

R/At No. 47, 1st Floor, Dasanpur Hobli,
Lakshmipura, Bengaluru-562162.

Permanent Address
Sambrama Nilaya 2nd Stage, Jayanagar,
Opp MCE Collage, Hassan-573201.

(By Sri.Ashok Kumar, Adv.)

Vs.

Respondents in
both the
petitions:

1. M/s Cholamandalam Ms Gen Ins Co.
Ltd.,
TP Claim Hub,
“Golden Heights” Complex, Ninth Floor,
Level-6, 59th Cross, Dr. Rajkumar Road,
Near Sujatha Theater,
Bengaluru-560010.

Policy No.3362/60062252/000/00
Validity: 06-09-2023 to 05-09-2024.

(By Smt. Suma, Adv.)

2. Mr.Hemanth .H.P.
S/o Prakash K.M.
R/At S A S 49
Thalagara Street
Hemanth Complex
Hassan Dist-573201

(Exparte)

COMMON JUDGMENT

These two petitions are filed by the Petitioners U/s.166 of MV Act, seeking compensation amount for the injuries sustained by them in a road traffic accident.

2. The cases are arising out of one and same accident, the respondents are one and the same, therefore, these cases are clubbed to trial and dispose together to save the precious time of the court and to avoid repetition of facts and to make convenient to the parties. The evidence is led in MVC.No.2054/2024.

3. The facts of the case are that on 15.01.2024, at about 1:00 a.m., the petitioners were travelling as passengers in a car bearing Registration No. KA-13-N-6537 (hereinafter referred to as the “offending vehicle”) towards Hassan. When the vehicle reached near Ranganathapura Village on NH-75, B.M. Road, Shanthigrama, Hassan District, a dog suddenly came onto the road from the opposite direction. In an attempt to avoid hitting the dog, the driver, Likith

gowda, abruptly applied the brakes and lost control of the vehicle, causing the car to topple on the road.

4. As a result of the accident, both petitioners sustained grievous injuries. They were immediately shifted to the Government Hospital, Hassan, where they received first aid and were thereafter referred to Manjunatha Hospital, Hassan, where they underwent further treatment as in-patients.

5. According to the petitioners, at the time of the accident they were employed as Zomato delivery boys, earning Rs. 30,000/- per month each. It is their case that they have suffered permanent disabilities due to the injuries sustained in the accident and, consequently, are unable to lead their normal lives or earn as they did prior to the accident. They further contend that they have incurred substantial medical and incidental expenses. Alleging that the accident occurred due to the negligence of the driver of the offending vehicle, they seek compensation from Respondent No. 1 (insurer) and Respondent No. 2 (owner), who are stated to be jointly and severally liable.

6. Upon service of notice, Respondent No. 1 appeared through counsel and filed its written statement, while Respondent No. 2 remained absent and was placed ex parte.

7. In its written statement, Respondent No. 1 denied the petition averments and contended that the issuance of the insurance policy in respect of the offending vehicle was subject to verification by the concerned branch office and that any liability would be governed by the terms and conditions of the policy. It denied that the accident occurred due to the rash or negligent driving of the driver of the offending vehicle and asserted that the petitioners themselves contributed to their injuries by not wearing seat belts while travelling in the car. It further contended that the driver did not possess a valid and effective driving licence or fitness certificate as on the date of the accident. The insurer also pleaded that the claim petition was not maintainable for non-compliance with Section 158(6) of the Motor Vehicles Act.

8. Further, Respondent No. 1 denied the nature of the injuries, treatment, disability, occupation, income, medical expenses, loss of earning capacity, and all other consequential losses claimed by the petitioners. It contended that the compensation claimed is excessive, untenable, and without legal basis, and accordingly prayed for dismissal of the claim petitions.

9. On the basis of above pleadings, the following issues have been framed in both the cases:

IN MVC.2054/2024:

1. Whether the petitioner proves that he sustained grievous injuries in a Road Traffic Accident occurred on 15-01-2024 at about 1.00 a.m., on NH-75 B.M.Road, near Ranganathapura village, Shanthigrama hobli, Hassan District, due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of Car bearing No.KA-13-N-6537?

2. Whether the petitioner is entitled for compensation ? If so, what amount?

3. What order or award?

IN MVC.3923/2024:

1. Whether the petitioner proves that he sustained grievous injuries in a Road Traffic Accident occurred on 15-01-2024 at about 1.00 a.m., on NH-75 B.M.Road, near Ranganathapura village, Shanthigrama hobli, Hassan District, due to the rash and negligent driving of the driver of Car bearing No.KA-13-N-6537?

