

Supreme Court Directs Centre to Form Committee to Curb Unethical Pharma Freebies to Doctors

Published: October 11, 2026

Category: Pharmacy News | Pharmaceutical Industry | Healthcare Regulation

Introduction

The Supreme Court of India has directed the Central Government to establish a committee to examine unethical pharmaceutical marketing practices, including the alleged practice of offering gifts, expensive hospitality, sponsored travel and other benefits to doctors to influence their medicine-prescribing decisions.

The development marks an important step towards strengthening accountability in the pharmaceutical industry and addressing concerns about the relationship between drug manufacturers and healthcare professionals.

On October 8, 2026, a bench comprising Justices Vikram Nath and Sandeep Mehta asked the Centre to constitute the committee within two weeks, if it had not already done so. The committee has been directed to examine the adequacy of existing laws and regulations and recommend measures to improve transparency, monitoring and enforcement.

The panel must submit its recommendations within two months of its first meeting. The government will then be required to consider the recommendations and take an appropriate, reasoned decision.

Key Highlights of the Supreme Court's Direction

- **Court:** Supreme Court of India
- **Date of direction:** October 8, 2026
- **Bench:** Justices Vikram Nath and Sandeep Mehta
- **Main issue:** Alleged unethical pharmaceutical marketing practices and freebies offered to doctors
- **Government's deadline:** Constitute the committee within two weeks
- **Committee's deadline:** Submit recommendations within two months of its first meeting
- **Primary objective:** Strengthen the regulatory framework governing pharmaceutical marketing
- **Existing framework:** Uniform Code for Pharmaceutical Marketing Practices (UCPMP), 2024

What Are Pharma Freebies?

Pharma freebies refer to gifts, financial benefits, hospitality or other incentives allegedly offered by pharmaceutical companies to healthcare professionals as part of promotional activities.

Examples of practices raised in the legal proceedings include:

- Gifts and other personal benefits
- Sponsored travel and hospitality
- Entertainment expenses
- Direct or indirect monetary incentives
- Other inducements intended to influence prescribing behaviour

Not every interaction between pharmaceutical companies and doctors is unethical. Scientific conferences, educational programmes and legitimate professional collaborations can contribute to medical knowledge. The concern arises when benefits are intended to influence prescribing decisions or compromise independent clinical judgement.

The central issue is whether medicine selection is based on scientific evidence, clinical suitability and patient needs—or is influenced by commercial incentives.

Why Has the Supreme Court Intervened?

The proceedings arose from a public interest litigation filed by the Federation of Medical and Sales Representatives Associations of India and others, raising concerns about alleged unethical promotional practices in the pharmaceutical sector.

The petitioners argued that financial incentives and other benefits could encourage doctors to prescribe particular brands or medicines for commercial reasons rather than solely on the basis of patients' medical requirements.

According to the concerns raised before the court, such practices may contribute to:

1. **Irrational prescribing:** Medicines may be prescribed without adequate clinical justification.
2. **Higher treatment costs:** Patients may be directed towards expensive branded medicines when more affordable, clinically appropriate alternatives exist.
3. **Unnecessary medicine use:** Promotional incentives may contribute to prescriptions exceeding therapeutic requirements.

4. **Inappropriate drug combinations:** Commercial promotion may encourage the use of combinations that are not clinically justified.
5. **Patient safety concerns:** Irrational medicine use can increase the risk of adverse drug reactions and other treatment-related problems.
6. **Antimicrobial resistance:** Inappropriate antibiotic use can contribute to the development and spread of antimicrobial resistance.

These are potential consequences highlighted in the proceedings, rather than findings that every promotional interaction causes such outcomes.

The Supreme Court observed that the effectiveness of regulation must be assessed not merely by the existence of prescribed rules, but also by how effectively those rules are implemented and enforced.

What Will the New Committee Examine?

The committee is expected to undertake a comprehensive review of the regulatory framework governing pharmaceutical marketing.

1. Review of Existing Laws and Regulations

The committee will examine whether current statutory provisions, regulations and industry codes are sufficient to prevent unethical pharmaceutical promotion.

It will also consider whether additional legal measures are needed to address gaps in the existing system.

2. Monitoring and Enforcement Mechanisms

The panel will assess whether existing systems can effectively identify, investigate and address violations.

This includes examining the effectiveness of complaint-handling procedures, regulatory oversight and mechanisms for ensuring compliance by pharmaceutical companies.

3. Greater Transparency and Accountability

Another major objective is to strengthen transparency in interactions between pharmaceutical companies and healthcare professionals.

The review may help identify measures to improve disclosures, establish clearer responsibilities and make compliance more effective.

4. Recommendations for a Stronger Regulatory Framework

The committee will recommend an appropriate statutory or regulatory mechanism to address unethical pharmaceutical marketing.

Its recommendations will be considered by the Central Government, which must take a reasoned decision after examining the committee's findings.

