

WITNESS IS DULY SWORN ON:05.06.2026
EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY ADVOCATE FOR
PETITIONER :

Today, I have filed chief examination affidavit in lieu of oral evidence. I know the contents of affidavit sworn by me which are true and correct and it bears my signature.

I have produced the following documents,

- Ex-P24 : Clinical Note
- Ex-P25 : MMSE assessment report
- Ex-P26 : MRI report
- Ex-P27 : X-rays

Cross examination by advocate for Respondent No.1:

It is true to suggest that I have not treated the petitioner personally. I have seen the IP record and discharge summary of petitioner. I have not furnished said documents which I have seen. I have no personal knowledge related to accident and accidental injuries, but I have seen the medical records.

It is false to suggest that in order to help the petitioner I have created documents

and furnished the same. It is true to suggest that I have not taken opinion from the treated doctor. I have not seen the petitioner while he was availing treatment at the hospital. The petitioner has not been referred to me by any hospitals, but the petitioner approached me only for assessment of disability. For the suggestion that the petitioner is not came to me by getting discharged, the witness states that the petitioner is still under treatment. It is false to suggest that the aspects stated in para No.4 to 6 are false. It is false to suggest that in order to help the petitioner I have mentioned false aspects in my affidavit and assessed the disability at higher side.

For the suggestion that in the medical records of petitioner there is no mention of percentage of disability, the witness states that the aspect of percentage of disability will not the mentioned in the medical records and same will be given medical board or equivalent authority. It is false to

suggest that I am not a competent person to assess the disability since I have not taken opinion from the treated doctor. It is false to suggest that there is improvement in the condition of petitioner. It is false to suggest that I have mentioned the disability falsely. It is false to suggest that the petitioner is completely improved.

Cross examination by advocate for Respondent No.2:

Counsel for R2 adopt the cross examination done by R1.

(Computerized to my dictation in Open Court.)

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

I ADDL.SCJ & ACJM.,