

Witness present and duly sworn on 20.12.2025

Cross examination by Sri.RSS Advocate for Respondent:-

I have first seen and examined the petitioner on 30.08.2025. It is true to suggest that by the time of examination, the injuries were one year three months old. It is true to suggest that the petitioner underwent proper treatment in Santhosh & KIMS hospital. I am a specialized in brain and spine surgery.

2. It is true to suggest that the petitioner took conservative treatment for occipital bone fracture in Santhosh hospital. While examination, I did not suggest the x-ray or CT scan, because I expected the fracture to be healed. Hemorrhagic contusion right EDH SDH is related to the head injury. It is true to suggest that the neurosurgeon has treated for the injury-2 stated at Ex.P-6. It is true to suggest that subsequently the patient shifted to KIMS hospital, I have seen the discharge summary of KIMS hospital. Dr.Banuchandra has treated the petitioner in KIMS hospital. I have spoken with Dr.Banuchandra regarding treatment of the petitioner. Dr.Banuchandra is still working in KIMS hospital.

Question: Did he express the treatment and satisfaction about the improvement in the condition of the patient?

Ans: Yes.

3. It is true to suggest that there is a lot of improvement from date of accident till my examination. It is true to suggest that hematoma is clear and now brain injury is improved.

Question: Have you satisfied the improvement shown in the patient?

Ans: I have not satisfied fully because the patient is not fully normal and there is only partial improvement.

4. While examination, I have advised for the patient to undergo further treatment. I have advised for the patient to undergo the further treatment only to avoid further complications. It is true to suggest that I have arrived conclusion regarding the disability on the basis of assessment report at Ex.P-24 of Dr. Prathiba Sharan. It is true to suggest that when Ex.P-24 was not prepared in my presence. It is false to suggest that I am not a competent person to rely upon the Ex.P-24 report, because it was not prepared in my presence.

5. It is true to suggest that Ex.P-24 is one of the report to arrive at percentage of disability. It is true to suggest that the percentage of disability at 34.83% has been assessed by Dr.Prathiba Sharan. I have assessed

the neurological disability and have combined both and I arrived final disability.

5. I am aware that the petitioner appeared and deposed evidence before this court. It is true to suggest that during the cross examination, he comprehend the questions posed to him and answer the same. I am aware petitioner's occupation. It is true to suggest that I have assessed the disability based on physical condition of the petitioner. It is false to suggest that I and Dr.Prathiba Sharan have assessed the disability at 50% on the higher side.

6. It is false to suggest that the patient is not carrying much less the disability which I have stated. It is false to suggest that in order to help the petitioner, I have assessed the disability on the higher side.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerised to my dictation in the Open Court).

R.O.I. & A.C.

II Addl. Judge

