Advances in Consumer Research
https://acr-journal.com/
Volume-3 | Issue-3 | March 2026
Original Researcher Article

Legal and Regulatory Challenges in Telepharmacy Practice in India: Current Status and Future Directions.

Mohit Kuamr[1], Neelam painuly[2]
[1]Assistant Professor, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of Pharmacy, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad-244001, U.P., India; mohitgoyal21111@gmail.com; 0009-0001-8236-7396.
[2]Associate Professor, School of Pharmacy & Research, Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, Naugaon, Dehradun, India; E-mail: neelu.painuly@gmail.com
Corresponding Author:
Mohit Kumar
Assistant Professor, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of Pharmacy, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad-244001, U.P., India; mohitgoyal21111@gmail.com; 0009-0001-8236-7396.

ABSTRACT
Telepharmacy, defined as the provision of pharmaceutical care through telecommunications and digital technologies, has emerged as a transformative component of modern healthcare systems. In India, telepharmacy has expanded rapidly due to increased internet penetration, digital health initiatives, and the need to improve access to medicines in rural and underserved areas. However, regulatory development has not kept pace with technological advancement. This review critically examines the existing legal framework governing telepharmacy in India, including the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940, Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945, Information Technology Act, 2000, and Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020. The paper identifies key regulatory gaps such as absence of telepharmacy-specific legislation, inconsistent state implementation, lack of standardized e-prescription norms, data privacy concerns, and unclear professional liability standards. Comparative analysis of regulatory frameworks in the United States, Australia, and Canada highlights global best practices in licensing, quality assurance, digital integration, and patient privacy protection. The review concludes with policy recommendations aimed at strengthening telepharmacy governance in India to ensure equitable, safe, and accountable healthcare delivery...
Keywords– Telepharmacy, pharmaceutical law, e-prescription, digital health regulation, India, patient privacy, professional liability.

INTRODUCTION:

Telepharmacy refers to the delivery of pharmaceutical services through information and communication technologies where the patient and pharmacist are geographically separated. It includes remote prescription verification, medication counseling, dispensing supervision, and medication therapy management. In India, telepharmacy has gained importance due to disparities in pharmacist availability, especially in rural regions.

Despite rapid digitalization, telepharmacy regulation remains fragmented. Indian pharmaceutical law was drafted in a pre-digital era, and existing statutes provide only indirect governance for remote dispensing services. This review evaluates current regulatory frameworks, identifies systemic gaps, and proposes reforms aligned with international best practices.

2. Existing Legal Framework Governing Telepharmacy

2.1 Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Rules, 1945

The primary legislation governing pharmaceutical practice in India is the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 [1], supplemented by the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945 [2]. These laws regulate manufacturing, licensing, distribution, and sale of drugs.

Section 18(c) mandates that sale of drugs requires a valid license. Rule 65 requires supervision by a registered pharmacist for dispensing Schedule H, H1, and X drugs. However, the Act does not define telepharmacy or digital dispensing. Licensing mechanisms are designed for physical premises, leading to ambiguity when applied to online pharmacies operating across multiple states.

Additionally, inspection provisions under Sections 21–23 focus on physical premises and do not provide digital audit mechanisms for telepharmacy platforms.

2.2 Information Technology Act, 2000

The Information Technology Act, 2000 [11] provides legal recognition to electronic records (Section 4) and digital signatures (Section 5), forming the statutory basis for e-prescriptions. Health data is categorized as sensitive personal data under the IT Rules, 2011.

However, the Act does not contain healthcare-specific cybersecurity standards. Telepharmacy platforms rely on general data protection provisions under Section 43A, which may be insufficient for safeguarding prescription data and patient medical histories.

2.3 Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020

The Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020 , issued by

the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, formalized remote medical consultation in India. These guidelines classify medicines into permissible and restricted categories for teleconsultation.
While they authorize e-prescriptions by registered medical practitioners, they do not define telepharmacy practice or clarify pharmacists' roles in remote dispensing. The guidelines are physician-centric and do not integrate pharmaceutical service standards.

3. Regulatory Challenges and Gaps

3.1 Absence of Specific Telepharmacy Regulations

Telepharmacy is not explicitly recognized as a regulated activity under Indian law. This results in:

- Uncertainty regarding licensing categories
- Absence of centralized digital accreditation
- Lack of uniform quality assurance standards

Although draft e-pharmacy rules were proposed in 2018, they remain unnotified, leaving telepharmacy in a regulatory grey zone.

3.2 Inconsistent State Implementation

Drug licensing enforcement is administered by state authorities under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act [1]. The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization provides coordination but retail licensing remains state-controlled.
Telepharmacy platforms operating nationally encounter varying interpretations of online sale permissibility, prescription validation, and inspection standards. This fragmented enforcement creates compliance burdens and jurisdictional confusion.

