

IN THE COURT OF PRL. JUDGE, COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AND
MACT., MYSURU.
MVC.NO. 1504/2023

Witness Name	:	Dr. Ravindranath K.	PW.2
Father Name	:	Sriram	
Age	:	49 years	
Occupation	:	Consultant orthopedic surgeon, Spandana Hospital, Mysuru.	
Residence	:	Mysuru	

Witness called and duly sworn on: 17.12.2025

EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. SAS 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.P12	The entire case sheet pertaining to Sri. Rohith
Ex.P13	One X-ray film

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

1. It is not noted anywhere in the case sheet as to who brought the petitioner to the Hospital after the accident. It is true to suggest that the injuries were sustained by the petitioner in a MLC case sheet. Though the Hospital has issued police intimation but I am not aware if the copy of the intimation is available in the case sheet produced by me today or not.

2. Upon being questioned as to when the police intimation was issued and to which police station the same was sent, witness states that the same is looked after by medical records department as such I have no further information regarding the same. Even the Ex.P12 case sheet is maintained by the medical records department.

3. It is true to suggest that as per the case sheet upon admission of the petitioner, CT scan of the brain was done and as per the entries made at page No.29 of Ex.P12, it is clearly forthcoming that the petitioner did not have any traumatic brain injury. Witness states that even the CT scan report is annexed to the case sheet. It is true to suggest that as per the case sheet the GCS score of the petitioner at the time of admission was 15. Upon being suggested that GCS score of 15 is considered as normal, witness states that though the same is medically considered as normal but the petitioner had issues like restlessness. I have not seen whether the fact that the petitioner had restlessness is mentioned in the case sheet or not.

4. It is true to suggest that in the stability component out of 9 points only on 2 points the petitioner had issues. I have not specified the height of the steps which the petitioner finds difficult to climb nor I have mentioned the number of steps the petitioner can climb without any issues. I have not specified as to extent of time in terms of hours the petitioner was made to stand to ascertain as to for how long the petitioner was able to stand on the left foot alone.

5. I have not specified in my affidavit regarding the cause of pain nor have I mentioned whether the pain is reversible or not. I have not referred the petitioner to District Medical Board for assessment of disability. I am not a member of the District Medical Board nor have I been authorized by the

District Medical Board to assess the disability. I have not produced the Form-B before this tribunal today.

6. I have not mentioned anything regarding the avocation of the petitioner. The disability assessed by me is only physical disability and not functional disability based on the occupation of the petitioner. It is true to suggest that the maximum disability that can be assessed under the stability component is only 10% to particular component i.e., climbing stairs, standing, etc.,

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. 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.

8. 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