

WITNESS IS PRESENT AND DULY SWORN ON : 11.09.2025

Cross Examination by Sri.KS Advocate for R2:

- 1) I have not given treatment to the petitioner. While assessing the disability of the petitioner, I have not verified the old X-ray films and case sheet and followup treatment record pertaining to the petitioner.

- 2) It is true to suggest that I have only assessed the disability of the petitioner. It is true to suggest that I have only once examined the petitioner and assessed his disability. While assessing the disability of the petitioner, the petitioner was subjected to X-ray examination. It is true to suggest that I have not produced the Radiology report pertaining to the petitioner, but, only produced the X-ray films pertaining to petitioner.

- 3) It is true to suggest that the fractures sustained by the petitioner are united.

- 4) It is false to suggest that the petitioner never sustained any fracture injury to his right knee joint. It is true to suggest that as per the Discharge Summary the petitioner did not sustain any ligament injury.

- 5) It is false to suggest that since the petitioner has not sustained any ligament injury, certainly the petitioner has also not sustained any restriction of movement of knee joint.

- 6) It is true to suggest that in the report, I have not mentioned the details like how many steps the petitioner was asked to climb and asked to climb down the stairs and what distance the petitioner had walked and such other details.

- 7) It is false to suggest that as the fractured bones of the petitioner have already been united, the petitioner has not sustained any disability at all.

- 8) It is true to suggest that while assessing the wholebody disability of the petitioner, I have not taken only 1/3rd of the percentage of disability of particular limb.
- 9) I have not issued any disability certificate to the petitioner. It is false to suggest that as per the guidelines only after the removal of implants, the percentage of disability could be decided.
- 10) I have not advised any followup treatment to the petitioner. It is incorrect to state that as the petitioner had not sustained any difficulty or disability I have not suggested him for followup treatment.
- 11) It is true to suggest that I have not issued any estimation about the probable cost of another surgery for removal of implants.
- 12) It is false to suggest that the petitioner

(7)

SCCH – 01
MVC No.6036/2024
PW2

has not sustained any disability, yet, only with an intention to help the petitioner I am deposing false before this court.

Cross examination by R1:

R1 is 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.