

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

MVC NO.1769/2023

PW.2

Witness called and duly sworn on: 09.06.2026

EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. NYN., 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	The true copy of the MLC register extract.
Ex.P.13	X-ray films 03 in number are collectively marked.
Ex.P.14	The entire case sheet.

**CROSS EXAMINATION BY SRI. UMC ADVOCATE FOR RESPONDENT
NO.2:**

3. According to me all injuries are fresh. I do not know whether the patient had obtained any treatment before arriving to my hospital. The patient was not fully conscious at the time of arrival for treatment. It is true to suggest that we need to mention the details such as the person who brought the patient to the hospital and other related details. It is true to suggest that such details are mentioned in MLC register. It is true to suggest that as per the MLC rules, the hospital is required to record the details such as the name of the person who brought the patient to the hospital, details of vehicles by which the patient was brought to the hospital.

4. It is true to suggest that the above such details are mentioned in the MLC register. It is true to suggest that our hospital has not complied with the MLC rules. It is true to suggest that check x-ray of the operated parts of the patient was conducted in the case on hand. It is true to suggest that as per the said check x-ray alignment of the fracture bone was satisfactory. It is true to suggest that normally we would advise the patients for regular followups and physiotherapy treatment. It is true to suggest that the patient has not visited our hospital for followup treatment subsequent to his discharge. It is true to suggest that if the patient takes physiotherapy and followup treatment properly, there is chances of getting good range of movements of injured parts.

5. I am the only doctor who treated the patient in the present case. Dr.Lakshmi and Mousin have also contributed in treating the patient in the present case. We have taken opinion of one Dr.Shashidar. The said opinion is with regard to need of treatment for the face fracture. It is true to suggest that we have raised bills for a sum of Rs.7,000/- and 10,000/- respectively in the name of Dr.Shashidar as a part of charges of micro suturing of multiple lacerations. It is true to suggest that since, the patient has not attended for followup treatment, I am not aware of the fact whether the said patient has obtained followup treatment or not. It is true to suggest that as per the recent x-ray, the bones of the patient are united. It is not true to suggest that since, the bones of the patient are united, the patient is not suffering from permanent disability. It is true to suggest that I have not issued any estimation with regard to the future surgery needed for the

patient. It is not true to suggest that we have abnormally exaggerated the quantum of disability and future surgery cost only in order to help the patient for more compensation.

RE-EXAMINATION : Nil.

(Dictated by me in the open court)

R.O.I & C.

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

Witness signature