

**IN THE COURT OF PRL. JUDGE, COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AND  
MACT., MYSURU.  
MVC.NO. 210/2024**

<b>Witness Name</b>	: Dr. Rajesh. T.S	<b>PW.2</b>
<b>Father Name</b>	: Thimmaiah T.S	
<b>Age</b>	: 44 years	
<b>Occupation</b>	: Dept of Neurosurgery, K.R. Hospital, Mysuru.	
<b>Residence</b>	: Mysuru	

*Witness called and duly sworn on: 23.01.2026*

**EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. M.S LEARNED COUNSEL FOR  
PETITIONER:**

Now I see the affidavit filed in lieu of my examination in chief, the same bears my signatures. The same is prepared as per my instructions and i am aware of the contents of the same. The contents of the affidavit is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Ex.P13	The entire case sheet pertaining to Sri. Mohammed Salman
Ex.P14	One OPD slip consisting of assessment of disability
Ex.P15	Neuro behavioural and cognitive assessment
Ex.P16	4 X-ray films ( <i>collectively marked</i> )

**CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. RK LEARNED COUNSEL FOR  
RESPONDENT:**

1. I have been working at K.R. Hospital from the past 16 years. The said clinical psychologist who has issued Ex.P15 report has not treated the petitioner instead he has only examined the petitioner for the purpose of issuing Ex.P15 report.

2. Even as regards the petitioner I have maintained the case sheet. It is true to suggest that in the case sheet all the issues with which the petitioner is suffering would be mentioned. I have not mentioned in the case sheet that the petitioner had complained of headache and giddiness. The petitioner had suffered contusion on his scalp. Though It is true to suggest that the contusion can be treated with medication but the petitioner here had suffered injury to his brain as result of the said injury.

3. Upon being suggested that the issues like headache giddiness and imbalance while walking might get cured with passage of time considering the age of the petitioner witness states that it may or might not improve. It is not that the imbalance is due to giddiness as patients without giddiness can also suffer imbalance if they have sustained injuries on their head. It is false to suggest that the facial bone fractures suffered by the petitioner have united. I have not performed any surgery for injuries sustained by the petitioner in the accident.

4. The petitioner last consulted me on 13.11.2025. I have not procured the CT scan or MRI when I last examined the petitioner. It is false to suggest that the very fact that I have not procured the CT scan or MRI or x-rays goes to show that the assessment made by me is purely guess work without actually conducting the examination to arrive at proper disability. The X-rays produced today were procured during treatment.

5. It is false to suggest that since I have assessed the disability to suit the convenience of the petitioner and have mentioned exaggerated percentage of disability. It is false to suggest that I have assessed and

fixed higher disability in gross violation of guidelines in order to support the claims of the petitioner for higher compensation. It is false to suggest that in order to support the compensation claims of PW.1, I have issued a false disability certificate despite the fact that PW.1 has not suffered any such disability. Upon being suggested that the petitioner need not undergo any further treatment for the injuries sustained in the accident witness states that the petitioner as to undergo further treatment. The petitioner would not have any difficulties any performing his day to day basic activities.

**RE-EXAMINATION – NIL**

**(Typed to my dictation in the open court)**

**R.O.I. & A.C.**

**Sd/-**

**Prl. Judge.**

**Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru**