

**NO. MCI-211(2)/2011-Ethics/**

**MEDICAL COUNCIL OF INDIA  
SECTOR-VIII, POCKET- 14,  
DWARKA, NEW DELHI.**

Minutes of the meeting of the Ethics Committee held on 23<sup>rd</sup> August, 2011 at 2.00 P.M. in the Council Office, Sector- VIII, Pocket- 14, Dwarka, New Delhi.

The new Ethics Committee met with Profesor Sneh Bhargava in the Chair. All the members present introduced themselves as follows:-

|     |                            |                       |
|-----|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.  | Prof. Sneh Bhargava        | Chairman              |
| 2.  | Dr. Arun Bal               | Convenor              |
| 3.  | Dr. Anil Dhal              | Member                |
| 4.  | Dr. Y.K. Gupta             | Member                |
| 5.  | Dr. Vinay Sakhuja          | Member                |
| 6.  | Dr. Chandrashekhar Shetty. | Member                |
| 7.  | Prof. Kumudini Sharma      | Member                |
| 8.  | Dr. Sanjay Gupte           | Member                |
| 9.  | Dr. Raja Babu Panwar       | Member                |
| 10. | Dr. Reena Nayyar           | Deputy Secretary, MCI |
| 11. | Mr. Shikhar Ranjan         | Law Officer, MCI      |

The Deputy Secretary Dr. Reena Nayyar then circulated 2 important documents, the Standard operating Procedures of the MCI & Ethics Committee and IMC (Professional Conduct Etiquette and Ethics ) Regulations 2002. Dr. Nayyar took the committee through the documents page wise, to familiarize them with their functions, responsibilities and mandate.

Law Officer also informed the committee that "The Supreme Court has laid down the law that a review is not permissible where there is no provision" hence the Ethics Committee has no power to review its own decisions, therefore the review cases on the agenda were not pursued.

Thereafter the agenda was pursued.

**01. Minutes of the last meeting of the Ethics Committee- Confirmation of.**

The Minutes of the Ethics Committee meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2011, were confirmed.

**02. Minutes of the last meeting of the Ethics Committee meeting held on 08<sup>th</sup> March, 2011 - Action taken there on.**

The Ethics Committee noted the action taken on the items of the minutes of meeting of the Ethics Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2011.

**03. Appeal against order dated 07.06.2010 passed by Delhi Medical Council made by Mr. S.P.Manchanda. (F.No. 597/2010).**

The Ethics Committee considered the appeal filed by Mr. S.P. Manchanda against order dated 07.06.2010 passed by Delhi Medical Council. The Ethics Committee noted the order of High Court which is as under:-

*"In as much as that the hearing of the appeal is to take place on 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2011 and the Petitioners are yet to be heard, this Court is not inclined to*

*pass any order at this stage. It is obvious that no final order will be passed by the MCI without giving each of the Petitioners a full opportunity of being heard and considering all their submissions, including those raised in this petition and on the question of jurisdiction. The MCI will pass the final order without being influenced by any prima facie opinion which may have been formed by those at its meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> March, 2011. If aggrieved by the final order passed by the MCI, it will be open to the Petitioners to seek such appropriate remedies as may be available to them in accordance with law."*

The Ethics Committee decided that both the parties be called in the next meeting of Ethics Committee for hearing in accordance with the court order.

Minutes of Ethics Committee meeting held on 23.08.2011.

**04. Complaint against Dr. Rakesh Verma, HOD, Cardiology, Safdarjung Hospital, New Delhi. (F.No. 396/2009)**

The Ethics Committee considered the complaint against Dr. Rakesh Verma and noted that as per Regulations as well as Legal opinion given by Law Officer of the Council which states that as under:-

*"Supreme Court has laid down the law that the review is not permissible where is no provision."*

Hence, the Ethics Committee has no powers to review the matter.

**05. Appeal against order dated 19.04.2010 passed by Delhi Medical Council made by Mr. Anil Kumar Mahato.(F.No. 826/2010).**

This is an appeal filed by Mr. Anil Kumar Mahato against the order dt. 19.04.2010 of Delhi Medical Council and the Committee noted that the matter is in Court. This is an appeal filed by Mr. Anil Kumar Mahato against the order of Delhi Medical Council. Delhi Medical Council in its order, dated 19.04.2010 the operative part of that order is as follows:

*"In the of the above the Delhi Medical Council make the following observations:-*

*"A two year old child with a right divergent squint for last one year (approx.) and fundus showing and RD involving macula a diagnosis of Retinoblastoma should always be suspected and a B-scan USG, EUA and a CT/MRI of orbit and brain is mandatory immediately. In addition parents should be informed of the possibility of tumour in right eye. A squint surgery is not advisable till tumour is ruled out."*

*The Delhi Medical Council, therefore, issues a warning to both Dr. Madhu Karna (DMC registration no. 43965) and Dr. Avinindra Gupta (DMC registration no. 43001) of Centre for sight."*

*Matter stands disposed"*

The appellant filed the appeal against this order for enhancement of the punishment. Both the parties were given opportunity to present their arguments and evidence on 5/4/2011. Mr Mahato contended the concerned doctors did not take prompt action and delayed the correct treatment which resulted in the loss of eye of his child The treating doctors contended that they have treated the patient properly and delay of treatment has nothing to do with the surgery of enucleation. The committee perused all the records minutely and considered all oral evidence . The committee is of the opinion that there was error of judgment on the part of both the doctors on issue of B Scan, CT/MRI, which should have done. The

committee further noted that delay in diagnosis of the Retinoblastoma has not affected patient's prognosis because the nature of the disease is such having a poor prognosis. In view of the abovementioned facts the committee is of the opinion that the decision of Delhi Medical Council is correct. And appeal of Mr. Mahato can not be upheld.. However the committee noted that both the doctors are specially trained retinal surgeons from reputed institutes in the country specialized in eye surgery namely Arvind Eye Hospital and Shankar Netralaya.. The committee further noted that in view of their very specialized training it is expected that they should not have committed such an error of judgment.

Therefore, the committee recommends that Dr Arvind Gupta and Dr Madhu Karna should attend their above mentioned institutes i.e. Arvind Eye Hospital and Shankar Netralaya for CME and Update for 15 days every year for next 3 years. and submit compliance report with the certificate of completion of update from the concerned institutes to MCI ethics section every year for next three years. The committee directs MCI ethics section to inform this decision to the concerned institutes also.

Now, the Ethics Committee noted that this matter is already in Court and as per directions of the Court the topic of CME was to be specified. The Committee therefore, decided to request a member of the Committee to provide the same.

**06. Necessary action required to be taken by the Medical Council of India for removing the names from the Indian Medical Register.(F.No. 135/2011)**

The Ethics Committee considered the matter and noted that the complainant has sent an appeal in a prescribed format. Now, the Ethics Committee noted that Clause 7.5 of Indian Medical Council (Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 states as under:-

**"MISCONDUCT :**

*The following acts of commission or omission on the part of a physician shall constitute professional misconduct rendering him/her liable for disciplinary action:-*

*Conviction by Court of Law: Conviction by a Court of Law for offences involving moral turpitude / Criminal acts."*

Therefore, the Ethics Committee decided to obtain a legal opinion in the matter and after the opinion was received it will be placed before the Ethics Committee at its subsequent meeting.

**07. Appeal by Smt. Renu Khatri against order dated 26.07.2010 of Delhi Medical Council (F.NO. 773/2010).**

The Ethics Committee considered the appeal by Smt. Renu Khatri against order dt. 26.07.2010 of Delhi Medical Council and noted that the as per

Regulations as well as legal opinion given by Retainer Advocate vide email dated 23.08.2011 the Ethics Committee has no powers to review the matter.

**08. Is it Ethical- to Propagate use of Ayurvedic Aphrodisers at ANDROCON-2011- Complaint by Dr. G.S. Grewal, Member Punjab Medical Council.**

The Ethics Committee considered the complaint made by Dr. G.S. Grewal, Member Punjab Medical Council on the unethical promotion of ayurvedic aphrodisers at ANDROCON 2011. The Committee taking into consideration the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 8856 of 1994 dated 10.05.1996 in the case of Poonam Verma Versus Dr. Ashwin Patel & Anr. and clause 1.1.3 of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulation. 2002 as amended from time to time which is quoted as under:-

*"No person other than a doctor having qualification recognised by Medical Council of India and registered with Medical Council of India/State Medical Council (s) is allowed to practice Modern system of Medicine or Surgery. A person obtaining qualification in any other system of Medicine is not allowed to practice Modern system of Medicine in any form."*

As well the decision of the Ethics Committee of the Council taken at its meeting held on 06 & 07.12.2007 quoted as under:-

"The doctor having MBBS as MD degree, under modern (allopathic) medical system are not trained in the pharmacology, pharmacodynamic and Therapeutic aspect of Ayurvedic medicine during their course of study and as such they cannot prescribe Ayurvedic drugs." Came to the conclusion that there appeared to be a violation of the Ethics regulation, 2002 in the said case, decided to refer the matter to Punjab Medical Council for necessary action at their end, since, the concerned doctors are practicing in the State of Punjab. It is in their jurisdiction to take the necessary action and not that of MCI.

However, if the complainant is not satisfied with the decision passed by Punjab Medical Council, he may file an appeal with MCI under clause 8.8 of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulation. 2002.

**09. Appeal by Mr. Kamal Kant Sharma against order dated 18/08/2008 passed by Rajasthan Medical Council (F. No. 487/2008).**

The Ethics Committee considered the appeal made by Mr. Kamal Kant Sharma against order dt. 18.08.2008 of Rajasthan Medical Council and noted that the as per Regulations as well as legal opinion by the Law Officer, Medical Council of India, the Ethics Committee has no powers to review the matter.

**10. Appeal against the activities and order dated 26.10.2007 passed by Rajasthan Medical Council made by Sh. Ajeet Singh Singhvi, IAS (Retd.) (F.No. 277/2007).**

The Ethics Committee considered the appeal made by Sh. Ajeet Singh Singhvi against order dt. 26.07.2007 of Rajasthan Medical Council and noted that

the as per Regulations as well as legal opinion by the Law Officer, Medical Council of India, the Ethics Committee has no powers to review the matter. The Ethics Committee noted the letter dated 23.05.2011 from SMS Medical College, Jaipur in which they have stated:-

*"In reference to the subject cited above, following facts are submitted for your perusal and information:-*

*".....Therefore, vide order no.10610 dated 30.04.2011, Dr. R.K. Gupta, Retired PHOD, Department of Urology, S.M.S. Medical College, Jaipur was made convener of the inquiry committee, whose report will be submitted to you at the earliest, when received.*

*It is humbly submitted due to following unavoidable circumstances like repeated refusal by the conveners of inquiry committee, non availability of the committee members and the said letter of Mr. Ajit Singh Singhvi, Retired I.A.S. dated 17.03.2011 asking for a personal hearing has delayed the matter"*

The Ethics Committee noted the letter from SMS Medical College, Jaipur and decided to wait for reply from SMS Medical College, Jaipur.

**11. Review/Revision of the IMC (Professional conduct, Etiquette and Ethics Regulations, 2002-reg.**

The Ethics Committee noted that Ministry of Health & Family Welfare has requested for a clarification on Review/Revision of the IMC (Professional conduct, Etiquette and Ethics Regulations, 2002 sent to the Central Govt. vide MCI's letter dated 03.05.2011. Therefore, the Committee decided to take opinion of the Convenor, of the previous, Ethics Committee in this matter.

**12. Complaint against 1) Dr. Sudha Salhan, (2) Dr. Uma Goyal, (3) Dr. R.R. Kishore against whom the FIR's/RCs have been registered by CBI, New Delhi as alleged by Sh. Pankaj Kumar advocate (File No.182/2011).**

The Ethics Committee considered the complaint against Dr. Sudha Salhan, Dr. Uma Goyal and Dr. R.R. Kishore and noted that Clause 7.5 of Indian Medical Council (Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 states as under:-

**"MISCONDUCT :**

*The following acts of commission or omission on the part of a physician shall constitute professional misconduct rendering him/her liable for disciplinary action:-*

*Conviction by Court of Law: Conviction by a Court of Law for offences involving moral turpitude / Criminal acts."*

Therefore, the Ethics Committee decided to obtain a legal opinion by Law Officer, Medical Council of India in the matter.

