read: The matter with regard to recommendations of the Academic Cell.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the report of the Academic Cell which reads as under:-*

### **"Identification of new Centres**

*The Committee, after scrutiny of the activities in medical education conducted by Government Medical College Hospital, Kottayam, Kerala (Convener : Dr. Sajith Kumar, Coordinator, Medical Education Unit & Chief, Infectious Diseases) and Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad (Convener: Dr. P.V. Chalam, Coordinator, Medical Education Unit and Professor of Surgery) recommended that approval of the Executive Committee of the Council would be taken to recognize these centres and for the conduct of*

*Basic Course in MET to the faculty of the medical colleges allotted to them and reimbursement of funds for conducting the Workshop.*

*It is submitted that 68 medical colleges as per the following list have not been allocated to any Regional Centre so far, since the two centres identified in the southern region (Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai & St. John's Medical College, Bangalore) have already been allocated 30 medical colleges each:-*

*No. of unallocated Medical Colleges*

<i>Andhra Pradesh</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Karnataka</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>08</i>
<i>Kerala</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Pondicherry</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>07"</i>

*After due and detailed deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to approve (1) Govt. Medical College Hospital, Kottayam, Kerala and (2) Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad as additional regional centres for conducting the basic course in Medical Education Technology to the faculty of the medical colleges allotted to them."*

**53. Developing a Regional Centre at KGMU, Lucknow.**

Read: The matter with regard to Developing a Regional Centre at KGMU, Lucknow.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The Executive Committee of the Council considered the report of the Academic Cell on the matter regarding developing a Regional Centre at KGMU, Lucknow and after due and detailed deliberations decided to approve KGMU, Lucknow (Chhatrapati Shahuji Maharaj Medical University Uttar Pradesh) as a new Centre for conducting Workshops in Medical Education Technologies to the faculty of medical colleges."*

**54. Extension of services of Dr. Kamlesh Kohli as Whole Time Inspector.**

Read: The matter with regard to extension of services of Dr. Kamlesh Kohli as Whole Time Inspector.

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to extend the services of Dr. Kamlesh Kohli as Whole-Time Inspector of the Council for a further period of one year w.e.f. 31.12.2009."*

**55. Members who did not attend three consecutive General Body meeting of the Council – Reg.**

Read: The matter with regard to members who did not attend three consecutive General Body meetings of the Council.

The members of the Council noted that that Section 7(3) of the Indian Medical council act, 1956 reproduced as under, provides for vacation of seat by a member:

*"As elected or nominated member shall be deemed to have vacated his seat if he is absent without excuse, sufficient in the opinion of the Council from three consecutive ordinary meetings of the Council, or in the case of a member elected under clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3, if he ceases to be a member of the medical faculty of the University concerned or in the case of a member elected under clause (c) or clause (d) of that sub-section, if he ceases to be a person enrolled on the State Medical Register concerned."*

Accordingly, the members of the Council decided that action be initiated as per above provisions of Section 7(3) of the I.M.C. Act, 1956 operation of which is an automatic clause. The General Body approved the deletion of the names from the list of members namely Dr. A.N. Verma representing Allahabad University u/s 3(1)(b) and Dr. Samar Deb representing North Bengal University u/s 3(1)(b) have not participated in the said three consecutive meetings held on 13<sup>th</sup> November 2008, 1<sup>st</sup> March 2009 and 18<sup>th</sup> November 2009 and there has been no communication in writing/orally to that effect from any of these members.

**56. University of Bombay/Mumbai – Recognition of D.M.(Endocrinology) qualification in respect of students being trained at T.N. Medical College, Mumbai.**

Read: The compliance verification report (Feb.,2010) together with Council Inspector's report (July, 2001) along with the letter dt. 15.07.2004 from the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Health & family Welfare, Govt. of India, New Delhi on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at T.N. Medical College, Mumbai for purpose of recognition of D.M.(Endocrinology) qualification granted by University of Bombay/Mumbai.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

*"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Feb.,2010) together with Council Inspector's report (July, 2001) along with the letter dt. 15.07.2004 from the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Health & family Welfare, Govt. of India, New Delhi and decided to recommend that D.M.(Endocrinology) qualification granted by University of Bombay/Mumbai in respect of students being trained at T.N. Medical College, Mumbai be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."*

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

*".....*

*6.4 The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*



6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
.....”

**57. Sardar Patel University – Recognition of MD (Biochemistry) qualification in respect of students being trained at Pramukh Swami Medical College, Karamsad.**

Read: The compliance verification report (Jan.,2010) together with Council Inspector's report (May, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Pramukh Swami Medical College, Karamsad for purpose of recognition of MD(Biochemistry) qualification granted by Sardar Patel University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Jan.,2010) together with Council Inspector's report (May, 2009) and decided to recommend that MD(Biochemistry) qualification granted by Sardar Patel University in respect of students being trained at Pramukh Swami Medical College, Karamsad be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students per year.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....  
6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*  
  
6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
.....”

**58. Veer Narmed South Gujarat University – Recognition of M.S. (Obst. & Gynae.) qualification in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat .**

Read: The compliance verification report (October,2009) together with Council Inspector's report (May, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat for purpose of recognition of M.S.(Obst. & Gynae.) qualification granted by Veer Narmed South Gujarat University, Surat.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (October,2009) together with Council Inspector's report (May, 2009)and decided to recommend that M.S. (Obst. & Gynae.) qualification granted by Veer Narmed South Gujarat University, Surat in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**59. Bombay University/ Mumbai University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of M.D(Psychiatry) & DPM qualification in respect of students being trained at Grant Medical College, Mumbai.**

Read: The compliance verification report (Jan.,2010) together with Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Grant Medical College, Mumbai for purpose of recognition of M.D(Psychiatry) & DPM qualification earlier granted by Bombay/Mumbai University and now by Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Jan.,2010) together with Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) and decided to recommend that M.D.(Psychiatry) & DPM qualifications earlier granted by Bombay/ Mumbai University and now by Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik in respect of students being trained at Grant Medical College, Mumbai be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 2(Two) students in M.D.(Psychiatry) & 2(Two) students in DPM course per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
 .....

**60. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad for the award of DDVL qualification.**

Read: The compliance together with Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad for purpose of approval of the college for the award of DDVL qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance together with Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) and decided to recommend that Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad be approved for the award of DDVL qualification granted by Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....  
 6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*  
 6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
 ....."

**61. Rajasthan University & Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur – Approval of S.P. Medical College, Bikaner for the award of DA qualification.**

Read: The compliance verification report (Jan.,2010) together with Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at S.P. Medical College, Bikaner for purpose of approval of the college for the award of DA qualification earlier granted by Rajasthan University & Now By Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Jan.,2010) together with Council Inspector's report (June, 2009) and decided to recommend that S.P. Medical College, Bikaner be approved for the award of DA qualification earlier granted by Rajasthan University & Now by Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur restricting the number of admissions to 6(Six) students per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**62. Punjab University– Recognition of M.D(Forensic Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Chandigarh.**

Read: The compliance verification report (December, 2009) together with Council Inspector's report (August 2006) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Govt. Medical College, Chandigarh for purpose of recognition of M.D. (Forensic Medicine) qualification granted by Punjab University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (December, 2009) together with Council Inspector's report (August 2006) and decided to recommend that M.D.(Forensic Medicine) qualification granted by Punjab University in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Chandigarh be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**63. Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad – Recognition of DLO qualification in respect of students being trained at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow.**

Read: The Council inspector report (Jan., 2010) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow for purpose of recognition of DLO qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the Council inspector report (Jan., 2010) and noted that promotion of Dr. Abdul Rashid, Associate Professor, is not as per MCI norms.

However, the teaching faculty complement other than the teacher mentioned above is adequate and complete; and hence decided to recommend that DLO qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad in respect of students being trained at Era’s Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year.”

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**64. Padmashree Dr.D.Y.Patil University – Recognition of DTCD qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. D. Y. Patil Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Navi Mumbai.**

Read: The compliance verification report (Jan.,2010) together with Council inspector report (July 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Dr. D.Y. Patil Medical College Hospital & Research Center, Navi Mumbai for purpose of recognition of DTCD qualification granted by Padmashree Dr. D.Y.Patil University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Jan.,2010) together with Council inspector report (July 2009) and decided to recommend that DTCD qualification granted by Padmashree Dr. D.Y.Patil University in respect of students being trained at Dr. D.Y. Patil Medical College Hospital & Research Center, Navi Mumbai be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**65. Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad – Recognition of DTCD qualification in respect of students being trained at Era's Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow.**

Read: The clarification togetherwith Council inspector report (December, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Era's Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow for purpose of recognition of DTCD qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the clarification togetherwith Council inspector report (December, 2009) and decided to recommend that DTCD qualification granted by Dr. R.M.L. Avadh University, Faizabad in respect of students being trained at Era's Lucknow Medical College, Lucknow be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**66. Madurai University, Madurai Kamraj University, Madras University and The Tamilnadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University, Chennai – Recognition of M.D.(Forensic Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at Tirunelveli Medical College, Tirunelveli**

Read: The compliance verification report (Feb.,2010) together with Council inspector report (Sept., 2004) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Tirunelveli Medical College, Tirunelveli for purpose of recognition of M.D.(Forensic Medicine) qualification earlier granted by Madurai University, Madurai Kamraj University, Madras University and now by The Tamilnadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University, Chennai.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Feb.,2010) together with Council inspector report (Sept., 2004) and decided to recommend that M.D.(Forensic Medicine) qualification earlier granted by Madurai University, Madurai Kamraj University, Madras University and now by The Tamilnadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University, Chennai in respect of students being trained at Tirunelveli Medical College, Tirunelveli be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....  
 6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*  
 6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
 .....”

**67. University of Calicut – Recognition of M.Ch. (Neuro-Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at Calicut Medical College, Calicut.**

Read: The compliance together with the Council Inspector's report (April, 2004) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Calicut Medical College, Calicut and compliance verification reports (November, 2006, July, 2008 & October, 2009) for purpose of recognition of M.Ch.(Neuro-Surgery) qualification granted by University of Calicut.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance together with the Council Inspector's report (April, 2004) and compliance verification reports (November, 2006, July, 2008 & October, 2009) and decided to recommend that M.Ch.(Neuro-Surgery) qualification granted by University of Calicut in respect of students being trained at Calicut Medical College, Calicut be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) student per year.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**68. Padmashree Dr.D.Y.Patil University – Recognition of M.D (Radio-Diagnosis) qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. D. Y. Patil Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Navi Mumbai.**

Read: The compliance verification report (Feb., 2010) together with Council inspector report (July, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Dr. D. Y. Patil Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Navi Mumbai for purpose of recognition of M.D.(Radio-Diagnosis) qualification granted by Padmashree Dr. D.Y. Patil University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Feb.,2010) together with Council inspector report (July,2009) and decided to recommend that M.D.(Radio-Diagnosis) qualification granted by Padmashree Dr. D.Y. Patil University in respect of students being trained at Dr. D. Y. Patil Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Navi Mumbai be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1 (One) students per year.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*



6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
.....”

**69. Jammu University – Recognition of DGO qualification in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Jammu.**

Read: The compliance verification report (Feb.,2010) together with Council inspector report on (June, 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Govt. Medical College, Jammu for purpose of recognition of DGO qualification granted by Jammu University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Feb.,2010) together with Council inspector report on (June, 2009) and decided to recommend that DGO qualification granted by Jammu University in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Jammu be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 3(Three) students per year prospectively commensurate with number of units.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

“.....  
6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*  
  
6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*  
.....”

**70. Kashmir University – Recognition of M.S(Ophth.)& D.O. qualification in respect of students being trained at Government Medical College, Srinagar**

Read: The compliance verification report (Feb., 2010) together with Council inspector report (August, 2009) alongwith letter dated 15.7.2004 from the Joint Secretary, Govt. of India, Ministry of Health & F.W., New Delhi on the inspection of standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Government Medical College, Srinagar for purpose of recognition of M.S(Ophth.)& D.O qualifications granted by Kashmir University.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee considered the compliance verification report (Feb., 2010) together with Council inspector report (August, 2009) alongwith letter dated 15.7.2004 from the Joint Secretary, Govt. of India,

Ministry of Health & F.W., New Delhi and decided to recommend that M.S(Ophth.)& D.O qualifications granted by Kashmir University in respect of students being trained at Government Medical College, Srinagar be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 4 (Four) students in degree course and 1 (One) student in diploma course per year.

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

....."

**71. University of Delhi – Recognition of M.Ch. (Paediatrics Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at Maulana Azad Medical College, New Delhi, in respect of increased intake**

Read: The Compliance verification report (Feb.,2010) together with Council inspector report on (July 2009) on the standard of examination and other teaching facilities available at Maulana Azad Medical College, New Delhi for purpose of recognition of M.Ch.(Paediatrics Surgery) qualification granted by the University of Delhi in respect of increase intake.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee considered the Compliance verification report (Feb.,2010) together with Council inspector report on (July 2009) and decided to recommend that M.Ch.(Paediatrics Surgery) qualification granted by the University of Delhi in respect of students being trained at Maulana Azad Medical College, New Delhi be recognized and included in the 1<sup>st</sup> Schedule to the I.M.C. Act, 1956 restricting the number of admissions to 1(One) to 2(Two) students per year in respect of increase intake."

The Postgraduate Committee further decided that the attention of the institute be drawn to Clauses 6.4 and 6.6 of the Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000, Part-II, dated 21<sup>st</sup> July, 2009 and act accordingly at appropriate time, which reads as under:-

".....

6.4 *The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.*

6.6 *Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause-4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.*

.....”

**72. Essentiality Certificate and Consent of Affiliation to be submitted by the applicant for Opening of a New of Higher course of Study or Training (Including Post Graduate Course of Study or Training) and Increase of Admission Capacity in any course of Study or Training (Including a Post Graduate course of Study of Training.**

Read: To consider and approve the format of Essentiality Certificate and Consent of Affiliation to be submitted by the applicant for Opening of a New of Higher course of Study or Training (Including Post Graduate Course of Study or Training) and Increase of Admission Capacity in any course of Study or Training (Including a Post Graduate course of Study of Training.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

“The Postgraduate Committee at its meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> –28<sup>th</sup> Feb, 2010 considered the matter with regard to Essentiality Certificate and Consent of Affiliation to be submitted by the applicant for Opening of a New of Higher course of Study or Training (Including Post Graduate Course of Study or Training) and Increase of Admission Capacity in any course of Study or Training (Including a Post Graduate course of Study of Training and decided as under:-

“The members of the Postgraduate Committee observed that the Council after obtaining the prior approval of the Central Govt. u/s 33 of the IMC Act, 1956 has issued the following amendments in The Opening of a New or Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) and Increase of Admission Capacity in any Course of Study or Training (Including a Post Graduate Course of Study Or Training), Regulations 2000” pertaining to Essentiality Certificate and Consent of Affiliation vide Notification dated 29.12.2009:-

2. In “The Opening of a New or Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) and Increase of Admission Capacity in any Course of Study or Training (Including a Post Graduate Course of Study Or Training), Regulations 2000”, the Point No.3.2 & 3.3 of the Qualifying Criteria of “(A) PART-I : SCHEME FOR PERMISSION OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT FOR OPENING OF A NEW OR HIGHER COURSE OF STUDY OR TRAINING (INCLUDING A POSTGRADUATE COURSE OF STUDY OR TRAINING) IN A MEDICAL COLLEGE OR INSTITUTION” shall be substituted with the following: -

“3.2 That Essentiality Certificate in the prescribed format regarding no objection of the State Government/Union Territory administration for opening of New or Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) and Increase of Admission Capacity in any Course of Study or Training (including a Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) in the medical college/institution and availability of the adequate clinical material as per the Council Regulations have been obtained by the applicant from the concerned State Govt./Union Territory administration, as the case may be.

3.3 That Consent of Affiliation in the prescribed format with respect to opening of New or Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) and Increase of Admission Capacity in any Course of Study or Training (including a Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) has been obtained by the medical college/institution from the University to which it is affiliated."

3. The Point No.3.1(1), 3.2 & 3.3 of "(B) PART-II : SCHEME FOR PERMISSION OF THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TO INCREASE THE ADMISSION CAPACITY IN ANY COURSE OF STUDY OR TRAINING (INCLUDING POSTGRADUATE COURSE OF STUDY OR TRAINING) IN THE EXISTING MEDICAL COLLEGES/INSTITUTIONS" shall be substituted as under: -

"3.1(1): The medical college/institution must be recognized by the Medical Council of India for running Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery/Postgraduate course; however, the medical college/ institute which is not yet recognized by the Medical Council of India for the award of MBBS degree may apply for increase of intake in postgraduate courses in pre-clinical and para-clinical subjects of Anatomy, Physiology, Biochemistry, Pharmacology, Pathology, Microbiology, Forensic Medicine & Community Medicine at the time of 4th renewal – i.e. along with the admission of 5th batch for the MBBS course.

3.2: That Essentiality Certificate in the prescribed format regarding no objection of the State Government/Union Territory administration for opening of New or Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) and Increase of Admission Capacity in any Course of Study or Training (including a Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) in the medical college/institution and availability of the adequate clinical material as per the Council Regulations have been obtained by the applicant from the concerned State Govt./Union Territory administration, as the case may be.

3.3: That Consent of Affiliation in the prescribed format with respect to opening of New or Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) and Increase of Admission Capacity in any Course of Study or Training (including a Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) has been obtained by the medical college/institution from the University to which it is affiliated."

Accordingly, after due deliberations, the members of the Postgraduate Committee decided that the format of the Essentiality Certificate and Consent of Affiliation to be submitted the institutes may be prescribed as under:

"(A) ESSENTIALITY CERTIFICATE

No.

Government of \_\_\_\_\_

Department of Health & Family Welfare

Dated, the.....

To

The  
(applicant),

Course : \_\_\_\_\_

Sir,

The desired certificate is as follows:

- (1) It is certified that the \_\_\_\_\_ is recognized  
(name of institute)  
u/s 11(2) of the IMC Act, 1956 for \_\_\_\_\_ seats.

OR

For Subjects of Anatomy, Physiology, Biochemistry, Pharmacology, Forensic Medicine & Community Medicine only as per Section 8(1) of Postgraduate Medical Education Regulations, 2000 amended.

- (1) It is certified that the \_\_\_\_\_ is permitted u/s 10A of IMC Act, 1956 in the year \_\_\_\_\_ and the last letter of renewal of permission was given by the Govt. of India in the year \_\_\_\_\_.
- (2) No. of institutions already existing in the State :
- (3) No. of institutions offering \_\_\_\_\_ course :  
(name of course)
- (4) No. of seats available in the \_\_\_\_\_ course in the State:  
(name of course)
- (5) Full justification for instituting the \_\_\_\_\_ course:  
(name of course)

The (Name of the institute) \_\_\_\_\_ has applied for opening the course of \_\_\_\_\_. On careful consideration of the proposal, the Government of \_\_\_\_\_ has decided to issue an essentiality certificate to the applicant for the opening/ increase of seats in the above said course with \_\_\_\_\_ (no.) seats.

It is certified that:-

- (a) It is desirable to open/increase of seats in the course of \_\_\_\_\_ in the public interest.
- (b) Opening/increase of seats in the course of \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ by \_\_\_\_\_ (the name of institution) is feasible.
- (c) The institution in the said department is having the following faculty:

#	Name of Teacher	Designation

(d) The institution in the said department is having \_\_\_\_\_ beds in \_\_\_\_\_ units and adequate clinical material as per the Medical Council of India norms is available.

It is further certified that in case the applicant fails to create infrastructure for the course as per MCI norms and fresh admissions are stopped by the Central Government, the State Government shall take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the above said course at this college with the permission of the Central Government.

Yours faithfully,

(SIGNATURE OF THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY)

(B) CONSENT OF AFFILIATION

FORM -3

No. ....  
University of .....

Place.....  
Dated.....

CONSENT OF AFFILIATION

On the basis of the report of the Local Inquiry Committee, the University of ..... has agreed in principle, to affiliate the proposed course of \_\_\_\_\_ to be opened at ..... by the (Name of the college) subject to grant of permission by the Government of India, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi under/Section 10(A) of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956).

REGISTRAR"

**73. Amendment in Postgraduate Medical Education Regulations, 2000- Reservation of seats in postgraduate degree course to be filled through All India Entrance Examination quota for doctors serving in remote / difficult areas.**

Read: The matter alongwith recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee with regard to Amendment in Postgraduate Medical Education Regulations, 2000- Reservation of seats in postgraduate degree course to be filled through All India Entrance Examination quota for doctors serving in remote / difficult areas.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

"The Postgraduate Committee at its meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> –28<sup>th</sup> Feb, 2010 considered to consider the matter with regard to Amendment in Postgraduate Medical Education Regulations, 2000- Reservation of seats in postgraduate degree

course to be filled through All India Entrance Examination quota for doctors serving in remote / difficult areas and decided as under:-

"The members of the Postgraduate Committee observed that the Council after obtaining the approval of the Central Govt. has notified the amendment to Postgraduate Medical Education Regulations, 2000 pertaining to the reservation of seats and weightage of marks for doctors serving in the remote and difficult areas as under:-

(A) Vide Notification dated 21.07.2009, which reads as under:-

Clause 9

- (1)(a) Students for postgraduate medical courses shall be selected strictly on the basis of their Inter-se Academic Merit.
- (b) 50% of the seats in postgraduate diploma courses shall be reserved for Medical Officers in the Government services, who have served for at least three years in remote and difficult areas. After acquiring the PG diploma, the Medical Officers shall serve for two more years in remote and/or difficult areas."

(B) Vide Amendment dated 17.11.2009, which reads as under:

"3.The following proviso shall be added after clause 9(2)(d) of the "Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2000 as amended by "Postgraduate Medical Education (Amendment) Regulations, 2009 (Part II):

"Further provided that in determining the merit and the entrance test for postgraduate admission weightage in the marks may be given as an incentive at the rate of 10% of the marks obtained for each year in service in remote or difficult areas upto the maximum of 30% of the marks obtained."

It was further observed that the Central Govt. vide letter dated 14.01.2010, while stating that there is also a requirement for clearly defining the remote & difficult areas for proper implementation of relevant regulations as requested the Council to send their comments giving clarity to the issue of remote and difficult areas.

Accordingly, the members of the Postgraduate Committee after due and detailed deliberations decided that the following may be inserted after the words " remote and difficult areas" in the Clause 9(1)(b) and in the proviso to the clause 9(2)(d) :

"As decided by the competent State authorities from time to time."

**74. Recasting the already drafted MD/MS/ Diploma curricula into the competency mode, for which the template has been developed by the MCI-nominated group of experts.**

Read: The drafted MD/MS/ Diploma curricula into the competency mode, for which the template has been developed by the MCI-nominated group of experts as accepted by the Postgraduate Committee.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Postgraduate Committee:-

*"The Postgraduate Committee considered the drafted MD/MS/ Diploma curricula into the competency mode, for which the template has been developed by the MCI-nominated group of experts and accepted the recommendations of the Academic Cell with regard to the following 33 curricula also have been converted to the Competency mode subsequently, and are placed for consideration."*

1. MD in Aerospace Medicine
2. MD in Dermatology, Venereology and Leprosy
3. MD in Microbiology
4. MD in Nuclear Medicine
5. MD in Pathology
6. MD in Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
7. MD in Psychiatry
8. MD in Radiodiagnosis
9. MD in Radiotherapy
10. MD in Sports Medicine
11. MD in Tropical Medicine
12. MD in Pulmonary Medicine
13. MS in General Surgery
14. MS in Ophthalmology
15. MS in Orthopaedics
16. MS in Obstetrics & Gynaecology
17. Diploma in Anaesthesiology
18. Diploma in Clinical Pathology
19. Diploma in Dermatology, Venereology and Leprosy
20. Diploma in Health Education
21. Diploma in Health Administration
22. Diploma in Nutrition
23. Diploma in Obstetrics & Gynaecology
24. Diploma in Ophthalmology
25. Diploma in Orthopaedics
26. Diploma in Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation
27. Diploma in Psychiatry
28. Diploma in Radiodiagnosis
29. Diploma in Sports Medicine
30. Diploma in Tropical Medicine & Health
31. Diploma in Pulmonary Medicine
32. Diploma in Virology
33. Diploma in Radiation Medicine

The curricula are annexed as Annexures 1 – 33 (Colly)

**75. Continuance of recognition of MBBS degree granted by Pravara Institute of Medical Sciences, (Deemed University), Loni in respect of students being trained at Rural Medical College, Loni.**

Read: The matter with regard to continuance of recognition of MBBS degree granted by Pravara Institute of Medical Sciences, (Deemed University), Loni in respect of students being trained at Rural Medical College, Loni.



The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The Executive Committee of the Council considered the compliance verification inspection report (7<sup>th</sup> August, 2009) and decided to recommend that recognition of MBBS degree granted by Pravara Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University), Loni in respect of students being trained at Rural Medical College, Loni be continued restricting the number of admission to 125(One hundred twenty five) students."

**76. Continuance of recognition of MBBS degree granted by Barkatullah University, Bhopal in respect of students being trained at Gandhi Medical College, Bhopal.**

Read: The compliance verification inspection report (2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010) for continuance of recognition of MBBS degree granted by Barkatullah University, Bhopal in respect of students being trained at Gandhi Medical College, Bhopal.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council considered the compliance verification inspection report (2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010) and decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council to revoke its earlier decision 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2003 and 15.12.2006 to withdraw the recognition of MBBS degree granted by Barkatullah University, Bhopal in respect of students being trained at Gandhi Medical College, Bhopal and direct the institution not to make any further admissions in the MBBS course.

The members of the Executive Committee of the Council further decided that the recognition of MBBS degree granted by Barkatullah University in respect of students being trained at Gandhi Medical College, Bhopal be continued restricting the number of admissions to 140 (One Hundred Forty) students per year."

**77. Approval of Government Vellore Medical College, Vellore for the award of MBBS degree granted by The Tamil Nadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.**

Read: The Council Inspectors report (11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2010) for Approval of Government Vellore Medical College, Vellore for the award of MBBS degree granted by The Tamil Nadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu along with letter dated 15.07.2004 from the Joint Secretary, Ministry of Health & F.W., Govt. of India.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council considered the Council Inspectors report (11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2010) along with letter dated 15.07.2004 from the Joint Secretary, Govt. of India, Ministry of Health & F.W. and observed as under:-

1. Total area of library is 1143 sq.mt. as against the requirement of 1600 sq.mt. which is inadequate. The Director Medical Education and the Dean has provided a letter of undertaking stating that the necessary budget allocation, selection of site and initial processing for the commencement of construction of additional area required for library i.e. accommodation for 100 students for self reading room for the purposes will be started soon and the required 1600 sq.mt. will be made available at the earliest. However, an accommodation in 3 room for 25 male and 25 female students have been temporarily provided within library premises.
2. Radiological facilities: 4 static unit are available as against the requirement of 5 static units of 2x300mA, 2x500mA & 1x800mA.

In view of above and as the facilities of teaching faculty, residents, clinical material, teaching beds, hostels, library and other important infrastructure at Government Vellore Medical College, Vellore are adequate for recognition of the institute for award of MBBS degree for annual intake of 100 admissions, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council that Government Vellore Medical College, Vellore be approved for the award of MBBS degree granted by The Tamil Nadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu restricting the number of admissions to 100 (One hundred) students per year."

**78. Approval of Agartala Government Medical College & Hospital, Agartala for the award of MBBS degree granted by Tripura University, Tripura.**

Read: The Compliance verification inspection report (2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2010) for Approval of Agartala Government Medical College & Hospital, Agartala for the award of MBBS degree granted by Tripura University, Tripura.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council considered the compliance verification inspection report (2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2010) along with letter dated 15.07.2004 from the Joint Secretary, Govt. of India, Ministry of Health & F.W. and decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council that Agartala Government Medical College & Hospital, Agartala be approved for the award of MBBS degree granted by Tripura University, Tripura restricting the number of admissions to 100 (One hundred) students per year."

**79. Continuance of recognition of the institutions for award of MBBS Degree.**

Read: The matter with regard to Continuance of recognition of the institutions for award of MBBS Degree.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that at present the recognition of a medical qualification granted by a medical institute is governed by the provisions of Section 11(2) of the IMC Act, 1956. Once the recommendation for recognition/approval of a MBBS Degree is made by the Council in respect of any medical institute, the Central Government issues the notification in that regard from time to time.

Thereafter, continuance of the recognition for award of MBBS Degree by the same institute is governed by the provisions of Section 19 of the IMC Act, 1956 pertaining to the withdrawal of recognition, which reads as under:-

**"19. Withdrawal of Recognition**

1. When upon report by the Committee or the visitor it appear to the Council:-

- a. that the courses of study and examination to be undergone in, or the proficiency required from candidates at any examination held by any University or medical institution,
- b. that the staff, equipment accommodation, training and other facilities for instruction and training provided in such University or medical institution or in any college or other institution affiliated to that University, do not conform to the standards prescribed by the Council, the Council shall make a representation to that effect to the Central Government.

2. After considering such representation, the Central Govt. may send it to the State Government of the State in which the University or medical Institution is situated and the State Government shall forward it along with such remarks as it may choose to make to the University or Medical Institution, with an intimation of the period within which the University or medical institution may submit its explanation to the State Government;

3. On the receipt of the explanation or, where no explanation is submitted within the period fixed, then on the expiry of that period, the State Government shall make its recommendations to the Central Government;

4. The Central Government, after making such further inquiry, if any, as it may think fit, may by notification in the official Gazette, direct that an entry shall be made in the appropriate Schedule against the said medical qualification declaring that it shall be a recognized medical qualification, only when granted before a specified date or that the said medical qualification if granted to students of a specified college or institution affiliated to any university shall be a recognized

medical qualification only when granted before a specified date or, as the case may be, that the said medical qualification shall be a recognized medical qualification in relation to a specified college or institution affiliated to any University only when granted after a specified date."

It was further observed that neither in the Act nor in the Graduate Medical Education Regulations, 1997 or Minimum Standard Requirements for the Medical College for 50/100/150 Admissions Annually Regulations, 1999, the specific period up to which the recognition so granted to an institute for award of MBBS Degree has been prescribed.

Further, the Council, after obtaining the approval of the Central Government u/s 33 of the IMC Act, 1956, with regard to the continuance of recognition of postgraduate courses vide Notification dated 21.07.2009 has already notified amendments to Postgraduate Medical Education Regulations, 2000 as under:-

- 1...
- 2....
- 3...
- " .....
4. The recognition so granted to a Post Graduate Course shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.
5. The procedure for 'Renewal' of recognition shall be same as applicable for the award of recognition.
6. Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause 4 shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Post Graduate Course.
- ....."

The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the principle of renewal of recognition should be applied on a uniform basis in respect of MBBS qualifications granted to an institute as well. Accordingly, after due deliberation, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided that the following may be inserted after clause 8(3) of Establishment of Medical College Regulations, 1999 as under:-

8(3) (1) The permission to establish a medical college and admit students may be granted initially for a period of one year and may be renewed on yearly basis subject to verification of the achievements of annual targets. It shall be the responsibility of the person to apply to the Medical Council of India for purpose of renewal six months prior to the expiry of the initial permission. This process of renewal of permission will continue till such time the establishment of the medical college and expansion of the hospital facilities are completed and a formal recognition of the medical college is granted. Further admissions shall not be made at any stage unless the requirements of the Council are fulfilled. The Central Government may at any stage convey the deficiencies to the applicant and provide him an opportunity and time to rectify the deficiencies.

(2) The recognition so granted to an Undergraduate Course for award of MBBS degree shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.

(3) The procedure for 'Renewal' of recognition shall be same as applicable for the award of recognition.

(4) Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause (a) supra shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Undergraduate Course of MBBS at the said institute."

**80. Complaint against Dr. Yash Nigam, Orthopedic Surgeon as alleged by Mr. Sachin Shah.**

Read: The matter with regard to complaint against Dr. Yash Nigam, Orthopedic Surgeon as alleged by Mr. Sachin Shah.

The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the decision of the Ethics Committee in the above matter as under:-*

*" The Ethics Committee perused*

*i). the following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 21/05/2008:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the complaint against Dr. Yash Nigam, Orthopedic Surgeon as alleged by Mr. Sachin Shah and noted that this is the fourth complaint in the Medical Council of India received against this particular doctor. Previous complaints have already been disposed off.*

*The Ethics Committee decided that parawise comments may be called from Dr. Yash Nigam regarding all the points raised by the complainant within 15 days of receipt of this letter. All the documents may be sent to him. This case should be taken up once these replies are received."*

*ii). The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> & 12.08.2008:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter of complaint against Dr. Yash Nigam, Orthopedic Surgeon, by Mr. Sachin Shah and noted that Dr. Yash Nigam vide his letter dated 08.07.2008 has requested that he should be supplied the relevant "x-ray and its report" and further that he should be given at least 10 days to submit reply of the complaint.*

*The Ethics Committee, in view of above, decided that the complainant, Mr. Sachin Shah, should be asked to appear before the Ethics Committee alongwith all the documents including relevant "x-ray and its report". The Ethics Committee further decided that Dr. Yash Nigam should subsequently be called to appear before the Ethics Committee at one of its next meetings."*

*iii). The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 15/09/2008:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter today and noted Sh. Sachin Shah has come to appear before the Ethics Committee. He made the following submissions:*

*Statement of Mr.Sachin Shah*

*I, Mr. Sachin Shah, complainant has narrated all the sequence of events which followed the fracture on the left arm bone which he suffered on 1<sup>st</sup> May,2006 while coming from Vaishno Devi. I have already submitted my detailed case history paper vide letter dated 13.9.2007 addressed to Medical Council of India.*

*I am handing over the x-ray report one taken on 6<sup>th</sup> July, 2006 at MRI centre, Hauz Khas, New Delhi and 4 more x-rays which were taken on the advise of Dr. Pradeep Sharma at Holy Family Hospital, New Delhi. After operation at Holy Family Hospital, 4 months Physiotherapy treatment was given to me.*

*Now at present I am alright but my earnest request is to take the action against Dr.Yash Nigam.*

*Sd/-  
(Mr. Sachin Shah)*

*The Ethics Committee further decided that Dr. Yash Nigam may be called at one of its next meetings where only documents including x-rays would be made available to him."*

*iv). The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2008:-*

*"The Ethics Committee noted that Dr.Yash Nigam who was called to be present today at 11.30 a.m. before the Ethics Committee has failed to appear before the Committee. Also no communication has been received from him. The Ethics Committee, therefore, decided to give him one last and final chance to appear before the Ethics Committee and further decided that in case he fails to appear again, proceedings would be held ex-parte and decision taken accordingly. He may be called in the next meeting of the Ethics Committee."*

*v). The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> & 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2009:-*

*"Dr.Yash Nigam was called before the Ethics Committee on 19.1.2009 and he has presented himself before the Committee. The X-ray report which were submitted by the patient to the Ethics Committee and which were supposed to be shown to Dr.Yash Nigam were made available to him. Dr. Yash Nigam has given a written submission to MCI which he had earlier submitted to Consumer Court. He has said that he shall be submitting the detailed para-wise comments within two weeks from today. His statement is as under:-*

*Statement of Dr.Yash Nigam*

*I, Dr. Yash Nigam passed my MBBS from erstwhile USSR in the year 1984 and did my MS(Orthopaedics) from S.N. Medical College, Agra in the year*

*1989. I have taken a special training in the Institute of Professor Ilizarov at Kurgan, Russia.*

*I have seen the x-rays and I shall be submitting my para-wise comments within 15 days to the MCI.*

*Sd/-  
(Dr.Yash Nigam)*

*The Ethics Committee decided that final decision in this case will be taken after receipt of all the documents which are to be submitted by Dr.Yash Nigam. The Hon'ble members of Ethics Committee have discussed the matter regarding the quality of fixator under laser procedure by Dr.Yash Nigam and further advised him to submit copies of hospital's consent taken from the patient and the attendance before operation alongwith his statement.*

*The Ethics Committee further decided to take the opinion from reputed Orthopaedics specialist Dr.Kotwal, HOD, AIIMS, New Delhi. Dr.Kotwal may be requested to assist the Ethics Committee with his opinion after going through all the documents and also the X-rays regarding the quality of treatment by fixator in this case.*

*He be further requested to give an overall view of the patient as to whether there was any lacking or negligence on the part of Dr.Yash Nigam."*

vi). The following opinion dated 14.3.2009 received from Dr. P.P. Kotwal, Prof. & Head, Department of Orthopedics, A.I.I.M.S., New Delhi, which is as under:-

"..... regarding the complaint against Dr.Yash Nigam, I am submitting the following comments:-

- From the records it appears that the patient Mr.Sachin Shah had sustained a fracture shaft of humerus for which Dr.Yash Nigam performed an operation of external fixator (Ilizarov Fixator) on 3.5.2006. It is not clear from the papers whether the patient had a radial nerve palsy immediately after the injury and before the application of the fixator. However, it appears from the papers that somewhere down the line in the post-operative period the patient developed weakness of the hand on the same side as the fracture possibly due to radial nerve paralysis.
- Treatment of a fracture by the Ilizarov method is certainly a standard method of treatment although it is generally not used as the method of choice particularly in fracture of the mid shaft of the humerus since better methods of internal fixation are available which cause relatively less morbidity as compared to Ilizarov fixation. The Ilizarov fixator is also not used routinely in fracture of the mid shaft of humerus because there remains a risk of injury to the radial nerve since the nerve lies in close vicinity of the bone in the middle third of the humerus.
- The Ilizarov fixator used by Dr.Yash Nigam in this particular case was not biomechanically sound, in my personal opinion. Dr.Nigam had used only two rings which do not provide sound mechanical stability to the fracture. If at all this method of treatment is to be

used, more rings or wires are required to provide stability to the fracture which can enhance union of the fracture.

In my opinion, therefore, there was some error of judgement on the part of Dr. Yash Nigam in choosing the best method of treatment for the type of fracture which Mr. Sachin Shah had sustained since Ilizarov fixator is not the standard first choice of treatment these days, in fresh fractures of the mid shaft of humerus; and also there was perhaps inadequate stability provided to the fracture by the external fixator used."

vii). *The Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> March & 01<sup>st</sup> April, 2009 decided that the item be deferred for its next meeting.*

*The Ethics Committee after due deliberations of the documents, comments/statements of the patient and the doctor and the opinion of the expert Orthopaedic Surgeon Dr. P.P. Kotwal, Prof. & HOD, Deptt. of Orthopaedic, AIIMS, New Delhi is of the unanimous opinion that the name of Dr. Yash Nigam be erased from Indian Medical Register for a period of six months and further that during this period he should attend a minimum of six weeks of C.M.E programme in Orthopaedics Department of a recognized medical institution. The Committee further decided that the name of Dr. Yash Nigam would be restored in the Indian Medical Register only after he submits a certificate as proof of attending the C.M.E programme."*

*The Executive Committee of the Council at its meeting dated 13.10.2009 observed that it is not clearly evident from the record whether the patient had a radial nerve palsy immediately after the injury and before the application of the fixator or in the post-operative period after the application of the fixator. It is also not clear whether parawise comments have been submitted by Dr. Yash Nigam, as stated by him before the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 19-20 January, 2009.*

*After due and detailed deliberations and perusal of the above stated submissions, the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> November, 2009 and decided to defer the matter for its next meeting.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 17/11/2009 and the decision was as under:*

*"The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee Dr. Yash Nigam, Orthopedic Surgeon as alleged by Mr. Sachin Shah and noted the following:-*

- a) *Brief summary of the Case:*
  - i) *Complaint against Dr. Yash Nigam, Orthopedic Surgeon as alleged by Mr. Sachin Shah.*
  - ii) *Mr. Sachin Shah sustained fracture of left arm on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2006.*
  - III) *No injury of radial nerve at the time of first consultation.*
  - iv) *Dr. Yash Nigam performed operation of external Fixator (Ilizarov Fixator) on 3.5.2006.*



- v) *Developed weakness after surgery*
- vi) *Patient preferred complaint for improper treatment resulting in failure of treatment and heavy expenses – reg.*
- b) *Allegations by patient Mr. Sachin Shah:*
  - i) *Willful fraudulent treatment by Dr. Yash Nigam and ignorance on the part of doctor which reduced the chance of full recovery of left arm.*
  - ii) *Heavy expenses incurred on account of another surgery.*
- c) *Delhi Medical Council Observations:*
  - i) *Delhi Medical Council imposed a penalty on Dr Yash Nigam.*
  - ii) *Dr. Yash Nigam approached the Hon'ble Delhi High Court stating that he was not registered with the Delhi Medical Council.*
  - III) *Hon'ble Delhi High Court advised the Medical Council of India to look into the matter.*
- d) *Medical Council of India Observations:*
  - i) *MCI looked into all the records available with them.*
  - ii) *MCI has also taken Expert Opinion from Dr. P.P. Kotwal (Orthopaedic Specialist), HOD, AIIMS, New Delhi.*
- e) *Opinion of Dr. P. P. Kotwal:*
  - i) *Ilizarov Fixator is not the standard method of treatment for fracture of the mid shaft of the humerus.*
  - ii) *Having chosen that method, he used only two rings which did not provide sound mechanical stability to the fracture and could have caused injury to radial nerve.*
  - iii) *More rings or wires were required.*

*The Members of the Ethics Committee have gone through the available records provided as well as opinion of experts in the previous meeting and, now drawn the following conclusions:*

- (i) *The Doctor should have chosen a better method of treatment such as plating the fractured bone than Ilizarov Fixator to prevent radial paralysis.*
- (ii) *Having chosen this type of treatment he should have used adequate number of rings to provide stability to the fractured bone to enhance union and prevent injury to Radial Nerve.*
- (iii) *As a result of wrong method of management the patient had to suffer and had to go another type of surgery which costed him more and he suffered paralysis of the radial nerve.*
- (iv) *Inspite of three times warning issued to the same Doctor, Dr. Yash Nigam, on earlier occasions, the said doctor has not corrected himself. The Committee unanimously decided that his name be removed temporarily from the Indian Medical Register for a period of*

*three months and he has to go for continuing medical education in his speciality during that period under intimation to this Council.*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that at its meeting held on 13.10.2009 while considering the matter with regard to complaint against Dr. Yash Nigam, Orthopedic Surgeon as alleged by Mr. Sachin Shah had decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration observing that it is not clear whether parawise comments have been submitted by Dr. Yash Nigam, as stated by him before the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 19-20 January, 2009.*

*It was further observed that the issue pertaining to parawise comments submitted by Dr. Yash Nigam has not been resolved in the decision of the Ethics Committee dated 17.11.2009.*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*The matter was re-considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 15/02/2010 and the decision was as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee re-considered the matter with regards to complaint against Dr. Yash Nigam, Orthopedic Surgeon as alleged by Mr. Sachin Shah in the light of the Executive Committee decision dated 05.02.2010 and reviewed the records, the para-wise remarks of Dr. Yash Nigam and discuss the matter in depth.*

*The Members of the Ethics Committee has drawn the following conclusion:-*

- (i) The Doctor should have chosen a better method of treatment such as plating the fractured bone than Ilizarov Fixator to prevent radial paralysis.*
- (ii) Having chosen this type of treatment he should have used adequate number of rings to provide stability to the fractured bone to enhance union and prevent injury to Radial Nerve.*
- (iii) As a result of wrong method of management the patient had to suffer and had to go another type of surgery which costed him more and he suffered paralysis of the radial nerve.*
- (iv) The Ethics Committee unanimously decided that his name be removed temporarily from the Indian Medical Register for a period of three months and he has to go for continuing medical education in his speciality during that period under intimation to this Council.*

*The Executive Committee also perused the para-wise remarks submitted by Dr. Yash Nigam vide his letter dated 04.02.2009 as under:-*

*"In response to your notice dated 20/06/2008 I wish to inform you that the complainant came me through Sub-Inspector, K.C. Kaushik who knows me for the last more than ten years and also very well knows about my speciality of ILIZAROV rick fixator. He used to be a patient of mine earlier also. Sub-Inspector Kaushik requested me that the complainant is a son of his cousin sister and the complainant did not pay me any professional fee. Such fractures can be treated by plaster or surgical fixation. Surgical fixation can be INTERNAL or EXTERNAL. Internal fixation is a plating or nailing whereas External fixation is, e.g., ILIZAROV fixation or mono fixation etc. In this case the complainant came with Sub-Inspector Mr. Kaushik who knew me as a specialist for ILIZAROV fixator technique. Plaster treatment was already given to the complainant at Katra/ Jammu.*

*Mr. Kaushik called me on 2.5.2006 and requested for the treatment of the complainant and also asked not to charge any professional fee for the Consultation. The complainant already took advice at different hospital like AIIMS, etc. before coming to me. I explained the complainant about the ILIZAROV fixator technique, which is a specialized procedure without any plaster. The complainant and S.I. K.C. Kaushik already know that I am a specialist in the aforesaid technique. I explained about the expenses at Orthonova Hospital. The complainant informed that they do not have enough money as also written in the complaint itself, therefore, booking at Orthonova was not possible. Option of Sahi Hospital was taken under the influence of Mr. Kaushik as he knew well about me that earlier I used to go to Sahi Hospital, where payment would be within their pocket limit. After accepting the request of the complainant and his parents I arranged the treatment of the complainant at Sahi Hospital. Necessary tests/investigations were advised by me, which are mandatory before any surgery.*

*The complainant was duly explained about the aforesaid procedure, risks, etc. The complainant had given in writing to me that neither he will go to anyone before the treatment ends nor let anybody fiddle with the fixator. No money was paid to me directly by the complainant or his parents. The procedure of ILIZAROV Technique was successfully done without any complication at Sahi Hospital.*

*The complainant had a bad habit to visit different doctors and was himself very irregular in follow ups with me and he started threatening me from time to time through Sub-Inspector Kaushik, who wanted the answering respondent to go and do the follow up at complainant's residence that too without charging professional fee and tried to threaten me and said that he will involve me in false criminal cases. S.I. Kaushik was an Investigating Officer to me in my matrimonial case.*

*Non union is a common feature for fracture of humerus mid shaft. Fixator treatment was obtained to avoid big scar as well as blood transfusion and which can also generate bone on the fracture site by compression and distraction principle. Radial nerve was intact till he had followed up with me. The prescription of Dr. Sharma state that radial nerve involvement but does not write if there was any stiffness of fingers, wrist, wasting of muscles or any other complication which would have occurred had he not been given a caliper and proper physiotherapy in this case where he went after two months of surgery. There was no nerve damage, no infection or any other complication occurred till the complainant was under my*

*treatment. The nerve involvement took place between June 2006 and July 2006 when the patient was neither under me nor under Dr. Sharma at Holy Family Hospital. The fixator was manipulated elsewhere or by the patient/complainant himself and brought the nerve in shock, which is possible in such fractures. As written in the discharge of Holy Family Hospital that the nerve was explored and after exploration does not write any damage to the nerve by the fixator. As they inform about few doctors they might have gone elsewhere also and got the nerve damaged, as fiddling with fixator is injurious and they were cautioned about it.*

*During follow up no nerve injury was there as it cannot be ignored either by a doctor or a non-medico. It in fact happened when he went around and allowed other fiddle with the operated limb and fixator. Had any nerve injury taken place during fixator surgery, patient would have not sit quietly without complaint for full two months.*

*Neither the name of the doctor at AIIMS nor the prescription is attached. The complainant is concealing the truth that he went to AIIMS before the surgery and then decided for treatment with ILIZAROV fixator. There was no claim that union of fractured bony fragment will take how much time. Generally it is presumed that union of bone takes six weeks.*

*Doctors at Holy Family Hospital did routine plating with bone grafting along-with exploration of the nerve just because it was in shock and not damaged. In discharge slip of Holy Family Hospital no damage of nerve is stated.*

*The complainant came for the last follow up on 16.06.2006 and X-ray was taken. The X-ray, which was taken on 06.07.2006, was shown to me by S.I. Kaushik. (Where process of union of fractured fragments was observed clearly) It was observed that the fragment were not lying alike with the previous X-ray and it was evident that the fixator was fiddled by someone. The patient/complainant is concealing the post operative X-Rays taken during follow up with me. The complainant was always reluctant to come to the hospital for the follow up and wanted me to come to their residence that too without professional fees under the pressure of S.I. Kaushik. He had never paid any professional consultation fee.*

*The complainant has filed a consumer complaint against me before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum, Qutab, Delhi and I had already given an application to this Hon'ble Forum and demanded that investigation slips and all the X-rays done during the follow up with me but the complainant has failed to supply the same, which shows his habit to conceal the documents and hide the facts from the Hon'ble Forum.*

*There is no negligence on my part. The complainant damaged his nerve by his wrong deed to the treatment.*

*In addition to the above, para-wise reply to the complaint is as under :-*

- 1. The para no.1 of the complaint is denied for want of knowledge. The complainant be put to strict proof of allegations made therein.*
- 2. That para no. 2 of the complaint is wrong, illegal and hence denied. In reply to this paragraph it is submitted to this Hon'ble Forum that*

*the answering respondent is a Visiting Consultant to the respondent no. 2 (Orthonova Hospital). The complainant along-with Sub-Inspector Mr. K.C. Kaushik approached the answering respondent after K.C. Kaushik spoke to the respondent on phone, as he know that the answering respondent is specialized and expert in ILIZAROV Fixator Technique. The complainant already took advised at different hospital like AIIMS, etc. S.I. Kaushik knows the answering respondent for the last ten years that is why he brought the complainant and approached the answering respondent for the treatment of bone injury by ILIZAROV Fixator Technique. The answering respondent informed the complainant and Mr. Kaushik about the expenses incurred at the respondent no. 2 hospital to which they did not agree as they do not have enough money and requested the answering respondent to take the complainant to Sahi hospital where cost of treatment is less. As S.I. Kaushik knew that the answering respondent used to practice at Sahi Hospital. After that the answering respondent arranged the treatment arranged the treatment of the complainant at Sahi Hospital. No advance money was paid to the answering respondent. The contents of this paragraph are false and vehemently denied.*

3. *In reply to para no.3 of the complaint it is submitted to this Hon'ble Forum that the answering respondent had advised the complainant for certain tests which are required before the aforesaid procedure. It is denied for want of knowledge that whether the complainant paid Rs. 1,850/- for the aforesaid tests to the lab or not. The complainant is to produce the original slip of investigations prescribed by the respondent, as it is not in practice to give advice on slips. The complainant seem to have tried to conceal true facts in it. The other allegations of the paragraph are false and denied.*
4. *That para no.4 of the complaint is wrong, illegal, concocted and hence denied. As already submitted to this Hon'ble Forum that since Orthonova Hospital was not in the reach of the complainant as they were apprehensive of the cost of the treatment, therefore, they requested the answering respondent to take the complainant to some other hospital where the cost of the treatment will be less. After accepting the request of the complainant and his attendants the answering respondent arranged his treatment at the Sahi Hospital Jangpura. It is specifically denied that the answering respondent demanded Rs. 20,000/- in cash towards his fee in addition to the deposit of Rs. 15,000/- at Sahi Hospital. The contents of this paragraph are vehemently denied. The complainant be put to strict proof of allegations mate therein.*
5. *That para no. 5 of the complaint is wrong, illegal and hence denied. It is denied that the complainant paid Rs. 10,000/- to the answering respondent as final payment on account of the surgery charges. It is specifically denied that after 2 to 3 days from the date of discharge from the hospital some problem in the movement of fingers and wrist was noticed by the complainant and the answering respondent was accordingly informed. It is very important to mention here that the symptoms of radial nerve palsy are not supposed to occur, a week, after the surgery (2-3 days in hospital and 3 days in home as stated in this paragraph of the complaint). In-fact, it appear after*

*the last follow up of the complainant with the respondent and here he decided to change the doctor as he knew that he already strained his relations with the answering respondent and fiddled with the fixator and could see the consequences and afraid of getting caught, by the respondent about his mis-deeds and doctor may catch him. He decided to go to the other doctor and make a false story against the answering respondent. It is, further, denied that the answering respondent called the complainant at Sahi Hospital for check up and changed the external setting of the fixator and refixed the same. The contents of this paragraph are false and vehemently denied.*

- 6. That para no. 6 of the complaint is wrong, illegal, vague and hence denied. In reply to this paragraph it is submitted to this Hon'ble Forum that the complainant has willfully not filed the Report and X-ray Film before this Hon'ble Forum. The complainant with the influence of Sub-Inspector Mr. Kaushik troubled the answering respondent through different threats from time to time and wanted the answering respondent to visit and do the follow ups at the residence of the complainant that too without charging his professional fee. It is specifically denied that the answering respondent had done nothing for the treatment of the complainant and the broken bones are lying as they were seen in the first X-ray before the surgery fixation of fractured bony fragments with the ILIZAROV is one of the kind of treatment. It is also denied that the answering respondent only applied the fixator at the injured part of the complainant's hand without giving any treatment. In fact it is a treatment 11 Damage of the nerve did not take place at the time of surgery as the complainant himself states in paragraph 5 that he developed difficulty in his finger movements later. No threats were given either. The story of 6<sup>th</sup> July 2006 is false, concocted and denied. It is also specifically denied that the answering respondent directed the complainant to bring with him key, which was kept in his Bike for opening the fixator. It is submitted to this Hon'ble Forum that these averments are baseless and concocted by the complainant with a view to file the present complaint. In case the answering respondent used the tools of the Bike for opening of the fixator that can cause infection to the complainant. As per the record and the complaint itself filed by the complainant he did not suffer infection of any kind. The contents of this paragraph are vehemently denied.*
- 7. That as stated in this para of the complaint, fixator was not removed quickly by the doctor of Holy Family Hospital. In fact it was removed almost after two weeks, therefore, this statement of the complainant is wrong. The time of second surgery is two months after the accident and bone grafting is possible at any time even after years, therefore, the statement that the doctors of Holy Family Hospital that it is getting late is false. The complainant is making his own stories. The bone graft is probably taken from Iliac crest which is a conventional procedure. The reason for the function of wrist and fingers is best known to the complainant as it did not develop during the follow up with the respondent. The rest of the contents of this para are denied for want of knowledge. The complainant be put to strict proof of allegations made therein.*

8. *That para no. 8 of the complaint is wrong, illegal and hence denied.*
9. *That para no. 9 of the complaint is denied for want of knowledge. The complainant be put to strict proof of allegations made therein. It is submitted to this Hon'ble Forum that after the procedure of ILIZAROV Fixator and after follow ups the hand of the complainant was working properly. He lost follow up from the answering respondent after 15.6.2006 complaints of radial nerve palsy could not be ignored, had it been there, as it becomes very obvious as patient is in his para 5 also states that he observed it at home. Though the time of happening of nerve palsy which is stated in paragraph 5 is not correct, he himself states that he observed it by himself.*
10. *That para no. 10 of the complaint is denied for want of knowledge. The complainant be put to strict proof of allegations made therein along-with the O.P.D. Card of AIIMS.*
11. *That para no. 11 of the complaint is denied for want of knowledge. The complainant be put to strict proof of allegations made therein.*
12. *That para no. 12 of the complaint is wrong, illegal and hence denied. It is denied that the complainant spent a huge amount of his treatment under the answering respondent. The rest of the contents of this paragraph are denied for want of knowledge. The complainant did not explain why he did not opt for AIIMS, for second surgery as it is the Prime Government institution of the country and the treatment is free.*
13. *That para no. 13 of the complaint is denied for want of knowledge. The complainant be put to strict proof of defamatory allegations saying "False application of fixator".*
14. *That para no. 14, of the complaint is denied for want of knowledge. The complainant be put to strict proof of allegations made therein. It is denied that lost of time of the complainant was got wasted due to wrong and negligent practice on the part of the answering respondent.*
15. *That para no. 15 of the complaint is wrong, illegal, vague and excessive, without any nexus and hence denied. In reply to this paragraph it is submitted to this council that vide their Order dated 13.9.2005 the Ethics Committee was pleased to order that "no medical negligence can be substantiated against Dr. Yash Nigam in the above mentioned case....".*

*It is, therefore, prayed to this Council that the complaint of the complainant may kindly be dismissed."*

*In view of above and looking into the parawise remarks of Dr. Yash Nigam and the opinion of expert, after due deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee decided to approve the decision of the Ethics Committee and further decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council to remove the name of Dr. Yash Nigam temporarily from the Indian Medial Register for a period of three months."*

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11/03/2010 decided that as a result of wrong method of management by Dr. Yash Nigam, the patient had to suffer and had to go for another type of surgery which cost him more and he suffered paralysis of the radial nerve and decided that his name be removed temporarily from the Indian Medical Register for a period of three months.

**81. Complaint-cum-Appeal dt.14.12.06 against Medical Mishaps - Representation/ Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju.**

Read: The matter with regard to complaint-cum-Appeal dt.14.12.06 against Medical Mishaps - Representation/ Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju.

The Council Observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the decision of the Ethics Committee in the above matter as under:-

"The Ethics Committee considered the ongoing matter of complaint-cum-Appeal vide letter dated 14.12.2006 from Mr. P. Raju and noted:-

i) The letter dated 14.12.2006 from Mr. P. Raju:-

"I beg to bring the following a few lines before your Honourable presence for necessary action.

Sir, I applied to the Director of Medical Services, Chennai on 25.04.2001 for necessary action due to the sudden demise of my daughter Smt. Sarada, on 4.01.2001 who was admitted for delivery in the Salem Poly Clinic, Salem. The demise occurred due to the negligence and improper treatment in the said Hospital. The same was again brought to the notice of the Director (Mr. C.M.K. Reddy) by name on 25.04.2001, 13.12.2002. Both turned deaf ears to my petition.

Repeatedly I brought to the notice (my incident) to the relevant authorities on 8.03.2003, 28.12.2004, 16.8.2005 and 8.03.2003 (Dr. Reddy, Registrar of Medical Council, Chennai and Delhi and C.E.R.S., etc.) But all brought forth nothing and I received no reply from any authorities. The Tamil Nadu Govt. looked into the grievance and advised the Joint Director, Salem to enquire and submit the report of enquiry. The Joint Director as directed, enquired on 7.12.2001 and sent his report.

I again represented my grievance to the Director of Health and Rural Services, Chennai on 28.12.2004. As per reference cited I, I received an answer that for such medical mishaps, I have to approach, if desired, either to Tamil Nadu Medical Council, Chennai/ Indian Medical Council or Competent Consumer Redressal forum. Accordingly I approached to the Medical Council of India on 5.04.2006 for Justice.

The Honourable Medical Council of India directed the Registrar of Medical Council, Tamil Nadu to make investigation and take necessary action and send the report within a period of Six months under clause 8.4 of the



Indian Medical Council (Decision on complaint against delinquent physician shall be taken within a period of six months. The copy of the letter cited in the ref.3 has also been forwarded to me. But so far I received no information about any action in this regard.”

I also extend my humble salutations and thanks to the Medical Council of India, New Delhi, which ordered the Registrar of Medical Council to investigate in this regard.

I humbly bring this before the Medical Council of India, that so far no action is being even after the said stipulated six months period. I again request and pray the Honorable benovent authority, kindly look into the matte for speedy action and favour me at the earliest convenience possible.”

ii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 19.02.2007:-

“The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against medical mishaps – Representation/Private Hospital as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that the matter was referred to Tamil Nadu Medical Council on 11.05.2006 and more than 6 months has lapsed till date the Tamil Nadu Medical Council has not taken any action and the Medical Council India take up this case as an appeal case and the Ethics Committee decided that Mr. P. Raju may be asked to appear before the Ethics Committee in its next meeting at 2.30 p.m. The Ethics Committee decided to ask the Director, Mr. C.M.K. Reddy, Salem Poly Clinic, Salem to give his para-wise comments on the complaint lodged against him by Mr. P. Raju within 15 days of issue of this letter alongwith copy of the case sheet and treatment records & all the relevant documents relating to this particular case.

The Ethics Committee further decided to write the Tamil Nadu Medical Council that this case has been taken over by the Medical Council India as an appeal case as per the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 as amended on 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2004.

