International Journal of Research in Management & Social Science
Volume 14, Issue 3 July - September 2026
ISSN 2322 - 0899

PATIENT SAFETY, PRODUCT LIABILITY, AND AI-ASSISTED QUALITY CONTROL IN 3D PRINTED HEALTHCARE DEVICES: AN INDIAN LEGAL PERSPECTIVE

Prashant Gogia[1] and Dr Sunil Kumar[2]
Research Scholar, Faculty of Law, Jagannath University, Delhi NCR, Bahadurgarh
Assistant Professor & Research Supervisor, Faculty of Law, Jagannath University, Delhi NCR, Bahadurgarh

ABSTRACT
3D printed healthcare devices create a difficult legal problem because safety may depend on patient imaging, digital design, software processing, material selection, printer settings, post-processing, sterilisation, AI-assisted quality control and clinical use. Indian law contains important building blocks through the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, the Medical Devices Rules, 2017, the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, ethical AI guidance and technical standards. Yet these sources do not provide a dedicated Indian liability and audit framework for AI-assisted quality control in 3D printed healthcare devices. This paper examines patient-safety risks, product defects, actor responsibility, AI inspection duties, evidence requirements, data protection and post-market surveillance. It argues that India should adopt a traceability-based liability model that links control over each stage of the 3D printing chain with legal responsibility. Innovation should continue, but only through validated design control, auditable AI systems, clear warnings, patient-data safeguards and post-market accountability.

Keywords: *3D printing; healthcare devices; product liability; AI-assisted quality control; patient safety; Consumer Protection Act, 2019; CDSCO; traceability; India.*

1. INTRODUCTION
The core legal question in 3D printed healthcare devices is responsibility for harm. A device may be designed from patient imaging, modified through software, printed through a particular machine, inspected by AI, sterilised by another unit and used by a clinician. If the device fails, causation may lie in design, material, printer calibration, post-processing, labelling, AI inspection, hospital handling or clinical use.

Indian medical-device law already regulates medical devices through the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and the Medical Devices Rules, 2017. Consumer law creates product-liability routes for harm caused by defective products or deficient product-related services. Data-protection law applies where patient data is processed digitally. The difficulty is that these legal layers have not yet been integrated into a dedicated framework for AI-assisted quality control in additive manufacturing.[1]

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
Medical literature shows that 3D printing supports patient-specific anatomical models, prosthetics, implants, surgical planning and related healthcare uses. These works establish the clinical value of customisation but also show why safety depends on materials, process control and intended use. Indian legal writing has discussed 3D printing liabilities and benefits, but the specific question of AI-assisted quality-control liability remains underdeveloped.[2]

Comparative regulatory material is relevant but not determinative. FDA guidance identifies technical considerations for additive manufactured medical devices, including design, manufacturing, process validation, material control, post-processing and testing. ISO 13485 and ISO 14971 provide quality-management and risk-management logic. These materials assist Indian analysis but cannot replace Indian statutory interpretation.[3]

[1]Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation, 'Medical Device & Diagnostics' (CDSCO) <https://cdsco.gov.in/opencms/opencms/en/Medical-Device-Diagnostics/Medical-Device-Diagnostics/> accessed 29 June 2026.

[2]Anna Aimar, Augusto Palermo and Bernardo Innocenti, 'The Role of 3D Printing in Medical Applications: A State of the Art' (2019) Journal of Healthcare Engineering, Article ID 5340616 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/5340616> accessed 29 June 2026.

[3]US Food and Drug Administration, Technical Considerations for Additive Manufactured Medical Devices: Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff (5 December 2017) <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/technical-considerations-additive-manufactured-medical-devices> accessed 29 June 2026.

ISSN 2322 - 0899

3. RESEARCH GAP

The research gap is the absence of a clear Indian model linking patient-safety duties, product-liability routes and AI-assisted quality-control evidence in 3D printed healthcare devices. Existing law can assign liability after harm occurs, but it does not clearly require a digital thread that connects patient input data, design decisions, machine parameters, material records, AI inspection output, human release decision and post-market action.

4. OBJECTIVES

The objectives are: first, to identify patient-safety risks unique to 3D printed healthcare devices; second, to analyse how Indian product-liability and medical-device law can apply to those risks; third, to examine the role and limits of AI-assisted quality control; and fourth, to propose an actor-wise audit and liability model for India.

5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The paper asks: (i) what patient-safety risks arise from additive manufacturing; (ii) how can product liability be allocated among manufacturer, hospital, clinician, software provider, importer, seller and AI tool developer; (iii) what evidence should be preserved to prove or defend legal responsibility; and (iv) what reforms can improve safety without blocking medical innovation?

6. METHODOLOGY

The paper uses doctrinal legal analysis and policy evaluation. It studies Indian statutes, medical-device rules, consumer product-liability provisions, data-protection law, ethical AI guidance, medical-device standards and comparative regulatory guidance. It is not an empirical injury study and does not claim survey data, litigation statistics or confidential industry records.

7. ANALYSIS: PATIENT SAFETY AND PRODUCT LIABILITY

Patient-safety risks may be grouped into design, material, manufacturing, post-processing, software, use and traceability risks. Design risk arises when geometry does not match anatomy or intended use. Material risk arises when feedstock is unsuitable or poorly controlled. Manufacturing risk arises from printer calibration, environmental conditions, layer bonding and machine maintenance. Post-processing risk arises from cleaning, curing, finishing, sterilisation and packaging. Software risk arises from segmentation, CAD, slicing, firmware and AI inspection. Use risk arises when clinicians use the device outside its validated purpose. Traceability risk arises when the final product cannot be linked back to the decisions that produced it.

The Consumer Protection Act, 2019 is significant because Chapter VI recognises product-liability claims against product manufacturers, product service providers and product sellers. For 3D printed healthcare devices, a manufacturing defect may arise from weak layer bonding or failed sterilisation. A design defect may arise from unsuitable patient-specific geometry. A warning defect may arise from inadequate instructions, use limitations or professional-use warnings. A service defect may arise where a hospital or design service provider performs a patient-specific design or printing service negligently.[1]

8. AI-ASSISTED QUALITY CONTROL

AI-assisted quality control can improve safety by detecting build anomalies, comparing printed geometry with design specifications, analysing CT or optical inspection data, identifying process drift and linking quality decisions to device history records. Its legal value depends on validation and auditability. The manufacturer or hospital using AI must record model version, input data, output, confidence level where used, human override, reviewer identity and release decision.

AI also creates legal risk. False negatives can allow defective devices to be released. False positives can reject safe products and delay patient care. Model drift can occur when materials, printers or geometries change. Poor explainability can prevent meaningful review. ICMR guidance supports ethical decision-making during development, deployment and adoption of medical AI.[2]

[1]Consumer Protection Act 2019, No 35 of 2019, ss 82-87 (India Code) <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/15256> accessed 29 June 2026.

[2]Indian Council of Medical Research, Ethical Guidelines for Application of Artificial Intelligence in Biomedical Research and Healthcare (ICMR 2023) <https://www.icmr.gov.in/ethical-guidelines-for-application-of-artificial-intelligence-in-biomedical-research-and-healthcare> accessed 29 June 2026.

ISSN 2322 - 0899

9. ACTOR-WISE RESPONSIBILITY MODEL

Actor	Primary duty	Core evidence
Manufacturer	Design control, material control, process validation, labelling, PMS and CAPA.	Design history, material lot, build record, inspection record, release decision.
Hospital lab	Risk classification, consent, SOPs, clinical release and incident reporting.	Print-job file, patient consent, sterilisation record, governance approval.
Software or AI provider	Validated software performance, cybersecurity, version control and support.	Validation report, model version, change log, audit trail.
Clinician	Patient selection, informed consent and proper clinical use.	Prescription, consent notes, operative record, use documentation.
Importer or seller	Regulatory documentation, warnings, complaint routing and traceability.	Licence record, labels, warranty, complaint and recall communications.

This model links liability to control, knowledge, duty and causation. It also protects compliant actors. A complete audit trail can show that a defect did not arise at a particular stage. Missing records, by contrast, can expand litigation and regulatory exposure across the chain.

10. EVIDENCE MATRIX FOR LIABILITY ASSESSMENT

In a dispute involving a 3D printed healthcare device, the first evidentiary question should be where the alleged defect entered the chain. If the harm arose from anatomical mismatch, the relevant evidence will include imaging source, segmentation approval, design history and clinician prescription. If the harm arose from material or build failure, the relevant evidence will include supplier certificate, lot number, printer calibration, build orientation, process parameters and inspection record. If the harm arose from post-processing, the relevant evidence will include cleaning, curing, finishing, sterilisation and packaging records. If the harm arose from AI-assisted quality control, the relevant evidence will include model version, input data, output flag, override history, human reviewer and release decision.

This evidence sequence matters because product-liability law cannot work effectively without causation. A patient may experience harm, but liability must still be connected to a defect, deficient service, inadequate warning, negligent use or regulatory breach. 3D printing complicates that inquiry because several actors may contribute to one product. A traceable digital thread reduces uncertainty by showing which actor controlled which risk at which stage.

11. LEGAL REASONING ON CONSENT AND NON-WAIVER OF SAFETY

Consent has a limited legal role in this field. A patient may consent to treatment, use of a patient-specific device, data processing and participation in research where applicable. However, consent cannot waive statutory safety obligations, poor manufacturing control or defective quality release. A hospital or manufacturer cannot defend an unsafe device merely by saying that the patient agreed to a 3D printed solution. The better view is that consent informs autonomy and disclosure, while product safety remains a non-delegable compliance expectation for actors who design, manufacture, supply or use the device.