3.3 E-Prescription and E-Dispensing Issues

Although e-prescriptions are legally recognized under the IT Act [11], there is no standardized national protocol for:

- Digital authentication
- Unique prescription identifiers
- Interoperable prescription databases
- Secure record retention

Some states impose stricter controls on dispensing Schedule H1 and X drugs digitally, leading to inconsistency in enforcement.

3.4 Patient Data Protection and Privacy

Telepharmacy platforms collect sensitive health data. While general data protection provisions exist under the IT Act [11], India lacks a comprehensive health-specific data governance framework.
Risks include unauthorized access, cyberattacks, and commercial misuse of prescription data. The World Health Organization emphasizes privacy-by-design in digital health systems [13], a principle not fully operationalized in Indian telepharmacy regulation.

3.5 Professional Liability and Ethical Concerns

Telepharmacy alters traditional pharmacist–patient interactions. Legal ambiguities arise concerning:

- Liability for dispensing errors
- Responsibility for reliance on digital prescriptions
- Accountability in case of technological failures

The absence of telepharmacy-specific malpractice standards exposes pharmacists and platforms to uncertain legal risks.

4. Global Models and Best Practices

Countries such as the United States, Australia, and Canada provide structured telepharmacy governance.
In the United States, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy develops model telepharmacy standards, while privacy is governed under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act [14].
Australia regulates telepharmacy through the Pharmacy Board of Australia and enforces privacy under the Privacy Act 1988 [15].
Canada integrates digital health systems through Canada Health Infoway and ensures data protection under the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act [16].
These models demonstrate the importance of statutory clarity, centralized accreditation, real-time supervision, and robust privacy protection.

2.1 The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945: Detailed Legal Analysis in the Context of Telepharmacy

The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 (DCA) is the principal legislation regulating the import, manufacture, distribution, and sale of drugs and cosmetics in India [9]. Enacted to ensure safety, efficacy, and quality of drugs, the Act establishes statutory controls over pharmaceutical trade and professional responsibility. It is supplemented by the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945 (DCR), which prescribe detailed procedures for licensing, labeling, storage, supervision, inspection, and record maintenance [10].
Although neither the Act nor the Rules explicitly define "telepharmacy," several provisions indirectly regulate remote pharmaceutical services.

A. Licensing Requirements for Sale of Drugs

Section 18(c) of the DCA prohibits manufacture or sale of drugs except under a valid license issued under the Act [9].
Relevant provisions under the DCR include:

- Rule 61 – Application procedure for drug sale licenses [10]
- Rule 62 – Forms of retail and wholesale licenses [10]
- Rule 65 – Conditions of license [10]

Telepharmacy Implications

Online pharmacies and digital platforms must hold valid retail or wholesale licenses issued by State Licensing Authorities under the DCA framework [9,10]. However, telepharmacy platforms frequently operate across state

boundaries, while licensing authority remains decentralized at the state level. This creates jurisdictional ambiguities.

Importantly, there is no statutory category recognizing a "digital pharmacy license." The absence of centralized registration has been highlighted in policy discussions and academic analysis [11,12]. The 2018 draft amendment proposing e-pharmacy registration has not been notified, leaving regulatory uncertainty.

B. Registered Pharmacist Supervision

Rule 65(2) mandates that drugs listed under Schedule H, H1, and X be dispensed only under the supervision of a registered pharmacist [13].

Telepharmacy Challenges

While the requirement of supervision is mandatory, the Rules assume physical presence. The concept of "remote supervision" is not defined. There are no legally prescribed standards regarding:

- Real-time video verification
- Identity authentication of supervising pharmacists
- Digital accountability logs

This regulatory gap creates uncertainty regarding compliance in remote dispensing models .

C. Prescription-Only Drugs and Controlled Substances

Schedules under the DCR include:

- Schedule H – Prescription-only medicines
- Schedule H1 – Antibiotics and monitored drugs
- Schedule X – Narcotic and psychotropic substances [10]

The Rules require written prescription by a Registered Medical Practitioner (RMP), maintenance of prescription records, and strict labeling and storage requirements [10].

Telepharmacy Concerns

The DCA and DCR were drafted assuming physical prescriptions. While they require maintenance of prescription copies, they do not define digital authentication standards. The lack of uniform e-prescription verification mechanisms increases risks of duplication, forged prescriptions, and unlawful dispensing [12].

D. Record Maintenance and Inspection

Rule 65(4) requires maintenance of purchase and sale records and retention of prescription copies for Schedule H1 and X drugs [10].

Under Sections 21–23 of the DCA, Drug Inspectors are empowered to inspect premises, seize drugs, and examine records [9].

