DMC/DC/F.14/Comp.1987/2/2020/ 28th May, 2020

**O R D E R**

**The Delhi Medical Council through its Disciplinary Committee examined a** representation from Ms. Geeta Jotwani, Scientist “E” for Director General, Indian Council of Medical Research, wherein certain observation have been made against Dr. Udhav Dorwal of Indian Brain and Spine Institute, Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi.

The Order of the Disciplinary Committee dated 16th March, 2020 is reproduced herein-below:-

**The Disciplinary Committee of the Delhi Medical Council examined a** representation from Ms. Geeta Jotwani, Scientist “E” for Director General, Indian Council of Medical Research, wherein certain observation have been made against Dr. Udhav Dorwal of Indian Brain and Spine Institute, Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi.

The Disciplinary Committee perused the complaint of Mrs. Neeta Arora, representation of Ms. Geeta Jotwani, Director General Scientist “E” Indian Council of Medical Research, joint written statement of Dr. Udhav Dobal, Dr. Pawan Sharma, and Shri Sumit Kumar, Centre head, Indian Brain and Spine Institute Hospital, written statement of Dr. Kaveshver Ghura, Dr. Rakesh Kapoor, Shri Hitesh Bhaskar, additional written statement of Dr. Udhav Dorwal, copy of medical records of Indian Brain and Spine Institute Hospital and other document on record.

The following were heard in person :-

1. Dr. Udhav Dorwal Ophthalmologist, Indian Brain and Spine Institute
2. Dr. Pawan Sharma Physician, Indian Brain and Spine Institute
3. Dr. Rakesh Kapoor Anaesthetist, Indian Brain and Spine Institute
4. Dr. Kaveshver Ghura Plastic Surgeon, Indian Brain and Spine

 Institute

1. Ms. Radhika Advance Cell Lawyer
2. Shri Hitesh Bhaskar Director Operation, Indian Brain and Spine Institute
3. Shri Sumit Kumar Representative, Indian Brain and Spine

 Institute

The complainant Mrs. Neeta Arora failed to appear before the Disciplinary Committee, inspite of notice.

In the interest of justice, the Disciplinary Committee decided to proceed with the matter in order to determine it on merits.

It is noted that as per the complaint of Mrs. Neeta Arora it is alleged that her husband (the patient) Shri Jeet Arora was suffering from optic nerve damage in both the eyes and they were informed that stem cell treatment could help. So, they contacted Advance Cells managed by Shri Vipul Jain. In May, 2016, her husband was operated in both the eyes at IBIS Hospital, Lajpat Nagar by Dr. Udbhav Dobral. After the operation, her husband’s vision in both eyes deteriorated and he has become totally blind now, as the stem cells have not diluted in the eyes. Later, they talked to the ICMR and they informed that the hospital nor the doctor is authorized to perform such operations and this was illegal.

Ms. Geeta Jotwani, Director General Scientist “E” Indian Council of Medical Research in her representation averred that the ICMR had received a complaint from the patient Danish Citizn Shri Jeet Arora, who has availed stem cell transplant for optic nerve damage at Institute of Brain and Spine (IBS), Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi on 5th May, 2016. On perusal of the emails forwarded by the patient and the information collated regarding the entities involved from the web pages available in the public domain, ICMR has following observations and comment for the Delhi Medial Council perusal and necessary action at its end.

Observations : From the series of correspondences provided by the complainant, it appears that he was in touch with Mr. Vipul Jain from Advance Cell Stem Cell Therapy’s for the treatment. A cell therapy package for optic nerve atrophy was ordered by Dr. Udhav Dorwal (attending doctor), ophthalmologist at Indian Brain and Spine Institute (IBS), Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi. The cost of the package was 5.32 lakhs from Mirage International Services, Noida. No information is provided on hospital charges and for procedure. As per the details provided, the patient was implanted with bone marrow derived hematopoietic stem cells and adipose tissue derived mesenchymal stem cell as follows : The total of 156 million cells out of which one million cells injected intra-vitreous, five million via retro-bulbar, 40 million via LP route and balance via IV route. The patient has alleged that his eye sight has deteriorated post-stem cell transplant.

Comments : As per the National Guidelines of Stem Cell Research (NGSCR) (2013), stem cell transplant other than hematopoietic stem cell transplant of blood disorders is not yet approved. The clinical applications other than HSCT can be done only in the form of clinical trials and the patients cannot be charged for the same. Thus, the therapeutic use was unscientific and unethical on the part of the hospital/clinician. As the source of stem cells is adipose tissue, the procedure falls under the category of more than minimal manipulation and as per NGSCR for this category of research requires approval from IEC, ICSCR and DCGI. Another type of cells injected was derived from the patient’s bone marrow. Over and above, the cells to be used for human application should be prepared in the GMP complaint facility licensed by CDSCO. The dosages and the route for administration do not have any scientific basis. None of the entities (IBS, Advance Cell) are registered with the National Apex Committee for Stem Research and Therapy (NAC-SCRT) and none of the organizations have applied for IC-SCR registration. It may be noted that the deal is mediated by Sh. Vipul Jain, CEO, Mirage International Services involved in mediating medical tourism for overseas patients, and specifically for stem cell therapies through advanced cells, Noida.

Dr. Udhav Dorwal, Opthalmologist, Indian Brain and Spine Institute stated that it is pertinent to mention that Mr. Jitender Arora (accompanied by his wife Mrs. Neeta Arora) came himself for stem cell treatment, as he (Mr. Jitender Arora) was suffering from optic nerve atrophy, and his both eyes were severely damaged and had vision Loss in both eyes, right more then left eye. The patient was not in any way influenced by IBS hospital or by him for the Stem Cell Therapy. In fact Mr. Jitender Arora (the patient) approached on his own for stem cell treatment through M/sAdvance Cell. It has been specifically admitted by the patient that the patient contacted M/sAdvance cell for the treatment. As a hospital/doctor they have not/ do not endorse stem cell as treatment modality. The patient was aware of his disease and prognosis, as the patient was informed by the doctors abroad that his problem cannot be cured and the only ray of hope is stem cell treatment. Thereafter the patient on his own contacted M/sAdvance Cells. The patient’s treatment was done in good faith for therapeutic use, on his insistence, after proper investigations, study of his reports and counselling with minimal manipulation. No assurance or guarantee of any sort was extended to the patient. The Patient was well informed that the introduction of cells in vitreous cavity may result in reduction of vision due to physical barrier in the visual axis. Further, all other risks associated were well explained to the patient including that the cells may not get absorbed in the eyes or may take time to get absorbed. In the scenario, that the cells do not get absorbed, and then it is treatable and can be removed. The patient has taken second opinion about the treatment offered before proceeding with the treatment. It is pertinent to mention that the ‘Optic Nerve Atrophy’ means damage to the optic nerve that can adversely affect central vision, peripheral vision and color vision. Unfortunately, there is no effective treatment for optic atrophy in regular ophthalmology. However, stem cell therapy has come to an aid in such cases. There are scientific basis to the same with proven results. In the present case the patient’s condition was already deteriorating day by day. The patient did not maintain proper control of diabetes following the surgery, in the following visit in October, 2016, his HbA1C was around 16.0. The patient was counseled to urgently seek a specialist care for control of diabetes. It is further pertinent to mention that ‘Optic Nerve Atrophy’ causes vision to dim and reduces the field of vision so much so that over a period of time, the pupil will be less able to react to light and eventually its ability to react to light may be lost. The patient was also not keeping control over his diabetes. Thus, the blindness, as is alleged by the patient cannot be said to have been attributed by the stem cells so administered to the patient. The fact that stem cells have not been absorbed in the patient’s eyes, was one of the complications explained to the patient before procedure, and the same can be treated by performing ‘vitrectomy’ (i.e., as procedure to remove the unabsorbed stem cells). The patient should be put to strict proof and should be medically examined here in India and expert medical opinion be sought in the said regard.

Dr. Udbhav Dorwal in his additional written statement averred that the patient Mr Jatinder Arora was presented to him 4th May, 2016 in OPD. The patient had not contacted him or the hospital earlier and he had no correspondence in this matter. The patient came with very poor vision and, as evident from his letter to Advancells. The patient was suggested to join a blind institute in Sweden and was suggested stem cell treatment by his (the patient) doctors abroad. The patient pleaded for this treatment which, according to the patient, was the only hope and a chance, however diminutive, to regain any of his(the patient) lost vision.. The patient quoted several studies which his wife had researched. The patient could not walk without support and bumped into instruments while examinations. The patient mentioned, as the patient did in the mail, that the patient has been rapidly losing vision since September 2014 and had lost 99% of his (the patient) vision in about 15 months. They clearly explained that the stem cells are not a definitive and established treatment then and did not guarantee any outcome. The patient said he was visually incapacitated and requested him to help him. He proceeded with the treatment on compassionate grounds, keeping his Indian roots in mind. He did not charge anything from the patient for the treatment. He did cell harvesting and processing in accordance with the studies published before. He did the procedure in the aseptic conditions in the modular lamellar-flow operating theatre of the hospital. All the paper works were done in accordance with the hospital policy. The patient put his thumb print on the consent which was a clear indication of his visual handicap. The patient followed up with positive response in the weeks following the treatment. However, the patient mentioned that the vision has reverted back to the pre-operative stage. The patient came back for follow up in November 2016. He wanted to proceed with the vitrectomy to try and benefit the patient but then the patient was found to have uncontrolled diabetes with HbA1C of 16. He asked the patient to control his blood sugar first, as the norm. He even referred him to a diabetologist for prompt control of blood sugar. The patient stopped all the contact afterwards. His (Dr. Udbhav Dorwal) intent was to help the patient which he so desired and pleaded for. He did not coax the patient to undergo this treatment and did not advertise so. He did not have any financial interest in this procedure, as he was drawing a modest salary from the hospital. The hospital and he did not receive a single penny for this procedure did not stand to gain financially. He has not conducted any other such procedures before or since and do not intend to involve himself in future as well, unless legalized by the government and has clear benefits.

On enquiry by the Disciplinary Committee, Dr. Udhav Dorwal stated that he had given two injections namely intravitreally and retro-bulbar to the patient Shri Jateinder Arora.

Dr. Pawan Sharma, Physician, Indian Brain and Spine Institute stated that it is pertinent to mention that the patient was not charged for the treatment by Dr. Udbhav Dorwal and hospital. It was done in good faith, on compassionate ground and as part of clinical trial. The clinical trial information was provided to the Ethics Committee Anupam Hospital Institutional Committee for Stem Cell and Research. No amount was received by the doctor/ hospital for the treatment or on any other account. All the amounts (if any) were billed by M/s Advance Cells, as they were the health care facilitators. M/s Advance cell / Mr. Vipul Jain are independent entities and no referrals or commission was offered for the present case to Mr. Vipul Jain on any account by the Hospital. The IBS Hospital informed Ethics Committee ‘Anupam Hospital Institutional Committee for Stem Cell and Research’ about the procedure/clinical trial. They did not hear back from the IEC and presumed that there is no objection and to their understanding they complied with the legality. The cells were prepared in the lab having GMP compliant facility and the stem cells for the procedure done were minimally manipulated. The equipment/ machine used for manipulation have been registered by DGCI. For the clinical trial, they had informed the Ethics Committee, and they have further understanding that the Ethics Committee must be registered with the appropriate authority (National Apex Committee for Stem Cell research and Therapy (NAC-SCRT) registration), which they need to seek further clarity from the Delhi Medical Council. The hospital and Dr. Udbhav Dobwal are law abiding entity/citizen and have done the best and in accordance with scientific basis without charging any medical fees for the treatment. Dr. Udbhav Dorwal was approached specifically by Mr. Jitender Arora for stem cell as there was no other treatment/hope and the same was approved by the doctors of the patient internationally. The patient was discharged in satisfactory condition and there is no medical evidence by the patient so provided to prove his stance. The patient should be called for medical examination and testimony. The patient has put the goodwill and esteem of the hospital and of the doctor to question and should be questioned in the said regard.

On enquiry by the Disciplinary Committee, Dr. Pawan Sharma stated that in this case he performed the bone marrow aspiration, IV and Intra spinal injection of stem cells.