2. Whether the petitioner is entitled for compensation ? If so, what amount?

3. What order or award?

10. In order to substantiate the claim, the Petitioner in MVC 2054/24 and Petitioner in MVC 3923/24 have examined themselves as PW.1 and 2: in support of their case, 3 witnesses are examined as PW-3 to 5 and in all 29 documents are produced which are marked as Ex.P1 to 29.

11. The Respondents have not chosen to adduce any oral and documentary evidence.

12. I have heard the counsel on both sides and have perused the material on record.

13. On the basis of evidence and material available on record and by considering the facts, I have answered the above issues in both the cases as under:

Issue No.1: In the Affirmative.

Issue No.2: Partly in affirmative.

Issue No.3: As per the final order,
for the following:

REASONS

14. Issue No.1 in both petitions:- Both Petitioners have stated that on 15.01.2024, at about 1:00 a.m., the petitioners were travelling as passengers in the offending vehicle towards Hassan. When the vehicle reached near Ranganathapura Village on NH-75, B.M. Road, Shanthigrama, Hassan District, a dog suddenly came onto the road from the opposite direction. In an attempt to avoid hitting the dog, the driver, Likith gowda, abruptly applied the brakes and lost control of the vehicle, causing the car to topple on the road. As a result of the accident, both petitioners sustained grievous injuries.

15. In order to substantiate their case, the petitioners examined themselves as PW-1 and PW-2 and filed their affidavits in lieu of chief examination

under Order XVIII Rule 4 of the Code of Civil Procedure, reiterating the averments made in the claim petitions.

16. The petitioners relied upon documentary evidence marked as Exhibits P-1 to P-9 and Exhibit P-15, comprising the First Information Report (FIR), complaint, spot mahazar, notice and reply notice, IMV report, wound certificates, and charge sheet. The records disclose that, based on the first information statement, the FIR was registered, the spot mahazar was conducted, the offending vehicle was inspected, and upon completion of the investigation, the police filed a charge sheet against the driver of the offending car. The IMV report pertains to the inspection of the said car. The wound certificates further establish that both petitioners sustained grievous injuries in the accident.

17. The principal defence of Respondent No. 1 is that the petitioners contributed to their injuries by not wearing seat belts and that, had they worn them, the injuries could have been avoided or minimized. It was also suggested during the cross-examination of PW-1

and PW-2 that the occupants of the vehicle had consumed alcohol and non-vegetarian food and that the driver was driving the car at a high speed, resulting in the accident.

18. However, Respondent No. 1 has not produced any oral or documentary evidence to substantiate these allegations. Apart from making suggestions during cross-examination and raising such pleas in the written statement, no material has been placed on record to establish contributory negligence on the part of the petitioners or to rebut the allegation of negligence against the driver of the offending vehicle. Likewise, there is no evidence to prove that the driver lacked due care or that the accident occurred for any reason other than the manner reflected in the police records.

19. On the contrary, the testimony of PW-1 and PW-2 is consistent and finds corroboration from the contemporaneous police documents, including the FIR, mahazar, IMV report, wound certificates, and charge sheet. The investigation culminated in the filing of a charge sheet against the driver of the offending car,

indicating that the accident occurred when the driver suddenly applied the brakes in an attempt to avoid a dog crossing the road, lost control of the vehicle, and caused it to topple.

20. It is well settled that proceedings under the Motor Vehicles Act are summary in nature and that the Act is a beneficial piece of legislation. The Tribunal is not expected to insist upon strict proof of negligence as required in a civil suit. On the basis of the oral and documentary evidence available on record, this Tribunal is satisfied that the accident occurred due to the negligent driving of the offending car and that both petitioners sustained grievous injuries as a consequence thereof. **Accordingly, Issue No. 1 in both the petitions is answered in the Affirmative.**

21. Issue No.2 in MVC 2054/2024 : The petitioner has stated that he was aged 20 years as on the date of the accident. According to him, due to the accident, he sustained grievous injuries and was initially shifted to the Government Hospital, Hassan, where he received first aid. Thereafter, he was referred to Manjunatha Hospital, Hassan, where he underwent

treatment as an inpatient. After discharge, he continued follow-up treatment at the Government Hospital. He has further deposed that, on account of the injuries sustained in the accident, he is unable to perform his work as before, has suffered loss of income, and faces difficulty in carrying out his day-to-day activities.

