Jus Corpus Law Journal
Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026 – ISSN 2582-7820
Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Rhishikesh Dave; Publisher – Ayush Pandey

Case Comment: Dr Suresh Gupta v Government of NCT Delhi

Akshita Atti[a] Hemanya Sharma[b]

[a]Symbiosis Law School, Nagpur, India [b]Symbiosis Law School, Nagpur, India

Received 04 May 2026; *Accepted* 04 June 2026; *Published* 08 June 2026

INTRODUCTION

Medical negligence occupies a unique and complex position within the Indian legal system. While medical professionals owe a high duty of care to their patients, the practice of medicine is inherently uncertain, and even the most skilled practitioners cannot guarantee successful outcomes in every case. This tension creates a significant legal challenge: determining when a medical error or adverse outcome transcends ordinary negligence and becomes a matter of criminal liability.

Under Section 304A,[1] causing death by a rash or negligent act constitutes a criminal offence. However, the application of this provision to medical professionals has been the subject of considerable judicial debate. Excessive criminalisation of medical errors may discourage doctors from undertaking high-risk procedures and foster defensive medical practices, whereas complete immunity may undermine patient rights and accountability within the healthcare system. Consequently, courts have sought to strike a balance between protecting patients and preserving the professional autonomy of medical practitioners.

[1] Indian Penal Code 1860, s 304A

The landmark case of *Dr Suresh Gupta v Government of NCT of Delhi*[2] marked a significant turning point in the development of Indian jurisprudence on criminal medical negligence. The case arose from the death of a patient during a cosmetic surgery procedure, allegedly caused by improper airway management during anaesthesia. The prosecution contended that the accused surgeon's failure to ensure proper placement of an endotracheal tube resulted in asphyxia and ultimately the patient's death. The central issue before the Supreme Court was whether such conduct amounted to criminal negligence under Section 304A IPC or merely constituted civil negligence.

In its decision, the Supreme Court drew a crucial distinction between civil and criminal negligence, holding that criminal liability can arise only when the negligence is "gross," "reckless," or of such a high degree that it demonstrates a disregard for the life and safety of the patient. Mere errors of judgment, inadvertent mistakes, or unsuccessful medical treatment would not, by themselves, attract criminal sanctions. The judgment thereby established a higher threshold for prosecuting medical professionals and sought to prevent the misuse of criminal law in cases involving ordinary medical errors.

The decision also reflected principles recognised in comparative jurisprudence, particularly the English case of *R v Adomako*[3], and laid the groundwork for the Supreme Court's subsequent and more elaborate ruling in *Jacob Mathew v State of Punjab*[4]. As a result, *Dr Suresh Gupta v Government of NCT of Delhi* remains a foundational authority in Indian medical negligence law, shaping the legal framework governing the criminal liability of healthcare professionals and reinforcing the distinction between civil accountability and criminal culpability.

FACTS

A young patient came for advice from Dr Gupta regarding a nasal abnormality. Dr Suresh Gupta[5] was the appellant and was one of the renowned plastic surgeons in Delhi with a license that stated that the appellant was specialised in reconstructive and cosmetic surgeries. Whereas the Delhi National Capital Territory Government was the respondent facing the

[2] *Dr Suresh Gupta v Government of NCT Delhi & Anr* (2004) 6 SCC 422
[3] *R v Adomako* [1995] 1 A C 171
[4] *Jacob Mathew v State of Punjab & Anr* (2005) 6 SCC 1
[5] *Dr Suresh Gupta v Government of NCT Delhi & Anr* (2004) 6 SCC 422

criminal charges on behalf of the State. This was not an emergency or life-saving surgery, but rather an ordinary alternative cosmetic operation. The main goal was just to improve the patient's breathing and appearance. The procedure, which was to be performed under general anaesthesia, required the maintenance of the patient's airway. It was alleged that Dr Gupta and his team, during the actual procedure, failed to insert a secure endotracheal tube so that unhindered passage for breathing could be ensured under the dose of anaesthesia. It was reported that an ordinary and unsecured tube was fixed, which later on spilt during the procedure and did not allow adequate flow of air.

The patient experienced deprivation of oxygen, or asphyxia, eventually on the operating table during the surgery. Ultimately, the patient passed away despite multiple attempts; the patient couldn't be revived.

As per the postmortem report, the death was caused by asphyxia due to the improper maintenance of the breathing passage during the operation. This led to allegations that Dr Gupta had not exercised the due diligence and knowledge that medical professionals ought to possess. Based on the postmortem reports, a criminal case was filed against Dr Gupta under the provisions of IPC, section 304 A (causing death by negligence), which penalises any individual committing an action that may result in death by doing a rash or negligent action that may not amount to culpable homicide. The prosecution side further stated that the death of the patient was caused by negligence and the use of an endotracheal tube that was not suitable for the surgery.

Dr Gupta petitioned the Delhi High Court to dismiss the criminal case, contending that the incident does not amount to any kind of misconduct or carelessness that would be associated with any criminal liability. To which the high court denied his plea and contentions, stating that there was reasonable evidence to proceed with the trial. Since the high court refused the appeal, Dr Gupta filed an appeal in the Supreme Court, contending that even though a medical evaluation defect might have taken place, it was not criminal negligence under Section 304A.

ISSUES

1. In the context of medical practice, what does Section 304A IPC define as criminal negligence?

2. Does every instance of medical negligence or error of judgment carry criminal liability?
3. Was it appropriate to charge Dr Gupta with a crime in light of the alleged facts?

ARGUMENTS

Appellant: In contrast to the charge of criminal negligence, counsel argued that not all medical errors are criminally liable. The counsel of the appellant side stated that at most, this was civil negligence, which is not covered by Section 304A IPC, and should not be punishable and liable for the action. Not using a bound endotracheal tube was, perhaps, a medical oversight rather than 'a high level of negligence as mentioned by the counsel. It was contented that if every accident resulted in criminal prosecution, doctors would be discouraged from performing complex or risky procedures, leading to 'defensive medical care.' The counsel argued that in this case, there was no intent for carelessness or disregard for the consequences, which must be proven for criminal liability. The R v Adomako decision from the UK courts, which determined that only extreme negligence counts as criminal negligent death.

Respondent: Physicians have an especially high duty of care to those who are their patients. This duty was disregarded by not using standard equipment for managing the airways, as stated by the respondent side. The counsel further argued that it was carelessness to neglect appropriate breathing procedures because asphyxia is a predictable and avoidable risk while under anaesthesia. It was also contended that doctors are not exempt from Section 304A IPC, which applies to 'any person' who causes death by means of negligence. To protect the wellness of patients, public policy mandates that medical professionals that they should be held responsible for their actions when they cause death. The counsel of the respondent side also stated that professionals are not exempt from criminal prosecution because of their position or level of experience.

DECISION

Supreme Court CJI Justice Rajendra Babu dismissed the case against Dr Suresh Gupta, alleging that negligence didn't meet the criteria for criminal culpability under Section 304 (A) IPC. The Court began by defining the key distinction between civil and criminal negligence. It is deemed civil negligence and is punishable by compensation when someone does not use

the appropriate caution. Criminal negligence, on the other hand, has a far higher bar: conduct that is so careless or carelessness that it disregards human life.

The Court came to the conclusion that Section 304A IPC does apply to everyone, including doctors, after giving it some thought. However, it emphasised that doctors should only be held accountable for their severe negligence. Minor mistakes regarding evaluation or technique that occur during the course of medical practice cannot be used as justification for a conviction for a crime. The Court stated that 'the argument against Dr Gupta, that he did not use a secured endotracheal tube, could at best be an oversight in the practice of medicine, but it did not prove negligent behaviour.' There was no evidence that he neglected the patient's health or that his actions were sufficiently severe to justify charges against him.

The Court determined that only 'gross' negligence could lead to criminal liability, citing the English case of R v Adomako[6] as support. It also claimed that the healthcare sector would be impacted if medical professionals were held accountable for every mistake they commit because this would make them more cautious and discourage them from taking chances in complicated situations. The court passed the judgment that the patient's family were entitled to civil damages even though the criminal prosecution was not mandatory. This established the regulation that only severe and extreme negligence in the performance of medical treatment is punishable by law.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS

A seminal case in India which involved the medical and also the legal jurisprudence in the case of Dr. Suresh Gupta which clearly distinguished between the civil and also criminal negligence and recklessness in situations that involved malpractices and negligence of medica professionals therefore at the same time crucial decisions were made featuring the safety of patients also regarding their accountability and also the role of criminal law which will indirectly regulate the conduct and procedures of medical sector. The apex court ruled, and its judgment stated that only extreme negligence and carelessness will be liable criminally under section 304A of the IPC. It also stated doctrinal stability, which was much needed.

[6] *R v Adomako* [1995] 1 A C 171

Additionally, it was made so that the criminal responsibilities for damages and civil culpability could be distinguished from each other. The idea of criminal law must only be applied to actions that are morally reprehensible in the criminal jurisprudence and The decision has been criticized for raising the bar for liability too much, which limits the options for patients who lose loved ones due to negligent actions, even though it protects medical professionals and health care providers from excessive harassment and the threat of 'defensive medicine,' in which doctors avoid risky or complicated procedures out of fear of lawsuits. Critics also argue that focusing solely on legal remedies may not be enough to determine the actual intensity of careless behaviour in a country like India, where awareness of consumers is extremely low, and hospital regulation is usually insufficient. The Court's careful balance of the act is so crucial, though, as it acknowledged the competing constitutional rights of doctors' freedom to practice their profession under Article 19(1)(g)[7] and patients' right to life under Article 21.[8] It is also discussed that it is crucial to balance these claims by establishing two criteria: one extreme negligence, which is punishable by criminal law, and the other, ordinary carelessness (negligence), which is actionable under civil law.

The court's decision was based on the English case R v Adomako,[9] which held that gross negligence manslaughter is acceptable but only in situations where the negligence was so severe as to be unlawful. This adherence to international common law standards emphasises the universality of the gross negligence threshold, which is also supported by the comparative perspective. While Kusum Sharma v Batra Hospital[10] upheld the need to consider negligence within the parameters of accepted medical practice, the final ruling in Jacob Mathew v State of Punjab expanded on Suresh Gupta by requiring that no criminal complaint against a doctor should be considered without an independent medical expert opinion, adding to a procedural safeguard against baseless prosecution from a perspective of policy the case of Suresh Gupta stated in its judgement the reasonable compromise shall be there as it perceives civil remedies for the victims and their compensation without over criminalising the industry of medicine which would prohibit any provisions of health care. It is still true that accountability shall not be guaranteed at this compromise, even when there

[7] Constitution of India 1950, art 19(1)(g)
[8] Constitution of India 1950, art 21
[9] *R v Adomako* [1995] 1 A C 171
[10] *Kusum Sharma & Ors v Batra Hospital & Med Research Centre & Ors* (2010) 3 SCC 480

is a small amount of carelessness that may cause irreparable harm. In the end, the decision struck a careful and smart balance between preserving the rights of patients and their safety, along with professional autonomy in India, by protecting doctors from abuse and also limiting the access to criminal justice of patients in the healthcare system.

CONCLUSION

In this dispute of Dr Suresh Gupta case, a landmark precedent was set regarding the negligence related to medicine by apex court by interpreting the provisions of IPC stating section 304 (A), it can only criminally prosecute extreme negligence and recklessness, apart from grant any civil law remedies for example compensation, this provision shall protect medical officers and health care provider from frequent risk from criminal prosecutions from any accidents permitting them to practice medicine without any hesitation, the judgement also states that it shall consider a fair balance that doesn't encourage reckless conduct without disturbing professional freedom, the ruling herein brought doctrinal clarity, and although it has been critised for setting the bar high for criminal culpability and liability, that family of victim can't see criminal justice. In affirming international jurisprudence, it has established a set of guidelines that courts continue to use and find a balance between the patience of victims and their right to life under art. 21, as well as protects integrity.