The Ethics Committee further decided to request Mr. P. Raju to appear before the Ethics Committee at 12.30 p.m. in its second next meeting.”

iii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 19.03.2007:

“The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against medical mishaps – Representation/Private Hospital as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that the matter was referred to the Tamil Nadu Medical Council by this Council and the Tamil Nadu Medical Council has not taken any action till date and the complainant Mr. P. Raju has requested to this Council to take up this case as an appeal case under Section 8.8 as per the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 as amended on 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2004 and the Committee decided to accept this as an appeal case and this may be informed to the Tamil Nadu Medical Council that this case has been taken over by the Medical Council of India as an appeal case as per Regulations. Mr. P. Raju was requested to appear before the Ethics Committee at 12.30 p.m on

19.03.2007 and he has explained & also informed that there is a clear-cut professional misconduct (medical mishaps/negligence) which her daughter died. The baby is certified as female but actually it was a male baby. He also brought to the notice of the Committee that the time of death of her daughter was different about the actual time of death with the hospital records.

In view of the above, the Ethics Committee decided to call the Director, Salem Ploy Clinic & Dr. S. Venketswara to appear before the Ethics Committee in its second next meeting at 3.00 p.m."

iv) The following Ethics Committee the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2007:-

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter and saw the letter given by Salem Polyclinic wherein it was stated that "Mr.C.M.K. Reddy and Dr. Venketwara Rao were never in our employment nor worked in the past or present in our hospital as doctor."

After receiving this letter from Salem Polyclinic, the Ethics Committee decided to write to the Salem Polyclinic the following:-

1. Who is the owner of Salem Polyclinic whether he is a doctor or non-doctor, if the owners are doctor, their detail i.e. name, postal address, and registration number are to be asked for.
2. The Authorities of Salem Polyclinic are to be requested to give the details, of all the doctors who have treated this particular case No.2000/F/9798 of Saradha w/o Panneerselvam, Namagiripettai.
3. The name and address alongwith registration number of the Managing Director/Medical Supdt./Medical Director/Incharge of Obst. & Gynae. wards at present as well as at the time of the said case, are to be provided.
4. The para-wise comments regarding this particular case is to be provided.
5. A copy of the hospital record and complaint is being sent to the Salem Polyclinic, Salem with a request to send the above information within 15 days of receipt of this communication.

Further a copy of the letter addressed to Salem Polyclinic may also be marked to:-

1. Secretary, Health, Tamil Nadu.
  2. The Registrar, Tamil Nadu Medical Council, Chennai-26.
  3. Director of Medical and Rural Health Services, Chennai-6
  4. The Joint Director of Medical and Rural Health Services, Salem-1.
  5. District Magistrate, Tamil Nadu
  6. Superintendent of Police, Tamil Nadu requesting their kind co-operation in obtaining the above information."
- v) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> August, 2007:-

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against Medical Mishaps-Representation/Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that Dr. Rashmi Rao, Salem Poly Clinic, Salem has sent a letter dt. 16.7.2007 to the Medical Council of India vide letter dated 28.6.2007 from the reply, it has been seen that Dr. Rashmir Rao, was the doctor who treated Mrs. Saradha W/o Mr. P. Raju the complainant.

The Ethics Committee therefore decided to call Dr. Rashmi Rao to appear before the Ethics Committee in its second next meeting at 11.30 a.m. with the relevant documents, case history and hospital records of the patient. The Ethics Committee further decided to ask the complainant to appear before the Ethics Committee in its next second meeting at 3.00 p.m."

vi) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> October, 2007:

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against Medical Mishaps-Representation/Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that Dr. Rashmi Rao was requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 16.10.2007 at 11.30 a.m. The Ethics Committee further noted that Dr. Rashmi has sent a letter dt. 9.10.2007 informing her regrets to appear before the Ethics Committee on 16.10.2007 due to unavailability of travel tickets.

The Ethics Committee therefore decided to call Dr. Rashmi Rao at its second next meeting at 2.30 p.m. (first day) alongwith all the relevant case records of the patients."

vii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 17/12/2007:-

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against Medical Mishaps-Representation/Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that Dr. Rashmi Rao has been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 17/12/2007 but she has failed to do so. The Ethics Committee decided that Dr. Rashmi Rao should be given a last and final chance to appear before the Ethics Committee in its next meeting at 1.00 p.m. failing which the Ethics Committee will be constrained to take ex-parte decision in this case."

viii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> & 13<sup>th</sup> February, 2008:

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against Medical Mishaps- Representation/ Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that Dr. Rashmi Rao was called on 2.30 p.m. on 12.2.2008 but she has failed to appear before the Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee decided to give her one last chance to appear before the Ethics Committee. She may be called on the second next meeting of the Ethics Committee, failing which the Ethics Committee will be constrained to take an ex-parte decision in this particular case."

ix) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> May, 2008:

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against Medical Mishaps- Representation/ Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that Dr. Rashmi Rao was requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 21.05.2008 but she did not turn up. The Ethics Committee further noted a letter dated 14.5.2008 received today i.e. 21.5.2008 addressed to the Addl. Secretary, Medical Council of India, New Delhi where she has written that she requires one month time.

Therefore, the Ethics Committee decided to give her one more chance to appear before the Ethics Committee in its next meeting."

x) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2008:

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against Medical Mishaps-Representation/Private Hospital as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that Dr. Rashmi Rao was asked to appear before the Ethics Committee on 16.10.2007, 17.12.2007, 12.02.2008, 21.05.2008 & 07.07.2008 but she did fail to do so.

The Ethics Committee unanimously decided to give her a last and final chance to appear before the Ethics Committee at one of its next meetings."

xi) The Council received a letter dated 25/07/2008 from the Complainant Mr. P. Raju conveying his inability to come because of his physical problems.

xii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2008:

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to complaint against Medical Mishaps as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and discussed the various aspects of this case and have called Dr. Rashmi Rao who is in-charge of Obst. & Gynea. Deptt. of Salem Polyclinic, Salem and observed that the case was admitted under Dr. Rashmi Rao. However, it is observed that this emergency operation (Caesarean Section) was not done by Dr. Rashmi Rao but one Dr. Venkatesan MS (FRCS) who is not in possession of qualification required for the speciality had performed this operation. The Ethics Committee therefore, decided that Dr. Venkatesan should be called to appear before the Ethics Committee to give his deposition with the original case sheets, operation register, form of consent and other hospital records of this patient. In the meantime statement of Dr. Rashmi Rao has also been recorded which is as under:

"Statement of Dr. Rashmi Rao

I Dr. Rashmi Rao did my MBBS from Bangalore Medical College in the year 1990 and did DGO from the same institute in the year 1994. My registration no. is 29936 of Karnataka Medical Council. My date of birth is 8.5.1967.

This is to certify that Mrs. Sharda age 30 years w/o Mr. Paneer Selvam came to me for four antenatal visits on the forth antenatal visit on 26.12.2000, the patient came with pregnancy of 37 weeks and leaking

since 3.00 p.m. The patient came to me at 4.30 p.m and labour was induced but as the labour did not progress satisfactorily She underwent emergency cesarean on 28.12.2000 and delivered a live male baby at 10.49 a.m. The baby cried well post operatively, the patient was normal until the third day. The patient was on Inj. Amoxy-Cloxacillin. On the forth post-operative day she had temperature of 101<sup>0</sup> F. On the forth day she was afebrile. On the fifth day she again had temperature of 101<sup>0</sup> F. on 4.1.01 at 4.45 a.m she complaint of mild dyspnoea and abdominal distension for which a suppository was given and the patient passed motion. She was given Inj. Ceftriaxone 1gm and Inj Tiniba at 9.00 a.m. She became breathless and x-ray abdomen and scan was taken which showed dilated bowel loops. Her Hb was 7.4 gms. She was transfused 2 units of blood.

Prophylactic ventilation was explained to the patient's father. At 1.25 pm the patient suddenly collapsed and resuscitation measures were immediately immediately under taken but the patient could not be revived and the patient was declared dead at 2.00 pm.

Suspected casue of death – Pulmonary embolism.

Sd/-  
(Dr. Rashmi Rao)  
12.12.2008"

The Ethics Committee also noted that the complainant Mr. P. Raju vide his letter dt. 28.07.08 has conveyed his inability to appear before the Ethics Committee because of his physical problems. Dr. Venkatesan may be called to appear before the Ethics Committee in one of its next meetings."

xiii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2009:

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to complaint against Medical mishaps-Representation/ Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that the operating surgeon Dr. M. Venkatesan had been asked to appear before the Ethics Committee on 21.05.2009. He has submitted his oral as well as written deposition before the Ethics Committee which is as under:-

#### STATEMENT OF DR. M. VENKATESAN

I, Dr. M. Venkatesan, passed my MBBS in 1986 and did my MS (General Surgery) in the year 1991 from Stanley Medical College, Chennai. I also finished my FRCS (Ed) and FRCS (Glas) in 1997. My Registration No. is 43296 with the Tamil Nadu Medical Council. My date of birth is 05.04.1964.

I worked in Salem Polyclinic, Salem from 1991 to 1993 and then from 1998 onwards. I had assisted Ceasarian operations and have performed myself under supervision and unsupervised during this period. I have enclosed a letter from the Chief of the Salem Polyclinic, Salem to support this. I also enclosed my training certificates.

On 28.12.2000, I was called by Dr. Rashmi Rao to do an emergency Caesarian Section at Salem Polyclinic, Salem. The indication was foetal distress. Under spinal Anaesthesia with Aseptic precautions, I did a lower

segment Caesarian Section and delivered a male baby and the baby cried after two minutes resuscitation. Perfect haemostasis was secured and the wound was sutured. The patient was haemodynamically stable and recovered well in the immediate post operative period.

I have done this procedure as an emergency life saving operation to the best of my knowledge and efforts to save the mother and the baby.

Sd/-  
Dr. M. VENKATESAN  
R/o 41/14, Bajanai Madam Street,  
Gugai, Salem – 636 006  
Tamil Nadu, India.

He was asked the following and the answers are given against each.

Question: During your MS training, was there any training on Caesarian Section and OBG Management procedure?

Answer: During my house surgeon period, I have worked in OBG Department and during that period I had exposure to Gynaecological surgery and Caesarian Sections. Occasionally, I have assisted emergency gynaecological surgeries like, twisted ovarian cyst and removal of uterine tumours.

Question: Whether the course and curriculum for MS (Surgery) during your training period included any chapter or hands on training on OBG patients management?

Answer: No.

Question: Was the matter referred to the Judiciary Court?

Answer: Yes, it was taken to the Judiciary Court also.

Sd/-  
Dr. M. VENKATESAN  
R/o 41/14, Bajanai Madam Street,  
Gugai, Salem – 636 006  
Tamil Nadu, India.

The Ethics Committee while considering the matter noted that Dr.M. Venkatesan, who had conducted the caesarian section of the patient, is a general surgeon and he did not attend to the patient any time after the operation; and moreover the post operative notes of the patient were noted to have been written by the Anaesthetist of the Hospital. The Ethics Committee, therefore, decided that the Dr.M. Venkatesan, General Surgeon should be issued a show cause notice as to why his name be not erased from the Indian Medical Register and further that he should ensure that the reply to the show cause notice should be sent within one month's period positively from the date of issue of the letter to this effect."

xiv) Dr. Venkatesan has sent letters dated 30/05/2009 & 23/06/2009 in response to the show cause notice issued to him.

The Ethics Committee noting the above and considering all the relevant documents, statements and the reply to the show cause notice and after observing that Dr.M.Venkatesan has been negligent by not caring to write the post operative notes of the patient and thereafter post operatively not

attending the patient even once; decided to recommend that the name of Dr.M.Venkatesan be erased temporarily from I.M.R. for a period of three months."

The Executive Committee observed that in view of above, an emergency caesarian operation was done by Dr.M. Venkatesan on 28.12.2000 wherein a male baby was delivered and baby cried after two minutes resuscitation. The patient was haemodynamically stable and recovered well in the immediate post operative period and was normal until the third post operative day.

After due and detailed deliberations, the Executive Committee decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."

The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> November, 2009 and decided to defer the matter for its next meeting.

The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 17/11/2009 and the decision was as under:

"The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee with regards to complaint-cum-Appeal dt.14.12.06 against Medical Mishaps - Representation/ Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted the following:

a) Brief summary of the Case:

- i) Mr. Raju Complaint-cum-Appeal dt.14.12.06 against Medical Mishaps - Representation/ Private Hospital, Salem Polyclinic
- ii) Dr. Rashmi Rao and Dr. M. Venkatesan are concerned doctors in this case.
- iii) Patient was admitted under Dr. Rashmi Rao for delivery.
- iv) Caesarian was done by Dr. M. Venkatesan, MS, General Surgery with FRCS General Surgery.
- v) Patient developed fever from 4<sup>th</sup> day and died on the 7<sup>th</sup> day.
- vi) The Operated Surgeon had not seen the patient before the surgery nor after the surgery till death.

b) Allegations:

- i) Mr. P. Raju, father of the dead victim appeals to various authorities for justice considering this is a case of medical negligence resulting in death of his daughter.

c) Defence Statement of Dr. Rashmi Rao:

- i) Patient was under her antenatal checkup.
- ii) Mrs. Sharda, 30 years old was admitted under her care on 26.12.2000 with 37 weeks of pregnancy and the leaking since 3.00 p.m.
- iii) At 4.30 p.m. labour was induced.
- iv) It did not progress satisfactorily.
- v) So she underwent emergency cesarean on 28.12.2000 and delivered a live male baby at 10.49 a.m.

- vi) Dr. M. Venkatesan, MS, General Surgery with FRCS General Surgery, had done the cesarean.
- vii) Dr. Rashmi Rao did not participated in cesarean.
- viii) Dr. Venkatesan had neither seen the patient before nor seen the patient after the surgery till the time of death.
- ix) The Anesthetist had written the operating notes in this patient.
- x) Patient was declared dead on 4.01.2001 at 2.00 p.m.

Defence Statement by Dr. M. Venkatesan:

That he had worked in OBG Department during house surgeonship and had been exposed to Gynaecological surgery and the cesarean section and he had done number of cesarean surgeries.

The Members of the Ethics Committee have gone through the available records provided as well as opinion of experts in the previous meeting and, now drawn the following conclusions:

- (i) The patient was admitted under the care of Dr. Rashmi Rao, DGO.
- (ii) She had not performed the surgery, even though the patient was under her care.
- (iii) Dr. Venkatesan who qualified in MS, General Surgery with FRCS General Surgery has performed low segment cesarean surgery though he has not qualified in Obstetrics & Gynaecology.
- (iv) Dr. Venkatesan had neither seen the patient before nor seen the patient after the surgery till the time of death.
- (v) Dr. Venkatesan has not even recorded his observation and operation Notes in the case file.
- (vi) Operation notes were written by Anaesthetist and not by Dr. Rashmi Rao or by Dr. Venkatesan.
- (vii) The progress notes of 28.12.2000 were written above notes dated 27.12.2000, which raises a doubt that the case sheet had been manipulated.
- (viii) Medicine that has been given to the patient during post operative period till the time of death is not available in the case sheet/record.
- (ix) The medical notes available in the case sheet was written on 04.01.2001 i.e. on the day of death.

The Members of the Ethics Committee are of unanimous opinion that there is a gross medical negligence in the medical Management. The Committee unanimously decided that the name Dr. Rashmi Rao and Dr. Venkatesan be removed temporarily from Indian Medical Register for a period of Six months.

The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:

“The members of the Executive Committee of the Council while considering the decision of the Ethics Committee dated 17.11.2009 with regard to Complaint-cum-Appeal dt.14.12.06 against Medical Mishaps - Representation/ Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju observed that no details have been furnished in the decision regarding application of Regulation 8.7 prescribed in Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2000 regarding the matter being decided by the Medical Council of India when it has not been decided by the State



Medical Council with which the doctor is registered within a period of 6 months as stipulated in the Regulations.

In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."

The matter was re-considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 15/02/2010 :-

"The Ethics Committee re-considered the matter with regards to complaint-cum-Appeal dt.14.12.06 against Medical Mishaps - Representation/ Private Hospitals as alleged by Mr. P. Raju in the light of the Executive Committee decision dated 05.02.2010. The Committee observed from the previous records that the above matter has been considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 19.02.2007 and the decision taken is as under:-

"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against medical mishaps – Representation/Private Hospital as alleged by Mr. P. Raju and noted that the matter was referred to Tamil Nadu Medical Council on 11.05.2006 and more than 6 months has lapsed till date the Tamil Nadu Medical Council has not taken any action and the Medical Council India take up this case as an appeal case and the Ethics Committee decided that Mr. P. Raju may be asked to appear before the Ethics Committee in its next meeting at 2.30 p.m. The Ethics Committee decided to ask the Director, Mr. C.M.K. Reddy, Salem Poly Clinic, Salem to give his para-wise comments on the complaint lodged against him by Mr. P. Raju within 15 days of issue of this letter alongwith copy of the case sheet and treatment records & all the relevant documents relating to this particular case.

The Ethics Committee further decided to write the Tamil Nadu Medical Council that this case has been taken over by the Medical Council India as an appeal case as per the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 as amended on 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2004.

The Ethics Committee further decided to request Mr. P. Raju to appear before the Ethics Committee at 12.30 p.m. in its second next meeting."

The above decision was communicated to Mr. P. Raju and Mr. C.M.K. Reddy as well as the Registrar, Tamilnadu Medical Council vide Council's letter dated 06.03.2007 and 15.03.2007. Since, no reply had been received from the Registrar, Tamilnadu Medical Council and no decision has been taken by Tamilnadu Medical Council for more than six months. No reminder was sent by MCI as the party appealed to Medical Council of India to take up the issue and render justice after seven months.

In view of above, further proceedings have taken place by the Ethics Committee of the MCI and the decision has been arrived. The Ethics Committee decided that the name Dr. Rashmi Rao and Dr. Venkatesan be removed temporarily from Indian Medical Register for a period of Six months."

The members of the Executive Committee observed that no reply has been received from the Registrar, Tamil Nadu Medical Council to the Council letters dated 06.03.2007 and 15.03.2007 and no decision was taken by Tamil Nadu Medical Council for a period of more than six months. Hence, the case was taken up by the Medical Council of India in accordance of the provision of Section 8.7 of the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002.

After due deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee decided to approve the decision of the Ethics Committee and further decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council to remove the names of Dr. Rashmi Rao and Dr. M. Venkatesan temporarily from Indian Medical Register for a period of Six months."

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11/03/2010 decided as under:

- (i) The patient was admitted under the care of Dr. Rashmi Rao, DGO but she had not performed the surgery.
- (ii) Dr. Venkatesan who qualified in MS, General Surgery with FRCS General Surgery has performed low segment cesarean surgery though he has not qualified in Obstetrics & Gynaecology. Dr. Venkatesan had neither seen the patient before nor seen the patient after the surgery till the time of death. Dr. Venkatesan has not even recorded his observation and operation Notes in the case file.
- (iii) Operation notes were written by Anaesthetist and not by Dr. Rashmi Rao or by Dr. Venkatesan. The progress notes of 28.12.2000 were written above notes dated 27.12.2000, which raises a doubt that the case sheet had been manipulated.
- (iv) Medicine that has been given to the patient during post operative period till the time of death is not available in the case sheet/record.
- (v) The medical notes available in the case sheet was written on 04.01.2001 i.e. on the day of death.

In view of above, it was decided that the name of Dr. Rashmi Rao and Dr. Venkatesan be removed temporarily from Indian Medical Register for a period of Six months.

**82. Matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. N. Venkatadri, Medical teacher.**

Read: The matter with regard to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. N. Venkatadri, Medical teacher.

The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the decision of the Ethics Committee dated 15.02.2010 in the above matter as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee noted the following:*

*The matter along with the Council Inspectors report and report of the verification of the degree/diploma/working experience of the teaching faculty of the Melmaruvathur Adhiparasakthi Institute of Medical Sciences & Research, Melmaruvathur, Tamil Nadu conducted by the MCI was placed before the Executive Committee of the Council at its meeting held on 09/05/2009. The operative part of the decision is as under:-*

*"The Executive Committee of the Council further observed that on scrutiny of the Declaration Forms submitted on behalf of the medical teachers and endorsed by the Principal of the medical college, it was observed/found that the teaching experience shown in a Declaration Form is incorrect. The office of the Council had undertaken the exercise of verifying the individual particulars regarding the claimed teaching experience from the Medical institutions concerned and found the claim to be fake. The following teaching faculty cannot be considered as the experience certificates submitted by him are forged as shown below:*

*"In his declaration form, he has claimed that he has worked at Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore as Asstt.Prof. from 03.03.1989 to 03.03.1993, as Associate Professor from 04.03.1993 to 03.03.1998 and as Professor from 04.03.1998 to 19.01.1999. While on confirmation the Dean, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore vide his letter dt. 21.04.2009 has confirmed that he has worked as Asstt. Prof. from 03.03.1989 to 31.03.1993 and as Associate Professor from 01.04.1993 to 19.01.1999 and therefore he cannot be accepted as a teacher."*

*The Executive Committee of the Council were, therefore, clearly of the view that the Council should take steps for referring this case to the Police authorities for registration of FIR and conducting investigations. It was observed that in the complaint to be sent to the Police authorities, it should also be clearly requested that in this case where there is a collusion and conspiracy of such persons with the management of the colleges, the necessary action should also be taken against the management of those colleges. It was further decided that appropriate action be taken against the Doctor and the Principal of the college in accordance with Professional Conduct (Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002."*

*Relatedly, it may be informed that:-*

- *In view of above decision, the Police authorities were requested to lodge an FIR against Dr. N. Venkatadri vide Council's letter dt. 25/05/2009.*
- *Thereafter, in terms of the Secretary's earlier direction that explanation be called in all such cases, the Council office asked for the comments with regards to the office observations from the doctor concerned vide MCI letter dt. 28/10/2009.*
- *The office observations as in FIR recommended to the Police authorities & to the doctor concerned were as follows:*

*"In his declaration form, he has claimed that he has worked at Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore as Asstt.Prof. from 03.03.1989 to 03.03.1993, as Associate Professor from 04.03.1993 to 03.03.1998 and as Professor from 04.03.1998 to 19.01.1999. While on confirmation the Dean, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore vide his letter dt. 21.04.2009 has confirmed that he has worked as Asstt. Prof. from 03.03.1989 to 31.03.1993 and as Associate Professor from 01.04.1993 to 19.01.1999 and therefore he cannot be accepted as a teacher."*

- *Dr. N. Venkatadri vide his letter dt. 05/11/2009 has sent his explanation.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 17/11/2009 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. N. Venkatadri, Medical teacher and gone through the explanation of Dr. N. Venkatadri and explanation letter of the Dean of the concerned medical college. It is noted that Dr. N. Venkatadri was working in the same institutions within the mentioned period i.e. from 3.3.1989 to 19.01.1999 and his total experience is approx. 10 years. He was entitled to be designated as Professor in Pharmacology, though such order had not been passed for promotion of Dr. N. Venkatadri by the competent authority, which he himself accepted.*

*Therefore, the Members of the Ethics Committee unanimously decided to give warning to him. Hence the case is disposed of."*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Ethics Committee while considering the matter on 17.11.2009 with regard to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. N. Venkatadri, Medical teacher has not taken into consideration the fact that Dr. N. Venkatadri had submitted a false and fake certificate of experience purported to have been obtained from the Dean, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore.*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*Dr. N. Venkatadri has been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 15/02/2010 at 12:00 Noon vide Council's letter dated 09/02/2010.*

*The matter was re-considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 15/02/2010 and the decision was as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee re-considered the matter with regards to supply of alleged forged / fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. N. Venkatadri, in the light of the Executive Committee decision dated 05.02.2010 and reviewed the case. Dr. N.*

*Venkatadri has produced the certificate with forged signature of the Dean, Kasturba Medical College, Mangalore. Hence, it was decided that his name be removed from the Indian Medical Register for a period of two years."*

*After due deliberations, as Dr. N. Venkatadri has produced an experience certificate which is fake/forged, the members of the Executive Committee decided to approve the decision of the Ethics Committee and further decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council to remove the name of Dr. N. Venkatadri from the Indian Medical Register for a period of two years."*

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11/03/2010 decided that Dr. N. Venkatadri has produced an experience certificate which is fake/forged and decided to remove the name of Dr. N. Venkatadri from the Indian Medical Register for a period of two years.

**83. Appeal by Ms. Nita against the order dated 04.02.2008 of Delhi Medical Council.**

Read: The matter with regard to Appeal by Ms. Nita against the order dated 04.02.2008 of Delhi Medical Council.

The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the decision of the Ethics Committee dated 15.02.2010 in the above matter as under:-*

*"i) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 15.12.2006:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the complaint against Dr. Subhash Khanna and Dr. Rinkesh Chawla as alleged by Ms. Nita and noted that Dr. Subhash Khanna is registered with Punjab Medical Council bearing Registration No. EP8121 dated 9.6.1966 and Dr. Rinkesh Chawla is registered with U.P. Medical Council.*

*In view of above, the Ethics Committee decided to refer this matter to both Punjab Medical Council and U.P. Medical Council for taking necessary action at their end within six months of receipt of this communication under intimation to this Council. A copy of the same may be marked to the complainant. This may be recorded in the referral register and the file may be treated as closed."*

*ii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 21/05/2008:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to appeal against Order passed by Delhi Medical Council on the complaint of Ms. Nita against Dr. Subhash Khanna and Dr. Rinkesh Chawla and decided that the Secretary, Delhi Medical Council may be requested to send all the papers pertaining to this case.*

*Dr. Subhash Khanna, Director, Khanna Nursing Home, Dr. Rinkesh Chawla, RMO, Khanna Nursing Home and Dr. R.K. Kapoor of the same Khanna Nursing Home may be asked to give their parawise comments on the complaint received from Ms. Nita."*

*iii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> August, 2008:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the appeal of Ms. Nita against the order dated 04.02.2008 passed by the Delhi Medical Council and noted that the documents as requested from Delhi Medical Council have been received as also the comments from Dr. Subhash Khanna and Dr. R.K. Kapoor on the complaints received. The comments from Dr. Rinkesh Chawla are awaited for which a reminder has been sent.*

*The Ethics Committee decided that Director, Health Services, Govt. of Delhi should be requested to supply information as to whether Delhi Private Nursing Homes/Hospitals in the territory of Delhi are authorized to take up the M.L.Cs (Medico-legal cases) and give the opinion regarding the same. In case they are not permitted then as to whether only Govt. Institutions are permitted/authorized to do the M.L.Cs. The matter may be taken up once reply is received."*

*iv) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2008:*

*"The Ethics Committee after discussing the various aspects of this case and also the response received from the Medical Superintendent, Nursing Homes-1, Directorate of Health Services, Govt. of Delhi has decided to call the concerned doctors - Dr.Subhash Khanna and Dr.R.K. Kapoor before one of the next meeting of the Ethics Committee. The complainant may also be called at different timings."*

*v) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2009 :*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to appeal of Ms. Nita against the order dated 04.02.2008 passed by Delhi Medical Council and noted that Dr. R.K. Kapoor & Dr. Subhash Khanna had been called to appear before the Ethics Committee and they have appeared before the Ethics Committee and their statements are as under:-*

**STATEMENT OF DR. R.K. KAPOOR**

*I, Dr. R.K. Kapoor did my MBBS from All India Instt. of Medical Sciences, New Delhi in 1988 and did my M.S. Ortho. from the same institute in 1991. I had worked as Sr. Registrar in the Institute from 1992 to 1995. My registration number is 7850 of MCI and 11169 of Delhi Medical Council. Presently, working as Sr. Orthopaedic Surgeon at Mata Chanan Devi Hospital, New Delhi.*

*I was called to see the patient on 1.7.2006 and around 8.30 p.m. I examined the patient. X-ray done earlier showed injury of the right ankle. Patient had pain in the knee and the x-ray shows no bony injury about*

knee. The patient at that time did not complain any injury of the back/spine. No other associated injury was complained. The patient was given below knee plaster and was asked to follow up the next day. Patient came on 4<sup>th</sup> July, 2006 for routine check up. Her x-ray of the ankle was taken. She had no pain in the knee. At that time also the patient did not complained of any back pain or injury to spine. The patient was brought by the Police to the nursing home and I had gone there as Specialist Consultant. I had to treat the patient where the patient had got an MLC or not got MLC according to the medical practice. There was no reason for me to suspect any foul play as the patient was herself brought by the Police. No one has taken signature on blank paper in front of me. I am not a regular Consultant of Khanna Nursing Home and had gone to see the patient as the regular Orthopaedic Consultant was unavailable. The MLC as a routine is made by the CMO of the Establishment who sees the patient and the nursing home is supposed to keep the record of MLC. I had given of my opinion on the hospital letter pad and handed over to the patient.

Sd/-  
(Dr. R.K. Kapoor)

STATEMENT OF DR. SUBHASH KHANNA

I, Dr. Subhash Khanna did my MBBS from Maulana Azad Medical College, New Delhi in the year 1965 and did my M.S. (General Surgery) from the same institute in 1970. My registration number is 10823, Delhi Medical Council and EP 8121 Punjab Medical Council.

Mrs. Nita was brought to my nursing home at 6.30 p.m. by ASI Uttamchand on 1st July, 2006 with alleged history of road traffic accident. She had fracture near the ankle joint for which she was given treatment, x-ray was done and Dr. R.K. Kapoor, Orthopaedic Surgeon was called at 8.30 p.m. He put the patient in plaster and there was no profuse bleeding. It was a closed fracture. She was treated as an OPD case. Dr. Kapoor treated the patient. As the patient was brought by the ASI Uttamchand, she gave in writing at my nursing home that she does not want a police case. Subsequently, the police has got a statement from us that she has a fracture and it was a grievous injury caused by a blunt object. The person with whom the accident occurred is never known to me and I have never met the person. We are already doing medico-legal cases even before this case brought in the year 2006.

Sd/-  
(Dr. Subhash Khanna)

The Ethics Committee while considering the matter also (i) perused the register maintained by Khanna Nursing Home, New Delhi for upkeep of MLC records and noted the entries in the register made before and after the incidence of this case;

(ii) decided to call the 3<sup>rd</sup> doctor – Rinkesh Chawla to appear before the Ethics Committee."

vi) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> & 09<sup>th</sup> July, 2009:

*"The Ethics Committee considered the ongoing matter of appeal by Ms. Nita against the order of Delhi Medical Council and noted that Dr. Rinkesh Chawla had been asked to appear before the Ethics Committee and he has appeared today and has given a statement which is as under:-*

*Statement of Dr. Rinkesh Chawla*

*I, Dr. Rinkesh Chawla, did my MBBS from Medical College, Meerut in the year 2000. My date of Birth is 25.7.1973. I am registered with Delhi Medical Council vide Registration No. 16821 in the year 2002. I am doing job as a Resident Medical Officer in Khanna Nursing Home from 2002 to till date.*

*On 1.6.2006, Ms. Neeta was brought by the Police as a road traffic accident case. After examining, her x-ray was done which shown that a fracture of posterior malleolus. Dr. R. K. Kapoor, Orthopaedic Surgeon was called within time for this patient. He came and put a plaster and patient was discharged the same day with proper prescription and x-ray report etc. She was called for the next day for check-up but she never came back again. She was brought by the police and she refused for any MLC, this was given by her in writing and the same paper is being enclosed with my statement. That's why MLC was not made. As far as, complaint of Ms. Neeta is concerned I would like to bring to your kind notice most important fact. When I appeared Delhi Medical Council in response to her complaint with the same, complainant Ms. Neeta was asked to identify me in the room and she failed to even identify me and also stated on record that neither had she seen me before nor she ever had any interaction with me.*

- Q. Did you examine, any other part of the patient to know about the possible injury?*  
*A. I examined properly but did not found any injury.*

*Thanking you,*

*Sd/-  
(Dr. Rinkesh Chawla)*

*The Ethics Committee decided that the matter would require further consideration at one of its next meetings."*

*The Ethics Committee further noted that as requested Ms. Nita has come to appear before the Ethics Committee today i.e. on 16/09/2009. Ms. Nita has submitted the copies of the documents available with her to the Ethics Committee and has made the following statement:-*

*Statement of Mrs. Nita*

*I, Ms. Nita, R/o C-2B/30-B, Janak Puri, Delhi, declares the following:-*

*I met an accident on 1.7.2006 at about 6.00 p.m. I was taken to casualty of Khanna Hospital by the local residents/people of that society. No police man was present and accompanied me to the hospital. Subsequently, local people informed the PCR and PCR reached at about 7.00. p.m. in hospital casualty. But they did not record my statement. No doctor has attended me till 7.00 p.m.*



*Then PCR, Police men informed by local Police Station. After that one ASI(Assistant Sub Inspector) Mr. Uttam Chand, came at casualty of the hospital at about 8.30 p.m.. I was not attended by doctors till then. I was bleeding from the Right Elbow, Right Knee and Right Leg. After came over of ASI from local police Station, doctor started attending me at 8.30. p.m. and the x-ray of Ankle and Knee Joint were taken. An Orthopedic Surgeon came there at 10.30 p.m. and saw me. Subsequently, the Orthopedic Surgeon applied plaster at 10.40 p.m. A Prescription was given by the doctor and about 11.00 p.m. he advised me to come on next day. Before leaving the nursing home doctors took my signature on a blank paper. I went of my own home with Riksha. Next day was Sunday, therefore, I did not went/attend the Khanna Hospital but reached at Khanna Hospital on 4.7.2006 and they refused to saw me at that day and also refused to provide my x-ray and other record. From 1.7.2006 to 15.7.2006, I did not go anywhere, did not consult any other Orthopaedics because I was not in a condition to move alone. And at that time I was not taken any treatment. On 5.9.2006, I am consulted with Dr. Gopal Goel and I told him about my back ache. He advised me for x-ray and MRI and the x-ray and MRI was taken and he suggested me to go in Spinal Injury Centre, Vasant Kunj. Now my treatment is going from that hospital.*

*Q.1 Did you want MLC for medico-legal purpose?*

*A.1. Yes, I wanted.*

*Q.2. Was MLC refused by you?*

*A.2. No, rather I was interested.*

*Thanking you,*

*Sd/-  
(Nita)*

*The Ethics Committee decided that the concerned doctors may once again be called to appear before the Committee at one of its next meetings."*

*As per above decision, Dr. Subhash Khanna, Dr. R.K. Kapoor & Dr. Rinkesh Chawla vide Council's letter each dated 20/11/2009 have been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 14/12/2009 at 10:30 A.M.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to appeal by Ms. Nita against the Order dated 04.02.2008 of Delhi Medical Council and noted the following:-*

*a) Appeal by Ms. Nita against the order dated 04.02.2008 of Delhi Medical Council*

*b) As requested Dr. Rinkesh Chawla, Dr. Subhash Chander Khanna and Dr. R. K. Kapoor have come to appear before the Ethics Committee today i.e. 14<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 and have given the following statements:-*

b(i)

Statement of Dr. Rinkesh Chawla.

*I Dr. Rinkesh Chawla was RMO(Resident Medical Officer) in Khanna Nursing Home, at that time. My date of Birth is 25.7.1973. I did my MBBS from LLRM Medical College, Meerut, in the year 2000. I am registered with Delhi Medical Council vide Registration No. DMC-16821.*

*Q. 1. When did you see the patient and what was the complaint?*

*A. I saw the patient in the evening hours and complaint was pain over her foot. I am not remembering properly whether it was right or left.*

*Q.2 What was the history of the case?*

*A. Her foot was rolled over by a Maruti Car Tyre.*

*Q.3 Did the car hit her from behind or from the side?*

*A. She was rolled over by the car tyre.*

*Q.4 Did she fall?*

*A. No.*

*Q.5 What was your observation?*

*A. I have examined the patient fully and found that Tenderness and Swelling over her foot then I have asked her for x-ray.*

*Q.6. What did you find from x-ray?*

*A. X-ray showed fracture.*

*Q.7 Where did you find the fracture?*

*A. Fracture of the Ankle.*

*Q.8. Did you advise her for admission?*

*A. Yes, I had verbally advised her.*

*Q.9 Did you make any entry in the Accident Entry Register?*

*A. No.*

*Q.10 Reason for not making entry?*

*A. There was not any provision for making such entries for accidental cases.*

*Q.11 Did the patient came alone or accompanied by any person?*

*A. She came alongwith local peoples and policemen.*

*Q.12 Do you think, it is a Medico Legal Case?*

*A. Yes.*

*Q.13. If, it is a medico legal case, then why she was not admitted?*

*A. I advised her but she refused to get admitted.*

*Q.14 Had you taken any written statement from her?*

*A. No*

*Q.15 Did you take in writing that she did not want admission?*

*A. No.*

Q.16. *Did you call the surgeon to examine the patient?*

A. *I called Dr. S. C. Khanna, Owner of the Khanna Nursing Home. He was with me and fully examined the patient.*

Q.17 *Did you ask for the Ultrasound of the Abdomen?*

A. *No.*

Q.18 *Tell Me the reason?*

A. *She was not giving any complaint of Abdomen. She was not giving any history of trauma to her Abdomen.*

Q.19 *How many hours patient remained in the OP?*

A. *Around two and a half to three hours, patient was in the OP.*

Q.20 *Whom did you call to examined the patient?*

A. *I called Dr. S.C. Khanna, Surgeon and Dr. R. K. Kapoor, Orthopaedic Surgeon to examined the patient.*

Q.21 *Who came first and saw the patient?*

A. *Dr. Khanna came first and seen the patient.*

Q.22 *Has he recorded any case-sheet?*

A. *No.*

Q.23 *Is there any observation written down by Dr. Khanna?*

A. *He has not written any observation.*

Q.25. *Is this a grievance injury or simple injury?*

A. *It is a grievance injury.*

Q.26 *Did you take consent of the police before sending the patient home?*

A. *She has given it in writing that she did not want any police case.*

Q.27 *Have you taken any written statement from the patient that she was not willing to get admission?*

A. *No.*

*Sd/-  
(Dr. Rinkesh Chawla)*

b(ii)

*Statement of Dr.Subhash Chander Khanna*

*I, Dr.Subhash Chander Khanna did my MBBS in the year 1965 from MAMC, New Delhi and did my M.S. (Gen.Surgery) in the year 1970 from the same institution. My date of birth is 8.11.1943. My registration number is 10823 from Delhi Medical Council.*

*Earlier I was a teacher in University College of Medical Sciences, Delhi.*

*The Ethics Committee put the following questions to Dr. S.C. Khanna as under:-*

Q. *When the patient came in the evening, who saw the first?*

Ans. *Both of us simultaneously Dr.Rinkesh Chawla & myself.*

*Q. Did you examine the patient fully?*

*Ans. Yes.*

*Q. Did you record your observation?*

*Ans. No. Observation recorded by Dr.Rinkesh Chawla (RMO).*

*Q. Why you have not recorded your observations inspite of it being an accident?*

*Ans. Because the RMO recorded the findings on the OPD slip.*

*Q. How did you rule-out the injury to other areas?*

*Ans. I examined the patient in detail and found that she had no other injury.*

*Q. Have you recorded in the case file?*

*Ans. No*

*Q. Where is your observation report?*

*Ans. Those are with the patient.*

*Q. Why you not kept in the hospital record?*

*Ans. Because it was an OPD patient. The photocopy of the OPD slip is with me.*

*Q. Is it an accident case, do you have an accident register?*

*Ans. No (I have an MLC register).*

*Q. Has it made an MLC on that day?*

*Ans. Patient was brought by the Police and patient gave a statement to the Police duly signed by her that I do not want a police case.*

*Q. Is it a patient or the police choice to make a case as Medico-legal?*

*Ans. It is my choice. But in this particular case, the policeman himself brought the patient and the patient gave a statement of not filing a medico legal case duly signed by her.*

*Q. Are you not deviating from the medical juris prudent guidelines?*

*Ans. I do not know.*

*Q. Why you have not admitted for observation when the patient sustained greivous injury due to road accident?*

*Ans. She had only fracture near the ankle joint and did not have any signs like head injury, abdominal injury or chest injury. Her vital signs were normal.*

*Q. Is it not important to record your observations about the patient's condition in a road traffic accident?*

*Ans. Because it was an orthopaedic case that is why it was not done.*

*Q. Is it Orthopaedic surgeon note given to you as per the orthopaedic surgeon statement? Will you able to show to us?*

*Ans. She was treated an OPD case and the record was given to the patient.*

*Q. Why you have not retained the copy of the report?*

*Ans. Presently, I have a photocopy of the record.*

*Sd/-  
(Dr. Subhash Chander  
Khanna)*

***b(iii)*** *Statement of Dr.R.K. Kapoor*

*I, Dr. R.K. Kapoor did my MBBS from AIIMS, New Delhi in the year 1988. I did my M.S.(Orthopaedics) from the AIIMS, New Delhi in the year 1991. My date of birth is 22.12.1964. My registration number is MCI-7850 & DMC-11169.*

*The Ethics Committee put following questions to Dr.R.K. Kapoor which are as under:-*

*Q. Did you examine the patient's spine?*

*Ans. Yes.*

*Q. Have you written about your observations about the spine?*

*Ans. In my memory yes.*

*Q. To whom did you handover the case file/record?*

*Ans. I examined and wrote my observations regarding the patient and gave it to Dr.Rinkesh Chawla in Khanna Nursing Home?*

*Q. Was there any injury to the spine or disc prolapse?*

*Ans. No*

*Q. How did you rule out to disc prolapse without MRI or X-ray?*

*Ans. Patient did not complaint of any pain or injury to the spine and there was no local tenderness that time to warrant any X-ray or MRI.*

*Q. Have you recorded the above statement in your observation record?*

*Ans. I do not remember at present as I have not seen the record for the last 3 years.*

*Sd/-  
(Dr.R.K. Kapoor)*

*c) Delhi Medical Council has issued an Order dated 4.2.2008 in the above matter. The operative part of the decision is as under:*

- 1. That since this was a case of road traffic accident, it was obligatory on the part of doctors of Khanna Nursing Home to initiate a MLC and more so when the X-ray of Ms. Neeta done on 1.7.2006 revealed a fracture.*
- 2. The patient sustained injury right ankle, fracture posterior malleolous, for which POP cast was applied at the Nursing Home as form of standard treatment for ankle injury.*
- 3. Back trauma can cause a PIVD L 4-5+ L5 S1 to back without an associated fracture.*

*In light of the observations made hereinabove, the Delhi Medical Council issues a warning to Dr. Rinkesh Chawla, Dr. Subhash Khanna and Dr. R. K.*

*Kapoor for failing to initiate MLC in this case. It is further held that line of treatment adopted in the management of this case was in accordance with professional practices in such cases and since the X-rays and the prescription slip dated 1.7.2006 of Khanna Nursing Home were produced by the complainant herself before the Council, no case of unethical conduct on the part of Khanna Nursing Home is made out for non supply of medical records."*

- d) *In view of above, the Ethics Committee after due deliberations, unanimously decided that the name of Dr. Subhash Chander Khanna be temporarily erased from the Indian Medical Register for a period of 3(three) months for not making the MLC(Medico Legal Case) and not admitting the patient.*

*The name of RMO, Dr. Rinkesh Chawla be temporarily erased from the Indian Medical Register for a period of 3(Three) months for not making the MLC (Medico Legal Case) and not admitting the patient."*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that Delhi Medical Council while considering the complaint filed by complainant Ms. Nita in its decision dated 04.02.2008 had decided as under:-*

- "1. That since this was a case of road traffic accident, it was obligatory on the part of doctors of Khanna Nursing Home to initiate a MLC and more so when the X-ray of Ms. Neeta done on 1.7.2006 revealed a fracture.*
- 2. The patient sustained injury right ankle, fracture posterior malleolous, for which POP cast was applied at the Nursing Home as form of standard treatment for ankle injury.*
- 3. Back trauma can cause a PIVD L 4-5+ L5 S1 to back without an associated fracture.*

*In light of the observations made hereinabove, the Delhi Medical Council issues a warning to Dr. Rinkesh Chawla, Dr. Subhash Khanna and Dr. r. K. Kapoor for failing to initiate MLC in this case. It is further held that line of treatment adopted in the management of this case was in accordance with professional practices in such cases and since the X-rays and the prescription slip dated 1.7.2006 of Khanna Nursing Home were produced by the complainant herself before the Council, no case of unethical conduct on the part of Khanna Nursing Home is made out for non supply of medical records."*

*It was further observed that the Ethics Committee while enhancing the punishment from warning to eraser the names of Dr. Subhash Khanna and Dr. Rinkesh Chawla has not indicated the specific reasons for doing so.*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*The matter was re-considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 15/02/2010 and the decision was as under:-*

*"The members of the Ethics Committee re-considered the matter with regards to appeal by Ms. Nita against the order dated 04.02.2008 of Delhi Medical Council, in the light of the Executive Committee decision dated 05.02.2010. The Ethics Committee reviewed the decision of Delhi Medical Council and was convinced that the warning would suffice in this case. The warning should be issued to Dr. Subhash Chander Khanna, Director, Khanna Nursing Home and Dr. Rinkesh Chawla, RMO, Khanna Nursing Home for not registering the case as Medico Legal case. Dr. R. K. Kapoor has done his professional duties as visiting Orthopaedic Surgeon and he is exonerated.*

*In view of above and after due deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee decided to approve the decision of the Ethics Committee to exonerate Dr. R.K. Kapoor and further decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council to issue warning to Dr. Subhash Chander Khanna, Director, Khanna Nursing Home and Dr. Rinkesh Chawla, RMO, Khanna Nursing Home for not registering the case as a medico legal case."*

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11.03.2010 decided that Dr. Subhash Chander Khanna, Director, Khanna Nursing Home and Dr. Rinkesh Chawla, RMO, Khanna Nursing Home had erred in not registering the case as a medico legal case and further decided to issue warning to Dr. Subhash Chander Khanna and Dr. Rinkesh Chawla to strictly follow the guidelines/provisions laid down in Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette & Ethics) Regulations, 2002. This fact may be recorded in the Indian Medical Register.

Further, the General Body of the Council decided that Dr.R. K. Kapoor has done his professional duties as a visited Orthopaedic Surgeon and further decided that no case of medical negligence is established against Dr. R. K. Kapoor and he may be exonerated.

**84. Approval of SRM Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Kancheepuram, Tamil Nadu for the award of MBBS degree granted by SRM University, Tamil Nadu.**

Read: The Council Inspectors report (10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> February, 2010) for Approval of SRM Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Kancheepuram, Tamil Nadu for the award of MBBS degree granted by SRM University, Tamil Nadu.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council considered the Council Inspectors report (10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> February, 2010) and decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council that SRM Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Kancheepuram, Tamil Nadu be approved for the award of MBBS degree granted by SRM University, Tamil Nadu restricting the number of admissions to 150 (One hundred fifty) students per year.

The members of the Executive Committee of the Council further decided to recommend to the Central Govt. to renew the permission for admission of 6<sup>th</sup> batch of 150 (One hundred fifty) MBBS students at SRM Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Kancheepuram, Tamil Nadu for the academic session 2010-2011."

**85 Gross deficiencies of teaching faculty, Residents & Clinical material observed during Council inspections at various colleges in the country.**

Read: The matter with regard to Gross deficiencies of teaching faculty, Residents & Clinical material observed during Council inspections at various colleges in the country along with the following recommendations of the Executive Committee.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the report of the Sub-committee constituted to look into the matter and after due deliberations decided to approve the report of the sub-committee as under:

"... That as per Establishment of Medical College Regulations, 1999, the permission to establish a medical college and admit students is granted initially for a period of one year which is renewed on yearly basis subject to verification of achievement of annual targets. As per Section 8(3) of these Regulations, the medical institutes are required to inform the Council six months prior to the expiry of the permission about the status of development of infrastructure and availability of teaching faculty, Residents and clinical material, etc. in the institute till such time formal recognition of the medical college is granted. As per the instructions issued by the Council from time to time, the institutes are required to deposit the standard inspection forms and declaration forms of teaching faculty and Residents by 15<sup>th</sup> October for scrutiny and verification.

However, it is observed that in several instances, whenever a regular inspection to verify the teaching faculty, residents and infrastructure facilities for renewal of permission / recognition for award of M.B;B.S. degree / periodical inspection for continuance of recognition / pre PG inspection is carried out by the Council inspectors, gross deficiencies of shortage of teaching faculty, Residents and clinical material are observed, besides other deficiencies of infrastructure, etc. When such inspection reports are placed before the Executive Committee for consideration, on account of such gross deficiencies, the Executive Committee of the Council decides to recommend to the Central Government not to issue renewal of permission or to issue notice to the institutes for rectification of deficiencies, as the case may be.

The decision of the Executive Committee is communicated to the Central Govt. and to the institute, further requesting the institute to submit its compliance within a specified time period. However, it is observed that the institutes submit the compliance only at the last possible moment nearer to the end of the time schedule as prescribed under the Regulations or time limit as extended by Hon. Supreme Court or by the Central Govt. This



results in a situation wherein the time interval available to the Council for conducting the inspections is too short as many inspections have to be carried out by the Council in a short period of time. For instance, for the Academic Year 2009-10, 43 inspections for verification of compliance were carried out by the Council during the period from 12<sup>th</sup> May to 7<sup>th</sup> June (i.e. 3 weeks). Thereafter, the Central Govt. vide its letter dt. 23.06.2009 and 26.06.2009 had requested the Council to send its recommendations by 8<sup>th</sup> July 2009.

Thus 30 inspections had to be carried out by the Council in a span of 12 days as the meeting of the Executive Committee had to be convened on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2009 for considering the inspection reports. Almost always, it is observed that during such inspections carried out by Council inspectors in such a short period, the deficiencies of teaching faculty, Residents and clinical material are found to be rectified by the institutes and the recommendation to renew the permission is made to the Central Government. In all these cases also positive recommendations for granting renewal of permission were sent to the Central Govt. as the deficiencies were found to be rectified on inspections carried out in such short period.

It is further observed that when the regular inspection in such institutes is carried out for renewal of permission for the next Academic Year or pursuant to the order of Hon. High Courts or on receipt of complaints forwarded by the Central Govt. in such institutes, the gross deficiencies of teaching faculty, Residents and clinical material are observed once again. Such a cycle of gross deficiencies, rectification of such deficiencies and gross deficiencies has been observed in many institutes during last several years.

As per the prevalent practice, the details furnished by the teachers in their Declaration Forms which are signed by the teachers and countersigned by the Deans, are sent for verification with concerned colleges. It has been observed that in some instances, the concerned institutes report that such a teacher has never worked at the institute or has worked in a different capacity than claimed by the teacher during the said period. Thus, the teacher is found to have submitted a fake / forged document. In such cases, the Executive Committee has decided not to consider him as a member of the teaching faculty and to initiate action against such teachers by filing FIR with police authorities as well as taking action under the code of Ethics. In the FIR filed against the teacher, it is also mentioned that if it is brought to the notice of police authorities that the management of the institute has colluded with the teacher, appropriate action should be initiated against the management also.

The Committee taking stock of the relevant documents brought before it observed that for the inspections carried out for renewal of permission for the academic year 2010-11 till date the Executive of the Council has not recommended renewal of permission in case of 37 institutes in varying batches (from 2<sup>nd</sup> batch upto 6<sup>th</sup>) wherein the deficiency of teaching faculty, residents, and clinical material in terms of OPD & IPD has been observed in table-I and annexed as Annexure-I.

Analyzing the said table, it is seen that the shortage of teaching faculty more than 20% is observed in 21 cases. Similarly, the shortage of residents more than 20% has been observed in 29 cases. Likewise, the bed occupancy of less than 60% is observed in 23 cases.

.....

In view of above, the recommendations of the Sub-Committee are as under:-

(A) Colleges in the stage upto II renewal (i.e. Admission of third batch):

If it is observed during any regular inspection of the institute that the deficiency of teaching faculty and/or Residents is more than 30% and/or bed occupancy is < 60 %, such an institute will not be considered for renewal of permission in that Academic Year.

(B) Colleges in the stage from III renewal (i.e. Admission of fourth batch) till recognition of the institute for award of M.B;B.S. degree:

If it is observed during any regular inspection of the institute that the deficiency of teaching faculty and/or Residents is more than 20% and/or bed occupancy is < 70 %, such an institute will not be considered for renewal of permission in that Academic Year.

(C) Colleges which are already recognized for award of M.B;B.S. degree and/or running Postgraduate Courses:

If it is observed during any regular inspection of the institute that the deficiency of teaching faculty and/or Residents is more than 10% and/or bed occupancy is < 80 %, such an institute will not be considered for processing applications for postgraduate courses in that Academic Year and will be issued show cause notices as to why the recommendation for withdrawal of recognition of the courses run by that institute should not be made.

(D) Colleges which are found to have employed teachers with faked / forged documents:

If it is observed that any institute is found to have employed a teacher with faked / forged documents and have submitted the Declaration Form of such a teacher, such an institute will not be considered for renewal of permission / recognition for award of M.B;B.S. degree / processing the applications for postgraduate courses for two Academic Years – i.e. that Academic Year and the next Academic Year also.

However, the office of the Council shall ensure that such inspections are not carried out at least 3 days before upto 3 days after important religious and festival holidays declared by the Central/State Govt....."

The members of the Executive Committee further observed that in today's meeting also there are 22 instances where the colleges have not been recommended for renewal of permission or for approval on account of deficiencies of teaching faculty, residents, OPD attendance, bed occupancy, teaching beds and other important infrastructure. It was also observed that considering all the 59 cases (i.e. 37 institutes considered by the Sub-Committee + 22 cases considered

by the Executive Committee in today's meeting), it is seen that the shortage of teaching faculty more than 20% observed in 30 cases, deficiency of residents more than 20% is observed in 41 cases. Likewise, bed occupancy of less than 60% is observed in 28 cases. Thus the average deficiency observed is as under:-

Teaching faculty shortage	-	30.29%
Residents shortage	-	45.15%
OPD attendance shortage	-	389 as required at the relevant stage
Bed occupancy	-	45.78% against the requirement of 80%

In view of above and after due deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council further decided that accordingly clause 8(3) of Establishment of Medical College Regulations, 1999 may be further amended by inserting the second proviso as under:-

8 (3) (1) The permission to establish a medical college and admit students may be granted initially for a period of one year and may be renewed on yearly basis subject to verification of the achievements of annual targets. It shall be the responsibility of the person to apply to the Medical Council of India for purpose of renewal six months prior to the expiry of the initial permission. This process of renewal of permission will continue till such time the establishment of the medical college and expansion of the hospital facilities are completed and a formal recognition of the medical college is granted. Further admissions shall not be made at any stage unless the requirements of the Council are fulfilled. The Central Government may at any stage convey the deficiencies to the applicant and provide him an opportunity and time to rectify the deficiencies.

Further provided that in respect of

(a) Colleges in the stage upto II renewal (i.e. Admission of third batch):

If it is observed during any regular inspection of the institute that the deficiency of teaching faculty and/or Residents is more than 30% and/or bed occupancy is < 60 %, such an institute will not be considered for renewal of permission in that Academic Year.

(b) Colleges in the stage from III renewal (i.e. Admission of fourth batch) till recognition of the institute for award of M.B;B.S. degree:

If it is observed during any regular inspection of the institute that the deficiency of teaching faculty and/or Residents is more than 20% and/or bed occupancy is < 70 %, such an institute will not be considered for renewal of permission in that Academic Year.

(c) Colleges which are already recognized for award of M.B;B.S. degree and/or running Postgraduate Courses:

If it is observed during any regular inspection of the institute that the deficiency of teaching faculty and/or Residents is more than 10% and/or bed occupancy is < 80 %, such an institute will not be considered for processing applications for postgraduate courses in that Academic Year and will be issued show cause notices as to why the recommendation for withdrawal of recognition of the courses run by that institute should not be made for Undergraduate and Postgraduate courses which are recognized u/s 11(2) of

the IMC Act, 1956 along with direction of stoppage of admissions in permitted Postgraduate courses.

(d) Colleges which are found to have employed teachers with faked / forged documents:

If it is observed that any institute is found to have employed a teacher with faked / forged documents and have submitted the Declaration Form of such a teacher, such an institute will not be considered for renewal of permission / recognition for award of M.B.B.S. degree / processing the applications for postgraduate courses for two Academic Years – i.e. that Academic Year and the next Academic Year also.

However, the office of the Council shall ensure that such inspections are not carried out at least 3 days before upto 3 days after important religious and festival holidays declared by the Central/State Govt."

- (2) The recognition so granted to an Undergraduate Course for award of MBBS degree shall be for a maximum period of 5 years, upon which it shall have to be renewed.
- (3) The procedure for 'Renewal' of recognition shall be same as applicable for the award of recognition.
- (4) Failure to seek timely renewal of recognition as required in sub-clause (a) supra shall invariably result in stoppage of admissions to the concerned Undergraduate Course of MBBS at the said institute."

**86. The matter pertaining to definition of Resident Doctor as well as requirement of Senior Residents in medical college.**

Read: The Sub-Committee report to look into the matter pertaining to definition of Resident Doctor as well as requirement of Senior Residents in medical.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the report of the Sub-Committee to look into the matter pertaining to the definition of Resident Doctor as well as requirement of Senior Residents in medical college as under:-

**"Preamble**

Resident doctors have been long continued to be regarded as the backbone of health care delivery and patient care in a large hospital – both teaching and non-teaching. The young doctors recruited according to the policy of the hospital are the first line of physicians who directly deal with the patients from their admission to their discharge and supervise the patient during their investigations and treatment in the hospital under supervision of consultants. The system of residency thus provides the young doctor one of the best opportunities of working, caring for the patients, performing investigative and treatment procedures and thus getting the greatest opportunity of hands on training, acquisition of skills and learning under supervision of specialists and teachers. In

teaching hospitals and medical colleges the resident not only gets the opportunity of learning, but also the opportunity of teaching their juniors and medical students. This is also the period when they learn the management of all kinds of emergency patients and tackling of all kinds of emergency situations. The period of residency is considered as the golden period in a doctor's life.

However, due to lack of uniform policy and regulations this period is also such when the young doctors are put to work for unhealthy hours, not provided with decent accommodation and emoluments and at times mercilessly exploited by employers and management of hospitals leading not only to work stress, frustrations, hardships etc. but all these conspire to rob the young doctor one of the most productive and satisfying period of his / her life.

.....

### **Definition of a Resident Doctor**

The Committee felt that definition of resident doctors would necessarily mean defining the nature, categories, duties, responsibilities and working conditions of a resident doctor. Only then the definition can be comprehensive. Therefore, the three-member committee proceeded for such a comprehensive and inclusive definition of resident doctors.

### **Resident Doctors**

#### **1. Generic Definition**

A resident doctor shall primarily be defined as a registered doctor who stay and work in residence in the hospital of a medical college on whole time basis where he / she is employed under supervision of medical teacher's and essentially shall be non practicing.

This definition shall be equally applicable to all.

#### **2. Categories of Resident Doctors**

A resident doctor would be primarily of two categories, viz., (a) Senior Residents, and (b) Residents.

- a) **Senior Resident** : Senior Resident shall be a registered doctor who either has.
  - i) a recognized post graduate degree from a statutory university with 3 years experience of residency in the concerned speciality, or
  - ii) a recognized postgraduate diploma from a statutory university in the concerned specialty with 1 year residency experience in the concerned specialty obtained before or after acquiring the PG diploma or,
  - iii) A graduate doctor with recognized MBBS degree and registered in IMR who has got 3 (three) years experience as a resident doctor in the concerned speciality.
- b) **Resident** :- An doctor with a recognized MBBS qualification registered in the IMR shall be eligible to be a Resident.  
All doctors admitted into postgraduate degree and diploma courses under a statutory university in residency programme shall also be resident.

#### **3. Duties and Responsibilities**

The duties and responsibilities of resident doctors shall be as such.

- a) **Patient Care:** A resident/ senior resident shall be primarily responsible for the care of the patients put under his / her charge in the unit / ward. He / She be thorough, meticulous, caring and compassionate in dealing with the patients and shall always consider the interest of the patient as his / her primary concern.
- b) **Out Patient Work:** Patient Care in OPD.
- c) **Emergency:** Patient care and management in emergency situations.
- d) **Investigation and Management:** Investigation of patients in diagnostic laboratories of the institution both non-invasive and invasive that are entrusted to him / her. Residents shall perform these duties under direct supervision of senior residents/consultants.
- e) **Teaching:** In teaching institutes residents (PG) may be with bedside clinical teaching of undergraduate students. Senior residents may be entrusted with bedside teaching, tutorials and other teaching assignments for both undergraduate and postgraduate students.
- f) **Research:** Resident doctors, senior resident in a teaching institute may be entrusted with such medical research activities as are approved.

**4. Accommodation**

- a) The resident doctor shall be provided accommodation by the hospital authorities within the hospital premise or campus to facilitate their optimum working and ease.
- b) The accommodation shall be decent, clean and hygienic with cooking/ messing /canteen facilities.
- c) For residents both PG and non PG and unmarried senior residents, hostel type single room bachelors accommodation is to be provided.
- d) For married senior residents accommodation with attached bath and toilet are to be provided.

**5. Emoluments**

The stipend of resident doctors should be commensurate with their status and work and should be not less than Central/State Government stipend.  
Scheme for Rationalization of Number of Resident Doctors in a Medical College

**1) Clinical Department:**

The Three Member Committee worked out a scheme for rationalization of Resident doctors in the medical college as under:

1. The Committee took into consideration the bed strength prescribed for a hundred admissions medical college for its recommendations.
2. The recommendations are based on the workload, pattern of work and necessity of manpower at this level.
3. For 50 and 150 admission the requirement of number of admission would be based on these calculations.
4. The unit of 30-40 beds is taken as a unit for determining the number of resident in broad specialities and in case of super specialities, it is 20-30.
5. The general principle is followed that there shall be minimum 1 (one) Senior resident and 2 (two) residents for each unit.
6. Keeping in view the heavy, executive, night and emergency duties, the Committee recommends the following number department wise:-

Dept.	z o	z o	z o	No. of Residents
-------	-----	-----	-----	------------------

				<b>Present Regulations</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Medicine	120	4	4	12	10
Surgery	120	4	4	12	10
Obst. & Gynae	60	2	4	6	4
Eye	20	1	1	3	2
ENT	20	1	1	3	2
Chest	20	1	1	3	2
Skin	10	1	1	3	1
Psychiatry	10	1	1	3	1
Paediatrics	60	2	2	6	4
Ortho	60	2	2	6	4
				57	40

## 2) Departments of Anaesthesiology, Radio-diagnosis and pathology

In case of Radio-diagnosis, Anaesthesia the equivalent of Senior Resident shall be designated as Tutors and the minimum numbers considering an hundred admissions colleges shall be as such:

<b>Department</b>	<b>No. of Tutors.</b>
(i) Anaesthesia	3 (Total 6)
- for ICU	3
(ii) Radio-diagnosis	3
(iii) Pathology	6
- Blood Bank	3

## 3) Pre and Para clinical departments

In case of the following pre/para clinical departments the equivalent of senior residents shall be designated as demonstrators and their number shall be as such:-

	<b>Department</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>No. of demonstrators</b>
1.	Anatomy	4	3
2.	Physiology (including biophysics)	3	3
3.	Biochemistry	2	3
4.	Microbiology	2	3
5.	Pharmacology	4	3
6.	Forensic Medicine	4	3
7.	Community Medicine	4	3
		23	21

After due deliberations and considering the Minimum Standard Requirements prescribed under the regulations, the members of the Executive Committee decided to approve the report of the Sub-Committee as under:-

## Resident Doctors

### 1. Generic Definition

A resident doctor shall primarily be defined as a registered doctor who stay and work in residence in the hospital of a medical college on whole time basis where he / she is employed under supervision of medical teacher's and essentially shall be non practicing.

This definition shall be equally applicable to all.

### 2. Categories of Resident Doctors

A resident doctor would be primarily of two categories, viz., (a) Senior Residents, and (b) Residents.

**a) Senior Resident :** Senior Resident shall be a registered doctor who either has.

- i) a recognized post graduate degree from a statutory university with 3 years experience of residency in the concerned speciality while pursuing degree course, or
- ii) a recognized postgraduate diploma from a statutory university in the concerned specialty with 2 years experience of residency in the concerned specialty while pursuing diploma course and 1 year residency experience in the concerned specialty obtained after acquiring the PG diploma or,
- iii) A graduate doctor with recognized MBBS degree and registered in IMR who has got 3 (three) years experience as a resident doctor in the concerned speciality.

**b) Resident :-** An doctor with a recognized MBBS qualification registered in the IMR shall be eligible to be a Resident. All doctors admitted into postgraduate degree and diploma courses under a statutory university in residency programme shall also be resident.

### 3. Duties and Responsibilities

The duties and responsibilities of resident doctors shall be as such.

- a) Patient Care:** A resident/ senior resident shall be primarily responsible for the care of the patients put under his / her charge in the unit / ward. He / She be thorough, meticulous, caring and compassionate in dealing with the patients and shall always consider the interest of the patient as his / her primary concern.
- b) Out Patient Work:** Patient Care in OPD.
- c) Emergency:** Patient care and management in emergency situations.
- d) Investigation and Management:** Investigation of patients in diagnostic laboratories of the institution both non-invasive and invasive that are entrusted to him / her. Residents shall perform these duties under direct supervision of senior residents/consultants.
- e) Teaching:** In teaching institutes residents (PG) may be with bedside clinical teaching of undergraduate students. Senior residents may be entrusted with bedside teaching, tutorials and other teaching assignments for both undergraduate and postgraduate students.
- f) Research:** Resident doctors, senior resident in a teaching institute may be entrusted with such medical research activities as are approved.



#### 4. Accommodation

- i) The resident doctor shall be provided accommodation by the hospital authorities within the hospital premise or campus to facilitate their optimum working and ease.
- ii) The accommodation shall be decent, clean and hygienic with cooking/ messing /canteen facilities.
- iii) For residents both PG and non PG and unmarried senior residents, hostel type single room bachelors accommodation is to be provided.
- iv) For married senior residents accommodation with attached bath and toilet are to be provided.

#### 5. Emoluments

The stipend of resident doctors should be commensurate with their status and work and should be not less than Central/State Government stipend.

#### Scheme for Rationalization of Number of Resident Doctors in a Medical College

##### 1) Clinical Department:

1. The general principle is followed that there shall be minimum 1 (one) Senior resident and 2 (two) residents for each unit.
2. Keeping in view the heavy, executive, night and emergency duties, the Committee recommends the following number department wise:-

##### a. For 50 admissions:-

Dept.	No. of Beds	No. of Units	No. of Senior	No. of Residents	
				Present Regulations	Recommendation
Medicine	96	3	3	9	6
Surgery	96	3	3	9	6
Obst. & Gynae	48	2	2	6	4
Eye	16	1	1	3	2
ENT	16	1	1	3	2
Chest	16	1	1	3	2
Skin	8	1	1	3	2
Psychiatry	8	1	1	3	2
Paediatrics	48	2	2	6	4
Ortho	48	2	2	6	4
				51	34

##### (B) For 100 admission:

Dept.	No. of Beds	No. of Units	No. of Senior	No. of Residents
-------	-------------	--------------	---------------	------------------

				Present Regulations	Recommendation
Medicine	120	4	4	12	8
Surgery	120	4	4	12	8
Obst. & Gynae	60	2	4	6	4
Eye	20	1	1	3	2
ENT	20	1	1	3	2
Chest	20	1	1	3	2
Skin	10	1	1	3	2
Psychiatry	10	1	1	3	2
Paediatrics	60	2	2	6	4
Ortho	60	2	2	6	4
				57	38

**(C) For 150 admission:**

Dept.	No. of Beds	No. of Units	No. of Senior	No. of Residents	
				Present Regulations	Recommendation
Medicine	180	6	6	18	12
Surgery	180	6	6	18	12
Obst. & Gynae	90	3	3	9	6
Eye	30	1	1	3	2
ENT	30	1	1	3	2
Chest	30	1	1	3	2
Skin	15	1	1	3	2
Psychiatry	15	1	1	3	2
Paediatrics	90	3	3	9	6
Ortho	90	3	3	9	6
				78	52

**2) Pre and Para clinical departments**

(A) For 100 admissions, in the following pre-clinical and para-clinical departments the requirement of Tutors shall be as under:-

	Department	Existing	Substituted
1.	Anatomy	4	3
2.	Pharmacology	4	3
3.	Forensic Medicine	4	3
4.	Community Medicine	4	3
		16	12

(B) For 150 admissions, in the following pre-clinical and para-clinical departments the requirement of Tutors shall be as under:-

	<b>Department</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Substituted</b>
1.	Anatomy	6	5
2.	Physiology (including biophysics)	6	5
3.	Pharmacology	6	5
4.	Community Medicine	6	5
		24	20

**87. Extension of services of Director, Academic Cell in the Council office.**

Read: The matter with regard to extension of services of Director, Academic Cell in the Council office.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to extend the services of Dr. M. Rajalakshmi as Director, Academic Cell for a further period of six months w.e.f. 24.03.2010."

**88. Extension of services of Dr. Sushma Vashisht as Whole Time Inspector.**

Read: The matter with regard to extension of services of Dr. Sushma Vashisht as Whole Time Inspector.

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to extend the services of Dr. Sushma Vashisht as Whole-Time Inspector of the Council for a period of six months w.e.f. 17.03.2010."

**89. Extension of services of Dr. M.C.R. Vyas as Whole Time Inspector.**

Read: The matter with regard to extension of services of Dr. M.C.R. Vyas as Whole Time Inspector.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to extend the services of Dr. M.C.R. Vyas as Whole-Time Inspector of the Council for a further period of six months w.e.f. 10.04.2010."

**90. Increase of post in Computer Section of the Council.**

Read: The matter with regard to Cadre review for creation of post in Computer Section.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Computer Section in Medical Council of India (MCI) has grown in infrastructure and services offered since 1999 resultantly the workload has increased manifold

In the year 1999, the Computer Section had 6 computers and the work on software development had just begun. None of the sections in MCI had any computerisation worth mentioning and a website for MCI also did not exist.

Since then, a number of pioneering initiatives have been under taken in the Computer Section and following are some of the major achievements in the past 10 years:

1. Each desk in MCI today has a computer and the organization is well equipped with Servers, Desktop Computers, Laptops, Printers, Scanners, Broad band internet connectivity, UPS, Switches, Local Area Networking, WI-FI connectivity, etc.,
2. Setting up of a very useful interactive website ([www.mciindia.org](http://www.mciindia.org)) with lots of useful information for common public.
3. Creation of 7.5 Lakhs plus records of Indian Medical Register in Electronic Form in English and Hindi.and an IMR Database for Reference.(At present, the data is maintained from the date of inception of MCI)
4. Setting up a system and software for receiving Registration details from State Medical Councils and updation into IMR Database.
5. Setting up a system and software for receiving Faculty Details from Medical Colleges and updation into a common Faculty Database.
6. Setting up an e-office management system for movement of daks/files to various sections and its timely diposal
7. The following sections have been computerised and all certificates and receipts are generated through a centralised system:
  - a. IMR
  - b. Registration
  - c. Good Standing
  - d. Additional Qualification
  - e. Eligibility
  - f. U.G.Section
  - g. P.G. Section
  - h. Diary & Dispatch System

Apart from these, computers are very effectively used for all word processing, Email and presentation requirements of all staff and officers in MCI, including preparation of CD-Roms for Agendas for meeting, leading to savings in lakhs for paper print outs for each meeting. It is needless to mention the intangible benefits in savings in time and effort to MCI officers, staff and doctors through the various computerisation initiatives undertaken in MCI in the last ten years.

However, this has increased the work load in the Computer Section by many fold and the pressure of work on human resources within the computer Section has increased many times in comparison to the past. It is also envisaged that the workload on Computer Section is going to increase in the near future as the

following new projects are being undertaken:

1. Installation of biometric card readers in all the medical colleges and its connection with the server in MCI for Faculty tracking and monitoring.
2. Implementation of Web (Internet) based e-learning and evaluation system.

Hence it can be summarised that the present nature of work load of the Council in the Computer section has increased manifold as under

1. Data entry work of faculty Database,
2. Computerization of Registration Systems,
3. IMR database,
4. Eligibility Certificate
5. Goodstanding
6. Maintenance of website with its regular updating work in MBBS,
7. PG Courses, Various Regulations, minutes of Meetings , IMR data , Faculty data etc.
8. Monitoring and scrutinizing of online data for applicants applying online for Registration, IMR, Good standing and Eligibility Certificates.
9. Scanning of all the Agenda, Reports, preparation of CD of each General Body Executive Committee Meetings, PG Committee Meetings and Subcommittee Meetings
10. Database Administration (DBA) of IMR Data , Registration Data , Eligibility Data
11. Network administration , Systems administration and Computer Hardware Administration
12. The administration and maintenance work of wireless (Wi-Fi ) networking systems
13. Day-to-day user support for operating of software systems
14. Co-ordination and Project Management of various software systems implemented
15. Training man-power

Besides above a new activity is also going to start due to installation of biometric card reader in all the medical colleges which will be connected with server to be installed in MCI office for faculty tracking and monitoring.

The Computer Section is at present equipped with One Computer Programmer and six Computer Operators in the council office and there are no posts in between. It can be seen that this requirement of One Computer Programmer was planned ten years back and it is in urgent need of review due to the ever increasing work load.

The present cadre strength of Computer Section is as under:-

Sl. No	Designation	Cadre	No. of existing post	Pay scale (Pre-Revised)	Pay scale (Revised Pay Band with grade Pay)
1.	Computer Programmer	Grade-A	1	8000-275-13500	15600-39100,5400
2.	Computer Operator	Grade-C	6	4000-100-6000	5200-20200, 2400

In view of above and after due deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to increase the posts in the Computer Section as under:-

Sl. No	Designation	Cadre	No. of posts to be created	Pay scale (Pre Revised)	Pay scale (Revised Pay Band with grade Pay)
1.	Computer Programmer	Grade-A	1	8000-275-13500	15600-39100,5400
2.	Computer Operator	Grade-C	2	4000-100-6000	5200-20200, 2400

### **91. Cadre review for creation of post in Computer Section.**

Read: The matter with regard to Cadre review for creation of post in Computer Section.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Computer Section in Medical Council of India (MCI) has grown in infrastructure and services offered since 1999 resultantly the workload has increased manifold

In the year 1999, the Computer Section had 6 computers and the work on software development had just begun. None of the sections in MCI had any computerisation worth mentioning and a website for MCI also did not exist.

Since then, a number of pioneering initiatives have been under taken in the Computer Section and following are some of the major achievements in the past 10 years:

1. Each desk in MCI today has a computer and the organization is well equipped with Servers, Desktop Computers, Laptops, Printers, Scanners, Broad band internet connectivity, UPS, Switches, Local Area Networking, WI-FI connectivity, etc.,
2. Setting up of a very useful interactive website ([www.mciindia.org](http://www.mciindia.org)) with lots of useful information for common public.
3. Creation of 7.5 Lakhs plus records of Indian Medical Register in Electronic Form in English and Hindi and an IMR Database for Reference. (At present, the data is maintained from the date of inception of MCI)
4. Setting up a system and software for receiving Registration details from State Medical Councils and updation into IMR Database.
5. Setting up a system and software for receiving Faculty Details from Medical Colleges and updation into a common Faculty Database.
6. Setting up an e-office management system for movement of daks/files to various sections and its timely diposal
7. The following sections have been computerised and all certificates and receipts are generated through a centralised system:

- a. IMR
- b. Registration
- c. Good Standing
- d. Additional Qualification
- e. Eligibility
- f. U.G.Section
- g. P.G. Section
- h. Diary & Dispatch System

Apart from these, computers are very effectively used for all word processing, Email and presentation requirements of all staff and officers in MCI, including preparation of CD-Roms for Agendas for meeting, leading to savings in lakhs for paper print outs for each meeting. It is needless to mention the intangible benefits in savings in time and effort to MCI officers, staff and doctors through the various computerisation initiatives undertaken in MCI in the last ten years.

However, this has increased the work load in the Computer Section by many fold and the pressure of work on human resources within the computer Section has increased many times in comparison to the past. It is also envisaged that the workload on Computer Section is going to increase in the near future as the following new projects are being undertaken:

3. Installation of biometric card readers in all the medical colleges and its connection with the server in MCI for Faculty tracking and monitoring.
4. Implementation of Web (Internet) based e-learning and evaluation system.

Hence it can be summarised that the present nature of work load of the Council in the Computer section has increased manifold as under

16. Data entry work of faculty Database,
17. Computerization of Registration Systems,
18. IMR database,
19. Eligibility Certificate
20. Goodstanding
21. Maintenance of website with its regular updating work in MBBS,
22. PG Courses, Various Regulations, minutes of Meetings , IMR data , Faculty data etc.
23. Monitoring and scrutinizing of online data for applicants applying online for Registration, IMR, Good standing and Eligibility Certificates.
24. Scanning of all the Agenda, Reports, preparation of CD of each General Body Executive Committee Meetings, PG Committee Meetings and Subcommittee Meetings
25. Database Administration (DBA) of IMR Data , Registration Data , Eligibility Data
26. Network administration , Systems administration and Computer Hardware Administration
27. The administration and maintenance work of wireless (Wi-Fi ) networking systems
28. Day-to-day user support for operating of software systems
29. Co-ordination and Project Management of various software systems implemented
30. Training man-power

Besides above a new activity is also going to start due to installation of biometric card reader in all the medical colleges which will be connected with server to be installed in MCI office for faculty tracking and monitoring.

The Computer Section is at present equipped with One Computer Programmer and six Computer Operators in the council office and there are no posts in between. It can be seen that this requirement of One Computer Programmer was planned ten years back and it is in urgent need of review due to the ever increasing work load.

The members of the Executive Committee of the Council further observed the present status of Computer Section as under:-

Sl. No	Designation	Cadre	No of existing post	Pay scale (Pre Revised)	Pay scale (Revised Pay Band with grade Pay)
1.	Computer Programmer	Grade-A	1	8000-275-13500	15600-39100,5400
2.	Computer Operator	Grade-C	6	4000-100-6000	5200-20200, 2400

“

After due deliberation, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to create the following posts as under:-

Sl. No	Designation	Cadre	No. of posts to be created	Pay scale (Pre Revised)	Pay scale (Revised Pay Band with grade Pay)
1.	Systems Analyst	Grade-A	1	12000-375-18000	15600-39100,7600
2.	Junior Computer Programmer	Grade-B	1	6500-200-10500	9300-34800,4200

**92. Minimum Standard Requirements for the Medical College for 200/250 Admissions Annually.**

Read: The matter with regard to Minimum Standard Requirements for the Medical College for 200/250 Admissions Annually.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

“The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Council after obtaining the prior approval of the Central Government has notified amendments to Minimum Standard Requirements for the Medical College for 50/100/150 Admissions Annually Regulations, 1999 for maximum number of admissions into MBBS Course vide Notification dated 14.12.2009, which is as under:-

“6. The maximum number of admissions in MBBS course shall not exceed 250 annually provided that the eligibility criteria for fixing the upper ceiling of annual intake to 200/250 admissions annually shall be as under:-



- A. For Annual intake capacity of 200
- (i) Number of teaching beds not less than 1250 with the standing of not less than 15 years.
  - (ii) OPD strength per day not less than 2000.
  - (iii) Bed occupancy average not less than 80%.
  - (iv) The hospital must be unitary.
- B. For Annual Intake capacity for 250
- (i) Number of teaching beds not less than 1500 with the standing of not less than 15 years.
  - (ii) OPD strength per day not less than 3000.
  - (iii) Bed occupancy average not less than 80%.
  - (iv) The hospital must be unitary."

It was further observed that the Council after obtaining approval u/s 33 of the IMC Act, 1956 has notified the Minimum Standard Requirements for the Medical College for 50/100/150 Admissions Annually Regulations, 1999. However, no such Minimum Standard Requirements for the Medical College have been notified for 200/250 Admissions Annually till date.

After due deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided that the Minimum Standard Requirement for the Medical College for 200 admissions annually Regulations and Minimum Standard Requirement for the Medical College for 250 admissions annually Regulations may be recommended as shown in Annexure A & B respectively annexed herewith."

**93. Essentiality Certificate for increasing the annual capacity to 200/250.**

Read: The matter with regard to Essentiality Certificate for increasing the annual capacity to 200/250.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Council after obtaining the approval of the Central Government u/s 33 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 has amended the Opening of a New Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate course of study or training) and increase of admission capacity in any course of Study or Training (including a Postgraduate course of Study or Training) Regulation with regard to annual admission capacity in MBBS course vide notification dt. 14.12.2009 as under:-

*"6. The maximum number of admissions in MBBS course shall not exceed 250 annually provided that the eligibility criteria for fixing the upper ceiling of annual intake to 200/250 admissions annually shall be as under:-*

A. For Annual intake capacity of 200

- (i) Number of teaching beds not less than 1250 with the standing of not less than 15 years.
- (ii) OPD strength per day not less than 2000
- (iii) Bed occupancy average not less than 80%.
- (iv) The hospital must be unitary.

B. For Annual intake capacity of 250

- (i) Number of teaching beds not less than 1500 with the standing of not less than 15 years.
- (ii) OPD strength per day not less than 3000
- (iii) Bed occupancy average not less than 80%.
- (iv) The hospital must be unitary."

It was further observed that with these amendments besides the number of beds, three more criteria i.e. (1) Standing of not less than 15 years; (2) OPD strength per day not less than 2000/3000 for 200/250 admissions annually and (3) Bed occupancy average not less than 80% have been prescribed which are not included in the Qualifying Criteria for establishing a medical college with 50/100/150 admissions as prescribed under Establishment of a Medical College Regulations, 1999 or Opening of a New Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate course of study or training) and increase of admission capacity in any course of Study or Training (including a Postgraduate course of Study or Training) Regulation, 2000. It would therefore require appropriate modification in the format of Essentiality Certificate also.

Accordingly, after due deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee decided that the format of the Essentiality Certificate to be submitted by the institutes be prescribed as under:

**ESSENTIALITY CERTIFICATE FOR INTAKE OF 200/250 SEATS**

No.  
Government of \_\_\_\_\_  
Department of Health & Family Welfare

Dated, the.....

To

The

(applicant),

Course : \_\_\_\_\_

Sir,

The desired certificate is as follows:

- (1) It is certified that the \_\_\_\_\_ is recognized u/s  
(name of institute)  
u/s 11(2) of the IMC Act, 1956 for \_\_\_\_\_ seats in MBBS course
- (2) No. of institutions already existing in the State :

- (3) No. of institutions offering MBBS course :
- (4) No. of seats available in the MBBS course in the State:
- (5) Full justification for increasing the intake of MBBS course:

The (Name of the institute) \_\_\_\_\_ has applied for increasing the annual intake of MBBS course to 200/250 seats. On careful consideration of the proposal, the Government of \_\_\_\_\_ has decided to issue an essentiality certificate to the applicant for increasing the annual intake in MBBS course to 200/250 seats.

It is certified that:-

- (a) It is desirable to increase the annual intake in MBBS course to 200/250 seats in the public interest.
- (b) Increasing the annual intake in MBBS course to 200/250 seats by \_\_\_\_\_ (the name of institution) is feasible.
- (c) The institute has \_\_\_\_\_ number of teaching beds with the standing of \_\_\_\_\_ years.
- (d) The average OPD strength per day is \_\_\_\_\_.
- (e) The average bed occupancy is \_\_\_\_\_%.
- (f) The affiliated teaching hospital is unitary in character.
- (g) The number of teaching beds, average OPD strength and average bed occupancy available at \_\_\_\_\_ (name of institute) is not less than the criteria prescribed under the "Opening of a New or Higher Course of Study or Training (including Postgraduate course of Study or Training ) and increase of Admission Capacity in any course of Study or Training (including a Postgraduate Course of Study or Training) Regulation, 2000" as notified in the Gazette of India vide Notification dated 14<sup>th</sup> December, 2009.

It is further certified that in case the applicant fails to create infrastructure for the course as per MCI norms and fresh admissions are stopped by the Central Government, the State Government shall take over the responsibility of the students already admitted in the above said course at this college with the permission of the Central Government.

Yours faithfully,

**(SIGNATURE OF THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY)"**

**94. Amendment in Screening Test Regulations, 2002.**

Read: The matter with regard to Amendment in Screening Test Regulations, 2002 as approved by the Executive Committee: -

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Council after obtaining the prior approval of the Central Govt. u/s 33 of the I.M.C. Act,1956 notified the Regulations for Eligibility Requirement for taking admission in an undergraduate medical course in a Foreign Medical Institution Regulations, 2002 and the Screening Test Regulations, 2002 in respect of grant of registration of doctors who have acquired primary medical qualification from a medical institute located abroad.

It was further observed that Section 3 & 9 of the Eligibility Requirement for taking admission in an undergraduate medical course in a Foreign Medical Institution Regulations, 2002 as prescribed in the Screening Test Regulations, 2002 read as under:-

"3. An Indian citizen, who has passed the qualifying examination either from India or an equivalent examination from abroad and is desirous of joining an undergraduate medical course in any foreign medical institution on or after 15<sup>th</sup> March,2002 shall approach the Council for issue of an Eligibility Certificate for that purpose.

9. After verification, as required, if the candidate is found to fulfill the eligibility criteria, the Council shall issue an Eligibility Certificate in the prescribed format to the candidate certifying that he/she is eligible to join a medical institution outside India to obtain a primary medical qualification. The certificate shall indicate that on return after obtaining the foreign primary medical qualification, the candidate shall have to undergo a screening test, subject to fulfillment of the conditions prescribed in the Screening Test Regulations, 2002, and that passing this test shall only entitle him to provisional/permanent registration by the Medical Council of India or the State Medical Councils."

Section 4(1) of the Screening Test Regulations, 2002 reads as under:-

"4. Eligibility Criteria: No person shall be allowed to appear in the screening test unless:

(1) he/she is a citizen of India and possesses any primary medical qualification, either whose name and the institution awarding it are included in the World Directory of Medical Schools, published by the World Health Organisation; or which is confirmed by the Indian Embassy concerned to be a recognized qualification for enrolment as medical practitioner in the country in which the institution awarding the said qualification is situated;....."

It was further observed that this Section 4(1) has been amended after obtaining the prior approval of the Central Govt. u/s 33 of the I.M.C. Act,1956 vide notification dated 26.09.2009 in which the requirement of the name of the institute being included in the World Directory of Medical Schools, published by the World Health Organisation has been removed as under:-

"4 (1) "No person shall be allowed to appear in the screening test unless: he/she is a Citizen of India or has been granted Overseas Citizenship of India and possess any primary medical qualification, which is confirmed by the Indian Embassy concerned, to be a recognized qualification for

enrolment as medical practitioner in the country in which the institution awarding the said qualification is situated.”

Further it was observed that in several instances the candidates have been enrolled in medical schools/ colleges located outside India but a part or the whole training has taken place in India and subsequently the examination is purportedly claimed to have been taken by the school/college/university located abroad and the degree is awarded from the said foreign institute. Such institutes have never been permitted by the Council or by the Central Govt. u/s 10A of the I.M.C. Act, 1956 to offer training/teaching in medical course to such students. Thus not only these institutes are carrying out activities which are not within the framework of the I.M.C. Act, 1956 or the Regulations framed thereunder but which also lead to a lot of harassment to the innocent public as the students are unable to get registration after completion of their studies. This has also led to a situation in which the Council has to face a lot of litigation in the Hon. Supreme Court and Hon. High Courts.

After due and detailed deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided that the following sub-clause 4(3) be added to the Eligibility Criteria under Screening Test Regulation, 2002 as under:-

“4.....

(3) He/She has studied for the medical course at the same institute located abroad for the entire duration of the course from where he/she has obtained the degree.”

It was further decided that the Eligibility Requirement for taking admission in an Undergraduate Medical Course in a Foreign Medical Institution Regulation, 2002 be amended by inserting a proviso to Regulation 9 as under:-

“9. After verification, as required, if the candidate is found to fulfill the eligibility criteria, the Council shall issue an Eligibility Certificate in the prescribed format to the candidate certifying that he/she is eligible to join a medical institution outside India to obtain a primary medical qualification. The certificate shall indicate that on return after obtaining the foreign primary medical qualification, the candidate shall have to undergo a screening test, subject to fulfillment of the conditions prescribed in the Screening Test Regulations, 2002, and that passing this test shall only entitle him to provisional/permanent registration by the Medical Council of India or the State Medical Councils.

Provided that He/She has studied for the medical course at the same institute located abroad for the entire duration of the course from where he/she has obtained the degree.”

**95 Minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010 – Approval regarding.**

The Council approved the minutes of the Finance Committee meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010.

**96. Matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. P. Sireesha, Medical Teacher.**

Read: The matter with regard to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. P. Sireesha, Medical Teacher.

