International Journal of Health Research and Medico-Legal Practice

REVIEW PAPER

Medico-legal paradigms in dentistry: an exhaustive analysis of Indian jurisprudence, clinical liability, and ethical standards

Chaithra V[1], Vaarunee K[2], Keerthi Prasad K S[3], Ramesh L[4], Sreekar K[5], Winnifred D[6], Aishwarya J[7]

Address for correspondence
[1]chaitu1949@yahoo.co.in
Head and Professor
Mobile: 9886145047
ORCID-ID: 0009-0000-1401-5260
[2]Corresponding author
vaarunee12@gmail.com
Postgraduate student
Mobile: 8310685763
ORCID-ID: 0009-0009-3535-8233
[3]keerthi.prasad22@gmail.com
Reader
Mobile: 9844579437
[4]rameshlakshmikantha@yahoo.in
Reader
Mobile: 9448388516
[5]Sreekarkanugovi@gmail.com
Postgraduate student
Mobile: 9108772882
[6]winnipatrick7@gmail.com
Postgraduate student
Mobile: 9952741040
[76]aishwaryajamadagni@gmail.com
Postgraduate student
Mobile: 8151008454
Public Health Dentistry, Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital

Received: 20-04-2025
Revised: 30-04-2025
Editorial approval: 10-05-2025
Checked for plagiarism: Yes
Peer-reviewed article: Yes
Editor approved: Prof. D. Goswami

ABSTRACT

The profession of dentistry in India has undergone a seismic shift from a paternalistic "healer-patient" relationship to a "provider-consumer" dynamic. This transition, driven by the commercialisation of healthcare, the exponential rise of patient literacy, and judicial activism, has brought dental practices strictly within the Indian legal framework. This review provides a comprehensive analysis of the medico-legal landscape facing the modern Indian dentist. It critically examines the statutory hierarchy, ranging from the constitutional right to health and the Dentists Act, 1948, to the transformative impact of the Consumer Protection Act (CPA) 2019. Special emphasis is placed on expanding pecuniary jurisdiction, introducing "Product Liability", which poses new risks for implantology, and the legal nuances of "Unfair Contracts". The review dissects the "Bolam Test" for negligence, the doctrine of informed consent versus informed refusal, and the critical defence of contributory negligence. Furthermore, it analyses speciality-specific risks, such as distinguishing between clinical negligence in oral surgery and communication-based litigation in orthodontics. Conclusively, the article argues that, amidst the judicial uncertainty highlighted by the 2024 Bar of Indian Lawyers decision, a dental practitioner must evolve into a "hybrid professional" who balances clinical excellence with administrative rigour to navigate the complexities of contemporary jurisprudence.

Keywords: *Consumer Protection Act; Contributory Negligence; Dental Jurisprudence; Informed Consent.*

Cite this article: *Chaithra V, Vaarunee K, Keerthi Prasad K S, Ramesh L, Sreekar K, Winnifred D, Aishwarya J. Medico-legal paradigms in dentistry: an exhaustive analysis of Indian jurisprudence, clinical liability, and ethical standards. Int J Health Res Medico Leg Prae 2026 Jan-June;12(1):37-41. Doi:*

INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the profession of dentistry in India has undergone a radical transformation, moving away from its previous cloak of paternalistic trust and its reputation as a humanitarian vocation. This shift is not merely clinical or technological but fundamentally socio-legal. The transition from a fiduciary "healer-patient" relationship to a contractual "provider-consumer" dynamic has been catalysed by a confluence of factors: the corporatisation of healthcare, the exponential

rise in patient literacy enabled by the internet, and judicial activism that has progressively brought medical services within the ambit of consumer protection laws.[1]

As the healthcare ecosystem has become more "market-driven", with altruistic concepts frequently overridden by profit motives, the ethical standards of the profession have been perceived to face a steady decline.[2] The commodification of care has necessitated the intervention of the legal system to ensure accountability and standardised quality. Today, the "law of the land" operates on the non-negotiable premise that a dental practitioner, by virtue of their qualification and licensure, possesses a credible level of skill and will exercise reasonable care and caution in the treatment of patients.[3]

Despite the clarification of these legal obligations, a profound disconnect persists within the dental community. Studies consistently highlight a "deficient knowledge" regarding medico-legal aspects among dental practitioners, a gap that halts the effective implementation of health laws.[4] This ignorance is not bliss; it is a liability.

This review offers a comprehensive analysis of the medico-legal landscape in India. It dissects the statutory frameworks, judicial precedents, and clinical vulnerabilities that define contemporary practice. By synthesising data from indexed journal articles and statutory texts, this document serves as a definitive guide to understanding the intersection of dentistry and law.

THE STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

The regulation of dentistry in India is not monolithic. It is governed by a constellation of statutes that address different facets of the profession: licensure, education, ethics, and liability.

Constitutional and ethical foundations

At the apex of the legal hierarchy is the Constitution of India. The Supreme Court has broadly interpreted Article 21, which guarantees the "Right to Life," to include the right to health and medical care. [5]. The DCI Code of Ethics (2014) serves as the statutory compass for professional conduct.[6] These codes are binding regulations; a violation—such as failing to maintain records or breaching confidentiality—is not just an ethical lapse but a statutory offence that can lead to the suspension of registration under Section 46 of the Dentists Act, 1948.

The Consumer Protection Act (CPA)

No single piece of legislation has impacted the medical and dental professions in India more profoundly than the CPA. The Inclusion of Healthcare: For a decade after the 1986 enactment, there was ambiguity about its applicability to doctors. The Supreme Court resolved the issue in 1995 with the landmark judgement of Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha. The Court held that medical and dental services fall within the definition of "service" under Section 2(1)(o) of the CPA, 1986.[7] The rationale was grounded in the transaction: if a patient pays for treatment, they are a "consumer", and the doctor is a "service provider".

The CPA 2019: the new paradigm

The repeal of the 1986 Act and the enactment of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, marked a major shift.

1. **Pecuniary jurisdiction**: The 2019 Act substantially increased the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Consumer Disputes Redressal Commissions. The District Commission now has the authority to hear cases up to ₹1 Crore (previously up to ₹20 Lakhs).[8]
2. **Product liability**: This new chapter is critical for dentistry, a profession reliant on materials. Under the 2019 Act, a dentist can be held liable as a "product service provider" if an implant, crown, or orthodontic appliance fails due to faulty installation or inadequate maintenance warnings.

IJHRMLP
ISSN 2394-806X (Print), ISSN 2454-5139 (Online)

3. **Unfair contracts**: The Act empowers commissions to nullify "unfair contracts" where terms are significantly one-sided. In dental practice, this provision effectively invalidates broad liability waivers. A consent form where a patient "agrees to waive all rights to sue for negligence" would be deemed an unfair contract and struck down.

Judicial uncertainty: the 2024 developments

The legal stability established by V.P. Shantha is currently in flux. In the 2024 judgement of Bar of Indian Lawyers v. D.K. Gandhi, the Supreme Court held that advocates are not liable under the CPA, distinguishing the legal profession as sui generis.[9] Importantly, the Court questioned the rationale of the V.P. Shantha judgement and referred the matter to a larger bench. While the Medical Legal Society of India (MLSI) hopes the ruling will exclude doctors from the CPA, the current legal status remains that dentists are liable. Until the larger bench rules otherwise, the V.P. Shantha precedent holds.

THE ANATOMY OF DENTAL NEGLIGENCE

Negligence is the core concept around which most medico-legal battles are fought. It is defined as the breach of a duty caused by the omission to do something that a reasonable dentist would do, or by doing something that a prudent dentist would not do.[10]

The four pillars of liability

To succeed in a negligence claim, a patient must demonstrate four elements: 1) Duty: established when a dentist-patient relationship begins; 2) Dereliction (Breach): failing to meet the "Standard of Care"; 3) Direct Cause: a causal link between the breach and the injury; 4) Damage: actual harm experienced by the patient, either physical or financial.

The Bolam test and standard of care

Indian courts strictly adhere to "The Bolam Rule", originating from the English case Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee (1957).[11] Under this rule, a dentist is not guilty of negligence if they have acted in accordance with a practice accepted as proper by a responsible body of dental opinion, even if another body of opinion holds a contrary view.