Telepharmacy Limitation

Inspection mechanisms are structured for physical premises. There is no statutory digital audit mechanism for telepharmacy databases. Cross-state inspection authority over centralized online platforms remains unclear, contributing to enforcement fragmentation [12].

E. Draft E-Pharmacy Rules, 2018

In 2018, the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare proposed draft amendments introducing e-pharmacy provisions [3]. These proposed:

- Mandatory registration with a Central Licensing Authority
- Prohibition of online sale of narcotic and psychotropic drugs
- Data localization requirements
- 24×7 registered pharmacist availability

However, these draft rules remain unnotified [3], leaving telepharmacy without formal statutory recognition.

Critical Analysis

The DCA framework [1,2] was enacted in a pre-digital era. While it ensures drug quality and safety, it lacks provisions for:

- Centralized digital licensing
- Standardized e-prescription authentication
- Remote pharmacist supervision protocols
- Digital audit and inspection mechanisms

Scholarly analysis emphasizes the urgent need for legislative modernization to accommodate telepharmacy practices while safeguarding patient safety [4]. International digital health guidance from the World Health Organization also underscores the necessity of regulatory adaptation in digital pharmaceutical services [5].

2.2 The Information Technology Act, 2000: Legal Recognition of Digital Transactions and Implications for Telepharmacy

The Information Technology Act, 2000 (IT Act) was enacted to grant legal recognition to electronic records, digital signatures, and electronic transactions in India [6]. It forms the statutory backbone for digital communication and cybersecurity governance.

Although not healthcare-specific, the IT Act indirectly enables telepharmacy by legitimizing digital prescriptions and electronic communication.

A. Legal Recognition of Electronic Records

Section 4 of the IT Act provides that electronic records satisfy legal requirements for written documentation if accessible for future reference [14].

Telepharmacy Relevance

- E-prescriptions are legally valid.
- Online pharmacies may maintain digital prescription records.
- Electronic communication has evidentiary value.

However, practical enforcement depends on compliance with authentication standards [14].

B. Digital Signatures and Authentication

Section 5 recognizes digital signatures authenticated through cryptographic methods [15].

In telepharmacy practice:

- RMPs may digitally sign prescriptions.
- Pharmacists may verify authenticity.

However, informal transmission of scanned or photographed prescriptions without digital authentication raises compliance risks [16-17].

C. Data Protection and Privacy

The IT Act addresses data protection under:

- Section 43A – Compensation for failure to protect sensitive personal data [14]
- Section 72A – Punishment for breach of confidentiality [14]

The IT (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011 classify medical records as Sensitive Personal Data [15].

Telepharmacy Implications

- Prescription data and patient histories require reasonable security safeguards.
- The law lacks healthcare-specific cybersecurity standards.
- No dedicated digital health regulatory authority exists.

WHO guidance recommends privacy-by-design principles in digital health systems [13].

D. Cybersecurity and Liability

The IT Act penalizes unauthorized access (Section 43), identity theft (Section 66C), and online fraud (Section 66D) [14].

Telepharmacy platforms face risks including:

- Prescription fraud
- Identity theft
- Data breaches

However, liability apportionment between platform, pharmacist, and prescriber remains legally undefined [17].

E. Evidentiary Recognition

The IT Act amended the Indian Evidence Act to admit electronic records as evidence [14]. This is significant for malpractice claims and regulatory proceedings involving telepharmacy records.

2.3 Telemedicine Practice Guidelines (2020): Scope, Limitations, and Implications for Telepharmacy

The Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020 were issued by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW) in March 2020 to formalize teleconsultation practices in India [18]. These Guidelines were incorporated into the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002 through an amendment notified by the Board of Governors in supersession of the Medical Council of India [19]. The regulatory authority previously exercised by the Medical Council of India is now vested in the National Medical Commission.

The Guidelines represent a landmark development in India's digital health governance by granting legal clarity to Registered Medical Practitioners (RMPs) engaging in remote consultations [18]. However, while telemedicine practices were formally legitimized, telepharmacy services were not explicitly addressed, resulting in regulatory asymmetry within digital healthcare delivery systems.

A. Objectives and Scope of the Guidelines

The Telemedicine Practice Guidelines aim to [18]:

- Provide legal recognition and ethical standards for teleconsultation
- Define permissible modes of communication (video, audio, text-based platforms)
- Establish patient identification and consent requirements
- Classify medicines eligible for tele-prescription
- Protect patient confidentiality and mandate record retention

Scholarly analysis confirms that the Guidelines are physician-centric and focus primarily on regulating medical practitioners rather than pharmacists [20]. Consequently, while telemedicine consultation has statutory backing, pharmaceutical services delivered remotely remain indirectly governed.