The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the decision of the Ethics Committee in the above matter as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee, at its meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup> September, 2009 while deliberating in the matter of supply of alleged forged/fake information/ certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. P. Sireesha, Medical teacher, considered the following information as provided/placed before the Committee:*

- i) the following operational part of the decision by the members of the Adhoc Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and of the Executive Committee:*

*"The members of the Adhoc Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and of the Executive Committee of the Council were, therefore, were clearly of the view that the Council should take steps for referring these cases to the Police authorities for registration of FIRs and conducting investigations in all such cases. It was also observed that in the complaint to be sent to the Police authorities, it should also be clearly requested that all those cases where there is a collusion and conspiracy of such persons with the management of the colleges, the necessary action should also be taken against the management of those colleges."*

- ii) FIR had been recommended to the Police authorities vide Council's letter dated 07/04/2006 & the following office observations recommended in FIR:*

*"In her declaration form she has claimed that she has worked as Tutor/Demonstrator/Registrar/Sr. Resident at Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai from 01/06/2002 to 30/06/2005. In its letter Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai has stated that she has not worked at all in the institution. Thus she has submitted a false and forged experience certificate"*

- iii) Dr. P. Sireesha vide her letter dt. 11/08/2009 has sent her explanation.*

*The decision of the Ethics Committee is as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. P. Sireesha, Medical Teacher and noted the clarification submitted by her vide letter dt.11.08.09. She conveys that she was a bonafide PG student/Jr.Resident at Sri Ramachandra College of*

*Medical Sciences and Research Foundation, Chennai from 01.06.02 to 30.06.05, the certificate of which have been enclosed and she further conveys that the compliance report sent by her institution – Dr. Pinnamanenei Siddhartha Institute of Medical Sciences & Research Foundation, Chinoutapalli which was forwarded to MCI by Govt. clarifies her position and that she was present during all the MCI inspections in that institution from 2006 to 2009.*

*The Ethics Committee, therefore, decided to drop the proceedings against her and close the matter with regards to ethical consideration of the case.*

*The matter may be placed before the Executive Committee."*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 17/11/2009 and decided to defer the consideration of the matter for the next meeting.*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 01/12/2009 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the decision of the Ethics Committee dated 16<sup>th</sup> & 17<sup>th</sup> Sept., 2009 and observed that vital documents like administrative orders for appointment and joining, pay slips for the period claimed to have been shown as a Resident and the degree certificates have not been attached with the explanation given by Dr. P. Sireesha. It was further observed that no comments have been invited from the concerned institute i.e. Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai with regard to the claim made by Dr. P. Sireesha.*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee with a request to take appropriate decision on receipt of the above mentioned documents from Dr. P. Sireesha and Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 and it was decided to defer the matter for its next meeting.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup> January, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. P. Sireesha, Medical teacher and decided that Dr. P. Sireesha worked from 01/06/2002 to 30/06/2005 as the Postgraduate student in the department of Microbiology. Every PG student is considered as Demonstrator / Tutor / Registrar during the PG study. Thereby, her claim having worked as tutor during PG study is not wrong.*

*The Registrar of Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai has said that she has not worked as tutor. This is only an interpretation difference and not factual difference.*

*The Committee decided that the candidate had not made any false/fake statement. The action against her may be dropped and the file may be treated as closed."*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Ethics Committee while considering the matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. P. Sireesha has not taken cognizance of the fact that Dr. P. Sireesha in her Declaration Forms has submitted false information with regard to her employment at Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai from 1.6.2002 to 30.6.2005.*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee re-considered the matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. P. Sireesha, in the light of the Executive Committee decision dated 05.02.2010 and decided to send a letter to the Registrar, Sri Rama Chandra Medical College & research Institute, Chennai to find out whether the said doctor was a Registrar/Resident/Tutor/Demonstrator during his/her Postgraduate study. Further action will be taken in this case, on receipt of reply of that letter."*

*The above decision vide Council's letter dated 22/02/2010 was communicated to the Registrar, Sri Rama Chandra Medical College & research Institute, Chennai. In response, the Registrar, Sri Rama Chandra Medical College & research Institute, Chennai has sent a letter dated 25/02/2010 (received on 03/03/2010).*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 02<sup>nd</sup> & 03<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the fax letter received from Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai which indicates that during the period June-2002 to June-2005 while undergoing the postgraduate study, she did not work as a Registrar/Resident /Tutor/Demonstrator.*

*In the declaration form, Dr. P. Sireesha has mentioned that she has worked as a Tutor. Hence, the Ethics Committee decided that her name to be removed temporarily for a period of two years."*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee approved the decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010 and further decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council to remove the name of Dr. P. Sireesha temporarily from IMR for a*



*period of two years as per Section 8.1 of the Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics Regulations, 2002."*

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11/03/2010 decided that Dr. P. Sireesha has produced an experience certificate which is fake/forged and decided to remove the name of Dr. P. Sireesha from the Indian Medical Register for a period of two years.

**97. Matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand, Medical Teacher.**

Read: The matter with regard to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand, Medical Teacher.

The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the decision of the Ethics Committee in the above matter as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee, at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> October, 2009 while deliberating in the matter of supply of alleged forged/fake information/ certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand, Medical teacher, considered the following information as provided/placed before the Committee:*

- i) the following operational part of the decision by the members of the Adhoc Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and of the Executive Committee:*

*"The members of the Adhoc Committee appointed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and of the Executive Committee of the Council were, therefore, were clearly of the view that the Council should take steps for referring these cases to the Police authorities for registration of FIRs and conducting investigations in all such cases. It was also observed that in the complaint to be sent to the Police authorities, it should also be clearly requested that all those cases where there is a collusion and conspiracy of such persons with the management of the colleges, the necessary action should also be taken against the management of those colleges."*

- ii) FIR had been recommended to the Police authorities vide Council's letter dated 31/07/2006 & the following office observations recommended in FIR:*

*"In his declaration form, he has claimed that he has worked at Sri Ramachandra Medical College, Porur, Chennai from 17.6.2002 to 30.6.2005 as Tutor. In its letter, Sri Ramachandra Medical College, Porur, Chennai has stated that he has not worked at all in the institution. Thus, he has submitted a false and forged experience certificate and therefore cannot be accepted as a teacher."*

iii) Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand vide his letter dt. 09/09/2009 his sent his comments.

*The decision of the Ethics Committee is as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to the supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the Medical Council of India and noted that Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand vide her letter dt. 09.09.09 has conveyed that she was a postgraduate student in Community Medicine at Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai during the period 17.6.2002 to 30.6.2005. She has further conveyed that she showed her experience in the declaration form as Tutor because she was under the impression that during the postgraduation, the doctors are Tutors for the undergraduate students in their hospital and the same has turned out to be incorrect and this was all because of communication gap. She has further conveyed that she has not indulged in any act of forgery nor in the presentation of any fake certificate etc.*

*In view of above, the Ethics Committee decided that since Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand has regretted for the mistake, she may be exonerated and the file may be treated as closed.*

*The matter may be placed before the Executive Committee."*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 17/11/2009 and decided to defer the consideration of the matter for the next meeting.*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 01/12/2009 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand in her explanation dated 09.09.2009 has stated as under:-*

*".....*

- b) We, the students, were verbally told that as per the existing norms, postgraduate students are considered as Residents for all practical purposes. This fact i.e. we were to be treated as Junior Residents (as stated by SRMC & RI), during the study period has led to the misunderstandings.*
- c) I or for that matter none of the PG students received any written communication that we were Junior Residents and should not consider ourselves equal to Tutors.*

*....."*

*This misunderstanding/communication gap as explained above is a result of the fact that I trusted the verbal statements of some authorities, which was a mistake on my part, made in good faith.*

*It was further observed that the above said explanation of Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand is at variance with the statement made by the Dean, Sri*

*Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai in his letter dated 09.06.2006 in which he had stated as under:-*

*"With reference to your letter, we wish to state that Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand (2002-03 batch) joined Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Deemed University, Chennai as a Post Graduate/Junior Resident in the department of Community Medicine during June,2002 and completed M.D. Community Medicine degree course in June,2005 and she has not worked as a Tutor during the above period."*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee with a request to take appropriate decision in the matter after obtaining due clarification from the Dean, Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai with regard to averments made by Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand in her statement dated 09.09.2009."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 and it was decided to defer the matter for its next meeting.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 20<sup>TH</sup> & 21<sup>ST</sup> January, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand, Medical teacher and decided that Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand worked from 17.6.2002 to 30.6.2005 as the Postgraduate student in the department of Community Medicine. Every PG student is considered as Demonstrator / Tutor / Registrar during the PG study. Thereby, her claim having worked as tutor during PG study is not wrong.*

*The Registrar of Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai has said that she has not worked as tutor. This is only an interpretation difference and not factual difference.*

*The Committee further decided that the candidate had not made any false/fake statement. The action against her may be dropped and the file may be treated as closed."*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Ethics Committee while considering the matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand has not taken cognizance of the fact that Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand in her Declaration Forms has submitted false information with regard to her employment at Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai from 17.6.2002 to 30.6.2005.*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee re-considered the matter with regards to supply of alleged forged/fake information/certificate in/with the declaration forms submitted to the MCI by Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand, in the light of the Executive Committee decision dated 05.02.2010 and decided to send a letter to the Registrar, Sri Rama Chandra Medical College & research Institute, Chennai to find out whether the above said doctor was a Registrar/Resident/Tutor/Demonstrator during his/her Postgraduate study. Further action will be taken in this case, on receipt of reply of that letter.*

*The above decision vide Council's letter dated 22/02/2010 was communicated to the Registrar, Sri Rama Chandra Medical College & research Institute, Chennai. In response, the Registrar, Sri Rama Chandra Medical College & research Institute, Chennai has sent a letter dated 25/02/2010 (received on 03/03/2010)*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 02<sup>nd</sup> & 03<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the fax letter received from Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai which indicates that during the period June-2002 to June-2005 while undergoing the postgraduate study, she did not work as a Registrar/Resident/Tutor/Demonstrator.*

*In the declaration form, Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand has mentioned that she has worked as a Tutor. Hence, the Ethics Committee decided that her name to be removed temporarily for a period of two years."*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee approved the decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010 and further decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council to remove the name of Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand temporarily from IMR for a period of two years as per Section 8.1 of the Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics Regulations, 2002."*

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11.03.2010 decided that Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand has produced an experience certificate which is fake/forged and decided to remove the name of Dr. Ashoojit Kaur Anand from the Indian Medical Register for a period of two years.

**98. Review/revision of the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 – Proceedings regarding.**

Read: The matter with regard to Review/revision of the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 – Proceedings regarding.

The Council approved the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

“The members of the Executive Committee of the Council at its meeting held on 04/03/2010 considered the decision of the Ethics Sub-Committee to review/revision of the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 with regard to the action to be taken by the Council for violating Clause 6.8 of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 pertaining to the relationship between a medical practitioner and Pharma and Healthcare industry and decided that Clause 6.8 of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) (Amendment) Regulations, 2009 be further amended as under:-

(a) The title of the Section 6.8 be amended by deleting the words “and Professional Association of Doctors” as under:-

“**6.8** Code of conduct for doctors in their relationship with pharmaceutical and allied health sector industry.”

(b) Section 6.8.1(b) shall be substituted as under: -

“b) **Travel Facilities** : A medical practitioner shall not accept any travel Facility inside the country or outside, including rail, road, air, ship, cruise tickets, paid vacation, etc. from any pharmaceutical or allied healthcare industry or their representatives for self and family members for vacation or for attending conferences, seminars, workshops, CME Programme, etc. as a delegate.

(c) The action to be taken by the Council for violation of Section 6.8 be prescribed by further amending the clause 6.8.1 as under:-

“

SECTION	ACTION
<p><b>6.8.1</b> In dealing with Pharmaceutical and allied health sector industry, a medical practitioner shall follow and adhere to the stipulations given below:-</p>	
<p>a) <b>Gifts:</b> A medical practitioner shall not receive any gift from any pharmaceutical or allied health care industry and their sales people or representatives.</p>	<p><b>Gifts</b> more than Rs. 1,000/- upto Rs. 5000/- : Censure  <b>Gifts</b> more than Rs.5000/- upto Rs. 10000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for 3(three) months  <b>Gifts</b> more than Rs. 10000/- to Rs.50,000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for six months.  <b>Gifts</b> more than Rs. 50,000/- to Rs.1,00,000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for One Year.  <b>Gifts</b> more than Rs. 1,00,000/-: Removal for a period of more than one year from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register.</p>

<p>b) <b>Travel facilities:</b> A medical practitioner shall not accept any travel facility inside the country or outside, including rail, road, air, ship, cruise tickets, paid vacations etc. from any pharmaceutical or allied healthcare industry or their representatives for self and family members for vacation or for attending conferences, seminars, workshops, CME programme etc as a delegate.</p>	<p><b>Expenses for travel facilities</b> more than Rs. 1,000/- upto Rs. 5000/- : Censure  <b>Expenses for travel facilities</b> more than Rs.5000/- upto Rs. 10000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for 3(three) months  <b>Expenses for travel facilities</b> more than Rs. 10000/- to Rs.50,000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for six months.  <b>Expenses for travel facilities</b> more than Rs. 50,000/- to Rs.1,00,000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for One Year.  <b>Expenses for travel facilities</b> more than Rs. 1,00,000/-: Removal for a period of more than one year from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register.</p>
<p>c) <b>Hospitality:</b> A medical practitioner shall not accept individually any hospitality like hotel accommodation for self and family members under any pretext.</p>	<p><b>Expenses for Hospitality</b> more than Rs. 1,000/- upto Rs. 5000/- : Censure  <b>Expenses for Hospitality</b> more than Rs.5000/- upto Rs. 10000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for 3(three) months  <b>Expenses for Hospitality</b> more than Rs. 10000/- to Rs.50,000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for six months.  <b>Expenses for Hospitality</b> more than Rs. 50,000/- to Rs.1,00,000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for One Year.  <b>Expenses for Hospitality</b> more than Rs. 1,00,000/-: Removal for a period of more than one year from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register.</p>
<p>d) <b>Cash or monetary grants:</b> A medical practitioner shall not receive any cash or monetary grants from any pharmaceutical and allied healthcare industry for individual purpose in individual capacity under any pretext. Funding for medical research, study etc. can only be received through approved institutions by modalities laid down by law / rules / guidelines adopted by such approved institutions, in a transparent manner. It shall always be fully disclosed.</p>	<p><b>Cash or monetary grants</b> more than Rs. 1,000/- upto Rs. 5000/- : Censure  <b>Cash or monetary grants</b> more than Rs.5000/- upto Rs. 10000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for 3(three) months  <b>Cash or monetary grants</b> more than Rs. 10000/- to Rs.50,000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for six months.  <b>Cash or monetary grants</b> more than Rs. 50,000/- to Rs.1,00,000/-: Removal from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for One Year.  <b>Cash or monetary grants</b> more than Rs. 1,00,000/-: Removal for a period of more than one year from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register.</p>

<p>e) <b>Medical Research:</b> A medical practitioner may carry out, participate in, work in research projects funded by pharmaceutical and allied healthcare industries. A medical practitioner is obliged to know that the fulfillment of the following items (i) to (vii) will be an imperative for undertaking any research assignment / project funded by industry – for being proper and ethical. Thus, in accepting such a position a medical practitioner shall:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Ensure that the particular research proposal(s) has the due permission from the competent concerned authorities.</li> <li>(ii) Ensure that such a research project(s) has the clearance of national/ state / institutional ethics committees / bodies.</li> <li>(iii) Ensure that it fulfils all the legal requirements prescribed for medical research.</li> <li>(iv) Ensure that the source and amount of funding is publicly disclosed at the beginning itself.</li> <li>(v) Ensure that proper care and facilities are provided to human volunteers, if they are necessary for the research project(s).</li> <li>(vi) Ensure that undue animal experimentations are not done and when these are necessary they are done in a scientific and a humane way.</li> <li>(vii) Ensure that while accepting such an assignment a medical practitioner shall have the freedom to publish the results of the research in the greater interest of the society by inserting such a clause in the MoU or any other document / agreement for any such assignment.</li> </ul>	<p>First time censure, and thereafter removal of name from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for a period depending upon the violation of the clause.</p>
<p>f) <b>Maintaining Professional Autonomy:</b> In dealing with pharmaceutical and allied healthcare industry a medical practitioner shall always ensure that there shall never be any compromise either with his / her own professional autonomy and / or with the autonomy and freedom of the medical institution.</p>	<p>First time censure, and thereafter removal of name from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register.</p>
<p>g) <b>Affiliation:</b> A medical practitioner may work for pharmaceutical and allied healthcare industries in advisory capacities, as consultants, as researchers, as treating doctors or in any other professional capacity. In doing so, a medical practitioner shall always:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Ensure that his professional integrity and freedom are maintained.</li> <li>(ii) Ensure that patients interest are not compromised in any way.</li> </ul>	<p>First time censure, and thereafter removal of name from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register for a period depending upon the violation of the clause.</p>

(iii) Ensure that such affiliations are within the law. (iv) Ensure that such affiliations / employments are fully transparent and disclosed.	
h) <b>Endorsement:</b> A medical practitioner shall not endorse any drug or product of the industry publically. Any study conducted on the efficacy or otherwise of such products shall be presented to and / or through appropriate scientific bodies or published in appropriate scientific journals in a proper way”.	First time censure, and thereafter removal of name from Indian Medical Register or State Medical Register.

**99. Complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra.**

Read: The matter with regard to Complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra.

The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*“The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the decision of the Ethics Committee in the above matter as under:-*

*The Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> & 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2009 considered the matter with regards to complaint vide Govt's letter dated 02.11.2007 against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra and decided as under:*

*“The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra and noted :-*

*i) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> & 7<sup>th</sup> December, 2007:-*

*“The Ethics Committee noted that in this complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar by Mr. Navneet Chopra, there is no name of any treating doctors is mentioned. Therefore, the Ethics Committee decided that the complainant may be requested to give the names, addresses and registration particulars of treating doctors, if possible, to enable the Ethics Committee to follow up this case.”*

*ii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 06<sup>th</sup> October, 2008:-*

*“The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra and observed that Dr. Naveen Chitkara is registered with Medical Council of India and the Committee decided to take up the case.*



*The doctor may be asked to send parasive comment on the complaint within 15 days. The complainant may be called in one of its next meetings."*

*iii) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2009:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra and noted that Mr. Navneet Chopra has been called to appear before the Ethics Committee on 21.5.2009 and he has appeared before the Ethics Committee. His statement is as under:-*

*Statement of Mr. Navneet Chopra*

*I, Mr. Navneet Chopra, s/o Mrs. Pawan Rekha Chopra (deceased) complaint against the doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar namely Dr. Anwar Khan (heart-specialist) and Dr. Naveen Chitkara (brain-specialist) and the management, with regards to the treatment given to my mother Mrs. Pawan Rekha Chopra. She was taken for treatment in the Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar on the 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2007.*

*When we took her to a local clinic (when she complained of heart pain), the doctor gave an injection and told us that in case she does not improve then she should be taken to another hospital and he referred to Kapil Hospital, Jalandhar.*

*She stayed there for a period of two days but there was no improvement; so the doctor referred us to Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar and she was admitted with low BP and major heart attack. As soon as she was admitted she was given an injection GP-2 BAN and doctor told us that she had 50% chances of survival. On 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2007, an Angiography was done which revealed that there was 90% blockage in two arteries and 80% in the 3<sup>d</sup> arteries. On the same day in the evening she was injected Actilyse 20% to dissolve the blood clots and became unconscious immediately after that. When we asked the doctor why she was unconscious, he said that it was due to the effect of sedatives. For next 5 days, she did not open her eyes and doctor kept saying the same thing.*

*CT Scan of the brain was done after 4 days which revealed that there had been a Brain Haemorrhage. I have researched on the internet and consulted Dr. NDTV who told us that Actilyse should be given within 3-6 hrs. of the onset of heart attack and one of the major side effect is intra cerebral bleeding. But the doctor was so ignorant that he could not understand the reason for her unconscious state and my mother remained untreated for the next 4-5 days even though Brain Haemorrhage requires immediate attention. On 19<sup>th</sup> May, 2007 the first CT-Scan of the brain was done and it was decided that a brain surgery is mandatory so brain surgery was done a stunt pipe was inserted in her brain from which blood kept oozing out for the next 15 days @ 200-350 ml. per day but no extra blood was given to her. After the brain surgery, she opened her eyes after 10 days but could not speak and gradually her teeth became very miserable but no dentist was sent for. Besides, lying in ICCU, due to the negligence of nurses, she developed bed sores on both sides at the back and their condition was very miserable but no skin specialist was sent for. There were only two nurses for 8 patients in the NICU. On the 8<sup>th</sup> of June she*

*was shifted to private room from ICU without informing us and without any monitoring equipment, even though she was shivering badly and fever was 100 degree and she was still heart patient. Also before shifting no doctor came to inspect her. She was declared dead at 11.00 p.m; But I can firmly say that she had died much earlier than 11.00 p.m. but since there was no monitoring the nurse did not come to know that she was dead or the hospital authority waited till 11 so that we could not make a noise and call the media. When my sister asked the nurse regarding the reason for shifting, the nurse told her that another patient had come and an empty bed was required in ICCU.*

*My main grievance is that why Dr.Anwar Khan, Heart specialist of Oxford Hospital injected Actilyse (which cost Rs.18,000/-) without informing us of the side effects of this injection. Also he was so ignorant that he did not come to know of the brain haemorrhage after Actilyse injection and my mother remained untreated for brain haemorrhage for the next 4-5 days. Further the hospital authorities should have informed us before shifting her from ICCU to private room without monitoring. I further add that why bed sores developed in her back while lying in ICCU but no proper treatment was given for the same. Also, Naveen Chitkara should have informed us of the gravity and severity of Brain Surgery and that since she was already a heart patient, her chances of survival after brain surgery would be minimum (0 %).*

*My father is an Ex-service man, only when a doctor from Military Hospital, Jalandhar came to inspect my mother, the hospital authorities called a skin specialist.*

*My humble request is that this matter should be publicized and the concerned doctor and the hospital should be punished in the right manner so that they do not play with the lives of anyone whosoever suffered.*

*I have already e-mailed to you supporting papers. Once again I am enclosing herewith the extracts compiled from the internet and the reply of Dr.NDTV.*

*Sd/-  
(Navneet Chopra)*

*The Ethics Committee further noted that as per above decision, the Medical Superintendent, Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar; and the treating doctors - Dr.Anwar Khan and Dr.Naveen Chitkara have been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee today i.e. 26/08/2009 at 03.00 P.M. Dr.Anwar Khan and Dr.Naveen Chitkara had been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 26/08/2009 at 03.00 P.M. and both of them have come to appear before the Ethics Committee and their statements are as under:-*

#### STATEMENT OF DR. ANWAR KHAN

*I, Dr. Anwar Khan, passed my MBBS from GSVM Medical College, Kanpur in the year 1983. I did my M.D. (General Medicine) from the JNM Medical College, Aligarh in the year 1983 & DM(Cardiology) from SGPGIMS, Lucknow in the year 1993. I am registered with the U.P. Medical Council, bearing Registration No.28562. My statement is as under:-*

*Mrs. Pawan Rekha, a 67 years old lady was admitted in emergency ICU of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar at 8:30 PM on 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2007 in a very critical condition with no recordable blood pressure. She was diagnosed a case of "Diabetes Mellitus with Extensive Anterior Wall Myocardial Infarction with Left Ventricular Failure with Cardiogenic Shock". Patient's relatives were explained about the seriousness and nature of disease. They were also explained that even with aggressive medical treatment including coronary angioplasty the chances of survival is only 50% (as also noted in complaint)*

*She was managed with standard protocol in such situation with drugs to increase blood pressure and to prevent blood clotting which is the cause of heart attack. She was given IV fluids,*

*Injection Dopamine, Dobutamine Inj., GP-2 ban, Clexane. Tablet, Clopidogril and Aspirin. She was planned for coronary angiography and angioplasty as soon as patient is fit for the procedure.*

*On 16<sup>th</sup> May, when she got relatively stabilized, she underwent coronary angiography which revealed left main with severe triple vessel disease with severe LV systolic dysfunction (EF = 25% by ECHO) . She was not suitable for primary Coronary Angioplasty. Findings of coronary angiography and complex nature of disease was explained to patient's relatives (as mentioned in complaint also). They were also explained that she was not suitable for coronary angioplasty and will require CABG after stabilization.*

*It is to state that in view of ongoing Ischemia and chest pain (as mentioned in complaint also) and critical thrombotic lesion in LAD, she was advised thrombolytic therapy which is a standard alternative therapy of coronary angioplasty in acute myocardial infarction which can be given even upto 24 hours in selected cases.*

*Since she had underwent coronary angiography, an arterial access was already there, so to have more local, specific effect and to avoid complications, small dose of Inj. Actilyse (20mg) was given intra coronary at around 2:00 PM on 16-5-2007. This is the 1/5<sup>th</sup> of normal dose usually given by intravenous route. Studies have shown that reduced dosages of thrombolytic with GP 2b3a drugs gives better result in epicardial as well as myocardial perfusion with less chances of reinfarction.*

*She was shifted in ICCU and attendants were allowed to meet. Since patient was restless with violent behaviour and hemodynamic instability, sedation was given to make her asleep. Later on Intra Aortic Balloon Pump (IABP) was put in to stabilize her hemodynamics (Blood Pressure and Oxygen) after due consent and explanation to patient relatives. IABP is a device used in cardiogenic shock situation to stabilize BP and improve coronary arteries perfusion.*

*Next day, when she did not regain consciousness, case was discussed with Neurologist. But CT scan could not be done on 17-5-07 because she was unstable and was on IABP and was not in a position to shift for CT scan . Inj. GP-2 ban, Clopidogril and Aspirin were stopped in view of hematuria.*

*It is to state that on 19<sup>th</sup> May as soon as patient got little better and showed some improvement in hemodynamics , she was shifted for CT scan*

, which had revealed Intracranial hemorrhage. Even Intracranial hemorrhage would have been detected earlier the management would have been the same, i.e. Conservative in view of poor cardiac status and hemodynamic instability.

Inj Actilyse is a very short acting drug (Half life less than 5 minutes) and only 20 mg was given in cath lab. It was not repeated again. All antiplatelet drugs (Inj Gp2ban, Aspirin and Clopidogril) were stopped on 16<sup>th</sup> May in view of hematuria. So virtually there would have been no change in the line of management.

Considering the stable neurological condition (GCI – M5V2E1) and poor cardiac status, Patient was advised conservative management. This refuted the allegation that immediate surgery was advised. Second CT Scan was done on 21-5-2007 and patient was again advised conservative management as against allegation.

Next day patient deteriorated neurologically and to save life of patient, considering despite of all risk factors, an external ventricular drainage was put in which is a standard treatment for intraventricular hemorrhage with developing hydrocephalus.

The purpose of this drain is to drain CSF & Blood, and it continued to function properly in post operated period as also noted in the complaint.

Patient was unconscious after the hemorrhage. But following placement of EVD, patient gradually improved in sensorium as per medical record and as per communication with ECHS authority dated 31-5-2007 (which states that patient has improved neurologically from pre op GCI – M2V1E1 to GCF – M4V2E3). This improvement has also been stated in the same paragraph of complaint. Regular oral care and physiotherapy was given to the patient and because of debilitating condition she had retraction of gums which patient's attendants has interrupted as hole in teeth.

Since the patient was clinically stable, able to understand verbal command (as also mentioned in the complaint) and no active cardiological or cardiosurgical procedure was possible, a written request was sent to ECHS authority to assess whether to discharge or shift the patient to MH.

Patient was examined by medical officer on 8<sup>th</sup> June, 2007. Considering patient's stable condition and since, no cardiac intervention possible at this stage, it was planned to shift the patient to MH. Since patient was fully stable she was shifted to semi private ward which in our hospital is used as step down ICU, since it is adjacent to NICU. Cardiogenic shock is the most severe clinical presentation in acute myocardial infarction and it requires aggressive care. Coronary angioplasty with IABP is the treatment of choice. Thrombolytic therapy is an alternative treatment in such condition when coronary angioplasty can not be done.

Thrombolytic therapy with streptokinase or tPA is the standard treatment in majority of patients in Acute Myocardial Infarction. It is a life saving drug. But it carries 0.5 – 1% risk of Intracranial hemorrhage despite of all precautions.

*Since this patient had extensive myocardial infarction with LVF with cardiogenic shock and unfit for coronary angioplasty, all efforts were made to save her life with aggressive medical management. But unfortunately she developed intracranial hemorrhage which was also managed to the best by conservative and surgical procedure but she could not be saved and expired.*

*Sd/-  
(DR. ANWAR KHAN)"*

*"STATEMENT OF DR. NAVEEN CHITKARA*

*I, Dr.Naveen Chitkara did my MBBS from Medical College, Rohtak in the year 1990 and M.S. from the same institute in the year 1995 and M.Ch. from SMS Medical College, Jaipur in the year 2000. My registration number is MCI-9436.*

*Q. You did the surgery to decompress the brain?*

*Ans. Yes, I placed an EVD for intraventricular hemorrhage, and it worked well, and patient improved neurologically.*

*Sd/-  
(Dr.Naveen Chitkara)"  
26.08.2009*

*The Ethics Committee considered the above and decided that Dr. Anwar Khan and Dr. Naveen Chitkara may be requested to appear once again before the Ethics Committee alongwith all original records pertaining to this case."*

*As per above decision, Dr. Anwar Khan and Dr. Naveen Chitkara vide Council's letter dated 30/09/2009 were requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 21/10/2009 at 03.00 P.M.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> October, 2009 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra and noted that as requested, Dr. Anwar Khan and Dr. Naveen Chitkara have again come to appear before the Ethics Committee today i.e. 21<sup>st</sup> October, 2009 and have given the following statements:-*

*Statement of Dr.Anwar Khan*

*Q. How many hours after admission you have given thrombolytic therapy?*

*Ans. The patient Mrs.Pawan Rekha was admitted around 8.30 p.m. on 15.5.2007 in a state of Cardiogenic shock. She was managed conservatively and with standard protocol with aim to stabilise and to do primary angioplasty. Next day she underwent coronary angiography which revealed severe coronary artery disease not suitable for coronary angioplasty. Hence a small dose of TPA (20 mg.) intracoronary was given to dissolve the thrombus locally to improve the coronary perfusion. This was given after 16 hrs. after admission. This was not the conventional thrombotic treatment*

rather local thrombolytic drug was given to dissolve the thrombus to stabilise the patient.

Q. Where is your cath details?

Ans. Detailed report of coronary angiography and catherisation, CD of coronary angio and photoprint has been submitted.

Q. In your opinion how many hours the chest pain had occurred before the administration of thromolytic therapy?

Ans. Patient was having unstable angina (chest pain) for 3 days prior to admission, but has sustained extensive anterior wall myocardial infarction on 15<sup>th</sup> May, 2007.

