

**WITNESS IS PRESENT AND DULY SWORN ON : 24.11.2025**

**Cross Examination by Advocate Smt.PSU for Respondent NO.2:**

I have not given any treatment to the petitioner at any point of time.

2. I have not seen the Inpatient records and follow-up treatment records of the petitioner namely Smt.Mamarani Jena either before or during the assessment of the disability.

3. It is true to suggest that based on the data available in Wound Certificate and three Discharge Summaries I have assessed the percentage of disability of said Smt.Mamarani Jena.

4. I have not seen the accident in which the petitioner said to have sustained injuries, on the other hand, based on the information available in Wound Certificate I have just reiterated the same in my affidavit, filed in lieu of my examination in chief.

5. It is false to suggest that in the Wound Certificate and in the Discharge Summaries, pertaining to said Smt.Mamarani Jena, there is no mention about the facts which I have noted under the caption "She was diagnosed to have" to the effect that said Smt.Mamarani Jena sustained fractures of both right leg and left leg bones.

6. It is true to suggest that as per the Wound Certificate the petitioner Smt.Mamarani Jena had sustained comminuted fractures of only right leg bones.

7. It is false to suggest that the petitioner Smt.Mamarani Jena was subjected to surgery only to correct the fractured bones of right leg.

8. It is true to suggest that the fracture namely metacarpal head of left leg of the petitioner was treated conservatively.

9. It is true to suggest that soon after the

accident petitioner had visited Rajarajeshwari Hospital and took treatment only in that hospital. The witness volunteers that "The petitioner took treatment thrice in that hospital itself".

10. It is true to suggest that if the petitioner had sustained fracture of bones of both the legs, that too, displaced fractures, the same would have been reflected in the Wound Certificate. The witness volunteers that "Actually the same should have been mentioned in the Wound Certificate but for multiplicity of fractures".

11. It is false to suggest that petitioner Smt.Mamarani Jena had not sustained any fracture injuries to her left leg, thus, the same had not been reflected in the Wound Certificate.

12. The petitioner underwent surgery to both the legs.

13. It is false to suggest that when the petitioner had come to court to give evidence she was wearing normal healed slipper, and that itself indicates that she never ever suffered any shortening of any of the lower limbs.

14. It is false to suggest that if petitioner had taken physiotherapy regularly as advised by the doctor concerned, then, certainly she would not have had the stiffness of 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> fingers of her left hand.

15. It is false to suggest that only with an intention to help the petitioner I am falsely saying that the petitioner has got difficulties to do many co-ordinated activities by using her lower limbs at page no.3 of my affidavit.

16. It is true to suggest that the fractured bones of petitioner are united.

17. According to my knowledge, the doctor who had given treatment to the petitioner, had

only conducted surgery to Tibia Bone, but, never conducted surgery to correct the fibula bones of the right leg, hence, there is mall union.

18. I have not suggested any treatment to the petitioner for shortening of leg.

19. It is false to suggest that the petitioner has not at all sustained any loss of muscle power.

20. It is false to suggest that only 1/3rd of the percentage of the disability of the particular limb will become the whole body disability. It is true to suggest that I have only assessed the physical disability of the petitioner and I have not assessed the functional disability.

21. It is true to suggest that if the petitioner under goes surgery, for removal of implants, in any government hospital the charges will be very nominal.

**Cross Examination by Smt.SSS Advocate for R1:**

The learned advocate is present and submits that she also adopts the cross examination conducted by learned advocate for R2.

**Re-examination : Nil.**

(Computerized as per my dictation in open court)

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

**CHIEF JUDGE,**  
Court of Small Causes,  
Bengaluru.