Dr. Rakesh Kapoor in his written statement averred that he was an employee of IBS hospital from April 2015 to April 2017 as consultant anaesthesiologist. His official duty hours were from 8.00 am to 5.00 pm. This 56 year old, male patient Mr Jitender arora, was schedule to OT for liposuction and bone marrow aspiration. After thorough pre-anaesthetic check-up, procedure was performed by concern clinicians under spinal anaesthesia on 5/5/2016. His role as anaesthesiologist and being employee of IBS hospital was to provide pain free and hemodynamic stable conduct of procedures in OT. His services as an anaesthesiologist were taken only when a case was already decided and planned by treating clinician. His concern were to keep the patient pain free and hemodynamic stable during the procedure. With all his good intentions, he gave anaesthesia to keep patient stable during procedure, which is his duty as anaesthesiologist and as assigned by the hospital as an employee. He never met the patient before and discussed any kind of treatment planning, as that was not his domain. He has no knowledge of advancement in treatment modalities of eye ailments. He took it obvious that the procedure planned must be scientific and in the best interest of patient, as it was decided and posted by qualified clinician/surgeon. His concern was stable intra-operative period and good recovery. His services were taken only when a case was planned by respective surgeons. He was on fixed pay roll in IBS hospital during his tenure. The procedure was done by ophthalmologist under local anaesthesia, given by clinician himself. He duly respects the observations made by the scientist of ICMR, but he was unaware of researches and developments in treatment with stem cells, which was not his domain, considering that case was posted after all things checked by treating clinician and hospital, his only concern was safety of the patient during procedure.

On enquiry by the Disciplinary Committee, Dr. Rakesh Kapoor stated that he had administered spinal anaesthesia for bone marrow aspiration in this case.

Dr. Kaveshver Ghura in his written statement averred that he was visiting plastic surgeon in IBS hospital and has no regular OPD there. He was called only on need basis by the hospital or treating consultant. The complaint given by Shri Jeet Arora does not include his name. He never had any financial transaction with complainant. He is a qualified plastic surgeon and had no knowledge of the treatment involving eye disorders or its advances. As far as he remembers, n the day of the surgery, he got call from hospital that a procedure was planned by Dr. Udhav Dorval and he (Dr. Udhav Dorval) wants his help for lipoaspirate. He was asked that they need 50 cc lipoaspirate for procedure. No where words like stem cell, the treatment plan was discussed with him. Thereafter till the date, he received notice from the Delhi Medical Council; he had no knowledge of case of Mr. Jeet Arora. He has no knowledge of treatment of eye ailments or its advances. He took prima facie that the procedure planned by the operating surgeon was scientific and in the best interest of the patient, as he is a qualified ophthalmologist. The nature of procedure with regard to scientific authenticity any approvals, if needed, the concerns of hospital and the treating physician. Nowhere his name was taken by the complainant, the hospital or the operating surgeon that he discussed convinced the patient Mr Jeet Arora for any surgery, since ophthalmology treatment was not in his domain. As a practicing plastic surgeon, he never used any form of stem cells on his patients.

On enquiry by the Disciplinary Committee, Dr. Kaveshver Ghura stated that he had performed the procedure like bone marrow aspiration in this case.

Shri Hitesh Bhaskar in his written statement averred that the patient Mr. Jatinder Arora, a Denmark Citizen, visited IBS hospital, New Delhi, on his own and the patient were not solicited in doing so either by the hospital or the operating surgeon. The patient was suffering from Optic nerve atrophy and the patient’s both eyes had severe vision loss. This has been established by the patient’s medical assessment, both in Denmark and in India. Since the patient was well aware of his disease and prognosis, the patient was advised to undergo stem cells for the same by his (the patient) doctors abroad. Thereafter, the patient contacted M/s Advance cells, who are a health care facilitator, who in turn requested hospital. Thereafter, the patient’s treatment has been done in good faith and on compassionate grounds on his insistence after ascertaining that there is no cure for this disease in modern science. No assurance or guarantee of any sort was extended to the patient and instead he (the patient) was well informed about the complications that may arise as a result of procedure to the extent that the patient may not benefit from it at all. Neither hospital nor the doctor charged any amount from the patient and all the treatment was done on compassionate grounds. The patient constantly referred to him being an Indian and thus pleaded for help on compassionate grounds. He would like to submit that the patient had incurred no further damage to his (the patient) health or vision as a result of this procedure. He wants to conclude by saying that IBS Hospital is a specialty hospital in the field of neurosciences and has been serving the patients from India and abroad for over seven years and during this time, not a single complaint has been raised about the ethical conduct of their institution.

Shri Sumit Kumar, Representative, Indian Brain and Spine Institute stated that they have done experimental work in this case, even though, there was no ethical clearance taken, as such.

