

**WITNESS IS DULY SWORN ON: 07.11.2025**

**Cross examination by advocate for Respondent No.2:**

It is true to suggest that I have treated the petitioner personally. I have furnished documents in that regard. The surgeries are conducted by me and my colleague doctor. I have given follow-up treatment. I have not furnished OPD records. I do not know whether the petitioner came directly to our hospital or referred by some other hospital. I do not know about registering the MLC in our hospital. There is reference in the records about MLC. I have not furnished MLC extract. It is true to suggest that the age of the petitioner is 70 years. It is false to suggest that the contents of para No.5 of my affidavit are false. The petitioner has not used artificial limb when he approached me. I do not know about the petitioner appearing before court by the help of artificial limb. If the petitioner purchased artificial limb already, then there is no necessity of purchasing the same again. I have not given estimation regarding artificial limb. The

fore arm fracture is united. It is false to suggest that I have assessed the disability wrongly and not assessed the disability according to guidelines. It is false to suggest that 1/3 of particular limb disability is to be considered for whole body disability and I have not considered the same. I do not know the avocation of petitioner. By use of artificial limb, the petitioner can lead the life with great difficulty. It is false to suggest that I have assessed the upper arm disability at higher rate. It is false to suggest that the age factor of petitioner is also contributing to the disability. It is false to suggest that in order to help the petitioner I have assessed the disability at higher side and deposing falsely.

**(Computerized to my dictation in Open Court.)**

**R.O.I. & A.C.,**

**I ADDL.SCJ & ACJM.,**