

**IN THE COURT OF PRL. JUDGE, COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AND  
MACT., MYSURU.**

**MVC.NO. 1294 / 2022**

<b>Witness Name</b>	: Dr. N. Karunakara	<b>PW.2</b>
<b>Father Name</b>	: Nagarajegowda	
<b>Age</b>	: 54 years	
<b>Occupation</b>	: Orthopedic Surgeon, Nagarajegowda Memorial Hospital, Mysuru.	
<b>Residence</b>	: Mysuru	

*Witness called and duly sworn on: 04.09.2025.*

**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.P11	One case sheet pertaining to the petitioner
Ex.P12	9 X-ray films are collectively marked
Ex.P13	Recent examination report

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

1. The petitioner was treated for injuries on right leg and left foot. The surgery was performed with respect to right leg only. Though the petitioner had fractures on the left foot, but he was treated conservatively for left foot fracture. It is false to suggest that as the petitioner had not sustained any injuries on his left foot, he was not

operated for the same. The petitioner had sustained fractures of distal end of both bones of right leg.

2. The petitioner was discharged on 13.08.2022 after undergoing treatment as an inpatient for 6 days. I have not produced the X-ray films procured during the consultation visits of the petitioner. Witness states that the same would be with the petitioner. The petitioner might have consulted me around 8 to 10 times between 13.08.2022 and 30.05.2025 with respect to injuries sustained in the accident. I have not produced document in that regard. I do not recollect the date on which the petitioner consulted me prior to 30.05.2025.

3. I have not produced document to show that even prior to 30.05.2025 the petitioner had complained of issues which I observed during the assessment of disability. I have not issued the disability certificate. I am not aware if the petitioner had personally appeared before the court and has deposed in this matter. The assessment is made on the basis of 2024 guidelines. I have produced the calculation sheet on the basis of which I have arrived at the percentage of disability.

4. I have not specified the particular heads under which the petitioner had disability to arrive at final figure. It is false to suggest that for a person to suffer loss of muscle strength he should have suffered loss of muscle. It is true to suggest that in none of the records produced today there is anything to show that the petitioner had suffered muscle loss.

5. It is false to suggest that the disability assessed by me is not in accordance with the guidelines as I have not set out the material particulars on the basis of which I assessed the disability at 22% to the right limb and 11% to the left limb. It is false to suggest that even now the petitioner is in a position to do all the work which he was doing prior to the accident. It is false to suggest that merely because the petitioner obtained treatment at our Hospital, I have assessed the disability exaggeratedly and I have come before the court to depose false facts in support of the same. It is false to suggest that I have assessed the disability to suit the claim of the petitioner for higher compensation despite the fact that the petitioner has not suffered any disability.

**RE-EXAMINATION – NIL**

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

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

**sd/-**

**Prl. Judge.**

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