

Witness duly sworn on : 07.11.2024

Chief examination by Sri.RBY Advocate for petitioner

This witness has filed an affidavit in lieu of examination in chief and on oath he has submitted that the contents of the affidavit are true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

I can identify my signature on Ex-P25. As the witness has identified his signature on Ex-P25, the said signature is marked as Ex-P25(a).

Cross Examination by Sri. BVP for Respondent No.3

I have not treated the petitioner. Petitioner has underwent surgery. The date of surgery is 14.10.2021. For the question in disability certificate the date is mentioned as 14.10.2023 witness answers that, by mistake it is written he was admitted on 14.10.2021. ICD means Inter Costal Drainage. The petitioner had developed chest injury that is Pneumothorax there by ICD was done. Air was collected in lungs to remove that they have done ICD. The surgery was successful. It is true to suggest that, in wound certificate only injury No.2 is stated as fracture and rest of injuries are grievous in nature. It is true to suggest that, all grievous injuries are not compulsorily fractures. It is true to suggest that, all fractures will be grievous in nature. It is true to

suggest that, for injury No.1, 3 and 4 the petitioner has been treated conservatively. It is true to suggest that, Pubic Diastasis is a rare injury. It is false to suggest that, this type of injury normally occur in females. It is false to suggest that, said injury do not need any treatment and it gets cured by physiotherapy and complete bed rest. It is true to suggest that, the petitioner has no neurological problem.

2. For the question whether contusion temporal has resulted in any disability witness answers that, it has led to persistent headache and vertigo. It is false to suggest that, Sparsh Hospital record reflects no result and effect due to temporal contusion. For the question the head injuries of petitioner is cured witness answers that, still he is having headache and vertigo. It is true to suggest that, my disability assessment is with regard to all four injuries. I did not take expert opinion of neuro regarding injury No.1. It is false to suggest that, the petitioner has not undergone MRI and CT Scan for injury No.1, 3 and 4. It is true to suggest that, in my disability certificate there is no mention about MRI and CT Scan witness volunteers that, in discharge summary it is mentioned. It is false to suggest that, in Sparsh Scan report it is written as no significant changes. It is false to suggest that, the injuries sustained by petitioner are all cured without any

difficulty. It is false to suggest that, I have not properly verified the treatment record of the petitioner.

3. It is false to suggest that, there is no restriction of movement. It is false to suggest that, I have falsely stated that movement of chest has decreased. It is false to suggest that, petitioner has no limping while walking. It is false to suggest that, petitioner has no difficulty as per my disability certificate. It is false to suggest that, the petitioner is able to do his day to day activities even today. It is false to suggest that, petitioner has not suffered any disability. It is false to suggest that, I have not followed guidelines before issuing disability certificate. It is false to suggest that, my assessment of disability of 25% is without any basis. It is false to suggest that, to substantiate Ex-P25/disability certificate I am deposing falsely before the court.

Re-examination : NIL .

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I & A.C.

II Addl.Sr.Civil Judge Ballari.