

**IN THE COURT OF PRL. JUDGE, COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AND
MACT., MYSURU.
MVC.NO. 808 /2023**

Witness Name : Dr. Goutham Cugati **PW.2**
Father Name : Dr. Parameshwaraiah C
Age : 44 years
Occupation : Consultant Neurosurgeon, DRM
hospital, Mysuru.
Residence : Mysuru

Witness called and duly sworn on: 07.05.2025

**EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. HRMP 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.P10	The entire case sheet pertaining to the petitioner.
Ex.P11	One prescription
Ex.P12	Neuro-behavioral and cognitive assessment report.

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

1. The minor petitioner had obtained treatment at CIMS, Hassan before being admitted to DRM hospital. I did not get any details regarding the course of treatment given by Doctors ad CIMS, Hassan. The petitioner was admitted to DRM hospital on the same day after his admission at CIMS, Hassan.

2. The petitioner was discharged from the hospital on 03.05.2023. It is true to suggest that the petitioner has not obtained treatment as an

inpatient at our hospital after he is discharged on 03.05.2023. I do not recollect the date on which the petitioner consulted me prior to 17.03.2025. When I examined the petitioner on 17.03.2025, I observed that he did not have any difficulty in doing his day to day chores.

3. Upon being suggested that considering the age of the petitioner who is aged around 25 years, the petitioner's condition could improve gradually with passage of time, witness states that since the injury relates to head, the recovery would complete within first two years from the date of injury, as such the possibility of any improvement in the condition in future is very minimal.

4. I have assessed the disability on the basis of guidelines issued by the Central government. It is false to suggest that since the disability pertains to neuro behavioral and cognitive aspects, the competent person to assess the disability would be a psychologist. I have assessed the disability in my capacity as the neurosurgeon and treating doctor by taking into consideration of the report of the psychologist.

5. It is false to suggest that despite the fact that the disability should have been assessed by a psychologist and not by a neurosurgeon, I have deposed false facts in support of exaggerated percentage of disability assessed by me.

6. It is true to suggest that the petitioner does not require any further treatment or any surgery for the injuries sustained by him in the accident. As per my opinion the petitioner need not take any medication in future for the injuries sustained in the accident. It is

false to suggest that I have intentionally assessed the disability at 50% just to support the claim of the petitioner for higher compensation.

7. Upon being suggested that the petitioner would not have any difficulty to do the work which he was doing prior to the accident, witness states that a person with 50% disability would not be able to do skilled and semi-skilled work.

RE-EXAMINATION – NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-

Prl. Judge.

Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru