Journal of Indo-pacific Academy of Forensic Odontology

Vol. 14 (2), (2025) 29-31

https://jinpafo.in/

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Medico-Legal Aspects of Routine Dentistry in India

Bhuvan Nagpal[1*], Divya Uppala[2], Rujuta Patil[3], Manish Bhargava[4]

Abstract

Background: The evolving legal landscape in India has brought dental practice under increasing scrutiny, making medico-legal literacy essential for general dental practitioners. A rise in patient awareness, combined with access to consumer forums, has led to a significant increase in litigation against dentists.

Objective: This review aims to provide an in-depth analysis of the medico-legal responsibilities of general dental practitioners in India, focusing on key legal concepts, landmark court judgments, common allegations, and practical risk mitigation strategies.

Methods: A narrative medico-legal review was conducted using Supreme Court and consumer forum rulings, published medico-legal articles, and regulatory guidelines. Notable Indian precedents such as *Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha*[1], *Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab*[2], and *Martin D'Souza v. Mohd. Ishfaq*[3] were evaluated for their relevance to dental negligence and informed consent.

Results: Analysis revealed that common dental malpractice claims include wrong tooth extraction, failed endodontic treatment, cosmetic dissatisfaction, and inadequate consent. Legal liability is typically assessed based on breach of duty, causation, and deviation from accepted standards of care. Proper documentation, informed consent, patient communication, adherence to clinical protocols, and professional indemnity are critical preventive measures.

Conclusion: General dentists must integrate legal compliance with ethical and clinical excellence. This review emphasizes the need for continuous medico-legal education and adoption of preventive protocols to foster a safe, accountable, and litigation-resilient dental practice in India.

Keywords: Dental negligence, Informed consent, Consumer protection act, Dental litigation, Professional indemnity, Standard of care, Medical ethics, Indian judiciary.

Introduction

The relationship between patient and dentist in India has seen a significant transformation in recent decades. The emergence of medico-legal consciousness among the public has increased accountability in dental practice. With healthcare services now under the ambit of the Consumer Protection Act[1], dental practitioners can no longer view their work purely through a clinical lens—they must also navigate legal responsibilities. An estimated 25% of healthcare professionals express concern about being sued by patients, highlighting the urgent need for legal literacy within the dental fraternity.

This review article explores the medico-legal aspects of general dental practice in India. It explains key legal principles such as negligence, informed consent, duty of care, and standard of care. It also highlights landmark judicial decisions that have shaped medical jurisprudence, identifies common causes of litigation in dentistry, and offers preventive strategies to reduce legal risk.

Methodology

This article is a narrative medico-legal review integrating legal principles with clinical dental practice in India. A comprehensive literature search was conducted using PubMed, Scopus, Google Scholar, and SCC Online. Keywords included "dental negligence India," "medico-legal dentistry," "informed consent," and "Consumer Protection Act dentistry."

[1]Sr. Oral Pathologist, Clinical Biochemist & Medico-Legal Consultant, Tohana Manglam Diagnostics, Tohana

[2]Prof and HOD, Dept of Oral Pathology, GITAM Dental College, Rushikonda, Vizag- 530045

[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Periodontics, Al Ameen Dental College and Hospital, Vijayapura, Karnataka-586103

[4]Sr. Consultant (Oral Pathology & Microbiology), Dr Bhargava's Medical & Dental Clinic, New Delhi -110067

***Corresponding Author:** Bhuvan Nagpal, Sr. Oral Pathologist, Clinical Biochemist & Medico-Legal Consultant, Tohana Manglam Diagnostics, Tohana, E-Mail: dr.bhuvannagpal@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Nagpal B, Uppala D, Patil R, Bhargava M. Medico-Legal Aspects of Routine Dentistry in India. Journal of Indo-pacific Academy of Forensic Odontology. 2025;14(2):29-31. doi: 10.53275/jinpafo.v14.i2.07

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None.

© *Journal of Indo-pacific Academy of Forensic Odontology. 2025*

https://doi: 10.53275/jinpafo.v14.i2.07

1. **Received:** 12/03/2026 **Accepted:** 07/04/2026 **Published online**: 15/04/2026

Inclusion criteria

- Indian Supreme Court and Consumer Forum judgments
- Peer-reviewed dental and medico-legal literature
- Regulatory guidelines (DCI, IDA, Clinical Establishments Act)

Exclusion criteria

- Non-Indian legal context (unless conceptually relevant)
- Non-peer-reviewed sources

A qualitative synthesis approach was used to correlate legal doctrines with clinical practice scenarios.

Legal Framework and Key Concepts

Negligence and Duty of Care

Negligence in law is defined as the breach of a duty of care that results in harm to the patient. For liability to be established, three conditions must be satisfied: (i) the existence of a duty of care; (ii) breach of that duty; and (iii) resultant damage or injury. In the Indian context, courts apply the Bolam Test[7], which states that a medical or dental professional is not negligent if their actions are consistent with those of a responsible body of professionals skilled in that particular field.

Standard of Care

The standard of care is the benchmark against which a dentist's conduct is measured. It is determined based on the skill and diligence expected from an average, prudent practitioner. The Supreme Court of India in *Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab*[2] clarified that mere error of judgment is not negligence unless it results from gross incompetence or reckless disregard for patient safety.

Informed Consent

Consent is not a mere formality; it is a patient's legal and ethical right to be informed and to make decisions about their own body. In *Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda*[4], the Supreme Court emphasized that consent must be specific and informed, particularly for invasive procedures. Generic consent or blanket authorizations are legally inadequate.

Clinical Translation of Legal Principles

While legal doctrines provide a theoretical framework, their application in routine dental practice presents significant challenges. For example, informed consent requires detailed disclosure of risks, benefits, and alternatives. However, in high-volume dental settings in India, time constraints and patient literacy may limit effective communication. This creates a gap between legal expectations and practical feasibility. Similarly, the Bolam principle protects dentists when acting in accordance with accepted standards. However, variability in infrastructure across urban and rural settings raises concerns regarding what constitutes a "reasonable standard of care." In procedures such as endodontic treatment:

Clinically

Missed canals may be considered procedural limitations

Legally

May be interpreted as negligence if documentation is inadequate

Thus, proper documentation becomes a critical interface between clinical practice and legal defensibility.[7]

Landmark Judgments Shaping Dental Jurisprudence

These rulings collectively serve as a jurisprudential foundation that shapes dental practice in India. They establish that while patients must be protected from substandard care, practitioners also deserve protection against unjust claims. Table 1.

Common Allegations in Dental Negligence Cases

- Wrong Tooth Extraction: Considered a classic act of negligence. Courts usually apply the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur*, meaning the act speaks for itself.
- Failed Root Canal Treatment: Claims often involve missed canals, broken instruments, or inadequate aseptic techniques[9].
- Cosmetic Disputes: With rising demand for aesthetic dentistry, dissatisfaction with prosthetic work is becoming a major area of contention.
- Lack of Informed Consent: Many claims stem from alleged inadequate disclosure of risks or alternatives[8].
- Complications and Infections: Allegations of poor aseptic techniques, inadequate postoperative care, and lack of follow-up are commonly litigated[10].

Risk Mitigation and Best Practices

Comprehensive Documentation: Maintain detailed records of patient history, diagnosis, treatment plans, informed consent, and follow-ups. Courts rely heavily on written documentation[13].

- Informed Consent Protocols: Use procedure-specific consent forms explained in the patient's native language. Have them signed and witnessed[8].
- Adherence to Protocols: Follow guidelines by DCI and IDA[13]. Attend continuing education programs to stay updated with current practices.
- Judicious Referral: Refer complex cases to specialists when beyond your scope of training. It demonstrates prudence rather than inadequacy[9].
- Professional Indemnity Insurance: Essential financial protection. Choose coverage that includes legal consultation and appropriate claim limits[10].
- Clinic Preparedness and Staff Training: Equip the clinic with emergency drugs, sterilization logs, and trained staff for managing complications[14].
- Patient Rapport and Communication: Establish trust, explain risks, and encourage shared decision-making. Empathy can prevent many lawsuits[12].

Table 1: Summarizes landmark judicial decisions and their clinical implications

Case	*Court*	*Key Principle*
Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha (1995)[1]	Supreme Court	Brought healthcare services under Consumer Protection Act
Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab (2005)[2]	Supreme Court	Distinguished civil and criminal negligence; gross negligence required for criminal liability
Martin F. D'Souza v. Mohd. Ishfaq (2009)[3]	Supreme Court	Recommended expert opinion before proceeding with negligence claims
Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda (2008)[4]	Supreme Court	Specific informed consent is mandatory
Kusum Sharma v. Batra Hospital (2010)[5]	Supreme Court	Error of judgment not negligence if done in good faith
V. Kishan Rao v. Nikhil Super Speciality Hospital (2010)[6]	Supreme Court	Expert evidence not mandatory in clear cases

Ethical and Regulatory Compliance

Adhere to the Indian Dental Association's Code of Ethics.[13] Avoid misleading advertising, disclose qualifications honestly, and ensure valid licensure. Record keeping and confidentiality are now also governed by data privacy laws.

Dental practice in India is governed by multiple regulatory frameworks. Practitioners must adhere to guidelines issued by the Dental Council of India, which define professional conduct, ethical obligations, and scope of practice. Additionally, compliance with the Clinical Establishments Act (where applicable) mandates proper record maintenance, patient safety standards, and infrastructure requirements. With increasing digitization, data protection has become critical. Maintenance of electronic dental records, confidentiality of patient information, and secure data handling are emerging medico-legal responsibilities. Tele-dentistry and digital consent further introduce new legal dimensions requiring explicit documentation and patient authorization.

Conclusion

The practice of dentistry in India is at a crossroads of clinical excellence and legal accountability. While patient rights must be upheld, the law equally provides safeguards for well-meaning practitioners. Dentists must combine technical proficiency with legal awareness and ethical conduct to ensure both patient safety and professional security. Preventive law, as embodied by proper consent, documentation, and respectful communication, remains the strongest shield against litigation. There exists a gap between legal expectations and clinical realities in India. Addressing this requires policy-level integration of medico-legal training in dental education.

References

1. Indian Medical Association v. V.P. Shantha & Ors, (1995) 6 SCC 651. Supreme Court of India.
2. Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, (2005) 6 SCC 1. Supreme Court of India.
3. Martin F. D'Souza v. Mohd. Ishfaq, (2009) 3 SCC 1. Supreme Court of India.
4. Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda & Anr, (2008) 2 SCC 1. Supreme Court of India.
5. Kusum Sharma & Ors v. Batra Hospital & Medical Research Centre, (2010) 3 SCC 480. Supreme Court of India.
6. V. Kishan Rao v. Nikhil Super Speciality Hospital, (2010) 5 SCC 513. Supreme Court of India.
7. Pandit MS, Pandit S. Medical negligence: coverage of the profession, duties, ethics, case law, and enlightened defense – a legal perspective. Indian J Urol. 2009;25(3):372–8.
8. Nandimath OV. Consent and medical treatment: The legal paradigm in India. Indian J Urol. 2009;25(3):343–7.
9. Acharya AB, Savitha JK, Nadagoudar SV. Professional negligence in dental practice: Potential for civil and criminal liability in India. J Forensic Dent Sci. 2009;1(1):2–7.
10. Thavarajah R, Saranya V, Priya B. The Indian dental litigation landscape: An analysis of judgments on dental negligence claims in Indian consumer redressal forums. J Forensic Leg Med. 2019;68:101863.
11. Maiti R, Umashankar GK. Legal implications of dental practice in India: A critical review of court cases. J Oral Health Community Dent. 2021;15(3):152–5.
12. Radhika T, Bhasin N, Narayan A. Awareness about medico-legal aspects and the Consumer Protection Act among dental professionals in Chennai. J Forensic Odontostomatol. 2018;36(1):113–8.
13. Indian Dental Association. Code of Ethics for Dental Professionals. Mumbai: IDA; 2014.
14. Seshappa KN, Rangaswamy S. Death in dental clinic: Indian scenario. J Forensic Dent Sci. 2016;8(1):61–6.