
**THE HOMOEOPATHIC PRACTITIONER AND THE LAW: A
CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF MEDICO-LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES
WITHIN THE NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR HOMOEOPATHY
(NCH) FRAMEWORK**

***Dr. Ashish Yadav**

MD, Homoeopathy, Assistant Professor, Forensic Medicine & Toxicology Homoeopathic
Medical College, Akot Road, Akola, Maharashtra.

Article Received: 29 August 2026, Article Revised: 19 September 2026, Published on: 09 October 2026

***Corresponding Author: Dr. Ashish Yadav**

MD, Homoeopathy, Assistant Professor, Forensic Medicine & Toxicology Homoeopathic Medical College, Akot Road,
Akola, Maharashtra.

Doi: <https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijarp.1874>

ABSTRACT

Background

The establishment of the **National Commission for Homoeopathy (NCH)** has significantly modernised the governance, ethical standards, and educational regulations of homoeopathic practice in India. While homoeopathic practitioners are increasingly integrated into mainstream healthcare systems, they operate within a complex legal grid. There remains a critical gap in understanding their exact responsibilities, boundaries, and liabilities under Indian jurisprudence.

Objectives

This study aims to provide a **critical analysis of the medico-legal responsibilities** of homoeopathic practitioners under the current NCH framework. It evaluates the legal expectations regarding emergency handling, medical negligence, informed consent, and documentation, while identifying potential areas of vulnerability for the clinician.

Methodology

A **qualitative and analytical legal review** was conducted. It involved a comprehensive cross-examination of the National Commission for Homoeopathy Act, 2020, relevant NCH regulations, and landmark judgments by the Supreme Court of India concerning medical negligence (Section 106 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023) and the Consumer Protection Act, 2019.

Results

The analysis reveals that while the NCH framework strengthens professional ethics, ambiguity persists regarding the legal boundaries of homoeopathic physicians in handling acute socio-legal emergencies and cross-practice. Furthermore, many practitioners lack formal training in the exact protocols of issuing valid medical certificates, managing dying declarations, and navigating the witness box. This gap elevates their vulnerability to allegations of professional misconduct or negligence.

Conclusion

The NCH framework successfully elevates professional accountability but must be supported by continuous medico-legal education. To safeguard practitioners and ensure patient safety, there is an urgent need to introduce mandatory, practice-oriented training modules in Forensic Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence for registered practitioners.

KEYWORDS: National Commission for Homoeopathy (NCH), Medico-legal responsibilities, Medical Negligence, Homoeopathic practitioner, Medical Jurisprudence, Consumer Protection Act.

INTRODUCTION

The healthcare ecosystem in India has undergone a massive paradigm shift toward institutionalized regulation and accountability. A milestone in this transformation was the enactment of the National Commission for Homoeopathy (NCH) Act, 2020, which officially dissolved the legacy Central Council of Homoeopathy (CCH) to elevate professional standards, ethics, and medical education [1]. Under the umbrella of the Ministry of AYUSH, homoeopathic practitioners are increasingly recognized as core stakeholders in achieving universal health coverage [2]. However, as homoeopathic clinics integrate into frontline medical setups, practitioners face a complex web of legal, ethical, and clinical responsibilities that extend far beyond therapeutic selection [1,3].

This statutory expansion exposes homoeopathic professionals to the rigorous benchmarks of **Indian medical jurisprudence** [3]. Historically, a prevalent misconception suggested that alternative system clinicians were exempt from stringent malpractice litigations due to the inherent safety profile of potentized remedies. Contrastingly, current judicial trends dictate that any registered medical practitioner (RMP) can be held liable under consumer protection laws and criminal statutes for deficiencies in services [4]. The transition from the colonial Indian Penal Code (IPC) to the modern Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, specifically

through **Section 106(1)** (which succeeded Section 304A IPC), has redefined the punitive liabilities associated with rash or negligent acts causing death [5]. Although legislative sub-clauses provide distinct leniencies regarding maximum sentencing parameters specifically for RMPs performing medical procedures, they underscore a critical demand: absolute adherence to established standards of care, irrespective of the system of medicine [5,6].

Compounding these challenges is the legal ambiguity surrounding **cross-practice and medical emergencies** [4]. Landmark rulings by the Supreme Court of India and the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (NCDRC) have consistently declared that practicing outside one's registered system of medicine without valid statutory validation constitutes negligence per se [4,7]. Yet, homoeopathic doctors are routinely forced to navigate delicate socio-legal terrains, such as identifying acute toxicological emergencies, formulating referral pathways, issuing legal death certificates, and providing expert witness testimonies in court [3,8]. This creates a sharp educational and practical mismatch; while the NCH introduces competency-based dynamic curricula, field practitioners often find themselves undertrained in formal forensic procedures and legal defensive frameworks [1,3].

This research paper provides a critical, multi-dimensional analysis of the medico-legal responsibilities imposed upon homoeopathic practitioners within the current NCH framework. By cross-examining contemporary statutory provisions, BNS paradigms, and critical judicial precedents, this study maps the boundary lines of legal safety for clinicians. Ultimately, it highlights structural gaps in forensic training and offers actionable legal recommendations to safeguard practitioners while reinforcing patient safety and professional accountability.

METHODOLOGY

1. Research Design & Core Approach

This study is structured as a **doctrinal legal analysis** combined with a **comparative policy evaluation**. The primary focus is to interpret existing legal texts, statutory provisions, and judicial precedents to map out the exact boundaries of civil and criminal liability for homoeopathic practitioners in India.

2. Data Sources & Collection Strategy

Data collection was strictly limited to **authoritative primary and secondary legal sources**, categorized as follows:

- **Primary Legal Sources (Statutes & Acts):**

- The National Commission for Homoeopathy Act, 2020 (and subsequent gazette notifications by the NCH).
- The Central Council of Homoeopathy (HCC) Act, 1973 (for historical and comparative baseline data).
- The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 (specifically Section 106 and definitions of Registered Medical Practitioners).
- The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 (governing civil medical negligence and deficiency of service claims).
- **Primary Judicial Sources (Case Law):**
 - Landmark rulings on medical negligence from the **Supreme Court of India** (e.g., Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, Poonam Verma v. Ashwin Patel).
 - Recent orders and revision petitions from the **National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (NCDRC)** concerning alternative system clinicians and cross-practice limitations.
- **Secondary Sources:**
 - Peer-reviewed articles from medico-legal, forensic medicine, and bioethics journals.
 - Official reports, dynamic curriculum blueprints, and codes of ethics published by the **Board of Ethics and Registration for Homoeopathy (BERH)**.

3. Data Analysis & Interpretation Framework

The collected legal materials were analyzed through a three-tiered interpretive framework:

- 1. Statutory Literal & Purposive Interpretation:** Analyzing the shift from Section 304A of the old Indian Penal Code (IPC) to Section 106(1) of the BNS, checking specifically how the proviso clause applies to homoeopaths enrolled in the National Register.
- 2. Comparative Regulatory Mapping:** Directly comparing the institutional powers of the legacy CCH against the newly established autonomous boards under the NCH to track changes in ethical accountability.
- 3. Precedent Analysis (Stare Decisis):** Reviewing how courts apply the standard of "reasonable skill and care" to alternative systems of medicine. This helps determine whether matching a homoeopathic remedy to a symptom profile legally constitutes a standard of care sufficient to defend against criminal charges.

4. Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria

To keep the research focused and legally accurate, strict filters were applied during the document selection phase:

- **Inclusion Criteria**

- Statutes, legal frameworks, and amendments currently active in India.
- Supreme Court and Apex Consumer Court judgments directly involving AYUSH or homoeopathic practitioners.
- Official dynamic curriculum outlines updated following the implementation of the NCH Act.

- **Exclusion Criteria**

- International medical jurisprudence frameworks (e.g., UK or US case laws) that have no binding authority on Indian courts.
- Clinical efficacy trials or pharmacological studies of homoeopathic remedies that do not feature medico-legal or toxicological implications.

5. Synthesis & Outcome Formulation

The final phase of the methodology involves translating these legal interpretations into practical medical applications. By identifying areas where the NCH regulations collide with BNS penal liabilities, the study moves from theoretical analysis to practical solutions. This culminates in the design of risk-mitigation checklists, informed consent standards, and standardized referral pathways tailored specifically for homoeopathic clinics.

RESULTS

Based on the qualitative legal analysis, comparative policy mapping, and cross-examination of judicial trends, the **Results** of this study are synthesized below.

This table highlights how specific clinical actions or system breaches dictate the level of criminal liability under the new penal framework.

Table 1: Statutory Vulnerability and Liability Mapping under BNS Section. 106(1)

Clinical Action / Scenario	Legal Status of Practitioner	Applicable BNS Section	Maximum Imprisonment	Core Legal/Judicial Rationale
Pure Homoeopathic Practice (Within scope; matching remedy to	Registered Medical Practitioner (RMP)	Section 106(1) Proviso	2 Years (+ Fine)	Falls under the protective medical exception clause; evaluated on the standard of a

symptom totality; standard documentation maintained).				reasonable homoeopathic peer.
Unauthorized Cross-Practice (Prescribing intensive Schedule H allopathic drugs or performing modern surgical procedures).	Stripped of RMP protection for that specific act	Section 106(1) Main Clause	5 Years (+ Fine)	The act is deemed outside the statutory definition of an RMP. Governed by the Poonam Verma precedent (negligence per se).
Gross Clinical Negligence (Ignoring critical vitals, treating clear heart attacks or strokes without emergency referral).	Registered Medical Practitioner (RMP)	Section 106(1) Proviso	2 Years (+ Fine)	Fulfills the criminal threshold of gross recklessness established in Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab.
Unregistered / Expired License Practice (Failing to renew registration or update names in the National Register of BERH).	Quack / Non-RMP status	Section 106(1) Main Clause	5 Years (+ Fine)	Complete absence of statutory protection under the NCH Act. Tried as a lay citizen causing death by negligence.

This table presents the operational results of how the regulatory transition actively changes a practitioner's exposure to civil and professional liability.

Table 2: Comparative Institutional Efficacy (CCH vs. NCH Impact on Malpractice Litigations.)

Medico-Legal Domain	Old CCH Realities (HCC Act, 1973)	New NCH Realities (NCH Act, 2020)	Resulting Impact on Court Litigations
Ethical Disciplinary Action	Decentralized, state-level bias; slow enforcement; rare license suspensions.	Centralized enforcement via the Board of Ethics and Registration (BERH) .	Professional misconduct rulings are faster, providing rapid, pre-established evidence for consumer courts to rule on deficiency of service.
Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)	Complete absence of standard clinical guidelines or treatment protocols.	Empowered to issue national clinical, infrastructural, and digital record SOPs.	Deviation from NCH SOPs creates an immediate presumption of civil negligence under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019 .
National	Manual, fragmented	Live, digitized,	Speeds up judicial

Register Auditing	state records; difficult for courts to instantly verify credentials.	centrally transparent National Register of Homoeopathy .	verification of RMP status during initial cross-examinations in bail and trial stages.
Telemedicine Compliance	Unregulated; high risk of liability over undocumented digital chats/calls.	Explicitly integrated guidelines under modern NCH rules.	Virtual prescriptions without mandatory video/audio consent now constitute automatic malpractice.

An evaluation of current field practices against the strict requirements of Indian forensic medicine and medical jurisprudence.

Table 3: Systemic Risk Assessment of Forensic Procedures in Clinics.

Forensic Procedure	Prevailing Field Practice Gap	Direct Legal Risk	Mandatory NCH / Legal Remedy
Medical / Sickness Certificates	Issued casually without entering structured identification marks or clear diagnostic criteria.	Accusations of forgery, legal bias, or professional misconduct.	Strictly log certificates chronologically in a clinic register; state exact clinical findings; limit to homoeopathic scope.
Toxicological Identification	Delayed diagnosis of accidental or suicidal poisoning due to over-focus on chronic constitutional history.	Criminal charges for delaying lifesaver treatments or failing to report to local authorities.	Immediate deployment of first-aid stabilization protocols and execution of a documented carbon-copy Referral Note to an emergency hospital.
Informed Consent Execution	Verbal consent or generalized single-line signatures obtained via a relative/attendant.	Shift in the burden of proof under civil courts; invalidation of defense.	Implementation of written, vernacular, bipartite informed consent forms outlining specific homoeopathic parameters.

DISCUSSION

Action Plan Checklist for Clinicians

- Re-verify that your **Registration Certificate** with the state council/NCH is active and publicly displayed.
- Review clinic inventory to ensure zero stock of allopathic schedule H/H1/X drugs.
- Update the template of your prescription pad to include spaces for vital signs and patient consent signatures.
- Train clinic reception staff on identifying critical emergency patients for immediate triage and referral diversion.
- Implement an off-site digital backup for all patient case histories and informed consent sheets.

REFERENCES

1. India. The National Commission for Homoeopathy Act, 2020 (Act No. 15 of 2020). Gazette of India (Extraordinary), Ministry of Law and Justice [Internet]. 2020 Sep 21 [cited 2026 Oct 9]. Available from: <https://indiacode.gov.in/act/10e7b056-593b-473a-95fb-7eff54bd86e7>
2. Ministry of Ayush. World Homoeopathy Day: Evolution and institutionalization of homoeopathic infrastructure [Internet]. New Delhi: Press Information Bureau, Government of India; 2025 Feb 14 [cited 2026 Oct 9]. Available from: <https://www.pib.gov.in/PressNoteDetails.aspx?NoteId=154174&ModuleId=3>
3. National Commission for Homoeopathy. Code of Medical Ethics and Professional Conduct for Homoeopathic Practitioners Regulations. Gazette of India [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2026 Oct 9]. Available from: <https://nch.org.in/gazette>
4. National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission. Liability of AYUSH practitioners in unauthorized prescription of modern medicines: Revision Petition No. 1133 of 2018. South Asian J Cancer [Internet]. 2023 Sep 15 [cited 2026 Oct 9];12(3):210-212. Available from: <https://journal.sajc.org/ayurvedic-doctors-cannot-prescribe-allopathic-medicines-national-consumer-dispute-redressal-commission-judgement/>
5. Ministry of Home Affairs. Section 106: Causing death by negligence. In: The Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 (Act No. 45 of 2023). Government of India; Came into force 2024 Jul 1.
6. Sharma R, Kumar A. The doctor's dilemma: Analysis of medical negligence under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. Indian J Legal Law Rev [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Oct 9];6(2):45-52. Available from: <https://www.ijllr.com/post/the-doctor-s-dilemma-analysis-of-medical-negligence-under-the-bhartiya-nyaya-sanhita-2023>
7. Supreme Court of India. State of Gujarat v. Dr. P.A. Bhut & Ors. Civil Appeal No. 8753 of 2014. Judgment dated 2024 Dec 11.
8. Jacob Mathew v. State of Punjab, (2005) 6 SCC 1 (Extending the criteria of gross criminal medical negligence to alternative medicine systems).