

[C.R.P.67]

Form No.4 (Civil)
Deposition Sheets
(R.P.No.57)**IN THE COURT OF I ADDL., DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE , BENGALURU RURAL
DISTRICT, BENGALURU.****Sessions Case No. 135/2024****PW 3 CW 13**

Deposition of	Dr,Basappa.S.Hugar
Father name	Subhash hugar
Age	45 Years
Occupation	Casualty medical officer, Lakshmi multispeciality hospital Bengaluru.
Residence	Mattikere, Bengaluru

Duly sworn on 06.02.2026**Examination in chief by the Public Prosecutor.**

For the last five year I have been working for M/s. Sri. Lakshmi Multi Speciality hospital.

2. So far as the present case is concerned I have examined Smt. Geetha, who appeared before me for medical examination with the history of assault at 10.15 p.m by known person at her residence she appeared on that day at 11.10 p.m.

3. Upon my examination I noticed lacerated wound measuring 8cm x 1 cm muscle deep upon her left cheek besides another lacerated wound measuring 2 cm x 0.5 cm into bone deep upon her left side chin. Those injuries were treated with suturing. In my opinion those injuries are grievous in nature. Those injuries were fresh and consistent with blunt force assault. In this behalf I had

issued wound certificate shown to me now. The same is now marked at Ex.P8 and my signature therein as Ex.P8(a). On the same night at the same date and time I have examined another lady by name Mahadevamma who also came with an history of assault at 10.25 pm by known person at her residence. Upon examining her at 11.10p.m I noticed a laceration with near anticipation of left external pinna and another pinna, lacerated wound measuring 6 x 2 cms upon the right front neck portion near carotid region , another lacerated wound with tendon injury measuring 5 x 2cm into bone deep present over her left hand and naother lacerated injury measuring 3 x 1 into bone deep over the top of her left shoulder. Those injuries were treated with surgical management in my view the first three injuries mentioned supra are greivous by nature and the last one is simple in nature. Those injuries were fresh and consistent with blunt force assault. In this behalf I have issued the wound certificate. The same is now marked at Ex.P9 and my signature therein as Ex.P9(a).

4. The I.O had produced a photograph depicting a weapon and called upon me to form an opinion with regard to the nexus between the depicted weapon and the injuries noticed by me in Ex.P8 and 9. In his behalf I have given my opinion as per the document identified by me now. The same is marked at Ex.P10 and my signature therein as Ex.P10(a). The photo shown to me by the I.O is now marked at Ex.P11.

Cross examination by Sri.R.P.R. Advocate. appearing for Accused:

5. On the relevant date I was the casualty medical officer. It is true to suggest that we maintain MLC register with serial numbers.

6. It was some other doctor who treated the injured Mahadevamma with surgery. I did not take the report of concerned surgeon as suggested for the reason that the injury I noticed is very much visible and the same gave no necessity to receive the report of surgeon. The lacerated injuries mentioned in Ex.P8 and 9 are cut lacerated injuries. It is not true to suggest that when an injured was assaulted with blunt object there is no scope to sustain cut lacerated injury. The injuries I noticed were external. It is not true to suggest that Ex.P8 and 9 are incomplete opinions.

7. It is true to suggest that before coming to our hospital the injured persons had gone to some other hospital and then they came to our hospital. I have not annexed document of discharge against medical advice.

8. It is not true to suggest that it is not possible to form an opinion with regard to nexus of weapon and injuries without physically examining the weapon. I again say that if weapon is examined then an absolute opinion be given but it is not true to say that by looking into photo of a weapon we cannot found opinion. It is false to suggest that without mentioning the exact shape of injury the

opinion with regard to nexus of weapon and injury cannot be found. It is not true to suggest that I am bound to annexed the photography of injuries I noticed.

Re-Examination : NIL.

[Typed to my dictation in the open court]

R.O.I. & A. C.

(Siddalinga Prabhu)

I Addl. District & Sessions Judge.
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.