22. To substantiate the treatment undergone by him, the petitioner examined the Medical Records Department (MRD) official of Manjunatha Hospital as PW-4, who produced the relevant medical records marked as Exhibit P-23.

23. To prove the nature of injuries and permanent disability, the petitioner examined Dr. S.A. Somashekhar, Orthopaedic Surgeon, Victoria Hospital, Bengaluru, as PW-3. PW-3 deposed that the petitioner sustained a closed comminuted fracture of the middle third of the right humerus and an undisplaced fracture of the right ulna in the road traffic accident dated 15.01.2024. He further stated that the petitioner underwent Open Reduction and Internal Fixation (ORIF) with Locking Compression Plate (LCP) fixation for the fracture of the right humerus.

24. PW-3 further deposed that he conducted clinical and radiological examinations for assessment of disability and noted complaints of pain, difficulty in using the right upper limb for daily activities, tingling sensation and paresthesia over the ulnar aspect of the right forearm and hand, inability to extend the right fingers, difficulty in gripping objects, and inability to lift weights. Based on his assessment, he opined that the petitioner had sustained 42% permanent physical disability of the right upper limb, corresponding to 21% permanent disability to the whole body. He produced the clinical notes, OPD records, and X-rays, which were marked as Exhibits P-21 and P-22.

25. During cross-examination, PW-3 admitted that he was not the treating doctor and had assessed the disability only for evaluation purposes. His evidence also indicates that the assessment relates to physical disability and not necessarily to the petitioner's functional disability or loss of earning capacity.

26. Therefore, while the assessment of PW-3 cannot be accepted in its entirety for determining functional disability, it cannot be ignored that the

petitioner sustained grievous injuries, namely a comminuted fracture of the right humerus and an undisplaced fracture of the right ulna, underwent surgical intervention, and continues to experience residual pain and restriction of movement.

27. Considering the nature and location of the injuries, the treatment undergone, the age of the petitioner, his avocation as a Zomato delivery boy, and the evidence regarding persistent pain and functional limitations, it is evident that the injuries would impose certain restrictions on his mobility, lifting capacity, and use of the right upper limb, thereby affecting his day-to-day activities and earning capacity to some extent.

28. On an overall appreciation of the oral and documentary evidence, and bearing in mind that PW-3 has assessed only the physical disability and not the functional disability, this Tribunal is of the considered opinion that it would be just and reasonable to assess the petitioner's functional disability to the whole body at 9% for the purpose of computing loss of future earning capacity.

29. In the petition the age of the petitioner is mentioned as 20 years. Wherein Ex.P.10 Aadhar card shows that he was born on 16-09-2004, the same is considered as age of the petitioner as on the date of accident as 20 years and the multiplier applicable to the case on hand is **18**.

30. Due to the accident, he has sustained grievous injuries. He has stated that at the time of accident, he was working as a Zomoto Delivery boy and earning a sum of Rs.30,000/- per month. Due to the accidental injuries, he is unable to do his work and is unable to do his work as earlier and suffering huge loss of income. However, the petitioner has not produced any documents to prove his avocation and income. In the absence of material with regard to source of income, the tribunal has to be considered the notional income chart of the Lok Adalath.

31. The alleged accident has taken place in the year 2024, the notional income of the injured could be assessed at Rs 16,500/- Per Month.

32. Thus this tribunal is of the opinion that the petitioner who sustained the injuries is entitled for compensation under the following heads:

33. Loss of future income on account of permanent disability: Considering the petitioner's grievous injury which has resulted in performing daily vocational activities, this court is of the opinion that the functional disability of 9% is reasonable and just.

34. The petitioner was 20 years old as on date of alleged accident and the multiplier applicable to the petitioner as per decision laid down by Hon'ble Apex court in **Sarla Verma's case is at 18**. The notional income taken as $\text{Rs.}16,500 \times 12 \times 18 \times 9/100 = \text{Rs.}3,20,760/-$ towards loss of future income.

35. Pain and sufferings: So far as the compensation under non-pecuniary damages are concerned, considering the nature of the injury, which has resulted in difficulty in mobility and in performing daily vocational activities, as well as the duration of inpatient treatment and physical and mental suffering endured by the petitioner, **this tribunal is of the opinion that an amount of ₹.40,000/- would be just**

and fair compensation under the head of pain and sufferings.