Contributory negligence

A vital defence for dentists is the doctrine of "Contributory Negligence." If a patient fails to follow post-operative instructions (e.g., smoking after an extraction leading to dry socket or failing to attend follow-up appointments), and this negligence contributes to the injury, the dentist's liability is reduced or eliminated. Documenting patient non-compliance is therefore essential for defence.[12]

Criminal liability

Criminal negligence involves a higher threshold: "Gross Negligence." In Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, the Supreme Court laid down safeguards to prevent the harassment of doctors.[13] A private criminal complaint cannot be entertained without prima facie evidence in the form of a credible opinion from another competent doctor. Police cannot routinely arrest a doctor; they must first obtain an independent medical opinion establishing that the rash was of such a degree as to amount to a crime.

INFORMED CONSENT: THE ETHICAL CORNERSTONE

The doctrine of informed consent has evolved from a mere formality to a substantive human right. In India, consent is both an ethical duty under the DCI Code and a legal requirement.[14]

Validity and the reality gap

Valid consent must be voluntary, obtained from a competent adult, and "informed". The dentist must disclose the diagnosis, the nature of the treatment, the material risks, alternatives, and costs. Despite these mandates, research reveals a disturbing gap. A study in South India found that although most general practitioners obtained written consent, 100% used only a "general consent" form (a blanket permission) rather than procedure-specific consent.[15] Such blanket forms are often legally invalid for specific complications, such as paraesthesia or instrument separation.

IJHRMLP
ISSN 2394-806X (Print), ISSN 2454-5139 (Online)

Informed refusal

Equally important is the doctrine of "Informed Refusal." If a patient refuses a necessary diagnostic test (e.g., an X-ray for a root canal) or treatment, the dentist must document this refusal. This protects the dentist from claims of "failure to diagnose" or "supervised neglect" later on.

CLINICAL VULNERABILITIES BY SPECIALITY

Endodontics: the minefield of micro-instruments

Endodontics is a high-risk speciality. Instrument separation is a common complication. Legally, the breakage itself may be considered a "mishap" (not negligence) if the dentist used proper technique. However, negligence arises from the failure to inform the patient of the breakage.[16]

Oral implantology and surgery

As implant dentistry becomes ubiquitous, it has become a leading source of litigation. Damage to the Inferior Alveolar Nerve (IAN) causing paraesthesia is a primary cause of action.[17] Liability often hinges on "failure to warn" about the risk of nerve damage in the consent form or improper treatment planning (e.g., lack of CBCT). In exodontia, jaw fractures and the extraction of the wrong tooth remain classic examples of negligence that are difficult to defend.

Orthodontics: the communication trap

Orthodontics presents a paradox: it is a low-risk speciality for life-threatening emergencies but a high-risk speciality for litigation due to the long duration of treatment and aesthetic focus. Most orthodontic lawsuits are triggered not by poor clinical results but by "poor interaction" or communication breakdowns.[18] Root resorption is a known biological risk; if a patient is not warned about this possibility, the occurrence of resorption can be successfully litigated as negligence.

Paediatric dentistry

Treating minors introduces the complexity of "proxy consent.". Consent must be obtained from the parent or legal guardian. The use of physical restraint without explicit written parental consent can be legally construed as assault or battery.

DOCUMENTATION AND INSURANCE

In the eyes of the law, "Poor records mean no defence, and no records mean negligence."[19] Documentation is the primary evidence courts use to reconstruct the events of treatment.

Record retention and digitisation

While the CPA restriction period is two years from the "cause of action," the "discovery rule" implies that the clock starts when the patient discovers the injury. Therefore, indefinite retention of records is the safest policy. With the advent of the Digital Information Security in Healthcare Act (DISHA) guidelines, Electronic Health Records (EHR) must be tamper-proof, with audit trails that prevent the retrospective alteration of notes.

Professional indemnity insurance

In this age of claims, practising without insurance is financial suicide. The "deep pocket" theory suggests that patients often target professionals perceived as able to pay. Despite this, studies show that nearly 70% of Indian practitioners do not have PII.[20]

CONCLUSION

The practice of dentistry in India has irrevocably changed. Consumer law has pierced the protective shield of "professional status". The journey from V.P. Shantha to D.K. Gandhi illustrates a trajectory toward greater accountability. For the practitioner, safety lies in a tripartite strategy: clinical excellence (Bolam test), administrative rigour (documentation and consent), and financial prudence (indemnity insurance). Ultimately, the best defence is not a lawyer but rather an ethical, communicative relationship with the patient.

Author declaration: All authors have made substantial contributions to the conception and design of the review, drafted the manuscript and revised it critically, and approved the final version for publication.

IJHRMLP
ISSN 2394-806X (Print), ISSN 2454-5139 (Online)

REFERENCES

1. Bhadauria US, Dasar PL, Sandesh N, Mishra P, Godha S. Medico-legal aspect of dental practice. Clujul Med. 2018 Jul;91(3):255-258.
2. Radhika T, Nadeem J, Arthi R, Nithya S. Awareness about medico-legal aspects and the Consumer Protection Act among dentists. J Forensic Odontostomatol. 2017 Jul 1;35(1):1-8.
3. Singh G, Gambhir RS, Singh S, Talwar PS, Munjal V. Knowledge and awareness of the Consumer Protection Act among dental professionals in India: a systematic review. Indian J Dent. 2014 Jul;5(3):146-51.
4. Vilvadrinath S, Kadam S, Ingle R, Rathod D. Dental Negligence and Consumer Protection Act – The Indian Scenario. Int J Eth Trauma Victimology. 2024;10(1):32-34.
5. Constitution of India, 1950. Article 21.
6. Dental Council of India. Revised Code of Dental Ethics Regulations, 2014. New Delhi: DCI; 2014.
7. Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha and Others. AIR 1996 SC 550.
8. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019. No. 35 of 2019. Gazette of India. 2019 Aug 9.
9. Bar of Indian Lawyers v. D.K. Gandhi, PS National Institute of Communicable Diseases. Civil Appeal No. 2649 of 2009.
10. Kumari et al. Dental Negligence: It Is Time to Overcome It. Scientific Dental Journal 2020;4(2):39-43.
11. Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee. 1 WLR 582; 1957.
12. Kale Satishchandra, Mali. The role of contributory negligence in alleged cases of medical negligence – a review. Journal of Visual and Performing Arts. 2023;4(1):4504–08.
13. Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab & Anr. AIR 2005 SC 3180.
14. Kakar H, Gambhir RS, Singh S, Kaur A, Nanda T. Informed consent: cornerstone in ethical medical and dental practice. J Family Med Prim Care. 2014 Jan;3(1):68-71.
15. R Baiju, Peter Elbe, Narayan Vivek, E Roshna et al. Informed consent in dental practice: A Qualitative Analysis of awareness and apprehensions among practitioners in South India. International Journal of Social Science and Human Research. 2023;6(2):1007-16.
16. Ramugade MM, Sagale AA. A Review of Medico-legal Considerations of Endodontic Practice for General Dental Practitioners. J Int Soc Prev Community Dent. 2018 Jul-Aug;8(4):283-288.
17. Juodzbalys G, Wang HL, Sabalys G. Injury of the Inferior Alveolar Nerve during Implant Placement: a Literature Review. J Oral Maxillofac Res. 2011 Apr 1;2(1):e1.
18. Costanza-Gugiu F, Cernega A, Pițuru SM. Medico-Legal Implications and Risk Management Strategies in Orthodontic Practice: An Analytical Literature Review. Healthcare (Basel). 2025 Nov 25;13(23):3054.
19. Gupta A, Mishra G, Bhutani H, Hoshing C, Bhalla A. Forensic revolution need maintenance of dental records of patients by dentists: A descriptive study. J Int Soc Prev Community Dent. 2016 Jul-Aug;6(4):316-20.
20. Gupta D, Thomas S, Dagli R, Solanki J, Bhateja GA, Mahajan R. Professional indemnity insurance used among graduated and postgraduate dental surgeons in Mumbai city, India. J Health Res Rev 2014;1:44-8.

IJHRMLP
ISSN 2394-806X (Print), ISSN 2454-5139 (Online)