



بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

**IN THE COURT OF TAHIR PERVEZ DISTRICT  
& SESSIONS JUDGE, DISTRICT CONSUMER  
COURT, SAHIWAL.**

*Case No. 965/DCC/SWL*

*Dated. 18-06-2012.*

**D.C.O/AUTHORITY THROUGH DDO(Health) Sahiwal.**

-----CLAIMANT

**Versus**

**Muhammad Asif S/o Lal Hussain, Sadeem Medical Store, Chak No. 82/6-R,  
Sahiwal.**

-----DEFENDANT

**CLAIM UNDER SECTION 23 (4) OF PUNJAB CONSUMER  
PROTECTION ACT 2005.**

**ORDER.**

1. DCO/Authority Sahiwal referred the claim U/S 23(4) of the Punjab Consumer Protection Act 2005 against Muhammad Asif S/o Lal Hussain with allegation that the later, being quack, was involved in illegal medical practice.

2. The defendant appeared in the Court on 12-07-12. He was provided an opportunity to submit his written statement. Today i.e on 19-07-12, he filed his reply mentioning therein that he was a qualified dispenser and that he was running medical store. He denied that he was practicing as a doctor. However, he mentioned in his reply that he provides injection facilities to any patient on prescription of a doctor.

3. On the request of the defendant, his statement was also recorded. He reiterated facts mentioned in his reply besides that he was earning Rs.200/300 per day by providing medical facilities to the residents of the village not as doctor. He was simply performing his duties as per advice written on prescription issued by the doctor. According to him, if he did not provide the injection facilities to the local residents, they would lock his shop by putting "Elfi" in his outer

lock. However, he assured to remain careful in future expressing that he was ready to pay fine.

4. The allegation against the defendant was that he being a quack was involved in illegal medical practice. The documents furnished by the defendant would show that he was a qualified dispenser and diploma holder in Homoeopathic practice and that he had been duly authorized to run a medical store. All the three documents do not authorize him to provide injection facilities or prescribe medicine to any patient claiming himself to be doctor. The defendant assured to remain careful in future. However, this fact could not be ignored that he was duly authorized to sell medicines and that he was a diploma holder to do Homoeopathic practice and to act as dispenser. It therefore can be said that the defendant did not claim himself as a doctor and authorized to make prescription or to provide injection facilities to the patients. The defendant was ready to pay fine besides remaining careful in future.

5. In view of the reasons recorded above, the claim/reference is accepted in terms that the defendant is burdened with a fine of Rs. 5000/- to be paid /deposited in relevant government head within 03 days from today. He is also warned to remain careful in future and not to provide injection facilities and prescribe medicines to the patients with claim that he was a doctor.

**Announced**

19-07-2012

Sd/-  
District & Sessions Judge/District Judge  
Consumer Court Sahiwal

Certified that this order consists of two pages, which have been dictated and signed by me.

Sd/-  
District & Sessions Judge/District Judge  
Consumer Court Sahiwal





**Short order**

07-05-09 Present Claimant in person.  
Defendant in person.

Vide orders date today, the claim is accepted in the terms of the agreement to the parties as decided in the orders.

File be consigned to the record room.

**Announced.**  
07-05-09

**Khalid Mahmood**  
District& Sessions Judge/District Judge  
Consumer Court Sahiwal