36. Loss of amenities of life: undoubtedly the petitioner is suffering from difficulties in performing day to day activities and is facing continuous hardship due to the disability. **Therefore this tribunal finds to appropriate to award a sum ₹.25,000/- under head of loss of amenities of life.**

37. **Medical expenses:** Under the pecuniary damages, expenses relating to treatment, hospitalization and medicines, the Petitioner has relied on medical bills for ₹.1,77,237/- at Ex.P.12. On perusal of said medical bills it appears that the petitioner has spent Rs.1,77,237/- towards medical expenses. The medical bills appears to be genuine. Hence, Petitioner is awarded ₹.1,77,237/- towards Medical Expenses.

38. **Future Medical Expenses:** PW-3 has stated that the petitioner needs another surgery for removal of implant, which cost Rs.40,000/-. But he has not produced any estimation report. In the absence of

material evidence, it is just and reasonable to award **Rs.20,000/- towards future medical expenses.**

39. **Conveyance, food, nourishment and attendant charges:** Ex.P.9 - Discharge summary shows that Petitioner was treated as an inpatient at Manjunatha hospital, Hassan, from 15-01-2024 to 20-01-2024 i.e. totally for a period of 6 days. Therefore, it is just and reasonable to award compensation of **₹.6,000/-** under the head of conveyance, food, nourishment and attendant charges.

40. **Loss of earning during laid up period:** With regard to the loss of earnings during treatment period, Considering the nature of the grievous injury, which has resulted in significant difficulty in carrying out daily vocational activities, as well as the duration of impatient treatment and recovery, this tribunal considers the 2 months for rest is considered . As the monthly income of the Petitioner is already considered as ₹.16,500/- per month, **loss of earning during laid up period would be ₹.16,500 x 2 = Rs.33,000/-.**

41. Thus the compensation awarded under the various heads are as under:

Sl. No.	Nature of Compensation	Amount
1.	Loss of future earnings	₹ 3,20,760/-
2.	Pain and Sufferings	₹ 40,000/-
3.	Loss of amenities	₹ 25,000/-
4.	Medical expenses	₹ 1,77,237/-
5.	Future medical expenses	₹ 20,000/-
6.	Conveyance, Food, Nourishment & Attendant charges	₹ 6,000/-
7.	Loss of income during laid up period	₹ 33,000/-
	Total	₹ 6,21,997/-

42. **Issue No.2 in MVC.3923/2024:** The petitioner has stated that he was 20 years of age as on the date of the accident. According to him, due to the accident, he sustained grievous injuries and was immediately shifted to the Government Hospital, Hassan. After receiving first aid, he was referred to Manjunatha Hospital, Hassan, where he underwent treatment as an inpatient. After his discharge, he continued to take follow-up treatment.

43. The petitioner has further deposed that, at the time of the accident, he was working as a Zomato

delivery boy and earning Rs. 30,000/- per month. Owing to the injuries sustained in the accident, he is unable to perform his work as before, has suffered loss of income, and is facing considerable difficulty in carrying out his day-to-day activities.

44. To prove the treatment received at Manjunatha Hospital, the petitioner examined the Medical Records Officer of the said hospital as PW-4, who produced the relevant medical records marked as Exhibit P-24.

45. For the purpose of establishing the nature of injuries and the extent of disability, the petitioner examined PW-5, Dr. Shailesh A.V. Rao, Senior Consultant Neurosurgeon, who produced medical records marked as Exhibits P-25 and P-26. PW-5 deposed that the petitioner sustained head injuries in the road traffic accident and was treated at Manjunatha Hospital, Hassan. At the time of admission, the petitioner's (GCS) score was E3V5M6, and he was diagnosed with a scalp laceration, right temporal bone fracture with extradural hematoma, and left caudate nucleus contusion. He was managed

conservatively with medication, and at the time of discharge, his GCS had improved to E4V5M6.

46. PW-5 further deposed that, following the accident, the petitioner continues to complain of frequent headaches, giddiness, impaired memory, and inability to perform his previous work efficiently. On clinical assessment, he found the petitioner to be conscious and ambulant, with a scar over the right side of the head, impaired memory and intelligence, and decreased hearing on the left side. The petitioner underwent a MMSE and secured a score of 21 out of 30, indicative of cognitive impairment. His IQ was assessed at 107, which falls within the normal range. On further assessment, PW-5 opined that the petitioner suffers from approximately 10% neuro-cognitive disability to the whole body, which is likely to be permanent.

47. During cross-examination, PW-5 admitted that he was not the treating doctor and that the petitioner had undergone conservative management for the head injury. He also acknowledged that the petitioner's IQ level is normal and that only some

degree of impairment was noticed in the Mini-Mental State Examination.