Q. Why did you think of sedating the patient? What sedation you have given?

Ans. The patient was very restless and agitated and hemodynamically unstable and on intra-aortic balloon pump for pulmonary. Hence sedation (morphine injection) was given.

Q. When did the patient come out of sedation?

Ans. She did not regained complete consciousness on 2<sup>nd</sup> day. We consulted the Neurologist as well as Neuro-Surgeon.

Q. When did you suspect Hemorrhagic tendency in the patient?

Ans. We suspected hemorrhagic tendency on the same day i.e. on 16<sup>th</sup> May, 2007 due to hematuria. Hence all antiplatelet drug (injection tirofiban and clopidogril) and anti-thrombotic drugs were stopped.

Q. You have your own CT scan in your hospital?

Ans. Yes it was available but not done on that day because patient was not stable and all the necessary steps were already taken. Neurologist and Neuro-surgeon were consulted and was advised conservative management.

I have submitted detailed cath and angiography report alongwith CD of angio and photoprint of angio.

Sd/-  
(Dr.Anwar Khan)

Encl.: As above.

Statement of Dr. Naveen Chitkara

Q. When did you see the patient first time?

Ans. It was on 20<sup>th</sup> May, 2007 but on 19<sup>th</sup> she was seen by Neurologist Dr.Handa.

Q. Did you see the CT Scan on that day?

Ans. It revealed intraventricular bleeding and there was no hydrocephalus.

Q. What you suggested as management of the patient?

Ans. I suggested the conservative management to be continued as advised by the Neurologist.

Q. Did you suggest for 2<sup>nd</sup> CT Scan?

Ans. Yes, on the next day.

Q. Did you do any surgery for decompression of the brain?

Ans. I put in EVD on 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2007.

Q. Did you notice the external ventricular drain after that?

Ans. Yes it continued to function properly throughout the hospital stay.

Q. Do you think it was too late to do the surgery?

Ans. No. Since the patient was Neurologically stable and had very high risk of surgery due to the administered antiplatelet drugs and

*associated cardiac condition patient was initially managed conservatively.*

*Q. Why did you plan to do EVD very late?*

*Ans. EVD was planned when patient started to deteriorate neurologically. I would have managed the patient on conservative lines (because of higher risk of surgery), if she had not deteriorated.*

*Q. What was the result of surgery?*

*Ans. Patient gradually improved neurologically and started to follow the commands.*

*Sd/-*

*(Dr. Naveen Chitkara)*

*The Ethics Committee decided to defer the further consideration of the matter to its next meeting."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2009 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra and noted the following:-*

*a) (i) Alleged negligence against the doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar made by the complainant Mr. Navneet Chopra. Dr. Anwar Khan and Dr. Naveen Chitkara are involved in this case.*

*(ii) Complaint of negligence on the part of the Doctor, the management causing death of the patient.*

*(iii) Complaint forwarded by the Health Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare to Secretary, MCI.*

*b) Defence Statement by Doctors stating that they have managed the case properly.*

*c) The Ethics Committee after due deliberations in the matter and considering the complaint and the defence statement made by the doctors and made the following observations :-*

*1. Thrombolytic therapy had been given beyond the recommended time window which resulted without any benefit to the patient only in Haemorrhage of the Brain.*

*2. Patient was not put on Ventilator when it was required.*

*3. C.T. Scan - Brain was not done in time to intervene and to do external ventricular drainage(EVD).*

*4. Proper management of Cardiogenic shock was not done.*

*5. The improper management in Thrombolytic therapy, failure to recognize Brain Haemorrhage in time and failure to give prompt relief with EVD resulted in death of the patient, thereby the doctors*

*have erred in their management. Thus negligence in the management caused the death of the patient.*

6. *The name of Dr. Anwar Khan may be removed from the Indian Medical Register temporarily for a period of three months. The Neuro-Surgeon should have insisted for CT Scan - Brain, which could have saved to the patient and his name may be removed for 1(One) month from the Indian Medical Register."*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that the Ethics Committee while considering the matter with regards to complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> Dec., 2009 had decided to take an action against Dr. Anwar Khan who is registered with U.P. Medical Council while Section 8.2 of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2000 clearly provides that "any complaint with regard to professional misconduct can be brought before the appropriate authority for disciplinary action upon receipt of any complaint of professional misconduct. The appropriate Medical Council would hold an enquiry and give an opportunity to the registered medical practitioner to be heard in person or by pleader".*

*It was further observed that no comments of an expert in the field of Neuro-Surgery or Neurology with regard to the negligence arising from putting in EVD on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day have been obtained.*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*Dr. V.N. Jindal was requested to provide the expert opinion in this matter vide Council's letter dated 09/02/2010.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee re-considered the matter with regards to complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra, in the light of the Executive Committee decision dated 05.02.2010. The Ethics Committee considered the opinion of Dr. V. N. Jindal, Dean, Goa Medical College dated 12.2.2010 in which he says that there is no medical negligence on the part of the Neuro-Surgeon, therefore, the Ethics Committee decided the following:-*

1. *Thrombolytic therapy had been given beyond the recommended time window which resulted without any benefit to the patient only in Haemorrhage of the Brain.*
2. *Patient was not put on Ventilator when it was required.*
3. *C.T. Scan - Brain was not done in time to intervene and to do external ventricular drainage (EVD).*
4. *Proper management of Cardiogenic shock was not done.*



5. *The improper management in Thrombolytic therapy, failure to recognize Brain Haemorrhage in time, the doctor has erred in the management. Thus negligence in the management caused the death of the patient.*
6. *The name of Dr. Anwar Khan may be removed from the Indian Medical Register temporarily for a period of three months.*
7. *Dr. Naveen Chitkara, Neuro Surgeon is exonerated.*

*It is further to note that an Item was prepared to be placed before the Executive Committee for its consideration but the said was referred back by the Office stating that the Ethics Committee has not taken cognizance of the Executive Committee decision dated 5.2.2010. Therefore, the case may be referred to U.P. Medical Council for its consideration.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 02<sup>nd</sup> & 03<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*“The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to complaint against doctors of Oxford Hospital, Jalandhar as alleged by Mr. Navneet Chopra and enquired the delinquent doctors. It has also taken the opinion of Neuro-Surgeon. It has recommended that name of Dr. Anwar Khan may be removed from Medial Registry for 3 months and Dr. Naveen Chitkara may be exonerated. In the meantime, the opinion of the legal advisor has been taken with a view to refer the case to Uttar Pradesh Medical Council. Whether it is a fit case to refer the case UP Medical Council?*

*Legal opinion of the Retainer advocate is “if the complaint is received by the Council against few doctors and out of which some of them are registered with MCI and some of them are registered with State Medical Council, in such circumstances, the Ethics Committee has to act in accordance with the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulation 2002.”*

*In view of the opinion of the legal expertise the recommendation taken by the Ethics Committee on 05.02.2010 is reiterated.”*

*In view of above and after due deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee approved the decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010 to exonerate Dr. Naveen Chitkara and further decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council to remove the name of Dr. Anwar Khan temporarily from IMR for a period of three month”.*

After due deliberations, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11/03/2010 decided that by improper management in Thrombolytic therapy, failure to recognize Brain Haemorrhage in time, the doctor has erred in the management and his name may be removed from the Indian Medical Register temporarily for a period of three months.

The General Body of the Council further decided that no case of medical negligence is established against Dr. Naveen Chitkara and he may be exonerated.

**100. Appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council made by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) forward also by Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.**

Read: The matter with regard to Appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council made by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) forward also by Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.

The Council observed the following recommendations of the Executive Committee:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council perused the decision of the Ethics Committee in the above matter as under:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the ongoing matter with regard to appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council and noted :-*

*i). The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> May, 2008:-*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the appeal against the Order dated 01/11/2007 of Delhi Medical Council made by Sh. Harish Chandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament and decided to take this case as an appeal case against the decision of Delhi Medical Council. The Registrar, Delhi Medical Council may be requested to send copies of documents pertaining to this case. Dr. S.S. Sanyal against whom the complaint is lodged may be called and requested to submit their parawise comments on this case within 15 days of receipt of letter of MCI. The complainant Mr. N.C. Roy may be called in one of the next meetings of Ethics Committee."*

*ii). The following decision of the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2008:*

*"The Ethics Committee noted that at its meeting held on 21.05.2008, the Committee considered the letter dated 06.02.2008 from the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. wherein they had forwarded the complaint of certain Members of Parliament against Dr. S.S. Sanyal and requested to re-examine the matter; and decided "to take this case as an appeal case against the decision of Delhi Medical Council. The Ethics Committee further decided that the Registrar, Delhi Medical Council may be requested to send copies of documents pertaining to this case. Dr. S.S. Sanyal against whom the complaint is lodged may be called and requested to submit their parawise comments on this case within 15 days of receipt of letter of MCI. The complainant Mr. N.C. Roy may be called in one of the next meetings of Ethics Committee."*

*The Delhi Medical Council vide letter dated 23.06.2008 has sent the documents as requested. Dr. S.S. Sanyal and Mr. N.C. Roy were invited to appear before the Ethics Committee on 8<sup>th</sup> July, 2008. They appeared on 08.07.2008 before the Ethics Committee and have given the following statement:-*

"Statement of Dr. S.S. Sanyal

*I Dr. S.S. Sanyal did my MBBS from J.N. Medical College, Aligarh in the year 1976. I did my MS (Ortho.) in 1982 from the same place. My date of birth is 24.06.1953. I am registered with Delhi Medical Council bearing registration no. 14794.*

*I have already submitted by comments vide my letter dated 18.06.2008 which should be taken as my statement in addition, I will also like to submit a copy of documents from Dr. Pradeep Dutta, Radiologist, MD, DMRD indicating that x-ray and ultrasound were performed on 09.05.2006. Dr. Pradeep Dutta stated that Mr. N.C. Roy had sustained scooter accident on that day. The patient, Mr. N.C. Roy came to me on 10.05.2006 with history of injury at (R) Heel as a result of scooter accident.*

*Q.: Patient came on 10.05.2006 with what history?*

*Ans.: With acute pain in right heel as a result of scooter accident.*

*Q.: Was there any external injury?*

*Ans.: No, there was not any external injury.*

*Q.: Will it cause pathological fracture?*

*Ans.: No.*

*Q.: What is the proof that he has met with an accident?*

*Ans.: 1. My OPD register.  
2. Copy of the discharge slip of Moolchand Hospital.  
3. Copy of the certificate issued by Dr. Pradeep Dutta, Radiologist dated 05.07.2008.*

*Sd/-  
(Dr. S.S. Sanyal)"*

"STATEMENT OF SHRI N.C. ROY

*I, N.C. Roy son of Late K.P. Roy, Resident of 43, Amritpuri 'A', East of Kailash, New Delhi-110065 would like to bring to the notice of the Ethics Committee that I have submitted an application addressed to Hon'ble Health Minister dated 10.1.2007 which indicates the complete history of my case. I am presenting the copy of the same as my statement.*

*Further, I would like to state that I have never met with scooter accident or an injury and was never given any treatment for the same by Dr. S.S. Sanyal on 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2006. Further, I am not satisfied with the investigations/decision of the Delhi Medical Council and solemnly affirm that he wrongly injected me on the ankle while he should have injected on the sole, that too only after confirming that since I am a diabetic, whether the said injection was advisable in my case or not, that too four times. This treatment resulted in my being tendo Achillis rupture and had to undergo the surgery and long treatment till date by the noted surgeon Dr. R.P. Narayan, HOD, Plastic Surgery, Safdarjung Hospital, New Delhi.*

*Dr. S.S. Sanyal while injecting me the injection near the ankle joint to put needle inside and then used to rotate it claiming that the drug will spread all around. While his Compounder used to forcefully hold my right leg while I was crying in pain.*

*I underwent operation for tendo repair at Moolchand Hospital, New Delhi in September, 2006 and presently I am under treatment of Dr. R.P. Narayan, Head of Department of Plastic Surgery, Safdarjung Hospital, New Delhi.*

*I am saying truthfully and otherwise has no more proof.*

*Q. Do you have any history of disease?*

*Ans. I am diabetic since 1998 on medication tablets and now I am taking insulin since my operation.*

*Sd/-  
( N.C. Roy )"*

*The Ethics Committee discussed the matter and decided to request Dr. R.C. Siwach, Prof. & HOD, Deptt. of Orthopaedics, Medical College, Rohtak to assist the Ethics Committee with his opinion regarding the method of treatment followed in this case. Whether the course of treatment is the standard treatment or not. Whether, in view of long standing diabetes it was the suitable treatment or not and also regarding any shortcoming or negligence or want of competence on the part of treating doctor in this case or not. Further, the present treating doctor, Dr. R.P. Narayan, HOD, plastic surgery, Safdarjung Hospital may also be requested to give a detailed account of treatment of Mr. N.C. Roy under this case alongwith copy of records. He may be specifically asked as to what may have been the cause of rupture of tendoachillis in this case in view of the past treatment records. He may be requested to give his comments within 15 days."*

*iii) Dr. R.C. Siwach, Prof. & HOD, Deptt. of Orthopaedics, Medical College, Rohtak was requested to provide his opinion vide Council's letter dated 26/08/2008. In response to above, Dr. R.C. Siwach sent his opinion vide letter dated 20/09/2008, the same is as under:-*

*"After going through all the records and complaint of Sh. N.C. Roy, 43, Amrit Puri-A, East of Kailash, New Delhi-110065 forwarded by the Medical Council of India for expert opinion alleging medical negligence on the part of Dr. S.S. Sanyal in the treatment administered to Sh. N.C. Roy at Ramakrishna Orthopaedic and Trauma Centre. On perusal of complaint, record of various hospitals and investigations (X-rays and Ultrasound etc.) I am of the opinion that the complainant was treated for planter fasciitis of right heel by Dr. S.S. Sanyal by administering Injection Depomedrol alongwith 2% Xylocaine on 11.2.06, 20.2.06, 4.3.06 and 23.3.06 alongwith medical therapy in a diabetic patient. Steroid alongwith Xylocaine specially at the interval of 10 days is undesirable as diabetic patients are vey prone for infection and physical therapy like hot formentation, sponge under heel and medicines are first line of treatment.*

*As far as his rupture of Tendo Achillis is concerned, diabetic patients are prone for spontaneous rupture of Tendo Achillis and record of the patient indicates that there was calcification in Tendo Achillis on the first x-rays done in Oct. 2005 and this type of rupture are well known to occur while climbing stairs, just walking or trivial trauma. It is unlikely that scooter accident has caused this rupture because there has been no evidence of any external injury like abrasion, swelling or eckymosis on the rupture site of tendo achillis.*

*Hence it is concluded that rupture of Tendo Achillis has not much relevance with the treatment given for planter fibro fasciitis.*

*In light of above findings, I am of the opinion that 4 Injections of Depomedrol with 2% Xylocaine at interval of 10 days are not recommended specially in diabetic patients but this treatment has no relevance with the Tendo Achillis rupture for which the patient has complained. It may be an act of want of competence or less experience but not negligence.*

*This is for your information and necessary action, please."*

*iv) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 06<sup>th</sup> October, 2008:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council made by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) and noted Dr. R.P. Narayan, HOD, Plastic Surgery, Safdarjung Hospital, Delhi has been sent all the case records on 23.09.2008. However, the opinion has not received till date. A reminder may be issued to Dr. R.P. Narayan with the request to send his reply within 15 days of receipt of the letter to the Council, so that the Council to proceed further in this case. This may be informed to the complainant."*

*v) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> & 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2008:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards the appeal against order dt. 1.11.07 of Delhi Medical Council and noted that the detailed documents of the treatment to Sh. N.C. Roy by the Deptt. of Plastic & Burn*

*Surgery have not been forthcoming inspite of request for the same. The Ethics Committee therefore decided that Dr. R.P. Narayan. Prof. & Head, Deptt. of Plastic Surgery & Burn, Safdarjung Hospital, Delhi be called to appear before the Ethics Committee at one of its next meetings with all the relevant documents/record."*

*vi) The following decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2009:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council made by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) and decided to call Dr.R.P. Narayan to appear before the Ethics Committee. His statement is as under:-*

**STATEMENT OF DR. R.P. NARAYAN**

*I, Dr. R.P. Narayan passed MBBS from M.L.N. Medical College, Allahabad in the year 1978, MS (General Surgery) in the year 1982 from the same institute and M.Ch. (Plastic Surgery) from Delhi University, Safadarjang Hospital, New Delhi in the year 1985. Presently working as Professor & HOD, Burn, Plastic and Maxillofacial Surgery, Vardhman Mahavir Medical*

*College & Safdarjung Hospital, New Delhi. I am registered with U.P. Medical Council and Delhi Medical Council.*

*Mr. N.C. Roy was treated as an OPD patient for in the department for ulcer over Tendo Achilles area. The patient was known diabetic for which he was taking treatment. On examination, the patient had ulcer over Tendo Achilles area measuring approx. 6cm x3 cm in size. Patient had come with a request for surgery which was not done as in my opinion, doing another surgery in a diabetic foot had considerable risk of non-healing of operated area. The wound was managed conservatively which resulted in healing of the wound.*

*Q. What is your opinion of rupture of Tendo Achilles in following treatment of plantar fasciitis with local steroid injection.*

*Ans. As far as my opinion is concerned, both structures are quite far away and giving injection into plantar fascia region will not result into weakening/rupture of Tendo Achilles.*

*Sd/-  
(Dr. R.P. Narayan)  
22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2009"*

*The Ethics Committee noting the above and after going through all the documents and the consultant's expert opinion; decided to warn Dr. S.S. Sanyal to be more careful in dealing with his patients in future."*

*The Executive Committee of the Council further observed that the technical expert Dr. R.C. Siwach in his opinion has stated that "I am of the opinion that 4 Injections of Depomedrol with 2% Xylocaine at interval of 10 days are not recommended specially in diabetic patients but this treatment has no relevance with the Tendo Achillis rupture for which the patient has complained. It may be an act of want of competence or less experience but not negligence.*

*It was further observed that the present appeal against the order dated 1.11.2007 has been filed by Shri Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble M.P., Lok Sabha and not by either the patient or by the concerned doctor.*

*In view of above, the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> November, 2009 and decided to defer the matter for its next meeting.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 17/11/2009 and the decision was as under:*

*"The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee with regards to appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council forwarded by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) and noted the following:-*

- a) Brief summary of the Case:
- i) Appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council made by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha)
  - ii) Mr. N. C. Roy , 43 years old approached the Dr. S. S. Sanyal for pain in the right heel.
  - iii) Patient was Diabetic.
  - iv) Dr. S. S. Sanyal had given depomedrol on 11.2.2006, 20.2.2006, 4.3.2006 and 23.3.2006 (depot preparation of steroid injection)
  - v) Rupture of Tendo Achilles occurred later.
  - vi) Patient consulted with Dr. R. P. Narayan, Professor & HOD, Burn, Plastic and axillofacial surgery, Vardhman Mahavir Medical College & Safdarjung Hospital, New Delhi.
  - vii) Patient preferred complaint against Dr. S. S. Sanyal.
- b) Allegations by patient Mr. N. C. Roy:
- i) Patient says that he did not suffer any scooter accident for injury for the cause of Tendo Achilles rupture.
  - ii) Knowing that he was a diabetic, doctor had given him 4 times depot injection of (depomedrol – steroid), which resulted in Tendo Achilles rupture, thereby he had to undergo surgery and prolonged treatment.
- c) Defence Statement by Dr. S. S. Sanyal:
- i) Patient sustained scooter accident on 9.5.2006 and approached him on 10.5.2006 with history of injury on right heel.

Statement of Dr. R. P. Narayan:

The Ethics Committee taken a statement from Dr. R. P. Narayan which stated:

- i) Ulcer over Tendo Achilles area measuring 6cm x 3 cm. in size.
  - ii) Dr R. P. Narayan opined giving an injection into plantar fascia region will not result into weaking/rupture of Tendo Achilles.
- d) Expert Opinion of Dr. R. C. Siwach:

Medical Council of India sought the opinion of Dr. R. C. Siwach, Prof. & HOD, Deptt. of Orthopaedics, Medical College, Rohtak. He opined that steroid injection alongwith Xylocaine specially at the interval of 10 days was undesirable as a diabetic patients were very prone for infection. He also opined that Tendo Achilles in diabetic patients were prone for spontaneous rupture of Tendo Achilles which could occur while climbing stairs, walking or trivial trauma. He also opined that unlikely scooter accident had caused this rupture because no evidence of any external injury of like abrasion, swelling or echymosis on the rupture site of Tendo Achilles.

The Members of the Ethics Committee have gone through the available records provided as well as opinion of expert in the previous meeting and, now drawn the following conclusion:

- (i) *He was treated for planter fasciitis with Depomedrol injections. He received four injections in 10 day interval which is not a right line of approach. Being a diabetic patient Depomedrol will make the person to prone for infection.*
- (ii) *The rupture of tendo achillis can occur spontaneously or following trivial injury as opined by Dr. R. C. Siwach, Professor & HOD, Deptt. of Orthopaedics, Medical College, Rohtak. Hence, it is of considered opinion that rupture of tendo achillis is not related to the line of management adopted by Dr. Sanyal.*
- (iii) *There is no medical negligence in the management.*
- (iv) *He is warned to be more careful in not using depot preparation of steroid for a diabetic patient.*

*The matter was considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 05/02/2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that in the decision of the Ethics Committee dated 17.11.2009 regarding appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council made by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) the question of a complainant being filed by 3<sup>rd</sup> party has not been resolved by the Ethics Committee*

*In view of above, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to refer the matter back to the Ethics Committee for reconsideration."*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee re-considered the matter with regards to appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council made by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) in the light of the Executive Committee decision dated 05.02.2010. The members of the Ethics Committee have taken into consideration the decision of the Delhi Medical Council and Delhi Medical Council decision has been reproduced as under:*

- 1. The steroid injection given by Dr. S. S. Sanyal for plantar fasciitis is a known documented method of treatment.*
- 2. Depending on the severity of the case 3-4 injections can be given.*
- 3. The site of injection for plantar fasciitis is on the sole. The rupture of Tendo Achillis is on the posterior aspect of the calcaneum (heel bone). The two sites are different and hence injection for plantar fasciitis leading to Tendo Achillis rupture is not possible.*
- 4. Commonest age of Tendo Achillis rupture is around 40-50 yrs. Of age. Furthermore diabetic and hypertensive persons are predisposed for it. Hence the patients developing Tendo Achillis rupture after trivial trauma is known.*

*The Ethics Committee reiterated its earlier decision dated 17.11.2009 that there is no medical negligence in the management Plantar fasciitis. Dr. S. S. Sanyal may be warned to be more careful in using depot preparation of steroid for a diabetic patient, subsequently the Committee decided to take*



*Retainer Advocate opinion in view of appeal made by M.P.(IIIrd party) person in this case."*

*It is further to note that an Item was prepared to be placed before the Executive Committee for its consideration but the said was referred back by the Office stating that the Ethics Committee has not taken cognizance of the Executive Committee decision in reference to Appeal against Delhi Medical Council filed by 3<sup>d</sup> party.*

*The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 02<sup>nd</sup> & 03<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010 and the decision was as under:*

*"The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regards to appeal against the order dated 01.11.2007 of Delhi Medical Council made by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan, Hon'ble Member of Parliament (Lok Sabha) and also noted that the observation made by the Executive Committee of the Council and the opinion of legal retainer. Legal opinion states that third party request is outside the purview of Regulations 8.8 of the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) (Amendment) Regulation 2002.*

*In view of legal opinion the Ethics Committee is unable to consider the appeal forwarded by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan as it is beyond the Regulations."*

*In view of above and after due deliberations, the members of the Executive Committee of the Council decided to approve the decision of the Ethics Committee taken at its meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> March, 2010 and further decided to recommend to the General Body of the Council not to consider the appeal forwarded by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan as it is beyond the Regulations.""*

After due deliberation, the General Body of the Council at its meeting held on 11.03.2010 decided that the appeal forwarded by Sh. Harishchandra Chavan cannot be considered as it is beyond the Regulations.

**101. Continuance of recognition of Hospital for Internship Training – Holy Cross Hospital, Kottayam, Kerala.**

Read: The matter with regard to Continuance of recognition of Hospital for Internship Training – Holy Cross Hospital, Kottayam, Kerala as referred by the Executive Committee.

The members of the Council observed that the Executive Committee of the Council at its meeting held on 01.12.2009 while deliberating on the issue for recognition of Hospital for internship training had decided as under:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that at the meeting dated 19.8.2009 held between the officials of the council with the officials of the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Govt. of India, it was decided that henceforth internship should only be permitted in teaching hospitals affiliated to medical colleges.*

*In view of above, it was decided that this matter may be placed before the General Body of the Council for its consideration at its next meeting and further decided to defer the consideration of the matter till then."*

After due deliberations, the members of the Council decided to ratify the decision arrived at the meeting dated 19.8.2009 held between the officials of the Council with the officials of the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Govt. of India, that henceforth internship should only be permitted in teaching hospitals affiliated to medical colleges.

In view of above, it was further decided not to continue the recognition of Holy Cross Hospital, Kottiyam, Kerala for internship training.

**102. Recognition of Hospital for Internship Training – Shri Moolchand Kharaiti Ram Hospital & Ayurvedic Research Institute, New Delhi.**

Read: The matter with regard to Recognition of Hospital for Internship Training – Shri Moolchand Kharaiti Ram Hospital & Ayurvedic Research Institute, New Delhi as referred by the Executive Committee.

The members of the Council observed that the Executive Committee of the Council at its meeting held on 01.12.2009 while deliberating on the issue for recognition of Hospital for internship training had decided as under:-

*"The members of the Executive Committee of the Council observed that at the meeting dated 19.8.2009 held between the officials of the council with the officials of the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Govt. of India, it was decided that henceforth internship should only be permitted in teaching hospitals affiliated to medical colleges.*

*In view of above, it was decided that this matter may be placed before the General Body of the Council for its consideration at its next meeting and further decided to defer the consideration of the matter till then."*

After due deliberations, the members of the Council decided to ratify the decision arrived at the meeting dated 19.8.2009 held between the officials of the Council with the officials of the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Govt. of India, that henceforth internship should only be permitted in teaching hospitals affiliated to medical colleges.

In view of above, it was further decided not to continue the recognition of Shri Moolchand Kharaiti Ram Hospital & Ayurvedic Research Institute, New Delhi for internship training.

**103. Teachers Eligibility Criteria for Super-Speciality**

Read: The matter with regard to Teachers Eligibility Criteria for Super-Speciality alongwith the following recommendations of the Teachers Eligibility sub-committee:-

*"While going through the Amendment dated 24th July, 2009 in Minimum Qualifications for Teachers in Medical Institutions Regulations, 1998 (copy enclosed) it was observed that the Teachers Eligibility Criteria for the following Super-speciality need minor addition as below:-*

*(I) D.M. (Rheumatology)*

*(A) Professor D.M. (Rheumatology)  
M.D. (Genl. Medicine) }with 2 years  
M.D. (Paediatrics) }special training in  
M.D. (PMR) }Rheumatology*

*(B) Reader -do-*

*(C) Asstt. Prof./ -do-  
Lecturer*

*(D) Tutor/ MBBS  
Demonstrator/  
Resident/  
Registrar*

*(II) D.M. (Child Adolescent Psychiatry)*

*(A) Professor D.M. (Child Adolescent Psychiatry)  
M.D. (Psychiatry) with 2 years  
special training in Child Adolescent Psychiatry*

*(B) Reader -do-*

*(C) Asstt. Prof./ -do-  
Lecturer*

*(D) Tutor/ MBBS  
Demonstrator/  
Resident/  
Registrar*

*(III) D.M. (Paediatric Gastroenterology)*

*(A) Professor D.M. (Paediatric Gastroenterology)*

*D.M. (Gastroenterology) with 2 years special training in  
Paediatric Gastroenterology*

*M.D (Paediatrics) with 2 years special training in  
Paediatric Gastroenterology*

*(B) Reader -do-*

*(C) Asstt. Prof./ -do-  
Lecturer*

*(D) Tutor/ MBBS  
Demonstrator/  
Resident/ Registrar*

***(IV) D.M. (Paediatric Cardiology)***

*(A) Professor D.M. (Paediatric Cardiology)  
D.M. (Cardiology) with 2 years special training in  
Paediatric Cardiology.*

*M.D. (Paediatrics) with 2 years special training in  
Paediatrics Cardiology*

- (B) Reader -do-
- (C) Asstt. Prof./ Lecturer -do-
- (D) Tutor/ Demonstrator/ Resident/ Registrar MBBS

**(V) D.M. (Cardiac Anaesthesiology)**

- (A) Professor D.M. (Cardiac Anaesthesiology)  
M.D. (Anaesthesiology) with 2 years  
special training in Cardiac Anaesthesiology
- (B) Reader -do-
- (C) Asstt. Prof./ Lecturer -do-
- (D) Tutor/ Demonstrator/ Resident/ Registrar" MBBS

**104. Outcome analysis of the decisions of the General Body of the Council.**

The Council noted the Outcome analysis of the decisions of the General Body of the Council.

The members of the Council noted that the action taken of the items of the meetings of the General Body has been included in this agenda against item no. 2 and the current status / outcome analysis item wise are as under:

- (A) General Body dated 13-11-2008

SUBJECT	ACTION TAKEN	OUTCOME ANALYSIS
187. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Recognition of MD (Obst. & Gynae.) & DGO qualifications in respect of students being trained at SVS Medical College, Mahabubnagar	The decision has been communicated to the Central Government, Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 14.01.2009 for notification with copy to concerned authorities. Notification from the Govt. is awaited.	Notification awaited for D.G.O.
295. Maharashtra University of Health Sciences and MGM University of Health Sciences (Deemed University) – Recognition of D.G.O. qualification in respect of students being trained at MGM Medical College, Navi Mumbai	The decision has been communicated to the Central Government, Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 14.01.2009 for notification with copy to concerned authorities. Notification from the Govt. is awaited.	Notification awaited.

