Babies Switched In Nursery: Court Allows One Of The Mothers To Sue For Damages.

ne of the mothers was given an infant to nurse and nursed her for a time until she realized she did not look like her own baby. The mother checked the ID bracelet on the baby's ankle, realized it was not her own baby and jumped right up out of bed, injuring her sutured incision.

The neonatal nursing staff admitted there was a mistake. They went to the bassinet with her last name and found the ID bracelet on the infant inside had the other mother's last name. They put her name on a new ID bracelet for the baby and tried to assure her that the mix-up had been solved.

concerned. DNA testing was ordered on taken from the nursery and given to anhers and this baby's blood samples to es- other new mother to nurse. tablish that she had the right infant.

her when she was discharged. Her anx- stomach, along with glucose water that had iousness continued for ten days until the earlier been given to the infant, pending DNA results came back and proved she blood tests on the other mother to rule out now really had the right baby.

The Court of Appeals of Tennessee breast milk. The tests proved negative. ruled this mother did have the right to sue for her own mental anguish and emotional ruled the infant suffered no harm by being distress, from the time she discovered the nursed by another person and having her mix-up until the DNA results came back.

It did not matter that her attorney was January 27, 2009).

Each of the two mothers has filed suit because one of them was allowed to nurse the other's baby, due to a mix-up committed by the neonatal nursing staff. COURT OF APPEALS OF TENNESSEE

January 27, 2009

ne of the mothers was resting comfortably in her hospital room when She was still understandably quite she was informed that her infant had been

As a precaution, the other mother's The same infant was sent home with breast milk was suctioned from the baby's any infection that could be passed by her

> The Court of Appeals of Tennessee stomach contents removed.

There was no medical battery committhe one who finally sent her to a psychia- ted because the procedure was done pursutrist, basically so there would be expert ant to a physician's order and fell within testimony as to her anxiety reaction to the general consent to treatment papers the prove damages in her lawsuit. Filson v. parents had signed on the infant's behalf. <u>.</u> Seton Corp., 2009 WL 196048 (Tenn. App., <u>Hobbs v. Seton Corp.</u>, 2009 WL 196040 (Tenn. App., January 27, 2009).

Legal Eagle Eye Newsletter for the Nursing Profession

LEGAL INFORMATION FOR NURSES – Legal Eagle Eye Newsletter for the Nursing Profession Home Page