The Supreme Court has not yet imposed a new statutory marketing code through this direction. The immediate step is a time-bound review intended to help the government determine the appropriate framework.

What Is UCPMP 2024?

The Uniform Code for Pharmaceutical Marketing Practices (UCPMP), 2024, is the existing framework intended to guide ethical pharmaceutical marketing practices in India.

It addresses the conduct of pharmaceutical companies in promoting medicines and covers matters such as gifts, hospitality, medical representative activities, professional meetings, educational activities and the distribution of samples.

The code is intended to promote responsible interactions between pharmaceutical companies and healthcare professionals.

However, a major issue in the current legal debate is the extent to which the code provides effective, enforceable consequences for pharmaceutical companies that violate its provisions.

The Supreme Court's latest direction requires the proposed committee to examine the adequacy of the current framework and recommend appropriate improvements.

Important: The UCPMP 2024 remains operational during the review. The court has not, through this direction, automatically converted it into a statutory law.

Why Is Making Pharma Marketing Rules Legally Enforceable Important?

A central concern in the proceedings is the difference between having an industry code and having a regulatory system backed by clear legal obligations and effective enforcement.

The petitioners argued that existing arrangements do not adequately address the accountability of pharmaceutical companies that offer or facilitate improper inducements.

The proposed review could help clarify:

- Whether pharmaceutical companies need additional statutory obligations.
- How complaints against companies should be investigated and resolved.
- What transparency and disclosure requirements should apply.

- How violations should be identified and addressed.
- Whether enforcement measures should be strengthened or made more consistent.

The final approach will depend on the committee's recommendations and the government's subsequent decision.

Impact on Doctors and Healthcare Professionals

The development has important implications for doctors, pharmacists and other healthcare professionals involved in medicine selection, dispensing and patient care.

Healthcare professionals are expected to make decisions based on clinical evidence, safety, efficacy and individual patient requirements. Commercial incentives should not compromise these responsibilities.

A stronger pharmaceutical marketing framework could encourage more transparent professional relationships and reinforce the importance of independent clinical judgement.

For doctors, responsible prescribing involves selecting appropriate medicines based on the patient's condition, relevant clinical guidelines, safety profile and affordability.

For pharmacists, the issue highlights the importance of rational medicine use, ethical dispensing practices and patient counselling.

How Could Patients Benefit?

Patients are at the centre of the debate because prescribing decisions directly affect treatment outcomes and healthcare expenditure.

A more effective regulatory framework could offer several potential benefits.

More Rational Prescribing

Stronger oversight may help discourage promotional practices that could improperly influence medicine selection.

Improved Affordability

When prescribing decisions prioritise clinical suitability and cost-effectiveness, patients may be better positioned to access appropriate and affordable treatment.

Better Patient Safety

Promoting rational medicine use can help reduce avoidable medication-related risks, although patient safety also depends on diagnosis, monitoring, medicine quality and adherence.

Greater Trust in Healthcare

Transparent relationships between pharmaceutical companies and healthcare professionals can strengthen public confidence in prescribing decisions and the wider healthcare system.

These benefits are potential outcomes of improved regulation, not guaranteed results of the committee's formation alone.

What Happens Next?

The Supreme Court has established a time-bound process for the government to examine the issue.

The next steps are:

1. **Committee formation:** The Centre must constitute the committee within two weeks, if it has not already been established.
2. **Stakeholder consultation:** The committee is expected to provide petitioners, intervenors and other relevant stakeholders an opportunity to present their views. It may also seek expert and technical input.
3. **Regulatory review:** The panel will examine existing laws, monitoring systems and enforcement arrangements.
4. **Recommendations:** The committee must submit its recommendations within two months of its first meeting.
5. **Government decision:** The Centre must consider the recommendations and take an appropriate, reasoned decision.
6. **Compliance reporting:** The government must file a compliance affidavit in accordance with the court's directions.

The matter is scheduled to return to the Supreme Court on January 29, 2027, for further consideration.

Conclusion

The Supreme Court's direction to establish a committee on unethical pharmaceutical marketing represents an important development in India's pharmaceutical regulatory landscape.

By examining the effectiveness of existing rules, the accountability of pharmaceutical companies and the need for stronger enforcement, the review seeks to address longstanding concerns about commercial incentives in medical prescribing.

The Uniform Code for Pharmaceutical Marketing Practices, 2024, remains in operation while the review proceeds. The key question now is whether the committee's recommendations will lead to a more effective and enforceable system for regulating pharmaceutical promotion.

For the pharmaceutical industry, doctors, pharmacists and patients, the outcome could have significant implications for ethical marketing, rational medicine use, treatment affordability and public trust in healthcare.

Source: The Indian Express, October 8, 2026; Supreme Court directions concerning unethical pharmaceutical marketing practices.

Disclaimer: This article is for informational and educational purposes only. The committee's recommendations and any subsequent regulatory changes should be assessed after official publication.