## (B) General Body dated 01-03-2009

SUBJECT	ACTION TAKEN	OUTCOME ANALYSIS
86. Public Private Partnership	The decision of the General Body has been communicated to the Central Government vide letter dated 05.05.2009. Approval of the Central Government is still awaited	Approval of the Central Government is awaited

## (C) General Body dated 18-11-2009

SUBJECT	ACTION TAKEN	OUTCOME ANALYSIS
6. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Siddhartha Medical College, Vijayawada for the award of MD (Physiology) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 22.01.2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	No notification has been received from the Central Govt.
7. Sri Venkateshwara University, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada and N.T.R. University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada - Approval of S.V. Medical College, Tirupati for the award of M.D.(General Medicine) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 22/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
8. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of MS(ENT) qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Medical College, Karaikal.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 22/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
9. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of MD(General Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Medical College, Karaikal.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 22/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
10. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of MD(DVL) qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Medical College, Karaikal.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-

11. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of MS(General Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Medical College, Karaikal.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
12. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of MD(Paediatrics) qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Medical College, Karaikal.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
13. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of DA qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Medical College, Karaikal.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
14. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of MS(Orthopaedics) qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Medical College, Karaikal.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
15. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of MS(Ophthalmology) & DO qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Medical College, Karaikal.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
16. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of MS(OBG) qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Medical College, Karaikal.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
17. The Tamilnadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai – Recognition of MD(Paediatrics) qualification in respect of students being trained at Coimbatore Medical College, Coimbatore.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
18. The Tamilnadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai – Recognition of MD(DVL) qualification in respect of students being trained at PSG Institute of Medical Sciences & Research, Coimbatore.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-

19. The Tamilnadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai – Approval of College of Oncological Sciences Cancer Institute, Chennai for the award of MD (Radiotherapy) qualification again the increased intake.	The decision of Council has been communicated to the college authorities vide MCI letter dated 20/01/2010 with copy to the Central Govt., Ministry of H&FW, University and D.M.E.	-Do-
20. The Tamilnadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai – Approval of Madurai Medical College, Madurai for the award of MD (DVL) qualification granted by The Tamilnadu Dr. MGR Medical University against the increased intake.	The decision of Council has been communicated to the college authorities vide MCI letter dated 20/01/2010 with copy to the Central Govt., Ministry of H&FW, University and D.M.E.	-Do-
21. i) Bombay University, & Mumbai University – Approval of Tata Memorial Hospital, Mumbai for the award of MD(Radio-diagnosis) & DMRD qualifications.  ii) Maharashtra University Health Sciences & Homi Bhabha National Intitute (Deemed University) - Recognition of MD (Radio-Diagnosis) & D.M.R.D. qualifications in respect of students being trained at Tata Memorial Hospital, Mumbai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
22. Nagarjuna University & Dr.NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Recognition of DPM qualification in respect of students being trained at Guntur Medical College, Guntur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
23. Bhavnagar University – Recognition of MD (OBG) qualification in respect of students being trained at Government Medical College, Bhavnagar.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
24. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Andhra Medical College, Vishakapatnam for the award of MD (General Medicine) qualification in respect of increased intake.	The decision of Council has been communicated to the college authorities vide MCI letter dated 20/01/2010 with copy to the Central Govt., Ministry of H&FW, University and D.M.E.	-Do-

25. Rajasthan University –Approval of R.N.T. Medical College, Udaipur M.D.(Derm. Ven. & Leprosy) qualification in respect of students being trained at R.N.T. Medical College, Udaipur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
26. i) Sri Venkateswara University – Recognition of MS (Ophthal.) & DO qualifications in respect of students being trained at Kurnool Medical College, Kurnool. ii) Andhra Pradesh University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada and N.T.R. University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada - Approval of Kurnool Medical College, Kurnool for the award of MS (Ophthalmology) & DO qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
27. Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University) – Recognition of M.Ch. (Neuro-Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at Sher-I-Kashmir Institute of medical Sciences.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
28. N.T.R. University of Health Sciences, Vijaywada- Approval of Gandhi Medical College, Secundrabad for the award of D.M. (Gastroentrology) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
29. Dr. N.T.R. University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad for the award of DO qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
31. University of Mumbai & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nasik – Recognition of MD (Paediatrics) qualification in respect of students being trained at Bombay Hospital Institute of Medical Sciences, Mumbai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-



32. Inclusion of name of Sri Devaraj Urs University, Kolar (formerly known as Sri Devaraj Urs Academy of Higher Education and Research) in the first schedule of IMC Act, 1956.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
33. University of Mumbai & Maharashtra Institute of Health Sciences – Recognition of M.Ch. (Neurosurgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at Bombay Hospital Institute of Medical Sciences, Mumbai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
34. Sri Ramachandra University– Recognition of M.Ch. (Paediatric Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at Sri Ramachandra Medical College & Research Institute, Chennai	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
35. Bombay & Goa University – Recognition of M.D.(Radio-Diagnosis)_ & D.M.R.D. qualifications in respect of students being trained at Goa Medical College, Bombolim, Goa.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
36. Chhatrapati Sahuji Maharaj Medical University, Lucknow – Recognition of M.Ch. (Surgical Oncology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Chhatrapati Sahuji Maharaj Medical University, Lucknow.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
37. Saurashtra University– Recognition of M.D.(Pharmacology) qualification in respect of students being trained at C.U.Shah Medical College, Surendranagar.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
38. Gujarat University– Recognition of M.D.(Immuno Haematology & Blood Transfusion) qualification in respect of students being trained at B.J.Medical College, Ahmedabad.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
39. Sanjay Gandhi Postgraduate Institute of Medical Sciences	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt.,	-Do-

	(Deemed University), Lucknow – Recognition of M.Ch. (CTVS) qualification in respect of Sanjay Gandhi Postgraduate Institute of Medical Sciences, Lucknow – regarding amendment in the notification of Government of India.	Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
40	Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of M.D.(Anaesthesia) qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Kirupananda Variyar Medical College, Salem.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
41	Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of M.S. (ENT) qualification in respect of students being trained at Vinayaka Mission's Kirupananda Variyar Medical College, Salem.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
42.	D.Y. Patil University, Kolhapur – Recognition of M.D.(Obstetrics & Gynaecology) qualification in respect of students being trained at D.Y.Patil Medical College, Kolhapur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
45.	Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences University, Nagpur – Recognition of M.S.(Orthopaedics) qualification in respect of students being trained at J.N. Medical College, Swangi Wardha.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
46.	Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences University, Nagpur – Recognition of DPM qualification in respect of students being trained at J.N. Medical College, Swangi Wardha.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
47.	Datta Meghe Institute of Medical Sciences University, Nagpur – Recognition of MD (Radio-Diagnosis) qualification in respect of students being trained at J.N. Medical College, Swangi Wardha.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
50.	Veer Narmad South Gujarat University- Recognition of M.D.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt.,	-Do-

	(Physiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Surat,	Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
51.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S. Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of DTCD qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
52.	Veer Narmed South Gujarat University – Recognition of M.D. (Paeditrics) qualification in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat .	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
53.	Veer Narmed South Gujarat University – Recognition of M.S. (General Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat .	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
54.	Madras University – Recognition of M.D. (Pharmacology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. ALM Postgraduate Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, Chennai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
55.	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval of Yenepoya Medical College, Mangalore for the award of M.S. (ENT) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
56.	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval of Yenepoya Medical College, Mangalore for the award of M.S. (Ophthalmology) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
57.	D.Y. Patil University, Kolhapur– Recognition of M.D.(Paeditrics) qualification in respect of students being trained at	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of	-Do-

	D.Y.Patil Medical College, Kolhapur.	notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
58.	West Bengal University of Health Sciences, Kolkata – Approval of Medical College, Kolkata for the award of M.D.(Biochemistry) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
61.	D.Y. Patil University, Kolhapur – Recognition of M.D.(Pathology) qualification in respect of students being trained at D.Y.Patil Medical College, Kolhapur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
62.	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval of M.D. (Anaesthesia) qualification in respect of students being trained at K.S. Hegde Medical Academy, Mangalore.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
63.	Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of DGO qualification in respect of students being trained at Aarupadai Veedu Medical College, Pondicherry.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
64.	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval of M.S. (General Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at K.S. Hegde Medical Academy, Mangalore.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
65. (i)	Sri Venkateswara University & Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Kurool Medical College, Kurool for the award of MD (Dermatology/DVL) & DD/DDVL qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
(ii)	Sri Venkateswara University & Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Recognition of MD(Venereology) & DV in respect of students being trained at Kurool Medical College, Kurool.		

69.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of MD (DVL) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
70.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of MS (Ophthalmology) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
71.	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval of Bangalore Medical College, Bangalore for the award of M.Ch. (Paed. Surgery) qualification at Bangalore Medical College, Bangalore.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
72.	The Tamilnadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai– Approval of MD (Paediatrics) qualification in respect of students being trained at Govt. Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College, Salem.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
74.	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval of M.S. (ENT) qualification in respect of students being trained at K.S. Hegde Medical Academy, Mangalore.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
75.	The Tamilnadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai – Recognition of M.Ch. (Surgical Oncology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Kilpauk Medical College, Chennai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 19/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
76.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, Eluru for the award of MS (Obst.& Gynae) & DGO qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
77.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Siddhartha Medical College, Vijayawada for the award of MD	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of	-Do-

(Anatomy) qualification.	notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
78. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Siddhartha Medical College, Vijayawada for the award of MD (Community Medicine) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
79. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (Biochemistry) qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
80. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (Community Medicine) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
81. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (Radio-Diagnosis) qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
82. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (Psychiatry) qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
83. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MS (Ophthalmology) qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
84. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Gandhi Medical College, Secunderabad for the award of M.D.(Forensic Medicine) qualification in respect of increased intake.	The decision of Council has been communicated to the college authorities vide MCI letter dated 21/01/2010 with copy to the Central Govt., Ministry of H&FW, University and D.M.E.	-Do-
85. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College,	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council	-Do-

	Nellore for the award of MD (Paediatrics) qualifications	letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
86.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (DVL) qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
87.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (Anaesthesia) qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
88.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, Eluru for the award of DA.qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
89.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, Eluru for the award of DCH.qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
90.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Kamineni Institute of Medical Sciences, Narketpally for the award of MD (Psychiatry) qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
91.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad for the award of MD (Paediatrics) qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
92.	Dr. D.Y. Patil University Pune – Approval Dr. D.Y. Patil Medical college, Pimpri,Pune for award of DO qualification in respect of increased intake.	The decision of Council has been communicated to the college authorities vide MCI letter dated 21/01/2010 with copy to the Central Govt., Ministry of H&FW, University and D.M.E.	-Do-
93.	Dr. D.Y. Patil University, Pune – Recognition of MD(Biochemistry) qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. D.Y. Patil	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of	-Do-

Medical college, Pimpri,Pune.	notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
94. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, Eluru for the award of DTCD qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
95. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Siddhartha Medical College, Vijayawada for the award of MD (General Medicine) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
96. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MS (Orthopaedics) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
97. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of MD (Microbiology) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
98. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of MS (General Surgery) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
99. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of MD (General Medicine) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 31/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
100. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Kamineni Institute of Medical Sciences, Narketpally for the award of MD (TB & Chest Dise) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
101. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Kamineni Institute of Medical	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council	-Do-



	Sciences, Narketpally for the award of MD (Microbiology) qualification.	letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
102.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Kamineni Institute of Medical Sciences, Narketpally for the award of DMRD qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
103.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Kamineni Institute of Medical Sciences, Narketpally for the award of MD (Biochemistry) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
104.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad for the award of DGO qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
105.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Deccan College of Medical Sciences, Hyderabad for the award of MD(Microbiology) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
106.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (Physiology) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
107.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, Eluru for the award of DMRD qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
108.	Rajasthan University & Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur – Approval of Govt. Medical College, Kota for the award of M.D.(Radio-Diagnosis) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
109.	Bharati Vidyapeeth University– Recognition of M.D (Psychiatry) qualification in respect of	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council	-Do-

	students being trained at Bharati Vidyapeeth University Medical College, Pune.	letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
110.	Padmashree Dr.D.Y.Patil University – Recognition of M.D (Pathology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. D. Y. Patil Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Navi Mumbai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
111.	KLE University, Belgaum – Recognition of M.D (Psychiatry) qualification in respect of students being trained at J.L.N.Medical College, Belgaum.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
112.	Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Faridkot – Approval of Sri Guru Ram Das Institute of Medical Sciences & Research, Amritsar for the award of MD (General Medicine) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
113.	Andhra University, Nagarjuna University & Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Recognition of DCP in respect of students being trained at Guntur Medical College, Guntur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
116.	Andhra University & Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam for the award of MD (Forensic Medicine) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
117.(i)	Poona University – Approval of Rural Medical College, Loni for the award of MD (Pharmacology) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
(ii)	Pravara Institute of Medical Sciences (Deemed University) – Recognition of MD(Pharmacology) in respect of students being trained at Rural Medical College, Loni.		

118. Sri Venkateswara University & Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Kurnool Medical College, Kurnool for the award of DGO qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
119. Kakatiya University & Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Recognition of DDVL qualification in respect of students being trained at Kakatiya Medical College, Warangal	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
120. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (TB & RD) qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
122. Bharati Vidyapeeth University – Recognition of DMRD qualification in respect of students being trained at Bharati Vidyapeeth Medical College, Pune.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
124. Bombay University/ Mumbai University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of M.D(Radio-diagnosis) qualification in respect of students being trained at Grant Medical College, Mumbai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
125. Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Faridkot – Approval of Sri Guru Ram Das Institute of Medical Sciences & Research, Amritsar for the award of MS (General Surgery) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
126. Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Faridkot – Approval of Sri Guru Ram Das Institute of Medical Sciences & Research, Amritsar for the award of MD (Anaesthesia) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
127. Padmashree Dr.D.Y.Patil University, – Recognition of M.D	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt.,	-Do-

	(Microbiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. D. Y. Patil Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Navi Mumbai.	Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
128	(i) Nagpur University – Approval of Indira Gandhi Medical College, Nagpur for the award of MD (Biochemistry) qualification  (ii) RTM Nagpur University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of MD(Biochemistry) in respect of students being trained at Indira Gandhi Medical College, Nagpur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
129	Aligarh Muslim University– Recognition of MD(Biochemistry) in respect of students being trained at J.L.N. Medical College, Aligarh.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
130.	Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval Kempegowda Institute of Medical Sciences, Bangalore for the award of DMRD qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
131.	Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Faridkot – Approval of Dayanand Medical College, Ludhiana for the award of DM (Cardiology) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
132.	Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Faridkot – Approval of Dayanand Medical College, Ludhiana for the award of M.Ch. (Plastic Surgery) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
133.	Bihar University, Baba Shaheb Bhim Rao Ambedkar Bihar University, Mithila University and L.N.Mithila University – Recognition of M.S (Orthopaedics)& D. Ortho. qualification in respect of students being trained at	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-

	Darbhang Medical College, Laheriasarai.		
134.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of MD (Anaesthesia) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
135.	Veer Narmed South Gujarat University, – Recognition of M.D. (Community Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat .	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
136.	Mumbai University/ Bombay University & Maharashtra University Of Health Sciences – Approval of L.T.M Medical College, Mumbai for the award of DCH qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
137	Andhra University, Nagarjuna University & Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Recognition of MD (Physiology) in respect of students being trained at Guntur Medical College, Guntur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
138.	Rajasthan University & Rajasthan University of Health Sciences – Recognition of MD(Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation) qualification in respect of students being trained at S.M.S.Medical College, Jaipur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
139.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MS (Obst. & Gynae.) qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
140	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MS (General Surgery) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-

141. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (Pathology) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
142. D.Y. Patil University, Kolhapur – Recognition of M.S.(ENT) qualification in respect of students being trained at D.Y.Patil Medical College, Kolhapur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
143. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of MD (Anatomy) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
144. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Kamineni Institute of Medical Sciences, Narketpally for the award of MD (DVL) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
145. Sardar Patel University – Recognition of MD(TB & Respiratory Diseases) qualification in respect of students being trained at Pramukh Swami Medical College, Karamsad.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 31/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
146. Aligarh Muslim University – Recognition of MD(Forensic Medicine) in respect of students being trained at J.L.N. Medical College, Aligarh.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
147. Bombay University/ Mumbai University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of DFM qualification in respect of students being trained at Grant Medical College, Mumbai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
148. Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Approval of NKP Salve Institute of Medical Sciences & Research Centre, Nagpur for the award of DO qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-

149. Berhampur University – Recognition of MD (DVL) qualification in respect of students being trained at MKCG Medical College, Berhampur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
150. Padmashree Dr.D.Y.Patil University – Recognition of DGO qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. D. Y. Patil Medical College Hospital & Research Centre, Navi Mumbai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
151. MGM University of Health Sciences, Navi Mumbai – Recognition of MD (Obst & Gynae) qualification in respect of students being trained at MGM Medical College, Navi Mumbai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 22/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
152. Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla – Recognition of MD (Pathology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Indira Gandhi Medical College, Shimla.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
154. Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut – Approval of Santosh Medical College, Ghaziabad for the award of M.S.(Ortho.) & D.Ortho. qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
155. Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut – Recognition of MS(ENT) qualification in respect of Students being trained at Santosh Medical College, Ghaziabad and also approval of the college for the award of DLO. qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
156. Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut – Approval of Santosh Medical College, Ghaziabad for the award of D.O. qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
157. Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut – Approval of Santosh Medical College, Ghaziabad for	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council	-Do-

	the award of DCH qualification.	letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
160.	University of Mumbai & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nasik – Recognition of MD (Anaesthesiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Bombay Hospital Institute of Medical Sciences, Mumbai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
161.	Rajasthan University & Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur – Approval of S.N. Medical College, Jodhpur for the award of MS (Anatomy) qualification .	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
162.	(i) Nagpur University – Approval of Indira Gandhi Medical College, Nagpur for the award of D.O./DOMS qualification  (ii) RTM Nagpur University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of D.O./DOMS in respect of students being trained at Indira Gandhi Medical College, Nagpur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
163.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S. Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of D.Ortho. qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
164.	Madras University & The Tamilnadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai – Recognition of MD (Physiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Kilpauk Medical College, Chennai.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
165.	Shivaji University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of MS (ENT) & DLO qualifications in respect of students being trained at Dr, V.M. Medical College, Solapur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-



166. Shivaji University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of MD (Microbiology) qualifications in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Miraj.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
167. Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Approval of NKP Salve Institute of Medical Sciences & Research Centre, Nagpur for the award of DCH qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
168. The Tamilnadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University, Chennai – Approval of P.S.G. Institute of Medical Sciences & Research, Coimbatore for the award of MD (Community Medicine) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
169. Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore –Approval of Kempegowda Institute of Medical Sciences, Bangalore for the award of DO/DOMS qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
170. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Alluri Sitarama Raju Academy of Medical Sciences, Eluru for the award of D..Ortho. qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
171. Sardar Patel University – Recognition of M.D.(Pharmacology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Pramukh Swami Medical College, Karamsad.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
172. Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Approval of NKP Salve Institute of Medical Sciences & Research Centre, Nagpur for the award of DGO qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
173. Kashmir University – Recognition of M.D.(Paediatrics) qualification in respect of students being trained	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council	-Do-

at Government Medical College, Srinagar	letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
174. Shivaji University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of MD (Pharmacology) qualifications in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Miraj.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
175. Bharati Vidyapeeth University– Recognition of M.S (ENT) qualification in respect of students being trained at Bharati Vidyapeeth University Medical College, Pune.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
176. SRTRM, University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of MS (ENT) qualifications in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Nanded.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
177. SRTRM, University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of MD (TB & Resp./ Chest Dis.) qualifications in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Nanded.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
178. Marathwada University/Dr.Baba Saheb Ambedkar Marathwada University, Aurangabad – recognition of MD (Radio Diagnosis) & DMRD qualification in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Aurangabad	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
179. B.P. Koirala Instt. of Health Sciences, Dharan, Nepal (Deemed University) - Recognition MD (Anaesthesiology) qualification in respect of B.P.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
180. University of Bombay/Mumbai & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of Diploma in Marine Medicine	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of	-Do-

Qualification in respect of students being trained at Institute of Naval Medicine, INHS, Asvini, Mumbai.	notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
181. Pondicherry University– Approval of Mahatma Gandhi Medical College & Research Insitute Puducherry for the award of D.Ortho. qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
182. Vinayaka Missions University – Recognition of DCH qualification in respect of students being trained at Aarupadai Veedu Medical College, Puducherry.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
183. Rajasthan University & Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur – Approval of Dr. S.N. Medical College, Jodhpur for the award of MD (Psychiatry) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
184. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MD (Microbiology) qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
185. SRTRM, University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of MD(Microbiology) qualifications in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Nanded.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
186. Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Faridkot – Recognition of DM(Gastroenterology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Dayanand Medical College, Ludhiana	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
187. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Recognition of MD(Microbiology)	The decision of Council has been communicated to the college authorities vide MCI letter dated 21/01/2010 with copy to the Central Govt., Ministry of	-Do-

	qualification in respect of students being trained at Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam in respect of increased intake.	H&FW, University and D.M.E.	
188.	Pondicherry University– Approval of Mahatma Gandhi Medical College, & Research Institute Puducherry for the award of D.D.V. L. qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
189.	Gauhati University– Recognition of M. Ch. (Urology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Gauhati Medical College, Gauhati.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
190.	Patna University, Patna- Recognition of M.D. (Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation) and DPMR qualification in respect of students being trained at Patna Medical College, Patna.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
191.	B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura – Recognition of M.D.(Microbiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Katihar Medical College, Katihar.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
192.	Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Gandhi Medical College, Hyderabad for the award of DM(Neurology) qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
193.	B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura– Recognition of M.D.(Obst.& Gynae.) & DGO qualifications in respect of students being trained at Katihar Medical College, Katihar.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
194.	Pondicherry University– Approval of Mahatma Gandhi Medical College & Research Institute Puducherry for the award of D.O. qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21.01.2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-

195. Pondicherry University – Approval of Mahatma Gandhi Medical College & Research Institute Puducherry for the award of DTCD. qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
196. Shivaji University & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of MD (Community Medicine)& DPH qualifications in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Miraj.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
197. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of Narayana Medical College, Nellore for the award of MS (ENT) qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
198. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of MD (TB & RD) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
199. B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura– Recognition of M.D.(Biochemistry) qualification in respect of students being trained at Katihar Medical College, Katihar.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
200. West Bengal University of Health Sciences, Kolkatta– Recognition of D.M. (Clinical Haematology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Medical College, Kolkatta.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
201. Mahatma Gandhi University, Kottayam – Recognition of MS/MD(Anatomy) qualification in respect of students being trained at Govt. Medical College, Kottayam.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
202. Delhi University – Recognition of DCH qualification in respect of students being trained at Kasturba Hospital, Delhi.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of	-Do-

	notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
203. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Recognition of MD (Microbiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Mamta Medical College, Khammam.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
204. B.N. Mandal University – Recognition of D.C.H. qualification in respect of students being trained at Mata Gujri Memorial Medical College, Kishanganj.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
205. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of D.P.M. qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
206. Veer Narmed South Gujarat University – Recognition of M.D. (Anesthesia) qualification in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat .	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
207. Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval of M.D. (General Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at K.S. Hegde Medical Academy, Mangalore.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
208. Punjab University & Baba Farid University of Health Sciences, Faridkot –Approval of Dayanand Medical College, Ludhiana for the award of M.D.(Microbiology) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
210. Veer Narmed South Gujarat University – Recognition of M.D. (General Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat .	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-

211. Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore – Approval of M.D. (Paediatrics) qualification in respect of students being trained at K.S. Hegde Medical Academy, Mangalore.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
212. B.N. Mandal University, Madhepura – Recognition of M.D.(Gen. Medicine) qualification in respect of students being trained at Katihar Medical College, Katihar.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
213. Rajasthan University & Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur – Recognition of MD (Microbiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Dr. S.N. Medical College, Jodhpur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
216. Saurashtra University– Recognition of M.D.(Gen. Medicine) & M.D.(P.S.M.) qualification in respect of Pt. Deen Dayal Upadhyay Medical College, Rajkot– regarding amendment in the notification of Government of India.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
217. Amendments in the earlier Notification against the entry of M.D.(Psychiatry) qualification of B.J.Medical College, Ahmedabad- regarding change of date.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
221 Recognition of Uttranchal Forest Hospital Trust Medical College, Haldwani for the award of MBBS degree granted by Kumoun University, Nainital.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university, D.M.E and State Government.	-Do-
222. Approval of Sri Aurobindo Institute of Medical Sciences, Indore for the award of MBBS degree granted by Devi Ahilya Vishwa Vidhyalaya University, indore.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university, D.M.E and State Government.	-Do-
223. Approval of Kanyakumari Government Medical College,	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt.,	-Do-

Asaripallam, Kanyakumari for the award of MBBS degree granted by The Tamil Nadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai.	Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university, D.M.E and State Government.	
224. Approval of Coimbatore Medical College, Coimbatore for the award of MBBS degree granted by The Tamil Nadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Chennai against increased intake i.e. from 110 to 150.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 with copy to college, university, D.M.E and State Government.	-Do-
229. Aarupadai Veedu Medical College and Hospital, Puducherry – Request for inclusion of MBBS degree in the first schedule of IMC Act, 1956- Reg.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 with copy to university.	-Do-
230. Vinayaka Missions University, Salem – Consideration of inclusion of Vinayaka Missions Kirupananda Variyar Medical College & Hospital, Salem for award of MBBS qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 with copy to University.	-Do-
256. D.Y. Patil University, Kolhapur – Recognition of M.S.(General Surgery) qualification in respect of students being trained at D.Y.Patil Medical College, Kolhapur.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
262. Fee as prescribed by the General Body for complaint & appeal cases received u/s 8.7 & 8.8 of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 – Govt. letter dated 09.03.2009 regarding.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Secretary, Central Govt. Ministry of H&FW. vide Council letter dated 3/12/2009.	-Do-
270. Shivaji University and now by Krishna Instt. of Medical Sciences, (Deemed University) Karad - Recognition of M.D.(Physiology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Krishna Instt. of Medical Sciences, Karad.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
271. Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur – Approval of J.L.N.Medical College, Ajmer for	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council	-Do-



	the award of M.D.(Psychiatry) qualification.	letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
272.	Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut – Approval of Santosh Medical College, Ghaziabad for the award of DGO qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
273.	Rajasthan University & Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur – Approval of J.L.N. Medical College, Ajmer for the award of M.D.(Physiology) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
275.	Nagpur University, RTM University Nagpur & Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Approval of Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Medical Sciences, Sewagram, Wardha for the award of MD(Radio-Diag.) & DMRD qualifications.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
276.	Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut – Approval of Santosh Medical College, Ghaziabad for the award of M.D.(Anesthesiology) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
277.	Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut – Approval of Santosh Medical College, Ghaziabad for the award of M.D.(General Medicine) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
278.	Ch. Charan Singh University, Meerut – Approval of Santosh Medical College, Ghaziabad for the award of M.S.(General Surgery) qualification.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
285.	Rajasthan University/Rajasthan University of Health Sciences, Jaipur – Approval of J.L.N. Medical College, Ajmer for the	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of	-Do-

award of MD(Microbiology) qualification.	notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	
286. Veer Narmed South Gujarat University – Recognition of M.S. (Ophthalmology) qualification in respect of students being trained at Surat Municipal Institute of Medical Education & Research, Surat .	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
287. Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Recognition of MS(Orthopaedics) in respect of students being trained at ACPM Medical College, Dhule.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
288. Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, Nashik – Approval of NKP Salve Institute of Medical Sciences & Research Centre, Nagpur for the award of DA qualifications	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
289. Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada – Approval of S.V.S.Medical College, Mahabubnagar for the award of MS (ENT) qualification	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
290. Sardar Patel University – Recognition of M.D.(Microbiology) & Diploma in Microbiology qualification in respect of students being trained at Pramukh Swami Medical College, Karamsad.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
292. Amendments in the earlier Notification against the entry of D.M.(Neuro-Radiology) of National Instt. of Mental Health & Neuro Sciences (Deemed University) – regarding change of date.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 21/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university and D.M.E.	-Do-
295. Reservation of seats in postgraduate degree course to be filled through All Indian Entrance Examination quota for doctors serving in remote/difficult areas.	The decision of the Council has been sent to the Central Govt. vide MCI letter dated 21/11/2009 for issue of Notification.	No reply has been received from the Central Govt. so far.

304. Change in the Eligibility Criteria pertaining to the qualifying examination for entering into medical courses.	The decision of the General Body was communicated to the Central Govt. vide letter dated 25/11/2009. In reference to the said communication, the Council office had received a letter dated 07/01/2010 from the Central Govt. in the matter and the same was again considered by the Executive Committee at its meeting held on 12/01/2010, the decision of the Executive Committee taken at its meeting held on 12/01/2010 has been communicated to the Central Govt. vide letter dated 29/01/2010 for further action & approval. The approval of the Central Govt. is still awaited in the matter.	No notification has been received from the Central Govt.
305. Requirements to be fulfilled by the applicant colleges for obtaining Letter of Intent and Letter of Permission for Establishment of New Medical Colleges and yearly renewals u/s 10A of the IMC Act, 1956.	The decision has been communicated to Central Govt. vide Council letter dated 26.11.2009. No Communication has been received by the Council till date in this regard.	-Do-
308: Approval of M.E.S. Medial College, Malapuram for the award of MBBS degree granted by Calicut University, Calicut.	The decision of the council has been communicated to the Central Govt., Ministry of Health & F.W. vide Council letter dated 20/01/2010 for issue of notification with copy to college, university D.M.E and State Government.	-Do-

The Minutes of item Nos.42, 47, 48, 80, 81, 82, 83, 96, 97, 99 & 100 pertaining to Ethics cases & item Nos.21, 72, 73, 74, 86, 92, 93, 94, 98 & 103 pertains to amendments in Regulations were read out and confirmed in the meeting itself and the Office was directed to send the communications to the Central Government/all the concerned immediately within the time limit prescribed under the Regulations, as the case may be.

[Lt. Col. (Retd.) Dr. A.R.N. Setalvad]  
Secretary

Place: New Delhi  
Dated: 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2010

**APPROVED**

**(DR. KETAN DESAI)  
PRESIDENT**