**13. Appeal against order dated 06.04.2010 passed by Rajasthan Medical Council filed by Mr. Ajeet Singh Singhvi. (F.No. 522/2010)**

The appellant Mr. Ajeet Singh Singhvi in his appeal has alleged medical negligence and professional misconduct on the part of Dr. Pramod Narang of Kothari Hospital & Research Centre, Bikaner.

The Committee considered the appeal in its hearing and after due consideration decided to issue notices to the respondents to appear in person or through lawyer before the Ethics Committee at its subsequent meeting.

Ethics section of Medical Council of India along with notice of hearing shall send a copy of the appeal along with complete annexures to the Respondents.

The Respondents are given an opportunity to file reply to appeal along with supporting documents within a period of four weeks from the receipt of the notice. The Respondents shall provide a copy of their respective replies to the Appellant before filing the same in Medical Council of India.

Both the parties are directed to appear either in person or through lawyer.

.Notice of hearing to the parties must clearly disclose that if the parties fail to appear ,the Ethics Committee may hear the matter in absence of either of the parties or both the parties and decide the same on the basis of available records.

Let a complete set of records of the case be summoned from Rajasthan Medical Council.

**14. Appeal against order dated 22.02.2011 passed by Delhi Medical Council made by Dr. Sunil Choudhary (F.No.172/2011).**

The Ethics Committee considered the appeal by Dr. Sunil Choudhary against order dt. 22.02.2011 of Delhi Medical Council and noted that Delhi Medical Council expresses its concern about the narrow scope of definition of specialist as per regulation 7.20 of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002.

Delhi Medical Council requests Medical Council of India to re-examine regulation 7.20 of Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002.

Therefore, the Ethics Committee decided to defer this matter for special (subsequent) meeting.

**15. Appeal against order dated 02.06.2011 passed by Karnataka Medical Council filed by Sh. Pankaj Rai.(F.No.102/2011)**

The appellant Sh. Pankaj Rai in his appeal has alleged medical negligence and professional misconduct on the part of doctors of Fortis Hospital.

The Committee considered the appeal in its hearing and after due consideration decided to issue notices to the respondents to appear in person or through lawyer before the Ethics Committee at its subsequent meeting.

Ethics section of Medical Council of India along with notice of hearing shall send a copy of the appeal along with complete annexures to Respondents.

The Respondents are given opportunity to file reply to appeal along with supporting documents within a period of four weeks from the receipt of the notice. The Respondents shall provide a copy of their respective replies to the Appellant before filing the same in Medical Council of India.

Both the parties are directed to appear either in person or through lawyer .

Notice of hearing to the parties must clearly disclose that if the parties fail to appear, the Ethics Committee may hear the matter in absence of either of the parties or both the parties and decide the same on the basis of available records.

Let a complete set of records of the case be summoned from Karnataka Medical Council. The Committee decided that the matter be reviewed by the members of Ethics Committee.

**16. Appeal against order dated 20.06.2011 passed by Rajasthan Medical Council filed by Sh. Praveen Kumar Gupta.(F.No.331/2011)**

The Ethics Committee considered the appeal filed by Sh. Praveen Kumar Gupta against the order dated 20.06.2011 passed by Rajasthan Medical Council and noted that the Rajasthan Medical Council vide Order dated 20.06.2011 held that Dr. Praveen Gupta be warned that in future before any Surgery/Procedure, he should take written consent.

Rajasthan Medical Council has given a decision that the doctor the order should be penalized and his registration should be suspended for one month. Therefore, the Registration No. 8679 of Dr. Praveen Gupta is hereby suspended for one month, with immediate effect.

The appellant Dr. Praveen Gupta in his appeal has stated that he was not satisfied with the decision of the State Medical Council.

The Ethics Committee decided that a request should also be made to the Rajasthan Medical Council to furnish the complete records/documents of the case and after receipt of the same matter may be placed before the Ethics Committee at its subsequent meeting.

**17. Appeal against order dated 29.03.2011 passed by Maharashtra Medical Council filed by Sh. Pramod P.K.(F.No.357/2011)**

The appellant Sh. Pramod P.K in his appeal has alleged medical negligence and professional misconduct on the part of doctors of Balabhai Nanavati Hospital, Mumbai.

The Committee considered the appeal in its hearing and after due consideration decided to issue notices to the respondents to appear in person or through lawyer before the Ethics Committee at its subsequent meeting.

Ethics section of Medical Council of India along with notice of hearing shall send a copy of the appeal along with complete annexures to the Respondents.

The Respondents are given an opportunity to file reply to appeal along with supporting documents within a period of four weeks from the receipt of the notice. The Respondents shall provide a copy of their respective replies to the Appellant before filing the same in Medical Council of India.

The Ethics Committee decided to issue notices to Dr. Dillip D Shah, Dr. Rohit G. Suchak and the Sh. Pramod P.K. to appear in person with latest x-ray and medical records for hearing in the subsequent meeting.

Notice of hearing to the parties must clearly disclose that if the parties fail to appear, the Ethics Committee may hear the matter in absence of either of the parties or both the parties and decide the same on the basis of available records.

Let a complete set of records of the case be summoned from Maharashtra Medical Council.

**18. Appeal against order dated 17.03.2011 passed by Delhi Medical Council filed by Sh. Parveen Kumar Sharma.(F.No.209/2011)**

The appellant Sh. Parveen Kumar Sharma in his appeal has alleged medical negligence and professional misconduct on the part of doctors of E.S.I. Hospital.

The Committee considered the appeal in its hearing and after due consideration decided to issue notices to the respondents to appear in person or through lawyer before the Ethics Committee at its subsequent meeting.

Let a complete set of records of the case be summoned from Delhi Medical Council and Hospital authorities. The Hospital Authorities may further be asked whether an autopsy was done or not as death took place within 24 hours of admission and should be treated as medico-legal and to submit a copy of death certificate. On receipt of the above documents, the matter may be placed before the Ethics Committee.

**19. Appeal against order dated 15.02.2011 passed by Delhi Medical Council filed by Dr. Amit Kumar Singh.(F.No.294/2011)**

The Ethics Committee considered the appeal filed by Dr. Amit Kumar Singh against the order dated 15.02.2011 passed by Delhi Medical Council and noted that the Delhi Medical Council vide Order dated 15.02.2011 held that the name of Dr. Amit Kumar be removed from State Medical Register for a period of three months.

The appellant Dr. Amit Kumar Singh in his appeal has stated that he was not satisfied with the decision of the State Medical Council.

The Ethics Committee decided that a request should also be made to the Delhi Medical Council to furnish the complete records/documents of the case after

which Dr. Amit Kumar Singh should be called for hearing before the Ethics Committee with the post operative monitoring records at its meeting. The Committee decided that a Convenor, of the previous, Ethics Committee would review this case.

**20. Appeal against order dated 10.06.2011 passed by Delhi Medical Council filed by Dr. Vinay Kaushik (F.No369/2011)**

The Ethics Committee considered the appeal filed by Dr. Vinay Kaushik against the order dated 10.06.2011 passed by Delhi Medical Council and noted that the Delhi Medical Council vide Order dated 10.06.2011 held that the name of Dr. Vinay Kaushik be removed from State Medical Register for a period of 30 days.

After considering all the facts of the case, the Ethics Committee decided to concur with the observations of Delhi Medical Council.

**21. Appeal against order dated 21.07.2010 passed by Delhi Medical Council filed by Mr. Ashok Kumar Gupta. (F.No. 890/2010)**

The Ethics Committee considered the appeal filed by Mr. Ashok Kumar Gupta against the Order dated 21.07.2010 passed by Delhi Medical Council and noted that the Delhi Medical Council vide order dated 21.07.2010 held that a warning be issued to Dr. Atul Garg and Dr. Gopal Sharma.

After considering all the facts of the case and related documents, the Ethics Committee noted that the Delhi Medical Council had passed the Order on 21.07.2010, around 1 year before the date of filing of an appeal. Therefore, the Ethics Committee decided not to admit the said appeal as it was a time barred in terms of Clause 8.8. of the Ethics Regulations namely the "Indian Medical Council (Professional conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002".

**22. Prayer for enquiry into corruption, evading income tax in the name of charitable society, collecting fund by blackmailing the pharmaceutical company, conducting pleasure trip and international travel sponsored by vaccine producing company, promoting irrational medicine throughout India, violating MCI regulations- reg. (F.No. 217/2011)**

The Ethics Committee considered the matter with regard to enquiry into corruption, evading income tax in the name of charitable society, collecting fund by blackmailing the pharmaceutical company, conducting pleasure trip and international travel sponsored by vaccine producing company, promoting irrational medicine throughout India, violating MCI regulations.

The Ethics Committee, therefore decided to ask the Samiti to provide evidence and documentary proof in this matter for the Committee to proceed further.

23      **G.A No. 112/2007, GA No. 3543/2006, GA No. 2523/2009, GA No. 1933/2010, CA No. 519/1970 – Md. Shakil Vakil & anr. Vs. Rehana Begum in the High Court at Calcutta.**

The Registrar, High Court at Calcutta vide its letter dated 04.03.2011( copy enclosed) has forwarded an authenticated copy of the order dated 2<sup>nd</sup> March, 2011 passed by the Hon'ble Justice Sanjib Banerjee wherein His Lordship has been pleased to direct the Medical Council of India to conduct a suitable enquiry upon the subject mentioned in the order dated 02.03.2011 and to furnish a report before the Hon'ble Court within 8 weeks from the date of order.

In the order dated 02.03.2011, the Hon'ble High Court has passed the following directions:-

*"The Court : One Dr. Siddique Sheriff, claiming to be an MBBS and having an apparent registration no. 29487, has issued a certificate on February 24, 2011 that Md. Shakil Vakil is under his treatment for diabetes, hyper cholestaemia and peripheral neuropathy. The doctor has claimed that the patient has been under his treatment from October 16, 2010 till the date of issuance of the certificate. The doctor has advised complete rest and required the patient not to travel.*

*Prima facie, the contents of such certificate appear to be without any basis and it appears that the doctor has lent his name and allowed himself to be used by this plaintiff for the plaintiff to dodge orders of this Court and not present himself before Court.*

*Let a copy of this order be forwarded to the Chairperson of the Medical Council of India by the Registrar, Original Side, for a suitable enquiry to be conducted and for a report to be filed before this Court eight weeks hence. A copy of the medical certificate will also be forwarded.*

*It is recorded that the certificate in original was made over by Mr. S.R. Islam, Advocate, claiming to represent the plaintiff. A copy of a pathology report of October 27, 2010 obtained from the Bangalore Diabetes Centre has also been made over. Copies of the pathology report and the medical certificate will be sealed and retained by the Registrar. Original Side for future reference.*

*Let the matter appear eight weeks hence."*

The matter was considered by the Ethics Committee at its meeting held on 05.04.2011 and it was decided to call Dr. Siddique Sheriff for hearing on 10.05.2011.

As per the above decision, Dr. Siddique Sheriff had been requested to appear before the Ethics Committee on 10.05.2011 at 3.30 p.m vide Council's letter dated 09.04.2011.

The Ethics Committee considered the order passed by Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta and noted that Dr. Siddique Sheriff has sent a letter stating that it would not be possible for him to appear before the Ethics Committee but he was willing to appear before Ethics Committee if the meeting of Ethics Committee was held at Bangalore. He has also send photocopy of certificate and laboratory report.

The Ethics Committee rejected the request of Dr. Siddique Sheriff. He ought to have appeared before the Ethics Committee and placed the material before the Committee. The Ethics Committee feels that such type of patient as described by Dr Siddique Sheriff in his certificate generally does not require bed rest. Therefore the certificate issued by Dr Siddique Sheriff appears to be incorrect from the available record. Ethics Committee is of the opinion that this decision should be communicated to Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta by MCI

After considering all the documents & the Court order the Ethics Committee is of the unanimous opinion that Dr. Siddique Sheriff be called for hearing again in next meeting on 27/09/2011 at 11.00 a.m.

**APPROVED BY**

**(Prof. Sneh Bhargava)  
Chairman**

**New Delhi,  
23<sup>rd</sup> August, 2011.**

**Note:- The Ethics Committee was of the unanimous opinion that the format for filing a compliant/appeal with the MCI, should be publicized by way of national press also.**