

**WITNESS IS PRESENT AND DULY SWORN ON : 18.07.2025.**

**Cross Examination by Sri.GS Advocate for R2 :**

- 1) It is true to suggest that there is no implant in situ. It is true to suggest that the petitioner / Smt.Manjula does not require any future treatment. The fractures are completely united. The petitioner can walk without any support.
  
- 2) It is true to suggest that I have only assessed the physical disability of the petitioner.
  
- 3) **Question:** Can the petitioner perform her day-to-day activities ?  
**Answer:** with difficulty she can perform.
  
- 4) I cannot comment **if** I am asked to say that the petitioner can do supervisory works.
  
- 5) It is true to suggest that the petitioner does not have any severe restrictions of movement of the right knee joint. It is false to suggest that the mobility and stability disability assessed by me is against to the guidelines prescribed by the Central Social Welfare Ministry.

- 6) It is false to suggest that **as** I am not the treating doctor, I am incompetent to assess the so called disability of the petitioner.
- 7) It is false to suggest that only with an intention to help the petitioner, I have given false evidence and false report before this court.

**Cross examination by R1:**

R1 is placed Exparte. Hence cross examination by R1 is taken as nil.

**Re-examination : Nil.**

(Computerized as per my dictation in open court)

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

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