

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary  
Peer Reviewed

[www.ijlra.com](http://www.ijlra.com)

## **DISCLAIMER**

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

## EDITORIAL TEAM

### EDITORS

#### **Dr. Samrat Datta**

*Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board*



#### **Dr. Namita Jain**

*Head & Associate Professor*

*School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.*

*Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019*



## Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

*Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.*



## Avinash Kumar



*Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.*

## **ABOUT US**

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS  
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

# **DETAILED CASE COMMENTARY ON SAMIRA KOHLI V. DR. PRABHA MANCHANDA (2008)**

AUTHORED BY - BHAUMIK PRATAP SINGH

## **Case Overview**

- **Case Name:** Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda
- **Citation:** (2008) 2 SCC 1
- **Court:** Supreme Court of India
- **Judgment Date:** January 16, 2008
- **Judges:** Justice Tarun Chatterjee and Justice R.V. Raveendran

The Supreme Court of India's ruling in this case is notable for its comprehensive take on informed consent and the rights of patients within the medical context. The case involved questions around medical ethics, patient autonomy and the standards required for valid consent in medical treatment.

## **FACTS OF THE CASE**

The appellant, Samira Kohli, consulted Dr. Prabha Manchanda, a gynecologist, about certain abdominal pains and gynecological issues. Kohli was advised to undergo a laparoscopic procedure to determine the cause of her condition. During the diagnostic procedure, Dr. Manchanda discovered abnormalities in Kohli's reproductive organs, which she deemed severe enough to require immediate surgical intervention.

Without obtaining Samira Kohli's explicit consent for the additional procedures, Dr. Manchanda proceeded to perform a hysterectomy (removal of the uterus) along with a bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy (removal of both ovaries and fallopian tubes). This surgery left Kohli unable to bear children.

Upon learning of the extensive procedures that were conducted without her specific consent, Kohli filed a legal suit against Dr. Manchanda, alleging that the doctor had violated her right to informed consent, especially as the procedures had long-term and life-altering effects on her reproductive health.

## **KEY LEGAL ISSUES**

### **1. Definition and Scope of Informed Consent:**

- The court had to clarify the standard for informed consent in medical practice. Specifically, it addressed whether the patient's general consent to a diagnostic procedure extended to the more invasive surgical procedures carried out by the doctor.

### **2. Patient Autonomy and Bodily Integrity:**

- The court needed to examine whether Dr. Manchanda's actions had violated Kohli's fundamental right to bodily autonomy, particularly as the decision to proceed with surgery was taken while the patient was under anesthesia.

### **3. Medical Emergencies and Doctor's Discretion:**

- Another issue was whether the circumstances constituted a medical emergency that would justify overriding the need for explicit consent. Dr. Manchanda argued that the decision to operate was necessary due to the immediate risk to Kohli's health.

### **4. Ethical and Legal Duties of Medical Practitioners:**

- The court had to explore the duties that medical practitioners owe their patients in terms of communication, transparency, and respect for patient autonomy when obtaining consent.

## **ARGUMENTS PRESENTED**

### **Appellant's Arguments (Samira Kohli):**

1. **Lack of Informed Consent:** Kohli argued that her consent was limited to the laparoscopic procedure intended for diagnosis, not for the extensive surgery that was subsequently performed. She maintained that she was not informed of the additional risks and consequences of a hysterectomy and salpingo-oophorectomy.
2. **Violation of Autonomy:** Kohli emphasized that her bodily integrity and autonomy were disregarded, as she was neither conscious nor aware of the decision taken on her behalf.
3. **Long-term Health Impact:** Kohli argued that the procedure left her unable to bear children and that she should have been given the right to deliberate on this life-altering decision.

4. **Damages for Mental Distress:** Kohli sought compensation, asserting that the experience had caused her mental anguish and a significant impact on her personal life, as the surgery was irreversible.

