

WITNESS IS PRESENT AND DULY SWORN ON: 19.02.2026
Cross Examination by Sri. HGS Advocate for R1/Insurance
Company :

1. It is true to suggest that I have not given any treatment to said Vutukuru Lakshmi Sireesha at any point of time.
2. It is true to suggest that I have not issued any wound certificate to the petitioner by name Vutukuru Lakshmi Sireesha
3. I have not given any treatment to said petitioner at any point of time.
4. It is true to suggest that I have not seen the case sheets or the old X-rays pertaining to said petitioner while assessing the disability of the petitioner.
5. It is true to suggest that said petitioner has sustained one fracture injury to her left Tibia bone.

6. It is false to suggest that the fracture sustained by said petitioner is simple fracture. Witness volunteers that “it is comminuted fracture”.
7. It is false to suggest that unless we peruse the old X-ray films and case sheets we cannot decide the nature of the fracture sustained by the petitioner or injured person.
8. It is false to suggest that petitioner has taken only conservative treatment.
9. It is false to suggest that the petitioner has sustained only simple fracture injuries, and, hence, she was discharged from the hospital within two days.
10. It is true to suggest that the fractured bones of the petitioner have already been united and healed.
11. It is false to suggest that since the fractured bones of the petitioner have already been united the question of petitioner sustaining any kind of disability does not arise at all.

12. It is false to suggest that as of now the petitioner does not have any problem, **yet**, only with an intention to help the petitioner I am giving false evidence before this court.
13. It is false to suggest that while assessing the problem of the petitioner I have not followed the guidelines published by the Central Government.
14. It is false to suggest that the stability and mobility components of petitioner are normal.
15. It is true to suggest that I have not made the calculation in my affidavit, but, I have done the same in Ex.P18 itself.
16. It is false to suggest that if we apply the guideline fixed by the Government to the facts and circumstance of this case, then, at the most one can say that the petitioner has sustained only 6 percent of disability.

17. It is false to suggest that the petitioner has not sustained 17 percent of whole body disability.
18. It is false to suggest that only 1/3 rd of the percentage of problem of particular limb will become whole body disability.
19. It is false to suggest that only with an intention to help the petitioner I have given more percentage of disability than the actual percentage of disability.
20. It is false to suggest that the petitioner does not require any further treatment.

Cross examination by R2:

R2 is absent. 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.