

Witness present and duly sworn in on:07.08.2021.

Cross examination: by Sri.HKR advocate for Respondent No.1.

It is true to suggest that I have not treated the petitioner. I have not seen the line of treatment given to the petitioner. But I know about the treatment given to the petitioner. The assessment made by me is based upon the discharge summary and the wound certificate and also the clinical examination. It is true to suggest that at the time of discharge the petitioner's condition was stable. It is true to suggest that both the fractures of the petitioner's is now united. It is true to suggest that the implants will be removed only after the complete recovery and no complications are found by the said fractures. It is true to suggest that the implants of the petitioner at right leg is removed. But in the instant case it is false to suggest that since the implants are removed after union of fracture, there is no disability to the petitioner. It is true to suggest that normally during the time of discharge from the hospital, the treating doctor would normally advise for a Physiotherapy for healing of the fractures. In the instant case there was no such suggestion by the treating doctor to the petitioner. It is false to suggest that since the loss of range of movements was not found, Physiotherapy was not advised to the petitioner. It is true to suggest that there is no complications to the petitioner with respect to both the lower limbs. It is false to suggest that the disability assessment with regard to mobility and stability to the right and left lower limb as per affidavit is just my imagination. It is true to suggest that the addition has not been mentioned

as per the telescopic formula. It is true to suggest that there is no shortening of limbs. It is true to suggest that the petitioner has not sustained any injuries pertaining to the knee. It is false to suggest that the percentage of disability with regard to right knee as assessed by me to the extend of 6% is my imagination. It is false to suggest that the stability components evaluated by me is on the basis of the say of the petitioner. I do not know about the occupation of the petitioner. I have not given any quotation regarding the future treatment to the petitioner.

2. The petitioner took treatment as a out patient at MVJ medical college, Bengaluru. I have not seen the follow up treatment availed by the petitioner. It is false to suggest that if the disability assessment is made as per the central government notification, the disability would come to 9%. It is false to suggest that in order to able the petitioner to get a higher compensation, I am falsely deposing before this court. It is false to suggest that the disability assessment made by me is against the central government notification and It is false to suggest that I have created Ex.P11 and P12 to help the petitioner.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Evidence deposed by the witness is computerized to my dictation in the open court).

R O I & A C

V Addl. Court of Small Causes Judge,
Court of Small Causes,
24th ACMM & Member MACT.