B6

BIOTECHNOLOGY SECTOR

Clinical Trial Liability, Ethics Disputes & Compensation Claims:

CDSCO Framework,
Subject Injury Proceedings &
Criminal Exposure

Clinical Trial Liability, Ethics Disputes & Compensation Claims

CDSCO Framework, Subject Injury Proceedings, SAE Reporting Compliance & Criminal Exposure — The Complete Practitioner's Guide

Booklet VI of VI — Indian Biotechnology & Life Sciences Legal Series

Advocates & Legal Consultants — Ultra-Premium Client Advisory Series

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

Clinical Trial Agreement Drafting: Sponsor-CRO Relationships, Site Agreements, Indemnification and Insurance Obligations

NDCT Rules 2019 Contractual Requirements, CRO Delegation of Responsibilities, Clinical Site Agreements, Indemnification Scope and GCP-Compliant Contract Structure

> *A clinical trial agreement — the contract that governs the relationship between the pharmaceutical company sponsoring a clinical study, the Contract Research Organisation it engages to manage the study, the hospital or clinical research site where the study is conducted,*

> *and the principal investigator who oversees the study — is simultaneously a regulatory compliance document (required to be in place before enrolment begins, as a CDSCO requirement), a commercial contract governing the payment and intellectual property relationships among the parties, and a risk allocation instrument that determines who bears liability if a study subject suffers a serious adverse event, if the trial produces commercially valuable data that the sponsor wants to protect, or if the trial is terminated early and the site is left with partially completed commitments. The quality of this agreement — and specifically the clarity of its indemnification provisions, IP ownership clauses, and compensation mechanism for trial-related injury — determines the outcome of the disputes that inevitably arise in the clinical development of any pharmaceutical product. A poorly drafted clinical trial agreement, entered into under time pressure to meet a study start timeline, is the most commonly avoidable source of expensive pharmaceutical litigation.*

1.1 Sponsor-CRO Delegation: What Can Be Delegated and What Cannot

The NDCT Rules 2019 permit the sponsor to delegate specific clinical trial functions to a Contract Research Organisation — creating a formal regulatory mechanism for the CRO's role in the trial, with the important caveat that the ultimate regulatory responsibility for the trial remains with the sponsor and cannot be fully delegated. The sponsor's non-delegable obligations include: obtaining CDSCO permission for the trial; ensuring the adequacy of the informed consent process; reporting Serious Adverse Events to the CDSCO; ensuring the provision of free medical management to subjects who experience trial-related injury; and ensuring that the compensation formula is applied and compensation paid to injured subjects or their families. CRO-delegated functions — monitoring, data management, statistical analysis, regulatory submissions preparation, and study conduct oversight — are performed by the CRO on the sponsor's behalf, but the sponsor's regulatory accountability for the adequacy of the CRO's performance is not transferred. In clinical trial agreements, the sponsor's indemnification of the CRO for regulatory action arising from the sponsor's decisions and the CRO's indemnification of the sponsor for regulatory action arising from the CRO's performance failures must be carefully delineated — with the CRO's contractual liability capped at an amount that reflects the CRO's service fee (which is typically far less than the sponsor's regulatory penalty exposure for a major SAE reporting failure). The cap on CRO liability is a routine commercial term in CRO agreements, but its presence means that the sponsor will typically be unable to recover from the CRO the full regulatory and litigation cost of a clinical trial failure — the contractual risk allocation must account for this irreducible residual risk that remains with the sponsor regardless of the CRO's performance failures.

1.2 Clinical Site Agreement: Key Provisions and Common Disputes

The clinical site agreement — between the sponsor (or CRO acting on behalf of the sponsor) and the hospital or research institution where the trial is conducted — governs: the site's obligations to recruit subjects, conduct the protocol procedures, maintain study records, and report adverse

events; the sponsor's obligations to provide the investigational product, pay site fees, and provide medical and legal support to the site in case of trial-related adverse events; the IP ownership of data generated at the site; the publication rights of the principal investigator (the investigator's right to publish study results versus the sponsor's right to review and delay publication to protect commercially sensitive data); and the indemnification of the site and the investigator against claims by subjects arising from the trial. IP ownership and publication right provisions are the most frequently contested elements of clinical site agreements at the drafting stage: academic institution sites routinely insist on an unrestricted right to publish study findings (a requirement of academic freedom and institutional accreditation under NAAC and NMC norms); sponsors routinely seek a review period before publication (to allow patent filing on discoveries made in the study and to ensure that commercial information is protected). A publication right provision that balances both interests — allowing publication after a 90-day sponsor review period, with the right to delay publication for an additional period only for specific IP protection reasons — is the standard compromise, but the specific terms require careful drafting to avoid ambiguity about what triggers the delay right and how long it can be exercised.

1.3 Indemnification and Insurance: Structuring the Risk Transfer

The NDCT Rules 2019 require the sponsor to obtain insurance coverage for clinical trial participants — covering the medical expenses and compensation payable in respect of trial-related injury. The insurance requirement is not merely a regulatory formality: it is the financial mechanism that ensures the compensation formula can be implemented without the sponsor's financial resources being exhausted by a large number of simultaneous SAE compensation claims. For clinical trials involving large numbers of subjects — a Phase III trial in India may enrol several hundred to several thousand subjects — the aggregate compensation liability for a product that turns out to have an adverse safety profile can be substantial, and the insurance coverage must be sized to cover this maximum foreseeable liability. The indemnification provisions in the site agreement must be aligned with the insurance coverage: the sponsor's indemnification of the site for subject injury claims (which is typically the site's most commercially important protection, since the site is the party physically in contact with the subject and most likely to be named in any civil suit) must not exceed the indemnification cap in the sponsor's insurance policy, and the site must be a named insured (or additional insured) on the sponsor's clinical trial insurance to access the coverage directly. Practitioners reviewing clinical trial insurance arrangements for pharmaceutical company clients must verify the insurance coverage against the maximum potential SAE liability and the CDSCO compensation formula's maximum quantum — a common deficiency in clinical trial insurance is a coverage limit that was set based on the planned number of subjects but not updated when the trial was expanded, leaving the sponsor exposed to uninsured excess liability if the subject population increases.

CHAPTER TWO

Ethics Committee Disputes: Registration, Composition Defects, Protocol Approval Challenges and Administrative Remedies

NDCT Rules 2019 Ethics Committee Requirements, CDSCO EC Registration, Composition Requirements, Protocol Review Obligations, EC Suspension Consequences and Challenge Proceedings

2.1 Ethics Committee Registration and Composition: Regulatory Requirements

The NDCT Rules 2019 require that every clinical trial be reviewed and approved by a CDSCO-registered Ethics Committee (EC) — an institutional committee that reviews the scientific merit, ethical propriety, and subject protection measures of the proposed trial before enrolment begins. CDSCO's EC registration requirements specify: the minimum EC composition (at least 7 members, including a medical scientist, a clinician, a legal expert, a social scientist or representative of a non-governmental organisation, a philosopher or ethicist, a lay person, and a member who is independent of the institution); the requirement that at least half the EC members be external to the institution (to ensure independence from institutional and commercial pressures); and the training requirements for EC members (in GCP, ethical principles, and the NDCT Rules). An EC that does not meet the CDSCO's composition requirements — whether because it has fewer than the required number of members, because its external member proportion is below 50 per cent, or because required categories (legal expert, lay person) are absent — is non-compliant with the NDCT Rules, and any protocol approval granted by a non-compliant EC is legally defective, exposing the trial sponsor to CDSCO enforcement for conducting a trial without a valid EC approval. Pharmaceutical companies that rely on a hospital's EC for their studies must conduct a due diligence verification of the EC's CDSCO registration status, composition, and training documentation before submitting the protocol — discovering the EC's non-compliance after enrolment has begun is a regulatory crisis that cannot be retrospectively remedied without CDSCO's specific approval.

2.2 Protocol Amendment Disputes: EC Refusal to Approve Amendments and Its Consequences

An EC that has approved a clinical trial protocol retains ongoing oversight authority over the study — including the power to review and approve (or reject) protocol amendments, to conduct interim safety reviews, and to suspend or terminate the trial if it believes that the subjects' safety or rights are at risk. An EC's refusal to approve a sponsor-proposed protocol amendment — where the sponsor believes the amendment is scientifically justified and the EC's refusal is based on non-scientific grounds (member conflicts of interest, institutional politics, or

inadequate review) — is a dispute that can delay the entire clinical programme and potentially jeopardize the study timeline. The sponsor's remedies for EC refusal are limited: there is no automatic right of appeal against an EC's rejection of a protocol amendment under the NDCT Rules — the sponsor can seek review by the CDSCO (which has supervisory authority over ECs and can intervene if an EC's functioning is irregular) or can, in extreme cases, seek judicial review of an EC decision that is arbitrary or in breach of the EC's own mandate. For practitioners advising pharmaceutical companies on EC disputes, the legal analysis must begin with the EC's specific grounds for rejection — an EC that rejects an amendment on scientific grounds that are within its expertise and mandate is exercising its proper function, and judicial review will not succeed; an EC that rejects an amendment for reasons that are outside its regulatory scope (commercial considerations, competitive interests, institutional conflicts) has exceeded its mandate and is vulnerable to CDSCO intervention and judicial review.

CHAPTER THREE

Serious Adverse Event Reporting: CDSCO Timelines, Causality Assessment Disputes and Regulatory Consequences of Late Reporting

NDCT Rules SAE Reporting Timelines, Causality Assessment Methodology, CDSCO Review of Causality Determinations, Late Reporting Enforcement and Trial Suspension Risk

3.1 SAE Reporting Timelines: The 24-Hour and 7-Day Rules

The NDCT Rules 2019 require sponsors to report Serious Adverse Events — defined as any adverse event that results in death, is life-threatening, requires hospitalisation, results in persistent or significant disability, is a congenital anomaly, or is medically important — to the CDSCO within specified timelines: fatal and life-threatening SAEs must be reported within 24 hours of the sponsor's awareness; other SAEs must be reported within 7 calendar days; and detailed follow-up reports must be submitted within 15 days of the initial report. These timelines run from the date of the sponsor's (or CRO's) awareness of the event — not from the date of the event itself — creating a critical documentation requirement: the sponsor's SAE management systems must record the precise date and time at which each SAE first comes to the sponsor's or CRO's attention, since this timestamp is the start of the reporting clock. A late report — filed after the prescribed timeline — is a NDCT Rules violation that can result in CDSCO enforcement action ranging from a warning letter to suspension of the clinical trial. For large pharmaceutical companies with multiple concurrent trials in India, the SAE reporting timeline management — across dozens of active sites, potentially with hundreds of enrolled subjects — requires a centralised, automated pharmacovigilance system with escalation protocols that guarantee compliance with the 24-hour deadline for fatal events regardless of time zone differences, holidays, or communication failures at the trial site.

3.2 Causality Assessment: The Regulatory Dispute That Determines Compensation

The causality assessment — the determination of whether a clinical trial subject's SAE was caused by the investigational product or by the subject's underlying disease, concomitant medications, or other factors — is the technical-scientific determination that triggers the sponsor's compensation obligation and that is most frequently the subject of dispute between the sponsor, the CDSCO, and the subject's family. The NDCT Rules and the CDSCO's compensation guidelines apply the "probable" causation standard: if it is "probable" that the SAE was caused by the investigational product (meaning that the causal relationship cannot be ruled out, even if the evidence is insufficient to establish it on a balance of probabilities), the compensation formula applies. This lower-than-civil-standard causality threshold means that the sponsor bears

a compensation obligation for adverse events that may well have occurred even without the investigational product's involvement — the regulatory compensation system is designed to provide quick financial relief to subjects who cannot readily prove causation in civil litigation, not to accurately apportion liability for established causal harm. Causality assessment disputes between the sponsor (who assesses the SAE as "unlikely related" or "unrelated") and the CDSCO or the EC (which assesses the same event as "probably related") are resolved by the CDSCO's review authority — and the CDSCO's causality determination, if it upgrades the sponsor's assessment, creates an immediate compensation obligation that the sponsor must meet within the prescribed period. For practitioners advising pharmaceutical sponsors on causality assessment disputes, the medical literature on the investigational product's known adverse effect profile, the subject's baseline medical condition, and the temporal relationship between drug administration and the SAE are the determinants of the assessment — and the practitioner's role is to present this evidence systematically to the CDSCO reviewer to support the sponsor's causality assessment.

CHAPTER FOUR

Subject Injury Compensation: CDSCO Formula, Quantum Disputes, Civil Claims Beyond Formula and Criminal Nexus

CDSCO Compensation Formula for Clinical Trial Subject Injury, Quantum Computation, Formula Limitations, Tortious Claims Beyond Formula and Criminal Negligence Exposure

4.1 The Compensation Formula: How It Works and Where It Fails

The CDSCO's compensation formula for clinical trial subject injury — introduced in 2013 and revised in subsequent guidelines — computes the compensation amount as a function of the subject's age (using the Workmen's Compensation Act multiplier table), the subject's annual income, and a "factor" that adjusts for the severity of the injury and the degree of causal relationship between the trial and the injury. The formula produces a defined minimum compensation amount that the sponsor must pay within a prescribed period of the CDSCO's compensation determination — failure to pay within the prescribed period results in CDSCO enforcement action and can trigger suspension of the sponsor's clinical trial operations in India. The formula's design as a minimum compensation mechanism — providing swift, no-fault compensation without requiring the subject to litigate causation — is its commercial value: it provides financial relief to subjects who lack the resources to pursue civil litigation. However, the formula has significant limitations: it does not cover the full economic loss of high-income subjects (because the formula's income multiplier is capped); it does not cover non-economic damages (pain and suffering, loss of consortium); and it does not compensate for long-term disability that manifests only after the formula's assessment period. Subjects or their families who receive formula compensation but believe their actual losses are significantly higher have the right to pursue civil claims for the excess — and the formula payment is not a full and final settlement unless the subject has specifically signed a release of civil claims, which the CDSCO's informed consent requirements may restrict. Practitioners advising pharmaceutical sponsors on the formula-civil claim interface must ensure that the compensation documentation is structured in a way that does not inadvertently constitute an admission of causation for civil litigation purposes, while still satisfying the CDSCO's regulatory compensation obligation.

CHAPTER FIVE

Clinical Trial Fraud: Protocol Deviation Prosecutions, Data Integrity Allegations and Whistleblower Complaints

Protocol Deviation Classification, GCP Fraud, CDSCO Data Integrity Investigation Powers, Whistleblower Protection Framework and Criminal Prosecution Under NDCT Rules

5.1 Protocol Deviations: Classification, Reporting and Regulatory Response

Protocol deviations — departures from the approved clinical trial protocol, whether intentional or accidental — are classified as either "important" (deviations that affect the subject's safety, the integrity of the data, or the ethical conduct of the trial) or "minor" (deviations that do not have a material impact on the trial's integrity). Important deviations must be reported to the EC and, where required by the CDSCO, to the CDSCO itself — and a pattern of important deviations at a specific site (suggesting systematic non-compliance with the protocol rather than isolated errors) triggers a site audit by the sponsor's clinical operations team and potentially a CDSCO inspection. The CDSCO's power to inspect clinical trial sites — and to review the site's source documents (medical records, nursing notes, and laboratory reports) against the Case Report Forms (CRFs) submitted to the sponsor — is the basis for data integrity investigations. A CDSCO inspection that identifies discrepancies between source documents and CRFs — such as subjects enrolled who do not appear in the hospital's outpatient records, laboratory values in CRFs that differ from the hospital's laboratory system, or adverse events reported in the medical record that are not captured in the CRF — is evidence of data manipulation that the CDSCO will characterise as clinical trial fraud, triggering both regulatory enforcement (site suspension, sponsor enforcement action) and potentially criminal investigation (for submission of falsified data to support a drug approval application).

CHAPTER SIX

Gene Therapy and Advanced Therapy Products: GEAC Regulatory Framework, Ethical Clearances and Emerging Liability Issues

EPA 1986 Rules on GMOs, GEAC Approval Requirements, DBT Guidelines for Gene Therapy, Ethics in Human Genetic Modification and Emerging Product Liability for ATMPs

6.1 GEAC Regulatory Framework: Approvals for Gene Therapy Clinical Trials

Gene therapy products — biological medicines that deliver genetic material into a patient's cells to treat disease by correcting a genetic defect, silencing a disease-causing gene, or introducing a therapeutic gene — are subject in India to a dual regulatory framework: the Genetic Engineering Appraisal Committee (GEAC) under the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (which evaluates the environmental safety and contained use aspects of gene therapy product manufacturing and administration), and the CDSCO under the Ministry of Health (which evaluates the clinical safety and efficacy of the gene therapy product as an investigational new drug). The DBT's Recombinant DNA Safety Guidelines and the Rules for the Manufacture, Use, Import/Export and Storage of Hazardous Micro-organisms/Genetically Engineered Organisms or Cells (1989) provide the foundational biosafety framework that governs gene therapy product manufacture and administration. A company seeking to conduct a first-in-human gene therapy trial in India must obtain: CDSCO permission for the clinical trial (under the NDCT Rules 2019's new drug clinical trial pathway); GEAC approval for the contained use of the gene therapy product at the manufacturing and clinical sites; and EC approval at each clinical site. The GEAC's approval process — which involves a detailed risk assessment of the gene therapy vector (viral or non-viral), the therapeutic gene, the target cell population, and the administration route — can take 12-18 months and requires extensive biosafety data that is typically generated in the pre-clinical development phase. For Indian biotech companies entering the gene therapy space — and several Gujarat-based companies are now investing in this area — the GEAC regulatory pathway is the least well-mapped element of the development programme, and early legal engagement with the GEAC process is critical to avoiding the regulatory delays that have historically affected gene therapy product development in India.

6.2 Product Liability in Advanced Therapy: The Emerging Legal Framework

The product liability framework for Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products (ATMPs) — gene therapies, cell therapies, and tissue-engineered products — in India is still emerging, as these products are only beginning to reach the clinical stage and no ATMP has yet been commercially approved for the Indian market. The Consumer Protection Act, 2019's product liability provisions

— which impose no-fault liability on the manufacturer for defective products and deficient services — apply to ATMPs as to any other pharmaceutical product, but their application to ATMPs raises novel legal questions: the individualised manufacturing process for autologous cell therapies (where each patient's cells are extracted, modified, and re-infused) creates a product that is manufactured specifically for one patient — the "product defect" framework (designed for mass-produced identical units) does not translate straightforwardly to a patient-specific product whose identity and characteristics are determined partly by the patient's own biological material. The tort liability framework — specifically the medical negligence standard applicable to the physician who administers an ATMP and the manufacturer who produces it — will evolve through case law as ATMPs enter clinical practice in India, and the practitioners who will be at the forefront of ATMP liability litigation will be those who have developed expertise in the intersection of pharmaceutical product liability, medical negligence, and the novel legal questions raised by personalised medicine's product identity, informed consent, and causation challenges.

Booklet VI Complete Summary: Clinical trial legal practice — from agreement drafting through SAE reporting compliance, ethics committee oversight, compensation formula administration, data integrity defence, and the emerging ATMP regulatory framework — is the practice area that will grow fastest as India's pharmaceutical and biotech sector invests in clinical development to support regulated market NDA filings and to position India as a global clinical research destination. The NDCT Rules 2019's enhanced sponsor obligations, the CDSCO's more active enforcement of SAE reporting timelines and compensation requirements, and the criminal liability provisions for protocol fraud and data manipulation create a regulatory risk environment that demands dedicated specialist legal counsel for any pharmaceutical company operating a meaningful clinical development programme in India. The emerging gene therapy and ATMP framework — with its GEAC-CDSCO dual regulatory pathway and its novel product liability questions — is the frontier practice area that will define the next decade of life sciences legal practice in India.