The Consumer Protection Act, 2019: A critical analysis from a medical practitioner’s perspective
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Abstract
The landmark judgment in the case of Indian Medical Association v VP Shantha in 1995 brought the medical profession under the ambit of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986. The Consumer Protection Act, 1986, was later repealed and replaced by the Consumer Protection Act, 2019. This article delves into the implications of the 2019 Act, highlighting significant changes in its scope, including the expansion of the definition of "consumer" and the incorporation of telemarketing and e-commerce within its ambit. Moreover, the amendments affect pecuniary jurisdiction, grounds for litigation, and introduce mediation cells, and the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA). This article underscores concerns related to an increase in frivolous cases against medical practitioners and in defensive practice, ultimately impacting the overall quality of patient care. Recommendations for timely redressal and safeguards against unwarranted litigation are proposed to mitigate the adverse implications of the amended Act and ensure the well-being of both healthcare providers and patients.
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Introduction
The doctor-patient relationship, which forms the cornerstone of healthcare, has swung from the idealisation of doctors to their devaluation. Violence against doctors has made newspaper headlines several times in the last two decades [1]. This has led to insecurity on the part of doctors who have worked hard to earn their licence to practise. The Consumer Protection Act (CPA) was first passed in India in 1986 [2]. For several years it was not clear whether the medical profession came under the ambit of the Act [3]. The matter was settled when the Honourable Supreme Court held, in the case of Indian Medical Association v VP Shantha, that medical services would be treated as services under the CPA 1986 [4]. This landmark decision declared the doctor-patient relationship to be “contractual” in nature [4, 5].

With rapidly evolving technology and the need for a more comprehensive Act, CPA 2019 received the assent of the President on August 9, 2019, and was made effective from July 20, 2020 [6]. The amendments in the CPA 2019 include changes in pecuniary jurisdiction, the introduction of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, new provisions for litigation, the introduction of regulators such as the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA), and the inclusion of telemarketing within the ambit of the law [6]. This article discusses the scope and implications of these changes from a medical practitioner’s perspective.

The medical profession as service provider under CPA 2019
The term “health services” was included in the definition of services in the draft bill of the CPA 2019 but was dropped from the final version of the law [7]. For this reason there were doubts about the applicability of CPA 2019 to medical services. It has since been clarified that the definition of services under Section 2(42) of CPA 2019 is inclusive, and categorically excludes only two types of services — those which are free of charge, and those which are “personal”. However, even here, “free” services provided by a hospital or doctor would fall under the ambit of the CPA if other patients pay for the same service [6, 8]. Regarding personal
services, the “contract for personal services” has been
differentiated from the “contract of personal services”. The
former deals with a contract where the provision of a service
depends on one’s skill, knowledge, and discretion (such as the
doctor-patient relationship), and comes under the CPA 2019.
The latter deals with the provision of services that involve
obeying orders to perform an assigned job (such as the
chauffeur-employer relationship) and does not come under
the ambit of the CPA 2019 [5]. Therefore, services of any
description, with the above exceptions, come under CPA 2019
and include the medical profession and healthcare services.

Significant amendments in CPA 2019
Table 1 provides a summary of the important changes in the
CPA 2019 [6]. These include: broader objectives and
definitions; more description of the Act; introduction of
regulatory bodies such as the CCAP, and inclusion of e-
commerce, telemarketing, unfair contract, product liability,
changes in pecuniary jurisdiction, provision for mediation,
regulations on advertisements, video-conferencing for
hearings, stringent punishment and penalties for offences
listed under Section 89, 90 and 91 of the Act.

CPA 2019 provides an expanded definition of “consumer” to
include any person who “buys any goods” and “hires or avails
[sic] any services” which includes offline or online transactions
through electronic means, or by teleshopping, or direct selling,
or multi-level marketing. The introduction of e-commerce may
have provided the impetus for the CPA 2019. Telemedicine
services also come under the ambit of CPA 2019. Moreover, all
doctors are mandated to provide a receipt or bill for payment
received for their services (consultation). This is required for
both in-person and tele-medicine consultations, and if a bill or
receipt is not provided, it shall be deemed to be an unfair
trade practice.

Scope and implications of CPA 2019 in the health
sector
Pecuniary jurisdiction
The word “pecuniary” means “relating to or consisting of
money” [9], and “jurisdiction” means “the official power to
make legal decisions and judgments” [10]. All courts in the
judicial hierarchy have pecuniary limits. There are several
changes made in the pecuniary jurisdiction in CPA 2019. First,
litigation up to Rs one crore, between Rs one and 10 crore, and
more than Rs 10 crore would be filed in the District, State, and
National Commissions, respectively. Second, the pecuniary
jurisdiction would depend on the consideration paid and not
the compensation claimed [6]. “Consideration” refers to the
amount of money paid by the patient to obtain the services
provided by the doctor [6: chap IV]. This means the
determination of consideration is based on the amount of
money paid by the consumer and not the actual value of the
service. This is an important change, as the pecuniary
jurisdiction under CPA 1986 was determined by the
compensation claimed by the patient, and not the actual
consideration [2].

To illustrate, a patient pays a doctor/hospital Rs 2 lakh for an
operation, sustains an injury during the operation due to
alleged medical negligence, and makes a claim of Rs 2 crore
as compensation. Under the previous legislation, this case
would have gone to the National Commission as the claim is
over Rs one crore. Under the current Act, it would come to
the District Commission as the consideration is less than Rs 1
crore. Therefore, with the new provision, cases which were
filed in either National or State Commission, are now likely to
come to the District Commission [6: chap IV].

The second major change is about the place where the
complaint can be lodged. Take the case of a doctor who
resides in Bengaluru and provides specialist urology care to
a patient from Bihar. The patient develops complications and
decides to file a complaint against the doctor. Under CPA
1986, the patient was required to file the complaint in
Bengaluru. Under CPA 2019, the patient has the choice of
filing the complaint either at the place where s/he resides or
works, or at the place where the service provider resides [6: sec
34 (2)].

Third, the provision for tele-hearing allows doctors to
participate in hearings from any part of the country [6: sec
38].

The workload of the District Commission is likely to increase
substantially as litigation of the amount of up to Rs one
crore will be taken up by these bodies which are already
under-staffed. Without additional human resources to meet
the objectives of this amended law, there will be a further
and substantial delay in delivering justice, defeating the very
objective of the CPA, which was to achieve speedy redress
unavailable in the civil courts.

Mediation cells
Alternate dispute resolution mechanisms in the form of
mediation cells have been introduced in CPA 2019 [6: sec
74]. Mediation is a process through which the people
involved in a dispute decide to mutually settle their legal
problems with the help of an unbiased third party who acts
as a mediator [11].

The involvement of mediation cells may hasten the process
of settlement between parties which may otherwise take
several months or years to settle. Furthermore, settlement in
mediation is reached after the demands of all parties
involved are heard. The settlement, therefore, is mutually
agreed upon and once arrived at, no appeal is allowed. The
mediation panelist need not be a specialist in the subject of
the case involved

However, the Consumer Protection (Mediation) Rules, 2020
[12], specify that certain matters, particularly medical
negligence that resulted in grievous hurt or death, are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.no</th>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>CPA, 1986</th>
<th>CPA, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Better protection of the interests of consumers.</td>
<td>Protection of the interests of the consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of consumer councils for the settlement of disputes.</td>
<td>Establish authorities for timely and effective administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of Chapters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of Sections</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Change in nomenclature</td>
<td>District Forum</td>
<td>District Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td>No separate regulator</td>
<td>Central Consumer Protection Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Relevant new inclusions</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>E-commerce, telemarketing, Unfair contract, product liability, pecuniary jurisdiction, mediation, endorsement of goods, misleading advertisements, offence and penalties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Complainant</td>
<td>As defined</td>
<td>The extended definition includes: In case of a minor, his parent or legal guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Deficiency</td>
<td>As defined</td>
<td>The extended definition includes: Deliberate withholding of relevant information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unfair contract</td>
<td>Not defined</td>
<td>Includes: imposing on the consumer any unreasonable charge, obligation, or condition which puts such consumer at a disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Product liability</td>
<td>No provision in the consumer court</td>
<td>Compensation available for product liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Consumer rights</td>
<td>As defined</td>
<td>Addition of rights to: protection, be informed, be assured, be heard, redressal, and consumer awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The limitation period for filing a complaint</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>2 years with a provision for condonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Filing jurisdiction</td>
<td>Place where the seller's office is located</td>
<td>Additional provision: complaint can be filed where the complainant resides or works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Electronic filing</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pecuniary jurisdiction</td>
<td>Based on the value of the compensation claimed District Forum: up to Rs 20 lakh State Commission: Rs 20 lakh to Rs 1 crore National Commission: above Rs 1 crore</td>
<td>Based on the value of the goods or services paid as consideration District Commission: up to Rs 1 crore State Commission: Rs 1-10 crore National Commission: above Rs 10 crore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Appeal deposit</td>
<td>50% of the amount or Rs 25,000, whichever is less</td>
<td>50% of the amount ordered by the District Commission before filing an appeal before the State Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Court fees</td>
<td>As defined</td>
<td>No fees for consideration of less than Rs 5 lakh; For amounts above Rs 5 lakh: Rs 200-2,000 in the District Commission, Rs 2,500-6,000 in the State Commission, Rs 7,500 in the National Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Provision for settlement and partial settlement through mediation is available. Appeal cannot be made against a settlement done through mediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Non-compliance of an order of the commission</td>
<td>Punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than one month, but which may extend to three years and/or with fine which shall not be less than two thousand rupees, but which may extend to ten thousand rupees</td>
<td>The term of imprisonment is the same but the fine has been increased, which shall not be less than Rs 25,000 and may extend to Rs one lakh, or both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bench</td>
<td>Circuit bench</td>
<td>Regional benches to be appointed by the Central Government by notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Experts to assist the National Commission or the State Commission</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>On application by a complainant or otherwise, may direct any individual or organisation or expert to assist the National Commission or the State Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Dismissal of frivolous or vexatious complaints</td>
<td>The complainant shall pay costs not exceeding Rs 10,000</td>
<td>No provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Video conferencing</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>Consumers can seek tele-hearings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
excluded from the scope of mediation. Therefore, it is imperative for doctors to know that cases relating to medical negligence involving grievous hurt or death, cannot be taken to mediation.

**Litigation**

India has witnessed an alarming increase in medical litigation after the judgment in *Indian Medical Association v VP Shantha* [13,14]. The CPA 2019 includes new provisions for grounds for litigation and their processes [6].

First, grounds for litigation include failure to issue a receipt or bill to the patient; failure to take informed consent (in the ambit of unfair trade practice); failure to maintain confidentiality; false endorsement of services or a misleading advertisement, product service liability and “deficiency” in services. This last encompasses “any act of negligence or omission or commission by such person which causes loss or injury to the consumer and deliberate withholding of relevant information by such person to the consumer”.

Second, there is no requirement for payment of a fee for filing litigation for services up to Rs five lakh. For filing litigation for services that cost more than Rs five lakh, a nominal fee needs to be paid. The CPA 2019 permits electronic filing of complaints, and tele-hearings. Changes in the pecuniary jurisdiction for filing complaints have been discussed above.

**Compensation**

On October 24, 2013, the Supreme Court awarded a record-breaking compensation of Rs 6,08,00,550 — with 6% interest per annum from the date of the payment —amounting to about Rs 11 crore, to the claimant in *Balram Prasad v Kunal Saha & Ors* [15], for the death of a patient from medical negligence by doctors and a private hospital. This judgment sparked debate about how medical negligence compensation should be calculated. The court stated that the "multiplier method," commonly used in the motor accidents tribunal, was not suitable for cases of death resulting from medical negligence because the two are fundamentally different in nature. The court reasoned that using the multiplier method for medical negligence cases would result in significantly lower compensation as it relies on a notional income figure, often set at a relatively low amount, which is even lower in cases where the victim has no income. As hospitals, nursing homes and doctors in India often earn substantial profits, using the multiplier method in medical negligence cases may not serve as a deterrent against medical negligence. Large payouts might ensure accountability and deter medical negligence, and unethical practice. Finally, it is important to provide financial support (in the form of compensation) to either the victim or the family.

On the other hand, it may be argued that the care of patients is also compromised by non-availability of infrastructure, which is the State’s responsibility. Hence, the State too bears responsibility for lapses or deficiency in care. It may also be argued that it is hard to implement first-world standards with a third-world infrastructure. High rates of compensation may encourage defensive practice, affect the mental health of doctors due to the constant fear of scrutiny, lead to their bankruptcy, and force them to spend time in legal proceedings, compromising patient care.

**Regulation**

Regulation under the CPA has become more stringent with the introduction of the Central Consumer Protection Authority (CCPA) under Sec 10(1) of the CPA 2019, which has been vested with powers to investigate *suo moto*, ie on their own accord, even without any request by the parties involved, and also upon the receipt of a complaint. The CCPA can look into matters related to consumer rights, product liability, unfair trade practices, etc. For example, if a hospital is offering a service package, the CCPA has the power to investigate the quality and cost of the products available in the service, and question the hospital about the same. The CCPA may also give its advice about and form new rules for such a package, including setting a “fair” charge [6: Chap III].

Implementing regulations could enhance service quality and lower expenses for patients, but it might also raise product prices as manufacturers will need to ensure top-notch quality. It is important to note that the CCPA is not the sole authority governing healthcare professionals. Other bodies like the Medical Council of India, State Medical Councils, and the National Human Rights Commission, along with laws like The Clinical Establishments Act, 2010, also play a role. The addition of the CCPA to the CPA could potentially create more confusion for healthcare professionals.

**Telemarketing and e-filing of complaints**

The practice of telemedicine is increasing due to advances in technology, awareness, affordability, acceptability, convenience, and requirements due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

Telemedicine requires doctors to treat patients with the same level of care and accountability as in an in-person consultation. Guidelines have been drafted for telemedicine that ensure safe and transparent practice [16]. Due to its potential to reach distant parts of the country for remote diagnosis and management of cases, telemedicine will be common in a few years, particularly for care in low-income regions. Hence, inclusion of telemedicine in the CPA 2019 is beneficial. However, technical issues, such as connectivity problems and data security concerns, can compromise the quality of telemedicine services and pose risks to patient confidentiality. Additionally, the lack of a physical examination in telemedicine consultations might limit the doctor's ability to accurately diagnose certain conditions, potentially leading to misdiagnoses or overlooked complications.
Conclusion
The ease of filing complaints under CPA 2019 — and the absence of any penalty for filing frivolous or false complaints — will enormously increase the number of frivolous cases against doctors and other service providers. Defensive practice may increase, leading to an increase in the cost of medical services. It is vital to have mechanisms for timely dispensation of cases to prevent violence against doctors and for early redress of consumers’ grievances. This would require increasing the number of courts and resources, especially at the district level. Penalties for filing false complaints should be included in the law. If doctors are found not guilty, they should be compensated for the loss of their earnings. Without such safeguards against unfair targeting by consumers and costly litigation, doctors are likely to lapse into defensive practice resulting in a reduced quality of care.
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