



\$~12

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 15631/2025**

RANJAN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Abhisht Hela, Advocate.

versus

**DR BABA SAHAB AMBEDKAR MEDICAL COLLEGE AND
HOSPITAL & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms Avni Singh Panel Counsel for
GNCTD

Mr. Vaibhav Mishra Standing
Counsel For NMC along with Mr.
Raghav Sood, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

10.02.2026

1. The instant petition is for the following reliefs:-

“(i) Direct the respondent no. 1, in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, to suspend the duties of the Concerned Doctors, Dr. Komal Chauhan, DNB III, Dr. Pankhuri (Senior Resident) and the nursing staff involved in the treatment of the patient.

(ii) Constitute a team of medical Experts to examine and submit a detailed analysis report in the present case, headed by retired Justice of Hon'ble Supreme Court or Delhi High Court.

(iii) Direct the respondent no. 2-4 in the nature of mandamus to issue mandatory guidelines for conduction of such tests, which could be fatal for the patients so as to lessen the number deaths due to such medical negligence.

(iv) Direct Respondents to pay a compensation of Rs. 2,00,00,000/-, to the petitioner and his family for destroying the future possibilities for the family and violating article 21 of the patient.

(v) Pass such other and further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem



fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

2. The facts of the case would indicate that on 17.08.2025, the patient was admitted at Dr. Baba Sahab Hospital and Medical College, Rohini. Certain medical advices were given to the patient and eventually, on the very same day, the patient had expired. The petitioner seems to have filed the complaint on 20.08.2024 to the concerned Police Station and sought for the strict adherence of the guidelines which are already in place, and an action of suspension against the concerned doctor.
3. The Court, however, finds that the adjudication of the grievance raised in the instant petition will require the appreciation of oral and documentary evidence, which cannot be undertaken by this Court under this jurisdiction. The petitioner, however, shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.
4. So far as the submission made on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has not received the copy of the post-mortem report is concerned, the said issue can be agitated before an appropriate authority.
5. If the copy of the post-mortem report is not furnished to the petitioner within a reasonable period of time, the petitioner is also granted liberty to file a fresh petition.
6. With the aforesaid observations and liberty, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 10, 2026

Nc/ksr