48. Although the assessment made by PW-5 cannot be accepted in its entirety for determining functional disability, it cannot be overlooked that the petitioner sustained grievous head injuries and continues to experience residual symptoms such as headaches and cognitive impairment. Considering the nature and location of the injuries, the treatment undergone, the age of the petitioner, and his occupation as a Zomato delivery boy, it is evident that the residual cognitive deficits are likely to impose certain limitations on his efficiency and day-to-day work performance.

49. Taking into consideration the oral and documentary evidence on record, and bearing in mind that the disability assessed by PW-5 pertains primarily to neurocognitive impairment and not necessarily to actual loss of earning capacity, this Tribunal is of the considered opinion that it would be just and reasonable to assess the functional disability to the whole body at 6% for the purpose of computing the loss of future earning capacity.

50. In the petition the age of the petitioner is mentioned as 20 years. Wherein Ex.P.16 Aadhar card shows that he was born on 21-07-2004, the same is considered as age of the petitioner as on the date of accident as 20 years and the multiplier applicable to the case on hand is **18**.

51. Due to the accident, he has sustained grievous injuries. He has stated that at the time of accident, he was working as a Zomoto Delivery boy and earning a sum of Rs.30,000/- per month. Due to the accidental injuries, he is unable to do his work and is unable to do his work as earlier and suffering huge loss of income. However, the petitioner has not produced any documents to prove his avocation and income. In the absence of material with regard to source of income, the tribunal has to be considered the notional income chart of the Lok Adalath.

52. The alleged accident has taken place in the year 2024, the notional income of the injured could be assessed at Rs 16,500/- Per Month.

53. Thus this tribunal is of the opinion that the petitioner who sustained the injuries is entitled for compensation under the following heads:

54. **Loss of future income on account of permanent disability:** Considering the petitioner's grievous injury which has resulted in performing daily vocational activities, this court is of the opinion that the functional disability of 6% is reasonable and just.

55. The petitioner was 20 years old as on date of alleged accident and the multiplier applicable to the petitioner as per decision laid down by Hon'ble Apex court in **Sarla Verma's case is at 18**. The notional income taken as $\text{Rs.}16,500 \times 12 \times 18 \times 6/100 = \text{Rs.}2,13,840/-$ towards loss of future income.

56. **Pain and sufferings:** The evidence on record establishes that the petitioner sustained grievous injuries in the road traffic accident and underwent inpatient treatment at Manjunatha Hospital, Hassan. The medical records and the testimony of the doctors reveal that the petitioner suffered head injuries requiring hospitalization, medical management, and follow-up treatment. It is evident that he would have

undergone considerable physical pain, mental agony, and trauma during the course of treatment and recovery.

57. Considering the nature of the injuries, the period of hospitalization, the treatment undergone, and the attendant pain and discomfort, **this tribunal is of the opinion that an amount of ₹.30,000/- would be just and fair compensation under the head of pain and sufferings.**

58. Loss of amenities of life: The petitioner has also deposed that, due to the injuries sustained in the accident, he is unable to lead his normal life as he did prior to the accident and experiences difficulty in performing his day-to-day activities. The medical evidence on record indicates that he continues to suffer from residual disability and functional limitations. Although the assessed functional disability has been taken into account separately for determining the loss of future earning capacity, the evidence also demonstrates that the petitioner has been deprived, to some extent, of the ordinary pleasures and conveniences of life.

59. Having regard to the age of the petitioner, the nature of the injuries, the residual pain and disability, and the impact on his day-to-day activities and enjoyment of life, **this tribunal finds to appropriate to award a sum ₹.25,000/- under head of loss of amenities of life.**

60. **Medical expenses:** Under the pecuniary damages, expenses relating to treatment, hospitalization and medicines, the Petitioner has relied on medical bills for ₹.1,37,480/- at Ex.P.18. On perusal of said medical bills it appears that the petitioner has spent Rs.1,37,480/- towards medical expenses. The medical bills appears to be genuine. Hence, Petitioner is awarded ₹.1,37,480/- towards Medical Expenses.

61. **Conveyance, food, nourishment and attendant charges:** Ex.P.24 – Case sheet shows that Petitioner was treated as an inpatient at Manjunatha hospital, Hassan, from 15-01-2024 to 20-01-2024 i.e. totally for a period of 6 days. Therefore, it is just and reasonable to award compensation of **₹.6,000/-** under the head of conveyance, food, nourishment and attendant charges.