B. Prescription Norms and Their Impact on Telepharmacy

The Guidelines classify medicines into specific categories [18]:

- **List O** – Over-the-counter drugs permissible via teleconsultation
- **List A** – Relatively safe drugs prescribed during first consultation (video-based)
- **List B** – Drugs prescribed during follow-up consultation
- **Prohibited List** – Drugs not allowed via teleconsultation, including Schedule X substances

These classifications significantly influence dispensing practices. However, pharmacists are not formally incorporated into the regulatory framework. The Guidelines:

- Do not prescribe standards for pharmacist verification of electronic prescriptions
- Do not define telepharmacy counseling responsibilities

- Do not clarify liability allocation in cases of dispensing errors arising from teleconsultations

Academic commentary highlights that this omission creates interpretational challenges for pharmacists operating within digital platforms [20,22].

C. Absence of Telepharmacy Definition and Regulatory Scope

A major limitation of the Guidelines is the absence of a statutory definition of telepharmacy. Telemedicine is clearly defined as the delivery of healthcare services using information and communication technologies [18]. In contrast, remote pharmaceutical care—including medication therapy management, counseling, and dispensing supervision—remains legally undefined.

This regulatory silence generates uncertainty regarding:

- Legality of pharmacist-led video counseling
- Remote medication review and therapeutic monitoring
- Documentation requirements for digital dispensing
- Cross-state telepharmacy operations

Scholars have identified this regulatory gap as a structural weakness in India's digital health framework [22].

D. Professional Liability and Ethical Dimensions

The Guidelines assign diagnostic and prescribing responsibility exclusively to Registered Medical Practitioners [18,19]. However, in digital ecosystems:

- Pharmacists frequently interact directly with patients
- Clarifications of prescriptions may occur electronically
- Medication adherence counseling is often delivered remotely

Without explicit telepharmacy recognition, pharmacist liability in cases of adverse drug reactions, prescription misinterpretation, or technical failure remains ambiguous. Ethical concerns regarding accountability and professional standards have been raised in legal analyses of telemedicine regulation in India [20].

E. Data Privacy and Record Maintenance

The Guidelines mandate maintenance of electronic medical records and emphasize patient confidentiality [18]. However, enforcement relies primarily on existing digital governance laws rather than healthcare-specific data regulation.

The World Health Organization recommends integrated digital health governance models that incorporate privacy-by-design and clear accountability structures [21]. In India, regulatory responsibilities remain fragmented:

- Medical consultations – governed by Telemedicine Guidelines [1]
- Drug dispensing – governed by the Drugs and Cosmetics Act framework
- Data protection – governed by the Information Technology Act

This segmented oversight complicates compliance for telepharmacy platforms and may result in inconsistent enforcement [5].

Critical Evaluation

The Telemedicine Practice Guidelines (2020) constitute a progressive step in legitimizing remote medical consultation. However, their limited scope in addressing pharmaceutical services reveals a physician-centric regulatory approach.

Key limitations include:

- Absence of formal telepharmacy recognition
- Lack of accreditation standards for telepharmacy platforms
- Undefined pharmacist–patient digital interaction protocols
- Unresolved cross-jurisdictional licensing concerns
- No standardized digital prescription authentication system

Regulatory scholarship emphasizes that without integrating pharmacists into telehealth legislation, digital healthcare governance remains incomplete [20,22].

Policy Recommendations

To harmonize telemedicine and telepharmacy governance, the following reforms are essential:

1. Statutory recognition and definition of telepharmacy under national health policy.
2. Clear delineation of pharmacist responsibilities in remote counseling and prescription validation.
3. Mandatory authentication mechanisms for digital prescriptions.
4. Unified digital health compliance standards integrating medical and pharmaceutical services.
5. Alignment with global digital health governance principles emphasizing privacy, accountability, and quality assurance [21].

3. REGULATORY CHALLENGES AND GAPS

3.1 Absence of Specific Telepharmacy Regulations in India

One of the most significant barriers to effective telepharmacy governance in India is the absence of a clear statutory definition and dedicated regulatory framework recognizing telepharmacy as a distinct healthcare practice. Pharmaceutical activities are primarily regulated under

the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 [23] and the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945 [24], while teleconsultation practices are governed under the Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020 [25]. However, telepharmacy remains legally undefined, resulting in ambiguity in licensing, jurisdiction, accountability, and quality assurance mechanisms.

A. Uncertainty About Licensing Requirements

Section 18(c) of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 mandates that no person shall manufacture or sell drugs except under a valid license issued by the State Licensing Authority [23]. The licensing framework under Rules 61–65 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945 was designed for physical, premises-based pharmacies [24].

Telepharmacy platforms, which often operate through centralized digital interfaces serving multiple states, do not neatly align with this framework. Key regulatory uncertainties include:

- Absence of a distinct "telepharmacy license" category
- Dependence on conventional retail or wholesale licenses
- Unclear requirement for separate licensing in each state of operation
- Ambiguity regarding mandatory physical storefront requirements

Although draft e-pharmacy rules were proposed in 2018 to introduce centralized registration and operational standards, they have not been formally notified [26]. Academic analyses have emphasized that operating telepharmacy platforms under interpretative extensions of traditional licensing provisions creates regulatory instability and compliance uncertainty [27,28].

The World Health Organization has recommended that digital health services require clearly defined regulatory frameworks to prevent fragmented governance and ensure patient safety [29].

B. Ambiguous Territorial Jurisdiction for Cross-State Services

Drug regulation in India follows a federal structure in which enforcement authority is primarily exercised by state governments under the DCA framework [23]. Telepharmacy platforms frequently:

- Accept prescriptions online from one state
- Process orders in another
- Dispatch medicines from centralized warehouses
- Deliver medicines nationwide

This raises significant jurisdictional questions:

- Which State Drug Controller has authority over violations?
- Which state's licensing norms apply?
- How are inspections conducted across digital infrastructures?

Scholarly literature highlights that decentralized enforcement mechanisms are structurally misaligned with the borderless nature of digital pharmaceutical services [27,28].

C. Lack of Standardized Quality Assurance Mechanisms

Traditional pharmacy quality assurance under the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules includes:

- Mandatory pharmacist supervision (Rule 65) [24]
- Physical inspection by Drug Inspectors [23]
- Storage and labeling verification
- Record maintenance requirements

Telepharmacy introduces additional quality dimensions, including:

- Remote pharmacist counseling standards
- Digital prescription verification protocols
- Cybersecurity safeguards
- Electronic audit trails
- Secure cloud-based data storage

Currently, no unified statutory framework prescribes minimum technological standards or standardized telepharmacy accreditation mechanisms. The absence of digital-specific quality benchmarks creates risks of improper dispensing, counterfeit medicine circulation, and data breaches [5].

D. Regulatory Fragmentation and Institutional Overlap

Telepharmacy operates at the intersection of multiple regulatory regimes:

Domain	Regulatory Instrument
Drug Licensing	Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 [23]
Digital Transactions	Information Technology Act, 2000
Teleconsultation	Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020 [25]
Consumer Rights	Consumer Protection Act, 2019

No single authority comprehensively oversees telepharmacy practice. This fragmentation complicates compliance, weakens accountability, and promotes reactive rather than preventive enforcement approaches [6].

Critical Evaluation

The absence of explicit telepharmacy regulation reflects legislative lag relative to technological advancement. While existing statutes indirectly apply, they were designed for traditional healthcare delivery models. The lack of:

- Statutory telepharmacy definition
- Centralized digital licensing
- National telepharmacy quality standards
- Interstate harmonization mechanisms

creates systemic legal uncertainty affecting both providers and patients.
Comparatively, jurisdictions such as the United States and Australia have enacted telepharmacy-specific operational standards aligned with digital healthcare systems [29]. India's framework requires similar modernization to ensure equitable and safe access to pharmaceutical services.

3.2 Inconsistent State Implementation
India's pharmaceutical regulatory structure is characterized by centralized legislative authority combined with decentralized enforcement. While the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 establishes uniform national standards [23], operational implementation is carried out by State Drug Control Authorities under the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945 [24].

A. Federal Structure of Drug Regulation
Under the DCA framework:

- Retail and wholesale licenses are issued by State Licensing Authorities [23].
- Drug Inspectors are appointed at the state level [24].
- Compliance checks and enforcement actions are locally administered.

The Central Drugs Standard Control Organization provides coordination and policy oversight but does not directly license most retail pharmacies [30].
While this structure functions effectively for brick-and-mortar pharmacies confined to one state, it becomes problematic for telepharmacy platforms operating across multiple jurisdictions.

B. Variations in Interpretation of Central Rules
Although the DCA applies uniformly, state authorities may differ in interpretation regarding:

- Legality of online drug sales
- Licensing requirements for warehouses
- Inspection protocols for digital platforms
- Enforcement approaches against e-pharmacies

These interpretative differences result in regulatory uncertainty, unequal compliance burdens, and potential forum shopping by digital platforms
Scholars argue that decentralized enforcement without centralized digital standards produces fragmented governance in digital health systems [27,31].

C. Cross-State Jurisdictional Conflicts
Telepharmacy platforms typically involve:

- A centralized digital application
- Multiple licensed partner pharmacies
- Warehouses in selected states
- Nationwide logistics networks

Jurisdictional conflicts arise when:

- A consumer in State A receives medicine from State B
- Prescription records are stored on cloud servers outside territorial jurisdiction
- Enforcement action requires inter-state coordination

Because the DCA was drafted with physical premises in mind, it lacks explicit provisions addressing borderless digital pharmaceutical services [23].

D. Enforcement Challenges
Inconsistent implementation has resulted in:

- Notices issued by certain State Drug Controllers
- Temporary operational restrictions
- Litigation regarding legality of online pharmacy models

In the absence of notified e-pharmacy rules, enforcement remains interpretative and reactive rather than standardized and preventive [27].

E. Public Health Implications
Regulatory inconsistency directly impacts patient safety, including:

- Variation in pharmacist supervision practices
- Inconsistent prescription verification
- Unequal quality assurance standards
- Challenges in national pharmacovigilance coordination

WHO digital health guidance emphasizes the importance of harmonized governance to ensure equitable protection of patients across jurisdictions [29].

Critical Evaluation
The decentralized enforcement model, although constitutionally consistent with India's federal structure, is misaligned with the digital and borderless nature of telepharmacy. The absence of:

- Centralized telepharmacy licensing
- National digital audit systems
- Inter-state enforcement coordination mechanisms
- Unified compliance standards

has resulted in fragmented oversight.
International experience demonstrates that coordinated regulatory frameworks can preserve federal autonomy while ensuring uniform digital health standards [29].

3.3 E-Prescription and E-Dispensing Issues

Telepharmacy systems fundamentally depend upon electronic prescriptions (e-prescriptions) for remote dispensing of medicines. In India, digital prescriptions derive indirect legal recognition under the Information Technology Act, 2000, which grants legal validity to electronic records (Section 4) and digital signatures (Section 5) [32]. However, India does not yet have a dedicated and uniform statutory framework specifically governing technical and operational standards for e-prescriptions in pharmaceutical practice.

A. Absence of a Uniform Legal Framework

The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 [33] and the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945 [34] require prescriptions for Schedule H, H1, and X drugs but were enacted in a pre-digital era and assume paper-based documentation. While the Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020 permit Registered Medical Practitioners (RMPs) to issue electronic prescriptions [35], they do not provide detailed technical standards concerning:

- Mandatory structured digital prescription formats
- Secure digital signature authentication
- Unique prescription identifiers
- Interoperable national prescription databases

Consequently, many e-prescriptions are transmitted as scanned copies or via informal messaging platforms. Such practices raise concerns about authenticity, tampering, duplication, and prescription fraud. Regulatory scholarship has highlighted the vulnerability of India's e-pharmacy ecosystem in the absence of standardized authentication protocols [5].

B. Restrictions on Scheduled Drugs

The Drugs and Cosmetics Rules classify high-risk medicines under Schedule H1 and Schedule X [3]. Although the Telemedicine Practice Guidelines impose certain restrictions on remote prescribing [4], decentralized enforcement has resulted in varying interpretations across states.
This divergence has created:

- Variability in permissible categories of drugs for online dispensing
- Inconsistent pharmacist compliance requirements
- Confusion for telepharmacy platforms operating nationwide

Scholarly analysis confirms that fragmented enforcement of scheduled drug provisions undermines regulatory predictability and patient safety [36].

C. Verification, Authentication, and Record-Keeping Challenges

Under Rule 65 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, pharmacists must maintain records of prescription drugs dispensed [34]. However, digital environments introduce new complexities:

- Authentication of prescribing physician identity
- Verification of digital signatures
- Retention period for electronic records
- Cybersecurity standards for cloud-based storage

While the Information Technology Act provides general cybersecurity obligations [32], it does not prescribe healthcare-specific safeguards. The absence of unified national standards increases risks of duplicate dispensing, unauthorized refills, and prescription manipulation.

3.4 Patient Data Protection and Privacy

Telepharmacy platforms routinely process highly sensitive personal health information, including prescriptions, medical histories, contact details, and payment records. Ensuring confidentiality is both a legal and ethical imperative.

A. Existing Legal Framework

Health data is classified as "Sensitive Personal Data or Information" under the IT (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011 framed under the Information Technology Act [37]. Section 43A of the IT Act provides compensation liability for failure to protect such data [32].
However:

- The IT Act imposes general cybersecurity obligations rather than healthcare-specific standards.
- There is no telepharmacy-specific data governance statute.
- Standards for data localization and cross-border transfers are not tailored to pharmaceutical services.

The World Health Organization has emphasized that digital health interventions must adopt privacy-by-design principles and strong governance safeguards [38]. India's telepharmacy regulation has yet to operationalize these recommendations comprehensively.

B. Risks in Telepharmacy Context

Inadequate sector-specific regulation increases risks of:

- Unauthorized third-party access
- Cyberattacks and data breaches
- Commercial misuse of prescription data
- Profiling and discriminatory practices

Without robust health-specific privacy architecture, telepharmacy expansion may compromise patient trust and confidentiality.

3.5 Professional Liability and Ethical Concerns

Telepharmacy modifies the traditional pharmacist–patient

relationship, introducing complex accountability challenges.

A. Legal Accountability for Dispensing Errors

Under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act and associated professional regulations [32,33], pharmacists are responsible for correct dispensing. However, telepharmacy environments involve:

- Electronically transmitted prescriptions
- Limited physical interaction
- Automated dispensing assistance systems

If harm occurs, ambiguity arises regarding liability allocation:

- Is the pharmacist liable for reliance on a digitally transmitted prescription?
- Does responsibility extend to the telepharmacy platform operator?
- What if technological malfunction contributes to patient harm?

Legal scholars have identified this liability gap as a significant risk in India's evolving digital pharmacy ecosystem [36].

B. Ethical Obligations in Remote Care

Pharmacists remain ethically obligated to ensure rational drug use, provide adequate counseling, maintain confidentiality, and avoid conflicts of interest. However, telepharmacy models sometimes limit real-time interaction, substituting prerecorded advisories or chat-based counseling. This may compromise informed patient understanding and adherence.

C. Malpractice and Insurance Gaps

Traditional professional indemnity policies may not explicitly cover telepharmacy services. Without statutory recognition of telepharmacy as a defined professional practice, pharmacists may face expanded legal exposure.

4. Global Models and Best Practices in Telepharmacy Regulation

Several countries have adopted structured telepharmacy regulatory frameworks that balance patient safety, accountability, and innovation. The United States, Australia, and Canada provide instructive models.[40]

4.1 United States

In the United States, telepharmacy regulation operates through state boards supported by model standards from the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy [8]. Many state pharmacy boards have enacted telepharmacy-specific rules allowing remote dispensing sites under defined conditions.

Key features include:

- Mandatory licensing of central and remote sites
- Real-time audio-visual pharmacist supervision
- Remote prescription verification before dispensing
- Periodic inspections and audit trails

Privacy protection is governed by the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) [40], which mandates strict safeguards for Protected Health Information (PHI), including encryption and breach notification.

4.2 Australia

Telepharmacy practice in Australia is regulated under national professional standards issued by the Pharmacy Board of Australia [41], operating within the AHPRA framework. Privacy protections are enforced under the Privacy Act 1988 [42].

Key elements include:

- Nationally consistent pharmacist registration
- Structured telehealth dispensing protocols
- Mandatory professional indemnity insurance
- Integration with national electronic health records

Australia's centralized regulatory coordination enhances consistency and patient safety.

4.3 Canada

In Canada, telepharmacy is regulated provincially but harmonized through national digital standards supported by Canada Health Infoway [43]. Privacy governance is ensured under the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA) [44].

Key features include:

- Explicit telepharmacy definitions in provincial regulations
- Mandatory pharmacist review prior to medication release
- Secure electronic transmission systems
- Continuous quality improvement programs

4.4 Comparative Lessons for India

Comparative analysis suggests essential reforms for India:

1. Statutory definition of telepharmacy.
2. Centralized national accreditation mechanism.
3. Mandatory real-time pharmacist supervision protocols.
4. Integration with national digital health missions.
5. Healthcare-specific privacy legislation aligned with WHO recommendations [38].

Global experience demonstrates that telepharmacy can be safely implemented when supported by structured licensing, quality monitoring, and strong privacy safeguards.

5. Policy Recommendations for India

1. Introduce statutory definition of telepharmacy under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act.
2. Establish centralized national telepharmacy licensing under CDSCO.

3. Develop uniform e-prescription authentication standards.
4. Mandate cybersecurity audits and health data encryption protocols.
5. Clarify professional liability and require telepharmacy-specific indemnity insurance.
6. Integrate telepharmacy platforms with national digital health infrastructure.

6. Conclusion (Point-Wise Summary)

- The Information Technology Act, 2000 provides basic legal recognition for digital transactions but lacks healthcare-specific standards for telepharmacy.
- The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940 and Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945 were designed for traditional, physical pharmacy models and do not adequately address digital pharmaceutical services.
- The Telemedicine Practice Guidelines, 2020 legalized teleconsultation but do not explicitly regulate telepharmacy, creating regulatory ambiguity.
- Major governance gaps exist in:
    - Interstate licensing and enforcement
    - Standardized e-prescription authentication
    - Patient data protection and cybersecurity
    - Professional liability and accountability
- Inconsistent state implementation leads to fragmented oversight and legal uncertainty for nationwide telepharmacy platforms.
- Global models (United States, Australia, Canada) demonstrate the importance of:
    - Statutory recognition of telepharmacy
    - Centralized accreditation systems
    - Real-time pharmacist supervision
    - Strong health-specific privacy laws
- India requires comprehensive telepharmacy-specific reforms, including:
    - Clear statutory definition
    - Harmonized national licensing framework
    - Standardized digital prescription protocols
    - Integrated data protection safeguards

Legislative modernization is essential to ensure **patient safety, legal clarity, professional accountability, and sustainable digital healthcare growth** in India.

.

REFERENCES

1. Government of India. Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940.
2. Government of India. Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945.
3. Government of India. Information Technology Act, 2000.
4. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Telemedicine Practice Guidelines. New Delhi: MoHFW; 2020.
5. World Health Organization. Recommendations on Digital Interventions for Health System Strengthening. Geneva: WHO; 2019.
6. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), United States.
7. Privacy Act 1988 (Australia).
8. Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA), Canada.
9. Government of India. The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare; 1940.
10. Government of India. The Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare; 1945.
11. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Draft Drugs and Cosmetics (Amendment) Rules – E-Pharmacy Provisions. New Delhi: Government of India; 2018.
12. Gupta R, Sharma S. Legal framework governing online pharmacies in India. Indian J Health Law Policy. 2022;7(2):115-128.
13. World Health Organization. WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening. Geneva: WHO; 2019.
14. Government of India. Information Technology Act, 2000. New Delhi: Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology; 2000.
15. Government of India. Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011. New Delhi: Ministry of Communications and Information Technology; 2011.
16. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Telemedicine Practice Guidelines. New Delhi: Government of India; 2020.
17. Narayanan A. Digital prescriptions and legal challenges in India. Indian J Health Law. 2023;8(1):45-58.
18. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Telemedicine Practice Guidelines. New Delhi:

Government of India; 2020.
19. Board of Governors in supersession of Medical Council of India. Amendment to the Indian Medical Council (Professional Conduct, Etiquette and Ethics) Regulations, 2002. New Delhi: MCI; 2020.
20. Thomas R, Gupta S. Telemedicine regulations in India: legal and ethical analysis. Indian J Med Ethics. 2021;6(2):95-102.
21. World Health Organization. WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening. Geneva: WHO; 2019.
22. Sharma P. Regulatory gaps in telepharmacy practice in India. J Health Policy Gov. 2022;9(1):41-53.
23. Government of India. The Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare; 1940.
24. Government of India. The Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare; 1945.
25. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Telemedicine Practice Guidelines. New Delhi: Government of India; 2020.
26. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Draft Drugs and Cosmetics (Amendment) Rules – E-Pharmacy Provisions. New Delhi: Government of India; 2018.
27. Gupta R, Sharma S. Regulatory challenges in online pharmacy governance in India. Indian J Health Law Policy. 2022;7(2):115-128.
28. Narayanan A. Telehealth regulation and cross-border pharmaceutical services in India. J Digit Health Gov. 2023;8(1):32-47.
29. World Health Organization. WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening. Geneva: WHO; 2019.
30. Central Drugs Standard Control Organization. Regulatory framework for drug licensing in India. New Delhi: CDSCO; 2022.
31. Thomas P, Patel H. Governance fragmentation in India's digital health ecosystem. J Public Health Policy. 2021;42(3):389-402.
32. Government of India. Information Technology Act, 2000. New Delhi: Government of India; 2000.
33. Government of India. Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940. New Delhi: Government of India; 1940.
34. Government of India. Drugs and Cosmetics Rules, 1945. New Delhi: Government of India; 1945.
35. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare. Telemedicine Practice Guidelines. New Delhi: Government of India; 2020.
36. Gupta R, Sharma S. Legal challenges in e-pharmacy and telepharmacy regulation in India. Indian J Health Law Policy. 2022;7(2):115-128.
37. Government of India. Information Technology (Reasonable Security Practices and Procedures and Sensitive Personal Data or Information) Rules, 2011. New Delhi: Government of India; 2011.
38. World Health Organization. WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening. Geneva: WHO; 2019.
39. National Association of Boards of Pharmacy. Model State Pharmacy Act and telepharmacy guidelines. Mount Prospect (IL): NABP; 2022.
40. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, Pub L No. 104-191, 110 Stat 1936.
41. Pharmacy Board of Australia. Guidelines for telehealth and remote dispensing. Melbourne: PBA; 2021.
42. Privacy Act 1988 (Cth) (Australia).
43. Canada Health Infoway. Digital health and electronic health record standards. Ottawa: Canada Health Infoway; 2022.
44. Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act, SC 2000, c 5 (Canada)..

.