

WITNESS IS DULY SWORN ON: 19.02.2026
Cross examination by advocate for Respondent
No.2:

It is true to suggest that as per Ex.P6, the petitioner sustained injury as he hit the four wheeler. For the suggestion that the nature of injuries sustained by petitioner could not be so sever if he wore helmet for which the witness states that it depends on the velocity of impact.

I cannot states that whether the bill furnish at serial No.1 of Ex.P10 is original or duplicate copy. Ex.P10 belongs to our hospital. It is true to suggest that if the medical is paid by any health insurance company, we will provide original bill to such company and a duplicate copy will be furnished to the patient. I cannot state whether the medical bill of petitioner is paid by any insurance company or not. It is false to suggest that I am intentionally evading to say regarding reimbursement of medical bills. It is true to suggest that it except tracheostomy, no other surgery to the head is conducted to the petitioner. It is true to suggest that tracheostomy means

inserting pipe to allow breathing. It is true to suggest that presently tracheostomy is closed and patient is breathing normally. It is false to suggest that the petitioner has not sustained stroke.

The petitioner is still under treatment as out patient. The complaints of patient will be mentioned in OP records. I have furnished OP records. The follow-up records are with patient. At the time of my examination, the petitioner does not have sever headache, giddiness or vomiting. The petitioner is having memory loss, but same is not mentioned in OP records as it is assessed neuro Psychologist. It is true to suggest that there is improvement in the condition of petitioner. It is true to suggest that I have not mentioned the formula for assessing the disability in my affidavit. I have not conducted the IQ test. In Ex.P6, there is mentioned about SAH which means there is blood clot. Presently, there is no blood clot.

For the suggestion that the person with cognitive impairment of 25% cannot state

history of two years, the witness states that he has not assessed the cognitive disability and as such, he cannot state about said aspect. It is true to suggest that I am not a competent person to assess cognitive disability. It is false to suggest that as the petitioner deposed properly before the court, he does not have cognitive impairment disability.

It is false to suggest that the petitioner does not have mental illness at present. It is false to suggest that there is no brain damage. At present GCS is normal. Normal GCS 15X15 and the score is E4V5M6. It is false to suggest that the petitioner is able to open his eyes, talk and walk.

It is false to suggest that the petitioner does not required any rehabilitation. I have suggested for rehabilitation and said aspect is mentioned in OPD record. It is false to suggest that I have not referred to rehabilitation center to the petitioner.

It is false to suggest that the petitioner does not have nerve injury. The problems which the petitioner has may or may not decrease on further treatment. It is false to suggest that the petitioner sustained only mild head injury. It is false to suggest that the condition of petitioner might become normal in future. It is false to suggest that I have not conducted clinical examination and assessed disability against guidelines. It is false to suggest that the petitioner will not have any disability if it has been assessed as per guidelines.

(Computerized to my dictation in Open Court.)

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

I ADDL.SCJ & ACJM.,