**9th July’15**

**01:00 pm.**

**APPROVAL STATUS OF PROSPECTIVE PATIENT FOR**

**ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION**

**Date of Transplant Meeting 9th July’15**

**Time 10:00 a.m.**

**(By Authorisation Committee)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No** | **Name of Recipient**  | **Name of Donor** | **Organ**  | **Status**  |
| **1** | Naresh Kumar | Satyawan  | Kidney  | Approved |
| **2** | Nidhi (deferred)  | Suresh Kumar  | Kidney  | Not Approved* **Please see next page for comments**
 |
| **3** | Tinomudashe Humphrey Hove | Tsungai Sheron Hove  | Kidney  | Approved |
| **4** | Saddan Khan | Jahid Khan  | Kidney  | Approved |
| **5** | Talvinder Kaur  | Bachno Devi  | Kidney  | Deferred * Husband of donor to appear before Authorisation Committee in the next meeting
 |
| **6** | Saeeda Begum  | Sabir Zaman  | Liver  | Approved  |

 ***“This approval of Authorization Committee is valid for a period of one year from the date of issue, only at Sir Ganga Ram Hospital”.***

**Sl. No. 2 Case of Nidhi(recipient) & Suresh Kumar (donor)**

This was a deferred case as parties were asked to produce supporting documents on the last occasion.

The committee spent a lot of time discussing with the donor, his claimed wife, recipient and their family members. The main concern was to establish any relationship of love and affection between the two parties and also to confirm that there was no financial transaction involved.

Sh. Suresh (prospective donor) seems to be financially not sound as he does not even have a bank account. He has no voter ID and only has an Adhaar Card.

Smt. Shalu claiming to be his wife does not have a voter ID or any other document to show her relation with ‘claimed’ husband Sh. Suresh.

There is apparently a huge disparity between the financial state of the recipient and the donor. It came to notice that the donor’s late father was employed as a driver with recipient’s father. The recipient continues to live in a part of the house of the recipient family, claiming to be paying rent of Rs. 3000 per month.

The following four things clearly come out :

1. The professed relationship of love and affection except 2 to 3 photographs of one occasion (family function) is not established.
2. Huge financial disparity between the two is established.
3. The source of income of donor who claims to give tuition to young children seems suspect. Even his two children according to him reside with his wife’s brother in Malhout, Punjah.
4. The donor could not produce any certificate of qualification in support of his claim to be a graduate and a home teacher.

In view of the above and having considered all the circumstances of the case and even after balancing the interest of the recipient’s medical needs, the Committee could not agree to the offer of donation in this case in terms of rules and instructions on the subject.

Since the committee could not rule out the possibility of financial transaction in this case, **the case is** **not approved.**