12. RISK-BASED REGULATORY REFORM PATHWAY

India should avoid a one-size-fits-all rule. Low-risk anatomical models used only for explanation or teaching should not face the same burden as implantable patient-specific devices. Surgical guides require a middle position because they may not remain inside the body, but they can direct irreversible surgical action. Implantable devices require the strongest controls because they create long-term patient risk. A risk-based reform pathway should therefore connect regulatory documentation with clinical consequence, invasiveness, duration of contact, patient specificity and the degree of AI involvement in release decisions.

13. DISCUSSION

The legal system should not treat AI inspection as a shield from liability. AI is a quality-system component, not a legal actor capable of bearing responsibility. Human actors who deploy the tool must validate it, monitor it and preserve records. Patient consent also cannot waive unsafe manufacture or regulatory non-compliance. Consent is relevant to treatment and data processing, but it does not convert an unsafe device into a lawful one.

Post-market surveillance is essential because some defects appear only after use. MvPI provides the institutional route for reporting medical-device adverse events. For 3D printed devices, reporting should include device type,

material, printer process, design version, sterilisation method, AI inspection use, defect mode, corrective action and whether similar design families show repeated failure.[1]

14. POLICY BALANCE: INNOVATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The policy objective is not to slow medical innovation. Patient-specific manufacturing can support complex treatment, reduce delays and improve fit where conventional devices are unsuitable. The legal concern is that speed and customisation should not weaken safety proof. A balanced rule should permit innovation where the responsible actor can produce design evidence, validation records, AI audit logs and post-market learning. The absence of such evidence should weigh against the actor who controlled the relevant stage.

A practical reform model should also distinguish between research use, compassionate or exceptional clinical use, routine hospital production and commercial supply. Each setting creates different expectations of consent, ethics review, licensing, quality control and post-market reporting. A research prototype should not quietly become routine patient-use manufacture without a documented regulatory route.

15. RECOMMENDATIONS

India should issue dedicated CDSCO guidance on 3D printed healthcare devices and AI-assisted quality control. High-risk and patient-specific devices should require a digital thread from scan to clinical use. AI tools used for quality release should be validated, auditable, cybersecurity-tested and subject to human approval. Hospitals operating point-of-care 3D printing labs should maintain SOPs, risk classification, consent documentation, sterilisation records and incident-reporting mechanisms. Contracts with software and printing vendors should define validation duties, confidentiality, audit rights, indemnity and record retention.

16. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE SCOPE

This paper is doctrinal and policy-based. It does not analyse actual injury claims, hospital records, insurance data or confidential AI validation files. Future research should examine Indian procurement contracts, hospital 3D printing SOPs, product-liability claims, recall data and regulator-industry consultation records. Empirical testing should assess whether AI inspection reduces adverse events or merely produces additional documentation.

17. CONCLUSION

3D printed healthcare devices require a legal architecture that follows the device from patient data to post-market performance. Indian law already offers medical-device regulation, product-liability remedies, data-protection principles and ethical AI guidance. The missing link is a traceable liability and audit model for AI-assisted quality control. India should permit innovation, but only where safety is verifiable, responsibility is allocated and digital evidence can identify where the defect entered the chain.

REFERENCES

1. Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation, 'Medical Device & Diagnostics' (CDSCO) <https://cdsco.gov.in/opencms/opencms/en/Medical-Device-Diagnostics/Medical-Device-Diagnostics/> .
2. Anna Aimar, Augusto Palermo and Bernardo Innocenti, 'The Role of 3D Printing in Medical Applications: A State of the Art' (2019) Journal of Healthcare Engineering, Article ID 5340616 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2019/5340616> .
3. US Food and Drug Administration, Technical Considerations for Additive Manufactured Medical Devices: Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff (5 December 2017) <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/technical-considerations-additive-manufactured-medical-devices> .
4. Consumer Protection Act 2019, No 35 of 2019, ss 82-87 (India Code) <https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/15256> .
5. Indian Council of Medical Research, Ethical Guidelines for Application of Artificial Intelligence in Biomedical Research and Healthcare (ICMR 2023) <https://www.icmr.gov.in/ethical-guidelines-for-application-of-artificial-intelligence-in-biomedical-research-and-healthcare> .
6. Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission, Guidance Document for Medical Devices: Materiovigilance Programme of India (2018) <https://ipc.gov.in/images/mvpi/Guidance_Document.pdf> .

[1]Indian Pharmacopoeia Commission, Guidance Document for Medical Devices: Materiovigilance Programme of India (2018) <https://ipc.gov.in/images/mvpi/Guidance_Document.pdf> accessed 29 June 2026.