62. **Loss of earning during laid up period**: With regard to the loss of earnings during treatment period, Considering the nature of the grievous injury, which has resulted in significant difficulty in carrying out daily vocational activities, as well as the duration of impatient treatment and recovery, this tribunal considers the 2 months for rest is considered . As the monthly income of the Petitioner is already considered as ₹.16,500/- per month, **loss of earning during laid up period would be ₹.16,500 x 2 = Rs.33,000/-**.

63. Thus the compensation awarded under the various heads are as under:

Sl. No.	Nature of Compensation	Amount
1.	Loss of future earnings	₹ 2,13,840/-
2.	Pain and Sufferings	₹ 30,000/-
3.	Loss of amenities	₹ 25,000/-
4.	Medical expenses	₹ 1,37,480/-
5.	Conveyance, Food, Nourishment & Attendant charges	₹ 6,000/-
6.	Loss of income during laid up period	₹ 33,000/-
	Total	₹ 4,45,320/-

64. Liability: As it is already held in issue No.1 that it was the negligence on the part of the driver of the offending vehicle in causing the accident, which was insured with 1st Respondent - insurance company. Hence, the Respondents No.1 and 2 are jointly and severally liable to pay the compensation. The policy was in existence as on the date of accident and hence Respondent No.1-insurance company is liable to indemnify the claim of the injured Petitioners with interest @ 6% p.a. Accordingly, I answer **Issue No.2** in both the petitions ***partly in the affirmative.***

65. Issue No.3 in both the petitions: In view of the above discussion, reasons stated and findings given to Issue Nos.1 & 2, I proceed to pass the following:

ORDER

Both claim Petitions filed under Sec.166 of M.V. Act is allowed in part with cost.

Petitioner in **MVC.2054/2024** is awarded compensation of **₹6,21,997/-** together with interest @ 6% p.a. (except future medical expenses) from the date of petition till the realisation.

Petitioner in **MVC.3923/2024** is awarded compensation of **₹4,45,320/-** together with interest @ 6% p.a. from the date of petition till the realisation.

Respondent No.1 shall deposit the compensation amount within two months from the date of this order.

After deposit of the compensation amount in both the cases, entire amount with interest shall be released in favour of the Petitioners through E-payment on proper identification and verification.

Advocate fee is fixed at ₹1,000/- each.

Draw award accordingly.

(Dictated to the Stenographer directly on computer, corrected, signed and pronounced by me in open court dated this the 19th day of June 2026).

(SHYLA S.M.)
II Addl. Judge & ACJM,
Member, MACT
Court of Small Causes,
Bengaluru.

ANNEXURE

List of witnesses examined for Petitioners :

PW.1	Pramanth P.Gowda
PW.2	Mohith H.N.
PW.3	Dr.S.A.Somashekar
PW.4	Pushpalatha

PW.5 Dr.Shailesh A.V.Rao

List of documents marked for Petitioners :

- Ex.P.1 : True Copy of FIR
- Ex.P.2 : True Copy of Complaint
- Ex.P.3 : True Copy of Spot Mahazar
- Ex.P.4 & 5 : True Copy of notice and reply
- Ex.P.6 : True Copy of IMV Report
- Ex.P.7 : True Copy of Wound Certificate
- Ex.P.8 : True Copy of charge sheet
- Ex.P.9 : Discharge summary
- Ex.P.10 : True copy of Aadhaar Card of PW-1
- Ex.P.11 : Prescriptions
- Ex.P.12 : Medical bills
- Ex.P.13 : Photos with CD
- Ex.P.14 : X-rays
- Ex.P.15 : True copy of wound certificate
- Ex.P.16 : True copy of Aadhaar card of Pw-2
- Ex.P.17 : Prescriptions
- Ex.P.18 : Medical bills
- Ex.P.19 : Photos with CD
- Ex.P.20 : OPD card
- Ex.P.21 : X-ray
- Ex.P.22 : Authorization letter
- Ex.P.23 : Case sheet

- Ex.P.24 : Case sheet
Ex.P.25 : OPD record
Ex.P.26 : Mini mental status examination report
Ex.P.27 : Skull X-ray report
Ex.P.28 : CT brain report
Ex.P.29 : Neuro -Psychological assessment report

List of witnesses examined for Respondents:

-None-

List of documents marked for Respondents:

-Nil-

**(SHYLA S.M.)
II Addl. Judge & ACJM,
Member, MACT
Court of Small Causes,
Bengaluru.**