

**IN THE COURT OF 3rd ADDITIONAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
HASSAN.**

MVC NO.1013/2023

PW.2

Witness called and duly sworn on: 04.02.2026

EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. RA., ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER:

I am the treating doctor in the above case and I am conversant with the facts of the case and I have filed my chief affidavit in lieu of my examination in chief and I know the contents of the said affidavit.

2. I have produced the following documents for the kind perusal of this court and the same are as below:

Ex.P.12 – Case sheet of the petitioner issued by HIMS Hospital, Hassan.

Ex.P.13 – Attested copy of MLC register extract issued by HIMS hospital, Hassan. (verified with originals and returned)

Ex.P.-14 - X-ray films two in number.

Ex.P.-15 - Copy of clinical notes and disability calculation.

The said documents are marked as Ex.P.12 to 15 respectively.

**CROSS EXAMINATION BY SRI. KMS ADVOCATE FOR RESPONDENT
NO.3:**

3. The injured was treated at our hospital since from the date of incident. The Petitioner was admitted to our hospital on 05.01.2023 with a history of alleged road traffic accident. The vehicles involved in the accident have not been mentioned in the MLC memo. The injured was brought by Inayath Pasha and Tafajul Ansari. I have treated the injured

on the same day at 05.30 in the evening. The injured was suffered two grievous injuries namely., near total amputation of left grater toe and crush injury on left foot. The injured has undergone for surgery. The injured was treated as in patient for 07 days. The injured has visited our hospital for follow up treatments, but no records have been submitted. It is false to suggest that the injured has not visited our hospital for follow up treatment. The injured has visited our hospital during the intervening period of the date of discharge and the date of assessment of disability.

4. It is false to suggest that the injured, after discharge from the hospital, never visited for follow up and thereafter she visited our hospital on 26.01.2026 only for the purpose of leading evidence before the court. The injured is aged about 09 years. It is true that as the injured is of tender age, there is a possibility of speedy recovery. It is true that we follow the guidelines of the Central Government while assessing disability. It is true that there is a particular disability in respect of the each fingers of human body when they are amputated. It is true that each toes have got particular disability. If all the toes are amputated, the disability will be 20%-25%. It is false to suggest that as the injured has lost only the grater toe, she suffers from only 3%-4% of disability. It is false to suggest that when disability is taken on the whole body, it comes to only 1% to 1.5%. The injured is not present before the court. It is true that the injury sustained by injured are all recovered.

5. It is false to suggest that the disability arrived at is exaggerated and the same are not in accordance with the guidelines of the Central Government. It is false to suggest that in spite of no disability, I have falsely disposed before the court in order to help the injured to get more compensation.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY SRI.MAP ADVOCATE FOR RESPONDENT

NO.2:

Counsel for R-2 adopts the cross examination of R-3. The same is permitted.

(Dictated by me in the open court)

R.O.I & C.

3rd Addl. Dist. & Sessions Judge,
Hassan.

Witness signature