#### **Respondent's Arguments (Dr. Prabha Manchanda):**

1. **Implied Consent and Necessity:** Dr. Manchanda contended that Kohli's consent to the diagnostic procedure included an implicit understanding that necessary treatments could be undertaken if any critical issues were found.
2. **Professional Judgment:** She argued that her decision to perform the surgery was made in Kohli's best interest, given her medical condition, which required immediate attention.
3. **Emergency Situation:** Dr. Manchanda suggested that the discovery of the condition constituted a medical emergency, warranting immediate intervention without waiting for additional consent, as a delay might have put Kohli's health at risk.
4. **Reasonableness and Standard of Care:** The defense argued that the doctor had acted reasonably and in line with the standards expected of a medical professional, prioritizing the patient's well-being.

#### **SUPREME COURT'S ANALYSIS**

The Court, in its analysis, emphasized several key principles:

1. **Informed Consent:**
  - The Court clarified that informed consent goes beyond a patient's general agreement to a procedure as it requires the patient to be made fully aware of all aspects of the treatment, including any potential risks, consequences and alternatives. Consent must be explicit, and blanket or implied consent is insufficient, especially when procedures have serious and irreversible consequences, such as the removal of reproductive organs.
2. **Right to Bodily Autonomy:**
  - Citing bodily autonomy as a fundamental right, the Court underscored that every patient has the right to decide what medical treatments they are willing to undergo. The Court held that bodily integrity could not be infringed upon without express permission, barring life-threatening emergencies.

### 3. **Exception for Medical Emergencies:**

- The Court allowed that in genuine emergencies where a delay could result in harm or death, a doctor may proceed without specific consent. However, it found that Kohli's case did not meet the threshold of an emergency, as there was no evidence that her condition was immediately life-threatening. Therefore, Dr. Manchanda's decision did not qualify as an exception to the consent requirement.

### 4. **Medical Ethics and Duty to Communicate:**

- The Court emphasized that doctors have an ethical duty to communicate openly with patients about their health, the implications of various treatments, and possible outcomes. Medical practitioners are expected to ensure that patients can make an informed choice.

### 5. **Guidelines on Informed Consent:**

- The judgment offered clear guidelines, noting that doctors should communicate the following to patients before obtaining consent:
  - The nature and purpose of the treatment.
  - Risks associated with the procedure.
  - Any alternatives available.
  - Possible outcomes of the procedure, including long-term effects.

## **JUDGMENT-**

The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Samira Kohli, holding Dr. Manchanda liable for performing a surgery without the requisite informed consent. The Court awarded Kohli compensation for the violation of her rights, marking a significant precedent in patient rights and informed consent in India.

### **Key Takeaways from the Judgment:**

1. **Patient Consent is Paramount:** This case firmly established that patient consent must be obtained for each specific treatment unless an immediate, life-threatening emergency exists.
2. **Respect for Autonomy and Bodily Integrity:** The Court reinforced that patients have a right to make decisions about their own bodies, underscoring the importance of autonomy in medical practice.

3. **Doctor's Duty to Inform:** The ruling reiterated the duty of medical practitioners to ensure that patients are well-informed about their treatment options, potential risks, and long-term impacts before consenting.

### **IMPACT AND SIGNIFICANCE**

The *Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda* decision is regarded as a landmark judgment in Indian medical jurisprudence. It set a clear standard for informed consent, highlighting the importance of patient autonomy, transparency in medical decisions, and the duty of medical professionals to respect the rights and dignity of patients.

The case has had significant implications for:

- **Medical Practice Standards:** Hospitals and medical practitioners in India now emphasize informed consent as a critical part of patient care. The case has encouraged the adoption of more rigorous protocols for obtaining consent.
- **Patient Awareness and Empowerment:** The ruling has raised awareness among patients about their rights and has empowered them to seek detailed information about medical procedures before consenting.
- **Legal and Ethical Frameworks in Healthcare:** The judgment has contributed to the ethical framework guiding medical practice in India, making it clear that doctors must prioritize patient rights alongside medical judgment.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Supreme Court's decision in *Samira Kohli v. Dr. Prabha Manchanda* has been instrumental in reinforcing the importance of informed consent in medical procedures in India. It reflects a balanced approach, acknowledging the expertise and judgment of medical professionals while firmly safeguarding patient rights. The judgment's emphasis on autonomy and informed choice continues to shape Indian medical law and patient care, promoting a healthcare system that is both ethical and respectful of individual dignity.