In view of the above, the Disciplinary Committee makes the following observations :-

1. It is observed that the patient Shri Jeet Arora underwent stem cell treatment for optic atrophy both eyes at Indian Brain and Spine Hospital in May 2016.According to the complainant post surgery vision detiorated further in both eyes.The patient was allegedly sent to the hospital by Mr Vipul Jain heading a facilitation center named Advanced Stem cell therapy Institute. The disciplinary committee deliberated upon the ethical and legal issues of the whole process. Certain clarifications with supporting documents were asked for from the treating group:
2. Were they aware of the National Guidelines of Stem Cell Research (NGSCR) 2013.
3. Did they know that therapeutic use of stem cells other than clinical trials is unscientific and unethical.
4. Were necessary approval taken from IEC (Institutional ethical committee ), IC- SCR (Institutional committee for stem cell research), and DCGI (Drug controller Govt. of India).
5. Was the processing of the stem cells done in a GMP (Good manufacturing practice) complaint facility licensed by CDSCO (Central drugs standard control organisation).
6. What was the rationale for injecting the stem cells in the form and sites as done by the treating doctors.
7. Were the concerned institution registered with NAC-SCRT(National apex committee for stem cell Research and Therapy) and IC-SCR.
8. The treating doctors, hospital representatives and representative of the facilitation unit, were told verbally and in writing to provide necessary valid documents justifying their line of action and treatment. Unfortunately even after a reasonable length of time they have as yet failed to produce any justifying document.

The Disciplinary Committee perused the matter at length and the following facts were noted:-

1. As per NGSCR-2013 & 2017 only Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation for hematological cancers and disorders is the approved, use of HSCs for any other disease condition is not approved and to be done only under the purview of well designed clinical trials with approval of CDSCO.
2. The doctors have used Bone marrow derived stem cells and adipose tissue derived mesenchymal stem cells for treating optic nerve atrophy . There is no scientific evidence for use either type of stem cells for the said condition. There is no substantial safety and efficacy established till date.

The doctors have used combination of cells in millions (without deciding the dosages) for non homologous application .

In view of the above it is opined that IBSI has offered unapproved therapy, charging patient.

1. On discussion during one of the hearing Dr. Udhav Dorwalmentioned that he was aware of NGSCR and have accessed publications to know the status of the stem cell for OHA.
2. As per the guidelines adipose tissue derived mesenchymal stem cell (MSCs) fall under the category of more than minimal manipulation; and use of such cells has to have approval of CDSCO if it is used for clinical application and has to be done only under purview of clinical trials.
3. As per New Drug & Clinical Trial Rules 2019, stem cells are now defined as ‘drug’.

Internationally, as per Us-FDA, TGA (Australia), TMP (Eu) and PDMA stem cell is now defined as ‘drug’ and adipose tissue derived MSCs fall under more than minimal manipulation and required regulatory approval.

1. It is therefore the opinion of the Disciplinary Committee that the operating doctors and personnel of other involved institutions were clearly negligent in their action. Necessary action as per rules may be initiated against Dr Udhav Dorwal for injecting the stem cells in various sites unethically and Dr Pawan Sharma for admitting for stem cell transplantation and doing bone marrow aspiration unethically in such a patient. Due notification regarding the unethical practices against the management of Indian Brain and Spine Institute along with those of Mirage International and Advanced Cell stem cell therapy Institute need to be sent to the appropriate authorities i.e. Directorate General of Health Services, Govt. of India, Directorate General of Health Services, Govt. of Delhi for taking appropriate action against Indian Brain and Spine Institute, Lajpat Nagar, New Delhi.

In light of the observations made herein-above, the Disciplinary Committee recommends that name of Dr. Udbhav Dorwal (Delhi Medical Council Registration No.42486) and Dr. Pawan Sharma (Dr. Pawantosh Vijay Prakash Sharma, Delhi Medical Council Registration No.18788) be removed from the State Medical Register of the Delhi Medical Council for a period of six months.

Complaint stands disposed.

Sd/: Sd/:

(Dr. Subodh Kumar), (Dr. Ashwini Dalmiya)

Chairman, Delhi Medical Association,

Disciplinary Committee Member,

Disciplinary Committee

Sd/: Sd/:

(Dr. B. Ghosh) (Dr. Geeta Jotwani)

Expert Member Expert Member,

Disciplinary Committee Disciplinary Committee

The Order of the Disciplinary Committee dated 16th March, 2020 was taken up for confirmation before the Delhi Medical Council in its meeting held on 20th March, 2020 wherein whilst confirming the decision of the Disciplinary Committee, the Council observed that in the facts and circumstances of this case, the punishment of removal of name of Dr. Udbhav Dorwal (Delhi Medical Council Registration No.42486) and Dr. Pawan Sharma (Dr. Pawantosh Vijay Prakash Sharma, Delhi Medical Council Registration No.18788) from the State Medical Register of the Delhi Medical Council for a period of six months awarded by the Disciplinary Committee was a bit harsh punishment and the same was not warranted. It was further observed that interests of justice will be served, if name of Dr. Udbhav Dorwal (Delhi Medical Council Registration No.42486) and Dr. Pawan Sharma (Dr. Pawantosh Vijay Prakash Sharma, Delhi Medical Council Registration No.18788) be removed from the State Medical Register of the Delhi Medical Council for a period of three months. The Council, therefore, directed that name of Dr. Udbhav Dorwal (Delhi Medical Council Registration No.42486) and Dr. Pawan Sharma (Dr. Pawantosh Vijay Prakash Sharma, Delhi Medical Council Registration No.18788) be removed from the State Medical Register of the Delhi Medical Council for a period of three months

The Council further observed that the Order directing the removal of name from the State Medical Register of Delhi Medical Council shall come into effect after 30 days from the date of the Order.

This observation is to be incorporated in the final Order to be issued. The Order of the Disciplinary Committee stands modified to this extent and the modified Order is confirmed.

 By the Order & in the name

 of Delhi Medical Council

 (Dr. Girish Tyagi)

 Secretary

Copy to:-

1. Mrs. Neeta Arora, jeet18n@hotmail.com -Through e-mail.
2. Dr. Kaveshver Ghura, Flat No.702, Tower 7, SPR Imperial Estate, Sector-82, Fardidabad, Haryana-121002.
3. Dr. Rakesh Kapoor, B-3/38 A, Lawrance Road, Near Tayagi Public Schook, New Delhi-110035.
4. Dr. Udhav Dovbal, Through Medical Superintendent, Indian Brain and Spine Institute, Lajpat Nagar-III, New Delhi-110024.
5. Dr. Pawan Sharma (Dr. Pawantosh Vijay Prakash Sharma), Through Medical Superintendent, Indian Brain and Spine Institute, Lajpat Nagar-III, New Delhi-110024.
6. Medical Superintendent, Indian Brain and Spine Institute, Lajpat Nagar-III, New Delhi-110024.
7. Addl. Dy. Commissioner of Police, South East District, Office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, South East District, New Delhi, Sarita Vihar, New Delhi-110076-w.r.t. letter No.10122/AC-II/HAC/SED dated New Delhi, the 26/10/2018-for information.
8. Section Officer, Medical Council of India, Pocket-14, Sector-8, Dwarka, Phase-1, New Delhi-110077-w.r.t. letter No.MCI-211(2)(Gen.)/2017-Ethics./162716 dated 27/12/17-for information.
9. Indian Council of Medical Research, Department of Health Research (Ministry of Health & Family Welfare), V. Ramalingaswami Bhawan, Ansari Nagar, New Delhi-110029-w.r.t. letter No.47/80/2002/SCRT-VIII/BMS dated 21/11/16-for information.
10. The Directorate General of Health Services, Govt. of India, Nirman Bhawan, Maulana Azad Road, New Delhi-110011-for information & necessary action.
11. The Directorate General of Health Services, Govt. of NCT of Delhi, Swashthya Sewa Nideshalaya Bhawan, F-17, Karkardooma, Delhi-110032--for information & necessary action.
12. Registrar, Maharasthra Medical Council, 189-A, Anand Complex, 2nd Floor, Sane Guruji Marg, Arthur Road Naka, Chinchpokali (W), Mumbai **(Dr. Udbhav Dorwal and** Dr. Pawantosh Vijay Prakash Sharma **are also registered with the Maharasthra Medical Council under registration No. 2003/0112131 dated 25th July, 2003 and 083780 dated 24th July, 1997, respectively**)-**for information & necessary action.**
13. Secretary, Medical Council of India, Pocket-14, Sector-8, Dwarka, Phase-1, New Delhi-110077-for information & necessary action.
14. Addl. Director, PG Cell, Directorate of Health Services, Govt. of NCT of Delhi, F-17, Karkardooma, Delhi-110032-w.r.t. letter No.F.23/34/DHS/PG Cell/2016/184798 dated 28.11.2016-for information.

 (Dr. Girish Tyagi) Secretary