

WITNESS IS DULY SWORN ON:04.12.2025
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-P12 : OPD book

Ex-P13 : X-ray

Cross examination by advocate for Respondent
No.2:

It is true to suggest that I have not treated the petitioner personally. I have seen the petitioner only for assessing the disability. I have not taken opinion from the treated doctor. I have seen the discharge summary and wound certificate of petitioner. As per said documents, the petitioner is having fracture at tibia. It is true to suggest that as per discharge summary, the condition of petitioner was stable. The fractures are mal united. It is false to suggest that the mal union might be due to improper treatment. The petitioner

may require knee replacement in future. The fracture is at knee joint. It is false to suggest that there is no mention regarding fracture at knee joint in medical records. It is false to suggest that the knee replacement will decrease the disability. The calculation of disability is not explained in affidavit, but stated in Ex.P12. I have not issued any estimation regarding the future surgery. If the person seeking knee replacement is having BPL card, then the surgery will be conducted free of cost. Otherwise, the cost of surgery will be around Rs.1,00,000/-. I do not know whether the petitioner possesses BPC card or not. It is true to suggest that there is no mention about taking 50% of lower limb disability to consider the whole body disability in the guidelines. It is false to suggest that I have not assessed the disability properly. It is false to suggest that the percentage of disability varies after removal of implants. It is false to suggest that the disability assessed by me is premature. I have not assessed the functional disability.

The petitioner can do his routine work with difficulty. It is false to suggest that the problems stated by me are due to presence of implants. It is false to suggest that in order to help the petitioner I have assessed the disability at higher side and deposing falsely. It is false to suggest that I am not a competent person to assess the disability.

Cross examination by advocate for Respondent

No.1:

R1 absent. None represented. Hence, cross examination of PW2 by R1 is treated nil.

(Computerized to my dictation in Open Court.)

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

I ADDL.SCJ & ACJM.,