

Date of filing:- 02.03.2021
at Thanjavur
Date of Filing:- 30.01.2024
at Karur
Date of order:- 19.03.2024

**BEFORE THE DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL
COMMISSION, KARUR**

PRESENT:-

THIRU N. PARI, M.A., M.L.,

PRESIDENT.

THIRU A.S. RATHINASAMY, M.Com., B.Ed., B.L.,

MEMBER-I

Tuesday, the 19th day of March 2024

CONSUMER COMPLAINT NO.29/2024

(THANJAVUR, DCDRC C.C NO.16/2021)

S.Gopinath,
S/o.Selvaraj,
No.2/456, Mela Street,
Mudhalipatti,
Alangudi Taluk,
Pudukottai District.

...Complainant

/Vs/

1. Meenakshi Hospital,
Managing Director,
No.244/2, Trichy Main Road,
Near New Bus Stand,
Thanjavur Town and Munisif.

...Opposite Party

This complaint came up before us for final hearing on 01.03.2024 in the presence of Thiru.K.Sureshkannan, Advocate for the complainant and Thiru.M.Pannerselvam, Advocate for the Opposite Party and upon hearing the arguments on the side of the complainant and on the side of the Opposite Party and perusing the records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Commission doth pass the following

ORDER:-

DELIVERED BY THIRU A.S. RATHINSAMY, MEMBER-I:-

This complaint was filed on 02.03.2021 under Section 35 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 with the plea to direct the Opposite Party to pay the claim of Rs.10,00,000/- towards pain and sufferings and Rs.30,00,000/- towards permanent disability loss of left eye and Rs,30,00,000/- towards the loss of income and Rs.16,00,000/- towards the deficiency of service of the Opposite Party and Rs.8,75,000/- towards Medical expenses in toto Rs.94,75,000/- towards compensation for mental agony caused to the complainant and to pay Rs.25,000/- towards the cost of the litigation and to pass such further or other reliefs as this Commission may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

Brief averments in the complaint:-

2) The contention of the Complainant is that on 29.01.2020 at about 7.30 pm while he was riding his two-wheeler, he met with an accident and sustained severe injuries on his body such as Abrasion over the left side forehead and both knee, laceration over the left upper and lower eyelid and left leg ZMC fracture and hence he was brought to the Opposite Party Hospital i.e Meenakshi Mission Hospital Thanjavur for treatment on 29.1.2020 at about 10.pm and wherein he was diagnosed with Zycomatic maxillary Complex fracture and laceration over the left

upper and lower eyelid and and admitted him as in patient on 30.01.2020 and a surgery was conducted by the doctors on 30.01.2020 at about 12.00 pm in the Opposite Party Hospital and a plate has been fixed during the surgery for the injury sustained for the ZMC fracture in the left eyelid maxillary area alone and he was not treated for the injury sustained in his left eye.

3) Further, it is stated by the Complainant that his left eye was severely injured and at the time of examination done by the Opposite Party Hospital doctors, the complainant clearly explained them that he cannot see through his left eye and he suffered with severe pain in his left Eye and he was undergoing treatment as an in-patient in the Opposite Party hospital for more than 4 days. During the whole time of his admission, he reported about his pain in the left eye to the duty doctors and nurses and they have told him that he will be treated by an ophthalmologist. But without providing any treatment by the Opposite Party Hospital for the problem in the left eye of the Complainant, he was discharged from the Opposite Party Hospital on 04.02.2020 morning itself. On the same day itself, due to severe pain in his left eye, he lost his visibility which forced him and his family to consult an Ophthalmologist namely Doctor.G.Mohan Kumar since the complainant was not treated properly by the Opposite Party Hospital and the doctor G. Mohan Kumar examined the Complainant and opined that his left eye has completely ruptured and he had suffered with Ruptured Globe and informed the Complainant to treat the same in a speciality hospital and referred him to consult the doctors in Aravind eye hospital at Madurai.

4) Further the complainant was immediately admitted in the Aravind Eye Hospital on 04.02.2020 as per the reference made by the doctor G. Mohan Kumar since the complainant was in a critical condition. Wherein the ophthalmologist opined him and reported that he had “Corneal Tear” in his left eye. They also

opined that he had lost visibility in his left eye completely and lost partially in his right eye. They suggested the complainant to undergo immediate surgery in his left eye in order to save the partial visibility in his right eye on 05.02.2020. The Complainant had undergone a surgery for Corneal Tear Repair and Wound exploration. Further the doctors from Aravind Eye Hospital told the complainant that he would not have lost his visibility and the Corneal Tear in the eye if he would have been treated properly at the early time of admission as soon as he met with an accident.

5). The complainant lost his visibility completely in his left eye and partially in his right eye due to the negligent treatment of the Opposite Party and if he was diagnosed and treated by the Opposite Party properly, he may not lose his eye sight. Further, the Complainant is 43 years old at the time of accident and he is the soul bread winner of his family. Due to this act, his entire routine life and earning power were lost. His future is at stake. Further, he had spent a huge amount of money for his medical treatment in the Opposite Party's Hospital and in private eye hospital at Thanjavur and at Arvind Eye Hospital at Madurai including medicines at the end. A medical practitioner faced with an emergency; he ordinarily tries his best to redeem the patient out of his sufferings. The Opposite Party does not gain anything by acting with negligence or by omitting to do an act. A professional man should command the Corpus of knowledge which forms part of the professional equipment of the ordinary member of this profession.

6) It is submitted by the complainant that due to the negligent treatment of the opposite party, he became incapable of earning for his lively good and the complainant sustaining complications regularly in his left eye due to the negligent treatment of the Opposite Party and he is unable to go in the sunlight and he has to depend on his family to discharge his daily duty and due to the negligence surgery

of the Opposite Party till now and the Complainant sustained disfigurement in his face and he lost his total vision in his left eye which amounts to permanent disability and the above disability not only affects the Complainant but also his family. Hence the Complainant issued a legal notice on 29.02.2020 to pay compensation to the Complainant for the deficiency of service and negligent treatment given by the Opposite Party and on receiving the above notice the Opposite Party neither paid compensation nor issued a reply notice. Hence, the Complainant.

Brief averments in the Written Version of the Opposite Party:-

7) The opposite party denies all the allegations stated in the complaint except those that are specifically admitted by him and the Complainant is put to strict proof of the same.

8) The opposite party submits that the allegation against him are false, frivolous and vexatious in nature which are neither maintainable in law nor on facts and it is liable to be dismissed in limine since the present complaint does not show any accurate deficiency on the part of the Opposite Party and the allegations contained in the Complaint are in the nature of misconception of medical process.

9) The opposite party submits that on 29.01.2020 at about 9:32 pm the complainant was brought to the accident and emergency department of the hospital of the Opposite Party by his relatives stating that he was met with a road accident and sustained injuries on his face and hand and immediately he was examined by the duty doctors and the routine examinations were done and stabilization procedure and wound debridement were done to the Complainant and in the examination, the Abrasion over the left side forehead and both knee, Laceration over the left upper and lower eyelid, pain over the left hand were identified and

finally decided that this is a case of Zycomatic Maxillary Complex Fracture and X-Ray, ECHO and CT Craniofacial were taken. The X-Ray Revealed that the Complainant sustained M/ Clavicle fracture on his left hand and the CT Craniofacial revealed that Open Left Globe Injury with Viterous haemorrhage and the Lens was not made out. Since, it was case of Left Side Zycomatic Maxillary Complex Fracture, the Orthopaedic, Cardiologist and the Neurologist physicians where invited to access the patient i.e is the Complainant and they suggested that the Complainant needed Ophthalmic surgery, for his Left eye which has sustained ruptured open globe injury, at a speciality hospital after retaining the ZMC fracture. The Complainant was explained about the pros and cons of the above surgery, state of affairs and critical conditions to the Complainant and his relatives and the Complainant and his relatives were consented for the surgery and the Complainant underwent the surgery for the above complications regarding ZMC fracture on 30/01/2020 in the Opposite Party Hospital.

10) The Opposite Party submits that the condition of the patient was informed regularly to the attendants and they are aware of the treatment given to the Complainant and the Opposite Party obtained consent from the Complainant and his attendants for each and every procedure. While it is so, the Complainant filed this complaint by suppressing material facts which had happened in the Opposite Party hospital with an intention to get unlawful gain from the Opposite Party. The Complainant mentioned in his complaint that the Opposite Party failed to provide treatment to the Complainant on priority basis. The medical treatment is a process in which the medical practitioner to do the procedure one by one and stage by stage according to the health condition of the patient and all the procedures cannot be done at one sitting especially when the patient was in a serious condition. So, the Opposite Party hospital doctors initially planned to treat the ZMC fracture and

Clavicle fracture in one sitting and thereafter to treat the eye injury since the Orbital region was very much swelling and was unable to open the left eye and without retaining the ZMC fracture it was not possible to treat the left eye of the Complainant and further the ruptured globe injury was already occurred due to the accident and it would be treated subsequently after settling the swelling and the fracture in the Left side Orbital regain. So the Opposite Party treated the patient according to the severe condition of the Left side Orbital regain by surgical intervention for stabilizing the fracture at the site and done the procedures warranted one by one according to the medical line of practice. Therefore there is no unethical activity or medical negligence on the part of the Opposite Party as alleged by the Complainant. The loss of vision has occurred due to the ruptured globe injury due to the accident and the same was explained to the Complainant as well as his relatives at the time of admission on 30/01/2020 and obtained consent from them. Therefore the loss of vision in the Left eye of the Complainant was only due to the accident and not due to the negligence of the Opposite Party as alleged by the Complainant. Further no fracture found on the Left leg as alleged by the Complainant and also the documents filed by the Complainant itself are falsified the allegation of loss of vision of the Right eye. Therefore the allegation that the Opposite Party treated the Complainant negligently is false and denied by the Opposite Party.

11) The Opposite Party submits that the quality of the treatment is clearly explained in the investigation reports, clinical examination reports and the medical records as well as the discharge summary dated 04/02/2020 provided to this Complainant itself. Further the Complainant issued a legal notice dated 29/02/2020 and the same was received by the skeleton staff of the Opposite Party during the Covid-19 lockdown period which was started from 22/02/2020 as per

the order of the Government. Subsequently the received letter was misplaced and hence it was not possible to the Opposite Party to send the reply notice to the Complainant.

12) The Opposite Party submits that the modality of the treatment which has been given to the patient by the Opposite Party is in golden standard and in accordance with the standard medical practice and all the available standard medical literature in to this effect and the Opposite Party denied the various related allegation contained in the complaint as false and the same were created by the Complainant as an afterthought with the intention of the speculative gain.

13) It is submitted by the Opposite Party that the claims made in the complaint are unsustainable in law and on facts. The Opposite Parties are not liable to pay any of the claims sought for in the complaint. The claims are made with an ulterior intention.

14) The Opposite Party submits that all the steps followed by them where that are expected of a prudent surgeon in the similar circumstances. The above mention sequence of events establish that, he did all the appropriate preoperative clinical evaluation about the critical condition of the Complainant and he explained to the relatives about the nature of his ailments and obtained consent, he explained to him about the need for surgery, he performed the surgery diligently, provided necessary post operative care, treated the patient diligently followed by necessary bio-chemical investigations and scan, proper advice was given to the Complainant and his relatives to the need of taking treatment for injured eye at specialised ophthalmic hospital and the Opposite Party submits that they never strayed away from the methodology to be adopted in such cases as described in classical medical textbooks. However, the above sequence of events clearly establish that the

Complainant approached this Hon'ble Commission without clean hands. Therefore it is highly unethical and illusionary on the part of the Complainant to allege that the Opposite Party has negligently treated the Complainant. Therefore, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Commission may graciously be pleased to dismiss the complaint as vexatious and frivolous with costs.

The points for consideration in this case are as follows:-

1. Whether the Complainant is entitled to get the reliefs as he prayed for in this complaint?
2. Whether there is any negligence and deficiency of service on the part of the Opposite Party towards the treatment given to the Complainant?
3. To what other reliefs the Complainant is entitled for?

11) On the side of the Complainant, his Proof affidavit is filed and recorded and Ex-A1 to Ex-A10 are marked and Proof affidavit of Opposite party is filed and recorded and Ex-B1 series is marked on his side.

12) Heard the Complainant side and on the side of the Opposite Party and perused the records.

POINT NO.2:-

13) It is admitted fact that the complainant had met with an accident as per Ex-A1 and he was brought to the Opposite Party Hospital on 29.01.2020 at about 10.00 pm and due to the accident he sustained severe injuries such as Aberration over the left side of his head and both knee, lacerated injury over the left upper and lower eyelid and left Zygomatic Maxillary Complex fracture (ZMC) and he was admitted as in patient in the Opposite Party Hospital on 30.01.2020 at about 1.20 a.m.and the duty doctors in the Opposite Party Hospital diagnosed the complainant

that he had sustained Zygomatic Maxillary Complex fracture laceration over the left side and surgery was conducted by the doctors on 30.01.2020 in the Opposite Party Hospital and it is evidenced through Ex-A2, Ex-A3 and Ex-B1 and it is the contention of the Complainant that the Opposite Party did not take any CT scan regarding the injuries sustained to the Complainant. But the Opposite Party denied the above allegation and insisted that the Complainant himself paid Rs.4,400- for CT Craniofacial Scan on 29.01.2020 under bill No.173017 as per Ex-A7 and got back the CT Scan report on 04.02.2020 from the Opposite Party as per page No.5 of Ex-B1 and the copy of the said CT Scan report is marked under Page No.11 of Ex-B1 and on perusing the same, it is found that the Complainant sustained *Open left globe injury with vitreous hemorrhage and the lens was not made out*. In this regard, the commission is of the Opinion that the allegation of the Complainant is not sustainable since the Opposite Party had taken Craniofacial CT Scan for the Complainant on payment of the fees by the Complainant himself and diagnosed the issue as per page No.11 of Ex-B1 as Open left globe injury with vitreous hemorrhage and as the lens was not made out. Hence it is clear that there was a problem in the left eye of the Complainant due to the accident.

14) The contention of the Complainant is that the Opposite Party has given treatment to the Complainant for the injuries and fractures sustained to the Complainant due the accident except the essentially required treatment in time for the Open left globe injury with vitreous hemorrhage till the date of discharge, i.e on 04.02.2020, of the Complainant from the Hospital of the Opposite Party. But the Opposite Party has insisted that the treatment to the Complainant was given on the priority basis and after completion of the surgery of ZMC, as a next procedure, the treatment for the left eye would have been given. But the Complainant disagreed to take treatment for his left eye with the Opposite Party since he has not

even provided the essentially required treatment for the Open left globe injury with vitreous hemorrhage sustained to the Complainant properly in this regard and hence he wanted to take treatment with one Doctor. G.Mohankumar and the said doctor examined the Complainant and opined that his left eye has completely ruptured and he had Ruptured Globe as per Ex-A4 and advised him to treat the same in a speciality hospital and referred the Complainant to Aravind Hospital, Madurai and on the same day the Complainant was admitted in the Aravind Hospital, Madurai and the Ophthalmologist in the above hospital examined him and reported that the Complainant had Corneal Tear in his left eye and also they opined that the Complainant had lost his visibility in his left eye completely and it is evidenced through Ex-A5, Ex-A6 and Ex-A10.

15) On perusing records, it is found that the Complainant was brought to the hospital of the Opposite Party on 29.01.2020 at about 10.00 pm and admitted as in patient and underwent surgeries and discharged on 04.02.2020. During the period of treatment, various medical tests were taken including CT Craniofacial Scan wherein it was identified that the Complainant was sustained ***Open left globe injury with vitreous hemorrhage*** and also it is found that the Complainant was admitted in the Opposite Party Hospital for more than 5 days. But from the date of the admission to the date of the discharge, no Ophthalmologist has examined the Complainant and has not given any essentially required treatment in time regarding the above ***Open left globe injury with vitreous hemorrhage*** in the Opposite Party hospital and also it is admitted by the Opposite Party in his argument that there was no Ophthalmology department in his hospital. If so, it is the duty of the Opposite party to refer the Complainant with all medical assistance including oxygen cylinders and other life saving drugs along with a medical attender to the superior hospitals through an Ambulance to treat the Complainant for all his ailments in one

roof or otherwise the Opposite Party should have invited the Ophthalmologist from some other Speciality hospitals to give treatment to the injured left eye of the Complainant and till then the Opposite Party should have given the essentially required treatment to the Complainant. But the Opposite Party has failed to do so. The term “*medical negligence means more than heedless or careless conduct, in omission or commission, it properly connotes the complex concept of duty, breach and damage thereby suffered the person to whom the duty was owing*”. In this regard, the Opposite has completely omitted the Ophthalmology treatment to the left eye of the Complainant in which he had sustained injuries. The Opposite Party should have taken treatment to the injured left eye of the Complainant in first priority. But he had stated that ZMC surgery must be given 1st priority. However no expert opinion was produced in this regard to show the priority treatment. Hence the commission comes to a conclusion that the Opposite Party carelessly omitted to provide Ophthalmology treatment to the Complainant till the end of discharge of the Complainant from the Opposite Party Hospital and even there was no examination by the Ophthalmologist in respect of the left eye of the Complainant and the Complainant sustained disfigurement in his face and he lost his total vision in his left eye which amounts to permanent disability and the above disability not only affects the Complainant but also his family. Hence the Complainant issued a legal notice on 29.02.2020 to pay compensation to the Complainant for the deficiency of service and negligent treatment given by the Opposite Party and on receiving the above notice the Opposite Party neither paid compensation nor issued a reply notice

16) It is pertinent to mention that the complainant had to undergo surgery under the treatment of treating doctor without knowing the reason for such complication in the left eye since no examination was made by the Ophthalmologist. As a

treating doctor, the Opposite Party has to explain the reason for such complication in the left eye in the earlier stage when he was admitted in the Opposite Party Hospital itself, but he has not even taken step to examine the Complainant through an Ophthalmologist and he failed to do so. Even the failure of the proper medical treatment given is not amounting to deficiency and at the same time the failure to provide essentially required treatment is absolutely a negligence. No particulars have been mentioned in the medical records about the essentially required treatment which has been given to the Complainant regarding the ***Open left globe injury with vitreous hemorrhage***. In this regard, this Commission relies the decision of the Hon'ble NCDRC in III (2019) CPJ 327 © in LALAN PANDEY VS. CHANDESWAR PRASANT DR. In the above judgment, it is decided apparently that the "ONUS" is on treating doctor to explain as to how the problem has set in – No whisper in medical record regarding the reasons for the loss of vision in the left eye of the Complainant having set in" since there was no Ophthalmology test in this regard. The Opposite Party cant explain the reason for the loss of vision without the examination by the Ophthalmologist. Hence it is a deficiency. The above decision of NCDRC is directly applicable to the facts of this case.

17) Further, in this case, the Opposite Party treated the complainant for ZMC surgery and the Opposite Party never treated the Complainant for the complication in the left eye which should have been treated first on the priority basis. In this regard the Opposite Party insisted the evidence of the Ophthalmologist Doctor. G.Mohankumar that ZMC surgery has been done as priority treatment. In this regard, the Commission places reliance on the following judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court:-

1.V. Krishna Rao vs. Nikhil Super Specialty Hospital and another.

2. V (2010) SLT 349
3. III (2010) CPJ 1 (SC)
4. (2010) 5 SCC 513

Wherein, it is stated that the expert opinion is not mandatory, while adjudicating a complaint of medical negligence. There is no whisper in the medical record regarding the reasons for the loss of vision having set in the left eye and as per the CT Craniofacial scan report, if this is a known complication, what steps have been taken during that period by the Opposite Party. In this case, the Opposite Party simply stated that the opinion of the Ophthalmologist is needed in the medical reports without taking any steps to provide treatment not even to examine the patient by the Ophthalmologist to the left eye of the Complainant for more than 5 days. Hence, this Commission comes to a conclusion that there is a negligence as well as deficiency of service on the part of the Opposite Party in this regard and this points is answered accordingly.

POINT NO.1:-

18) Due to the negligent treatment of the Opposite Party, the complainant sustained loss of vision in his left eye which is of 100% Partial permanent disability. It reveals that the complainant cannot continue his regular work as usual since the vision of his left eye was permanently lost.

19) Further, it is mentioned in the complaint that the complainant was earning Rs.1,00,000/- per month out of the income from agriculture, agricultural hard ware business and income from agricultural products harvesting machines. But, no proof has been produced to substantiate his contention. However, as per the guidelines given by the Honorable Supreme Court of India in National Insurance Company Ltd. vs. Pranay Sethi in SLP (Civil) No.25590/2014 and in Smt. Sarla Verma and others vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and another, the Notional

income of the complainant is fixed as Rs.10,000/- p.m. The complainant is an agriculturist and needs his complete eye vision and hence he cannot do his regular work without the vision in both eyes in full capacity. However, it is insisted by the Counsel of Opposite Party that the Complainant claimed a considerable amount before the Motor Accident Claims Tribunal for loss of income, pain and sufferings and hence the Complainant is not entitled for the claim towards loss of income and pain and sufferings. And it is stated by the Complainant that he had spent Rs.8,75,000/- towards medical expenses. However the Complainant has not raised any allegation regarding the ZMC surgery and other treatments except eye treatment. Hence the amount spent for medical treatment is also not subject to be refunded since it was not spent towards the Injury in the left eye.

20) Further, the compensation for the loss of eye due to the omission of treatment on the part of the Opposite Party is fixed as Rs.5,00,000/- by considering the age of the Complainant and a compensation of Rs.3,00,000/- is fixed for mental agony caused to the Complainant by the Opposite Party due to the deficiency of service on the part of the Opposite Party and in todo the Complainant is entitled to the Compensation of Rs.8,00,000/-with interest at the rate of 9% p.a from 04.02.2020 on which date the Complainant was discharged from the hospital of the Opposite Party and the Complainant is entitled to a sum of Rs.25,000/- towards the litigation expenditure which carries no interest and this point is answered accordingly.

POINT NO.3:-

21) As per the discussions made in point numbers 1 and 2, it is held that the Complainant is not entitled for any other reliefs and this point is answered accordingly.

In the result, the Complaint is partly allowed and the Opposite Party is directed to pay a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- as a compensation for the loss of eye due to the omission of treatment on the part of the Opposite Party and to pay a compensation of Rs.3,00,000/- for the mental agony caused to the Complainant by the Opposite Party due to the deficiency of service on the part of the Opposite Party and in toto the Opposite Party is directed to pay a compensation of Rs.8,00,000/-with interest at the rate of 9% p.a from 04.02.2020 on which date the Complainant was discharged from the hospital of the Opposite Party till the date of realization and to pay a sum of Rs.25,000/- towards the litigation expenses which carries no interest within one month from the date of the order and in other respects the Complaint is dismissed.

Dictated to Steno-typist, Typed, transcribed and corrected by him and pronounced by us in open Court on this the 19th day of March 2024.

Sd/- A.S.RATHINASAMY
MEMBER-I
DCDRC, KARUR.

Sd/- N.PARI
PRESIDENT,
DCDRC, KARUR.

LIST OF WITNESSES AND EXHIBITS:

COMPLAINANT'S SIDE WITNESSES:-

- 1.S.Gopinath (The Complainant) (DW1)
 - 2.G.Mohankumar (DW2)
 - 3.N.Venkateshprasanna (DW3)
- Proof affidavit is filed and recorded.

COMPLAINANT'S SIDE EXHIBITS:-

Ex.A1.	08/02/2020	First information Report	Xerox Copy
Ex.A2.	29/01/2020	Patient profile issued by the Opposite Party to the Complainant	Xerox Copy
Ex.A3.	30/01/2020	Discharge summary issued by Meenakshi Hospital,Thanjavur to the Complainant	Xerox Copy
Ex.A4.	04/02/2020	Referral Certificate issued by Dr. Mohankumar	Xerox Copy
Ex.A5.	04/02/2020	Discharge summary issued by Aravind Eye Hospital, Madurai	Xerox Copy
Ex.A6.	10/02/2020	Medical Report issued by Aravind Eye Hospital	Xerox Copy
Ex.A7.	04/02/2020	Prescriptions issued by Meenakshi Hospital	Xerox Copy
Ex.A8.	29/02/2020	Legal notice sent to the opposite party by the Complainant	Office Copy
Ex.A9.	05/03/2020	Postal Acknowledgment Card	Original
Ex.A10	04/02/2020	Medical report issued by Aravind eye Hospital.	Xerox Copy

1st OPPOSITE PARTY'S SIDE WITNESSES:-

Dr.R.Ravichandran (1st Opposite party)
Proof affidavit is filed and recorded.

2nd OPPOSITE PARTY'S SIDE EXHIBITS:-

Ex.B1 (Series)	---	Nursing care sheet/ICU Report. 1 to 91 and 92 to 181 pages	Xerox Copy
-------------------	-----	--	------------

**Sd/- A.S.RATHINASAMY
MEMBER-I
DCDRC, KARUR.**

**Sd/- N.PARI
PRESIDENT,
DCDRC, KARUR.**