

IN THE COURT OF PRL. JUDGE, COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AND
MACT., MYSURU.
MVC.NO. 1503/2023

Witness Name	:	Dr. V.R.Vasuki	PW.2
Father Name	:	Valmiki Rangachar	
Age	:	58 years	
Occupation	:	Orthopedic Surgeon, Kamakshi Hospital, Mysuru.	
Residence	:	Mysuru	

Witness called and duly sworn on: 18.12.2025

EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. MS 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.P14	The entire case sheet along with X-ray films and report pertaining to Sri. Mohan Kuamar N.L
Ex.P15	Recent X-ray film
Ex.P16	The MLC extract which forms part of Ex.P14 (at in-page No.6) is separately marked

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

1. I have assessed the disability with respect to right lower limb. The implants are insitu. I have advised removal of implants to the petitioner. It is false to suggest that the extent of disability might reduce once the implants are removed. Witness states that it might not reduce.

2. The petitioner will not have any issue to perform his basic day to day activities. I have no personal knowledge about avocation of the petitioner. Upon being suggested that the petitioner would not have any issue to continue his avocation as a co-coordinator at a company, witness states that unless I know the nature of the work I cannot say whether he can do the said work or not. Upon being suggested that the petitioner will not have any issue to do supervisory work, witness states that if it is a bench work or sitting work he would be able to do it.

3. The petitioner does not have any issue in respect of stability component. I have assessed 6% disability in respect of mobility component and 6% towards inability perform activities stated therein. It is false to suggest that as per the 2024 guidelines I am not competent to assess the disability of the petitioner. witness states that I am an orthopedic surgeon. 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.

4. It is true to suggest that perusal of Ex.P15 reveals that the fractures sustained by the petitioner have united. It is false to suggest that the petitioner has recovered fully and does not have any disability and yet I have deposed false facts just to support his claim for higher compensation.

5. It is false to suggest that considering the fact that the fractures have united, the disability of 12% to the lower limb assessed by me is exaggerated and hence cannot be accepted. 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 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.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. GSS LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.1:

Learned counsel for the respondent No.1 submits that the respondent No.1 adopts cross examination done by learned counsel for respondent No.2 on all material aspects other than liability.

RE-EXAMINATION – NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-

Prl. Judge.

Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru