

[UPDATED] MMA hails High Court stay on medicine price display order

By New Straits Times
May 21, 2026 @ 12:36pm



"MMA welcomes the court's decision. It confirms that the legal questions we have raised deserve full judicial consideration," MMA president Datuk Dr R. Thirunavukarasu said in a statement. - NSTP/AIZUDDIN SAAD

KUALA LUMPUR: The Malaysian Medical Association (MMA) has hailed the High Court's decision to grant a stay of enforcement on the Medicine Price Display Order 2025.

"MMA welcomes the court's decision. It confirms that the legal questions we have raised deserve full judicial consideration," MMA president Datuk Dr R. Thirunavukarasu said in a statement.

"We wish to be clear: MMA has never been against medicine price transparency. We support it. Patients have every right to know what they are paying for. What we have consistently opposed is the use of Act 723 — a trade and consumer protection statute — to regulate the practice of medicine," he added.

The remarks come after the High Court today granted a stay of enforcement of the Price Control and Anti-Profitteering (Price Marking

for Drug) Order 2025, pending the full disposal of the judicial review application.

MMA has previously urged the government to halt its plan to implement mandatory price labelling for medicines at private healthcare centres and community pharmacies.

It said the decision would allow a proper engagement and resolution of the concerns raised by the association.

Those fears included the need for a long-overdue revision of private general practitioner (GP) consultation fees and engagement on the price labelling policy.

Thirunavukarasu said a doctor treating a patient cannot be equated to a shopkeeper selling goods, adding that the distinction goes to the heart of how healthcare is defined under Malaysian law.

He said the imposition of Act 723 alongside existing regulations under Act 586 appears inconsistent with the government's Akta Iltizam commitment to reduce regulatory burden by at least 25 per cent and to apply a one-in-one-out policy.

Thirunavukarasu said there was a second concern.

The government's Akta Iltizam commits to cutting regulatory burden by at least 25 per cent and applying a one-in-one-out principle.

Private clinics are already regulated under Act 586, and the addition of Act 723 does not reduce burden — it expands it, in apparent tension with the government's own policy, he said.

Thirunavukarasu said MMA has engaged on the issue from the outset, through dialogue, a memorandum to the prime minister, and ultimately the courts, adding that litigation was a last resort after jurisdictional concerns raised with coalition partners remained unresolved for more than a year.

The High Court's stay of enforcement of the Price Control and Anti-Profiteering (Price Marking for Drug) Order 2025 does not settle the substantive legal questions, which will be determined in due course, he said.

MMA respects the process and will await the outcome, he said.

MMA urged the government to reflect on what the case has exposed — the layering of new regulatory controls on a fully regulated sector, under what it says is the wrong statutory framework and in contradiction of its own deregulation pledge.

"MMA remains committed to a private healthcare system that is transparent, accountable, and genuinely in the interest of patients," Thirunavukarasu said.