

IN THE COURT OF PRL. JUDGE, COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AND
MACT., MYSURU.
MVC.NO.410/2023

Witness Name	: Dr. Sunil Kumar P.C.	PW.2
Father Name	: Chandrashekar P.N.	
Age	: 54 years	
Occupation	: Orthopedic surgeon, K.R.Hospital, Mysuru	
Residence	: Mysuru	

Witness called and duly sworn on: 26.09.2025

EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. BSS 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.P9	The entire IP case sheet pertaining to the petitioner
Ex.P10	11 X-ray films (<i>Collectively marked</i>)
Ex.P11	One OPD case sheet

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. MVG LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.2:

1. The fact that the accident involved a motorcycle is mentioned in the case sheet. I am not aware if the said fact is mentioned in the wound certificate and MLC extract or not. It is true to suggest that the case sheet is a document which is prepared after MLC is issued. Witness states that the case sheet is prepared immediately after the MLC is

issued. I have not produced the extract of the MLC register before this tribunal. I have not produced any medical record issued by Gundlupete Govt. Hospital where the petitioner obtained initial treatment.

2. It is false to suggest that I have mentioned false facts about the history in the affidavit without verifying the same. The petitioner was admitted at K.R. Hospital at 1.51 a.m. on 16.02.2023. Witness states that the petitioner could have come to Hospital on 15.02.2023 itself but after completion of formalities he was admitted as such the date of admission is shown as 16.02.2023.

3. After perusing the X-ray film I diagnosed that petitioner had suffered fracture of tibia and fibula of left leg. At the time of discharge the wound of the petitioner was healthy. The petitioner was discharged on 22.02.2023. It is false to suggest that the perusal of case sheet goes to show that I am not the treating doctor.

4. The petitioner last consulted me on 10.09.2025. The petitioner might have consulted me several times between 22.02.2023 and 10.09.2025 but I have not produced document in that regard. It is false to suggest that the very fact that I have not produced any document pertaining to OPD consultation with respect to the petitioner goes to show that the petitioner never consulted me for follow up treatment. It is false to suggest that after being discharged the petitioner came to me only on 10.09.2025 and that too for the purpose of assessment of disability.

5. Since I do not have the OPD records I cannot say if there is any entry in the OPD records that petitioner had pain and swelling. Witness states that the same might have been mentioned. It is false to suggest that the petitioner never required any follow up treatment as such he never consulted me and it is for this reason that I have not produced any records pertaining to OPD visits.

6. It is false to suggest that I have not assessed the disability as per the guidelines by considering the relevant aspects covering mobility component and stability component. I have not produced the notes made by me at the time of assessment of disability however on the basis of those notes I have prepared my affidavit. It is true to suggest that the document issued by me is not disability certificate instead it is only an assessment.

7. 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.

RE-EXAMINATION – NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

sd/-

Prl. Judge.

Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru