

**BEFORE THE TELANGANA STATE CONSUMER DISPUTES
REDRESSAL COMMISSION:HYDERABAD**

(ADDITIONAL BENCH)

C.C.74/2015

Between :

Mr. Anand Kankipati, S/o. K. Hanumantha Rao,
R/o. Flat NO.101, Man Arcade Apartments,
Beside Ayyappa Swamy Temple, Chinna Thokata,
Bowenpally, Secunderabad – 500011.

... Complainant

And

1. Samatha Rehabilitation & Psychiatric Centre,
Rep.by Op NO.4 (Mr. K. Rami Reddy),
Plot No. 4, SBI Colony, Tadband,
Hanuman Temple, At Sick Village,
Secunderabad – 500009.

2. Dr. S. Dinesh, MBBS, DPM.MS (PSY),
Regd. No.48619, working as Consultant,
Psychiatrist in Op 1 Centre, R/o.2-1-271,
Nallakunta, Hyderabad – 500044.

3. Dr. Minhag, MD., (PSY).DPM,
Regd. No.57204, In-Charge Medical Officer of OP No.1,
R/o. H.NO. 16-2-2712, Akbar Bagh, Malakpet,
Hyderabad – 500036.

4. Mr. K. Rami Reddy,
Administrative Director of Op No.1 Centre,
R/o. Flat No. G-1, Lakshmi Saraswathi Apartments,
LIC Colony, Secunderabad – 500009.

.... Opposite parties

Counsel for the Complainant : Complainant - In - Person
Counsel for the Opposite Party No. 1 & 4 : Mr. Hari Babu
Counsel for the Opposite Party No. 2 & 3 : Mr. K. Chaitanya

**QUORUM: HON'BLE SRI V.V.SESHUBABU, MEMBER (M-J)
&
HON'BLE SMT R.S. RAJESHREE, MEMBER (N-J)**

**FRIDAY THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND TWENTY THREE**

Order : (PER HON'BLE SRI V.V.SESHUBABU, MEMBER-JUDL)

1. The complaint is filed on 08.04.2015 under Section 17 (1)
(a) (i) the Consumer Protection Act, 1986, praying this Commission

to direct the Opposite Parties No. 1 to 4 to pay Rs.90,000/- the treatment expenses and Rs.78,00,000/- towards loss of income and for costs.

2. The brief averments of the complaint are that the complainant is the proprietor of M/s. Sai Bhagavan Industries and having wife by name Jyothi Priya and he is the only the bread winner of the family; that he only consumes alcohol at social gatherings, against the liking of the wife; that the wife came to know about the opposite party No.1 centre and on enquiry with them learnt that her husband can become alcohol free in consumption; that opposite party No.2 is the Government Doctor working in the opposite party No.1 as consultant Psychiatrist and her husband kept in their centre would quit alcohol very easily for which she has to pay charges for one month; that on 27.01.2013 the wife of complainant along with her brother fought with the complainant, there upon called the police and took the complainant to the police station, where his parents were convinced by the brother and wife of the complainant that, it is better to join the complainant in the opposite party No.1 centre instead of sending him to the jail; that complainant was kept in the police station till the night of 28.01.2013 and then the goons of the opposite party No.1 kidnapped the complainant to the opposite party No.1 centre without his consent and kept him in the centre for six months; that the complainant was not allowed to meet his family members and others who visit the centre by threatening the family members that the complainant became wild and may even attack them; that the complainant was made to attend menial works; that on 15.03.2013 at about 9:30 AM was instructed by Mr. Durga Prasad (ex-alcoholic) to dry the under garments in the terrace of the centre; that annoyed with the behaviour of the opposite party No.1 centre people, the complainant shouted loudly and he was helped by one Mr. Kiran Kumar another patient calling the public to come for their rescue and the complainant even cut his hand with a piece of glass and also dropped some letters from the terrace to the public; that people gathered in the street called for police, the complainant was shifted to police station Bowenpally; that opposite party No.4 frightened the family

members of the complainant that he was suffering from withdrawals symptoms and make kill any of them and he was again taken to opposite party No.1 centre; that complainant was not allowed to meet the family members and not permitted to sign on the cheques to pay money to the creditors and EMI's.

3. It is further submitted that opposite party No.2 in his affidavit to Andhra Pradesh Medical Council dt.25.09.2014 stated that the admission of complainant is voluntary and consented by father and wife of the complainant in accordance with mental health Act, 1987; that the said affidavit is contrary to the mental health act; that opposite party No.2 is collecting money from the patients by keeping them maximum possible time in the opposite party No. 1 centre; that opposite parties No.2 & 3 kept several persons illegally in the opposite party No.1 centre, namely Mr. Balaraju, Dr. Ganta Satyanarayana, Mr. Moka Chandra Sekhar, Mr. Devadas, Mr. Gangadhar, Mr. Goutham & Dr.Shiva; that opposite party No.2 is in the habit of giving false and fake reports to keep the patients in the centre; that opposite party No.1 not displayed any of its registration certificates including regarding his degrees, thereby cheating the public; that the complainant was tortured in the opposite party No.1 centre and was kept along with other Psychiatric patients; that opposite party No.1 is doing business without registration for the last six years; that more number of patients stuffed into the rooms against the rules; that there are no qualified staff; that opposite party No.4 as no technical qualification; that a counsellor by name Mr. Anjaneyulu is the 10th failed candidate; that minimum facilities are not provided to the patients; that the complainant was made to suffer in the opposite party No.1 centre unnecessarily from 28.01.2013 to 31.07.2013 which is nothing but illegal detention; that due to the illegal acts of the opposite parties huge amounts were paid by the family members to the opposite party No.1 centre; that the complainant lost his entire business and livelihood; that made to suffer physical and mental agony; that complainant used to earn Rs.3.5 lakhs per annum and due to illegal detention failed to clear loans of about Rs.15,00,000/- and due loss of earning capacity suffered at least 20 years to come @ Rs.4 lakhs x 12 =

Rs.48,00,000/-; that the actions of the opposite parties amounts to deficiency in service and unfair trade practice: hence, the complaint.

4. The brief averments of the written version of opposite party No.1 as adopted by opposite party No.4 are that the complaint is not maintainable either on facts or under law; that the complainant is put to strict proof of all the averments made in the complaint except those that are specifically admitted; that the allegation of kidnapping the complainant with the help of alleged goons on 27.01.2013 from the police station is a deliberate false statement; that the complainant was taken care of, as if like a child in the opposite party No.1 centre; that treatment procedures were followed meticulously; that the complainant is highly addicted to alcohol (suffering chronic alcoholic syndrome, chronic petatis and anti-social personal disorders)and for the persons like him process of quitting addiction will be slow; that the family members used to regularly visit the complainant and they have satisfied with his progress; that never any menial works were entrusted to the complainant; that several times complainant made attempts to escape from the opposite party No.1 centre; that after six months of treatment he was discharged on satisfactory improvement; that the opposite parties never violated the rules under the metal health act, 1987; that the list of the persons mentioned in the complaint are the patients and one among them by name Mr. Surendra Babu expired in NIMS Hospital due to bad general medical condition; that the complainant submitted various complaints against the opposite parties to the Lok Ayukta, The Human Rights Commission, The AP Medical Council and the Hon'ble High court alleging that he was forcibly admitted; that he is in the habit of approaching one forum after the other with frivolous and vexatious grounds to make an illegal gain; that there is no deficiency in service or unfair trade practice. With this requested to dismiss the complaint with costs.

5. The brief averments of the written version of opposite party No.2 & 3 are almost in the same lines of the written version

of opposite party No.1 & 4. The other averments are that the opposite party No.2 completed MBBS and DPM (Diploma in Psychiatric Medicine), from Osmania Medical College and selected for Govt. Service; that opposite party No.3 completed MBBS from GMC, Mumbai, MD from LTMMC & GH Mumbai both of them registered in AP Medical Council; that previously opposite party No. 3 was in-charge medical officer of opposite party No.1 and opposite party No.2 is the consultant Psychiatric of the same centre; that opposite party No.1 is the licensed Psychiatric hospital providing inpatient and outpatient services; that the opposite party No.1 was closed on 09.09.2014 due to the personal reasons of opposite party No.4 and it was informed to the director of medical education and opposite party No.3 also resigned from therein due to personal reasons.

6. The other averments are that the opposite party No.2 had no role whatsoever in the administration and financial matter of opposite party No.1; that on request of family members and after a provisional diagnosis a certificate was issued in order to produce the same before the bank to gain time in the repayment of loans by the complainant; that the case sheet and other medical records of the complaints were seized by the Bowenpally police in connection with case No.5918/2013 before AP State Human Rights Commission filed by the complainant; that father of the complainant paid the amounts to the opposite party No.1 when he was in patient; that on 15.02.2013 the complainant due to his personality disorder with mood swings went to terrace, cut his hand with glass piece and threatened to jump off from the building; that the management of the hospital informed the police who came and shifted the complainant to the police station, called for the family members, but they have refused to take to the house in view of suicidal tendencies and so, he was brought back to the opposite party No.1 centre; that the complainant or his family members throughout his stay, made no complaint against opposite party No.1; that the APSHRC closed the case and given a clean chit to the opposite party No.1; So, also the Lok Ayukta. With this requested dismiss the complaint with costs.

7. To prove the case, complainant filed evidence affidavit as PW1 and got marked Ex.A1 to A66. He was subjected to cross examination in the presence of Advocate Commissioner. Dr. S. Dinesh/Opposite Party No.2 filed evidence affidavit as RW1 and got marked Ex.B1 to B3. Dr. Minhaj Zafar Nasirabadi/Opposite party No.3 filed evidence affidavit as RW2. Mr. K. Rami Reddy/Opposite Party No.4 filed evidence affidavit as RW3 and got marked Ex.B4 to B6. RWs 1 to 3 were subjected to cross examination before the Advocate Commissioner. Complainant filed written arguments besides case law and also submitted oral arguments. Written arguments filed for opposite parties No.2 & 3. Heard their oral arguments also.

8. Now the points for determination are:-

- (i) Whether the admission of complainant in the opposite party No.1 centre is not as per law? And his continuation in the centre as in-patient upto 31.07.2013 amounts to illegal detention?
- (ii) Whether the opposite parties have adopted unfair trade practices/deficient in their services, as against the complainant?
- (iii) Whether the complainant is entitled for the amounts as claimed? If yes, to what extent?
- (iv) Relief?

9. **Point No.1 & 2 :-** For the sake of convenience from herein after the Mental Health Act, 1987, will be referred as the “**act**” and opposite party No.1 centre will be referred as “**centre**”. Admittedly, PW1 was taken to the centre from the police station. It is the case of PW1 that after a quarrel in the house on 27.01.2013 he was taken to the police station by his wife and brothers-in-law, where he was detained upto 28.01.2013 and from there the goons of the opposite party No.1 kidnapped him to the centre. Whereas, it is the case of opposite parties that the admission of PW1 in the centre on 28.01.2013 is voluntary in nature. As per Sec-15 of the act, 1987, any person (not being a minor) who consider himself to be a mentally ill-person and desires to be admitted to any psychiatric

hospital or nursing home for treatment may request the medical officer in-charge for being admitted as a voluntary patient. Sec-19 of the act deals with admission under special circumstances. As per the same on an application made by a relative or a friend of the mentally ill person can be admitted if, such mentally ill-person, does not, or is unable to, express his willingness for admission as a voluntary patient and admission can be made if, the medical officer in-charge is satisfied that in the interest of mentally ill-person it is necessary to do so, provided in such case, such person shall not be kept as in-patient for a period exceeding 90 days.

10. In the case on hand PW1 is a major and not submitted any application to express his voluntariness to admit into the centre as per Sec-15. No document is available to show that at the time of admission of PW1 in the centre on 28.01.2013, the in-charge medical officer the centre examined PW1 and satisfied with his mental status; i.e., it was a fit case in the interest mentally ill-person to admit in the centre. As per Sec-19 of the act. Wife of PW1 said to have given a consent for his admission in the opposite party No.1 centre. As per Ex.A34 at page No.33 the signature of wife of PW1 (K. Jyothi Priya) is there in the application for reception order in form No.VIII, but no date is mentioned there on including the name and address of the witnesses. It shows PW1 was admitted in the centre, without following the procedure prescribed under Sec-15 and 19 of the act, when the order of the concerned Magistrate is not at all available. In view of the above discussion we are of the view that PW1 was not admitted in the centre as per law.

11. PW1 was kept as in-patient in the centre from 28.01.2013 to 31.07.2013. It is beyond 90 days of the maximum period, as prescribed U/s. 19 of the act. If any relative of mentally ill-person gives application for admission it shall be supported by two medical certificates from two medical practitioners, out of them one shall be medical practitioner in service of the Government shall be there. Nothing is followed while admitting PW1 in the centre. It is the contention of opposite parties that the certificate

said to have been given by RW1 dt.05.05.2013 under Ex.A8 is the basis, to continue PW1 in the centre as an in-patient beyond 90 days. As per Ex.A8 PW1 was said to have been suffering from **chronic hepapitis, ? ASPD (Anti Social Personal Disorders) and substance induced mood disorder** and require further treatment & psychotherapy for a further period of 2-3 months. No document/lab report is filed to support the above certificate. In the absence of any documents in support of the Ex.A8 one can conclude that it was given with pre-motive to detain PW1 in centre for some more time. The contention of PW1 that he was illegally kept in the centre with sole intention of extracting money is getting its support from the record itself. Therefore, we are of the view that detaining PW1 in the centre beyond 90 days amounts to illegal detention or illegal custody.

12. PW1 stated that there were no sufficient Doctors and Staff in the centre to look after the patients and he was made to attend all the menial works like sweeping, mopping the floor, cleaning the toilets, utensils etc., and he was inhumanly treated with an instructions to consume food by sitting on a toilet commode. Even though the opposite parties denied the same in the written version and in their respective chief examination affidavits, but the allegations were substantiated by PW1 by filing Ex.A46 CD besides the transcription of voice records in Telugu script. Three persons have engaged in those call recordings viz., PW1, one Mr. Krishna Reddy & RW1. We are of the view that the Ex.A46 itself is sufficient to conclude that how badly PW1 was treated in the centre and how the record cooked up by throwing procedures, rules and regulations to the winds. The Ex.A46 was emanated when one Mr. Krishna Reddy commenced compromise talks with PW1 at first on behalf of RWs 1 & 2 and followed by RW1 himself. It may as it is there.

13. Admittedly, after discharge in centre PW1 gave several complaints against opposite parties to the AP Human Rights Commission, AP Medical Council, to the concerned police and also approached the Hon'ble High Court for his Redressal. Ex.A61 is

the Telangana State Medical Council letter, dt.04.11.2016 addressed to PW1. Wherein it is mentioned that one Dr. Hari Kumar Ravva was found as guilty for misconduct for not possessing any recognised qualification to prefix “NEURO” to his degree, besides was also found guilty for running a clinic without valid license from DM and HO, Hyderabad and also applied for license when working as senior residence in a medical college and punished with a removal from the medical register for a period of six months.

14. Ex.A65 is the extract of minutes of the ethics committee dt.24.08.2016 and goes to show that RW1 & 2 inspite of giving opportunity failed to produce necessary records/registeres to show that the centre being run as per the provisions of the act and State Mental Health Rules, 1990, and also mentioned that RW2/Opposite party No.3 is the licensee of the centre and is responsible for the treatment rendered to the inmates. It is also mentioned that after going through the entire record, the oral submissions and written statements made before it by PW1 & RW1 & 2, the committee noted that **the centre** has misused the license awarded by the DME by not following the rules and regulations of the act; that RW2 failed to maintain and safeguard the medical records and also for not being in the centre due to his hectic schedule of working as professor in VRK Medical College and also running a clinic at Chanchalguda and also the Rehabilitation Centre; that RW2 suffixed non-medical degree, (which is also non-recognised) to his name as Dr.S. Dinesh, MS., (Psy) whereas he is only MBBS, DPM which he has registered with medical council and so, both RW1 & 2 were awarded with punishment of **“censure”**. The same is reiterated in the minutes of the meeting dt.004.11.2016 and it was informed to PW1 under Ex.A66/1 dt. 21.01.2017.

15. RW3 is the Administrative Director of the opposite party No.1 centre. He is not having any qualifications to run the centre as the Administrative Director. The medical record of PW1 was not handed over to him inspite of his best efforts. After elaborate

efforts the medical record maintained by the centre was provided to PW1 by the Inspector of Police, Bowenpally police on 18.05.2015. It shows nearly two years after his discharge from the centre, PW1 able to secure the record regarding his treatment, that went on in the centre. No worthwhile material is available in the Ex.A34 (medical record of PW1) to sustain his admission and detention in the centre.

16. After going through the Ex.A46 call records transcription one can understand that RWs 1 & 2 have just acted as tools in the hands of RW3 and one Mr. Durga Prasad. The record is very clear that without sufficient number of Doctors and staff the centre was maintained by RW3. Medical officer shall always available in the centre to attend the inmates. So, we are of the emphatic view that without in-charge medical officer of the centre it was run by RW3. the presence of in-charge medical office is mandatory as per the act. Therefore, the opposite parties No.1 to 4 are liable for their unfair trade practices, and deficiency of service towards PW1.

17. **Point NO.3 & 4:-** Ex.A1 to A7 are the receipts issued by the centre, where under Rs.90,000/- was paid by father of PW1 towards fee for the treatment of PW1. One Mr. Mohan Rao also paid the amount of Rs.24,000/- on 27.05.2011 for the treatment of one Mr. Somashekar Rao. It is not explained by PW1, how it is relevant to the case. It shows that the receipt was signed by RW3. Probably to establish the link between the centre and RW3, the Ex.A7 might have marked. PW1 also claimed for the refund of Rs.90,000/- paid by him.

18. Ex.A19 is the certificate of registration issued by the Asst. Commercial Tax Officer, Balanagar for Sai Bhagavan Industries dt.01.04.2004, belonged to PW1. Ex.A21 shows that PW1 was doing business in the items of manufacture/type of hydraulic equipment service. Ex.A23 is the bank statement of PW1 business with IndusInd Bank for the years 01.04.2012 to 07.06.2013. The maximum amount available in the said account by the date 29.01.2013 Rs.2,22,000/- so, the contention of PW1 that he used

to earn Rs.3,50,000/- p.a., is difficult to believe. Ex.A26 is the IT returns for the assessment year 2010-2011 shows PW1 paid tax of Rs.90,670/-. NO IT returns is filed subsequent to his discharge to show the decline trends in the business to establish that in view of his detention in the centre, there was a business close. As per PW1 during his absence, wife and brothers-in-law conducted his business, and caused losses. Nothing is proved to establish the same.

19. Though PW1 claimed himself as a social consumer of alcohol, the action of his wife and brother-in-law kept him in the centre shows that he was more than a social consumer of alcohol, now and then. Unless, his alcohol habits are more than the normal the wife, brothers-in-law and father might not have kept him in the de-addiction centre/opposite party No.1. It is the contention of PW1 that his wife and relatives were threatened by opposite parties, that if discharged from the hospital PW1 may attempt on their lives. PW1 not proved such threats by examining his wife or any other relations. Therefore, we are of the view that the contention of PW1 that he is an occasional consumer of alcohol is too much to believe. It is also the contention of PW1 as he was detained in the centre for about six months, he got the stigma of drunkard in the society and due to the same lost all business opportunities. In the above discussions we have not appreciated the contention of PW1. No affidavit of anybody is filed to show that PW1 is still suffering the stigma. One thing is certain that PW1 was illegally detained in the opposite party No.1 centre and was made to attend menial works and even tortured. For this we are of the view that PW1 shall be adequately compensated. RW1 with false diploma or degrees induced wife of PW1 to approach the centre to rescue PW1 from the habit of alcohol. RWs 1 to 3 are the culprits as such, liable to pay compensation. Taking a birds view of the entire case, we are of the view that PW1 is entitled for the refund of Rs.90,000/- besides compensation of Rs.3,00,000/- each from RWs 1 to 3, of course with a joint and several liability and also to be paid costs of Rs.25,000/-.

20. In the result, the complaint is partly allowed.

(i) Directing the opposite parties No.1 to 4 to refund of Rs.90,000/-.

(ii) To pay compensation of Rs.9,00,000/- with the joint and several liability and to pay costs of Rs.25,000/-.

Time for compliance is one month from the date of receipt of this order, in case of failure, the amounts will carry (except costs) interest @9% p.a., till the date of payment.

Typed to the dictation to the steno on system, corrected and pronounced by us in the open bench on 14.07.2023.

MEMBER(M-J) MEMBER (M-NJ)

Dt:14.07.2023.

BSR

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE
WITNESS EXAMINED

Evidence affidavit of
 The complainant
 Mr. Anand Kankipati

Evidence affidavit of
 Opposite party No. 1&4:
 Mr. K. Rami Reddy
 Opposite party No.2:
 Dr. S. Dinesh
 Opposite Party No.3:
 Dr. Minhaj Zafar
 Nasirabadi

EXHIBITS MARKED

For Complainant:

Ex.A1: is the Photostat copy of Receipt, dated: 29.01.2013.

Ex.A2: is the Photostat copy of Receipt, dated: 26.02.2013.

Ex.A3: is the Photostat copy of Receipt, dated: 29.03.2013.

Ex.A4: is the Photostat copy of Receipt, dated: 26.04.2013.

Ex.A5: is the Photostat copy of Receipt, dated: 27.05.2013.

Ex.A6: is the Photostat copy of Receipt, dated: 26.06.2013.

Ex.A7: is the Photostat copy of Receipt, dated: 27.05.2013.

Ex.A8: is the Photostat copy of Medical Certificate, dated:
 05.05.2013.

Ex.A9: is the Photostat copy of Dr. Dinesh prescription prescribed
 by his assistant Durga Prasad with his own hand writing,
 dated: 31.07.2013.

- Ex.A10: is the Photostat copy of Medical Reports of complainant, dated: 01.08.2013.
- Ex.A11: is the Photostat copy of Letter by A.P.M.C. under R.T.I. Act showing Dr. Dinesh qualification, dated: 13.09.2014.
- Ex.A12: is the Photostat copy of Register Post Letters by complainant wife to Dr. Dinesh for Medical Records, dated:23.08.2014.
- Ex.A13: is the Photostat copy of Register Post Letters by complainant wife to Dr. Dinesh for Medical Records, dated: 14.10.2014.
- Ex.A14: is the Photostat copy of Register Post Letters by complainant wife to Samata Rehabilitation centre for Medical Records, dated: 20.10.2014.
- Ex.A15: is the Photostat copy of Register Post Letters by complainant wife to Dr. Minhaj for Medical Records, dated:05.11.2014.
- Ex.A16: is the Photostat copy of Affidavit.
- Ex.A17: is the Photostat copy of Affidavit, dated: 14.10.2014.
- Ex.A18: is the Photostat copy of Cases against de-addiction centres for torture, dated: 11.02.2012.
- Ex.A19: is the Photostat copy of Commercial Taxes Department Certificate of Registration.
- Ex.A20: is the Photostat copy of Value added Tax Registration Certificate, dated: 04.04.2005.
- Ex.A21: is the Photostat copy of Entrepreneurs Memorandum for Setting up Micro, Small or Medium enterprise issued by D.I.C. Balanagar, Hyderabad, dated: 17.02.2011.
- Ex.A22: is the Photostat copy of Format of Bank Certificate for issue of IEC, dated: 13.03.2012.
- Ex.A23: is the Photostat copy of IndusInd Bank Statement.
- Ex.A24: is the Photostat copy of Current Bill, dated: 06.02.2012.
- Ex.A25: is the Photostat copy of PAN Card.
- Ex.A26: is the Photostat copy of Indian Income Tax Return Verification Form.
- Ex.A27: is the Photostat copy of ISO 9001:2008 Scope of Certification.
- Ex.A28: is the Photostat copy of Original Monthly Return for Value Added Tax (Form Vat 200), dated: 27.05.2012.
- Ex.A29: is the Photostat copy of CST Turnover Ledger for '28560144932-Sai Bhagavan Industries.
- Ex.A30: is the Photostat copy of Aadhar Card.
- Ex.A31: is the Photostat copy of Ration Card.
- Ex.A32: is the Photostat copy of Right to detailed medical records.
- Ex.A33: is the Photostat copy of Medical records and issues in negligence.
- Ex.A34: is the Photostat copy of Attested Xerox medical Reports issued by Samata Rehabilitation & Psychiatric Centre, dated: 18.05.2015.
- Ex.A35: is the Photostat copy of Attested copies of Attendance Register, dated: 26.04.2016.
- Ex.A36: is the Photostat copy of Order copies of A.P.S.H.R.C., Hyderabad, dated: 04.12.2014.
- Ex.A37: is the Photostat copy of Attested copies of Enquiry Report by DM&HO in Case No.260/2014/B2 Hon'ble Lokayukta, dated: 10.06.2014.
- Ex.A38: is the Photostat copy of Decision of A.P.M.C. in Complaint No. 13/2014, dated:05.12.2015.

- Ex.A39: is the Photostat copy of Minutes of Enquiry Committee Meeting in Complaint No. 13/2014, dated: 27.11.2015.
- Ex.A40: is the Photostat copy of Letter, dated: 16.10.2014.
- Ex.A41: is the Photostat copy of Inspection Report by three men committee to DME about opposite party No.1.
- Ex.A42: is the Photostat copy of Declaration by opposite party No.3 to M.C.I., dated: 13.02.2015 during their inspection to VRK women's medical college.
- Ex.A43: is the Photostat copy of Letter dated: 17.06.2015.
- Ex.A44: is the Photostat copy of Letter dated: 05.06.2012.
- Ex.A45: is the Photostat copy of Letter dated: 21.01.2016.
- Ex.A46: is the Photostat copy of Voice Recording of opposite party No.2 and his friend to compromise the issue by asking apologies to me and accepting the wrong done to me by opposite party centre.
- Ex.A47: is the Photostat copy of First Information Report, dated: 18.11.2015.
- Ex.A48: is the Photostat copy of First Information Report, dated: 26.05.2016.
- Ex.A49: is the Photostat copy of Doctor's prescription, dated: 28.10.2013.
- Ex.A50: is the Photostat copy of statement of the Respondent, Dr. S. Dinesh before Ethics Committee, dated: 26.11.2014.
- Ex.A51: is the Photostat copy of statement of the Respondent, Dr. Minhajzafer Naasirbadi before Ethics Committee dated: 26.11.2014.
- Ex.A52: is the Photostat copy of CIBIL Report of complainant.
- Ex.A53: is the Photostat copy of First Information Report, dated: 10.02.2012.
- Ex.A54: is the Photostat copy of Certificate of Registration, dated: 07.11.2014.
- Ex.A55: is the Photostat copy of Orders against Shreyas Foundation passed by Consumer Forum in CC. No. 357/2015, dated: 26.04.2018.
- Ex.A56: is the Photostat copy of False case filed by (Partner of Opposite party No.3) Krishna Reddy in CC. No. 393/2017 (Dismissal Judgement), dated: 29.10.2018.
- Ex.A57: is the Photostat copy of First Information Report, dated: 15.04.2017.
- Ex.A58: is the Photostat copy of Deputation Order, dated: 21.11.2016.
- Ex.A59: is the Photostat copy of Memorandum of Understanding.
- Ex.A60: is the Photostat copy of Letter along with Xerox Photos.
- Ex.A61: is the Photostat copy of Suspension order against the doctor under the control of opposite party No.3, dated: 04.11.2016.
- Ex.A62: is the Photostat copy of Paper cutting showing that opposite party No.2 wrongly mentioned his qualification.
- Ex.A63: is the Photostat copy of Endorsement given by police, Bowenpally disclosing that they obtained Xerox copies of case sheets of complainant, dated: 28.10.2016.
- Ex.A64: is the Photostat copy of Letter disclosing about opposite party No.4 character, dated: 09.11.2016.
- Ex.A65: is the Photostat copy of Report given Telangana State Medical Ethics Committee & General Body Resolution against opposite party No.2 & 3, dated: 24.08.2016 & 04.11.2016.

Ex.A66: is the Photostat copy of Decision passed by State Medical against opposite party No. 2 & 3, dated: 21.01.2017.

Ex.A67 is the Original Receipts correspondence on various dates (Ex.67 is the original of Ex.A1 to Ex.A7 already marked copies).

For Opposite Parties:

Ex.B1: is the Photostat copy of Letter, dated: 18.05.2015.

Ex.B2: is the Photostat copy of Letter addressed by Inspector of Police to DG Commission of Police.

Ex.B3: is the Photostat copy of Order of the Hon'ble UPA-Lokayukta for the States of Andhra Pradesh & Telangana, dated:16.03.2015.

Ex.B4: is the Copy of the Petition & Affidavit in IA. No. 398/2020 in CC. No.74/2015, dt.30.07.2018 filed by Opposite party No.1 & 4 against complainant, opposite party No. 2 & 3.

Ex.B5: is the Original Postal Cover.

Ex.B6: is the Photostat copy of Track Consignment.

MEMBER(M-J)

MEMBER (M-NJ)

Dt: 14.07.2023.

BSR

VVS (M-J) & RSR (M-NJ)
TELANGANA STATE
CONSUMER DISPUTES
REDRESSAL COMMISSION
AT HYDERABAD

CC.NO.74 OF 2015

ORDER DATE : 14.07.2023.

BSR