

ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು ಮತ್ತು ಜೆಎಂಎಫ್‌ಸಿ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯ

ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ನಗರ

ಸಿ.ಸಿ.1002/2017

ಪಿಡಬ್ಲ್ಯೂ-9

ಸಿಡಬ್ಲ್ಯೂ-9

ದಿನಾಂಕ 03-02-2020 ರಂದು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ವಚನ ಬೋಧಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.  
ಮುಂದುವರೆದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಸ್ವತಃ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯಿಂದ.

I have deposed my chief examination on the earlier date of hearing. As a further part of said chief examination I am producing a documents.

I have produced certified copies of case sheets pertaining to Swamygowda, Venkategowda and Mahadevamma. The said documents are marked as Ex.P12 to 14 respectively. I am producing 2 X-Ray documents of Swamygowda. Said X-Rays are marked as Ex.P15 and 16 respectively.

ಪಾಟೀ ಸವಾಲು: ಶ್ರೀ. ಕೆ ಎನ್ ಎಸ್ ವಕೀಲರಿಂದ ಆರೋಪಿ ಪರ ವಕೀಲರು:

Whether you have mentioned as the age of the wound in the wound certificate in respect of wound sustained by CW3 for this witness deposed that as it has been mentioned bleeding present and the nature of the wound being fresh, there was no necessary of mentioning specifically as fresh wounds.

For the suggestion that after causing of injuries those sustained by CW3 bleeding of blood from injured part continuous approximately for 1 to 2 hours depending upon the blood vessels of the concerned injured part of body.

Whether you have scanned the portion of head injury sustained by CW3 for this witness deposed that further examination in respect of scanning procedure was done by other doctor as further treatment.

I have not referred patient to get further treatment in respect of head injuries sustained by CW3. It is false to suggest that I do not have any information as to patient under going CT scan.

It is true to suggest that in order to treat fracture injuries a Specialist has

to treat the same. Witness further deposes that Ortho Doctor Goutham has treated the fracture injuries sustained by CW1 Swamygowda.

It is false to suggest that as per Ex.P15 I cannot depose as to the nature of injuries sustained by CW3. Witness further deposes that I have gone through the said report and it is also mentioned in case sheet of concerned patient.

It is true to suggest that left hand ring finger will get such injuries sustained by CW1 if comes to contact with the hard surface. In respect of said injury it is Ex.P16 which shows the concerned injury sustained by CW1 and Ex.P16 is the X-Ray taken initially before treatment and Ex.P15 after treatment.

It is false to suggest that if a ring finger got hit to a hard surface there is every chance of peeling of skin. Witness further deposed that the nature of wound sustained by CW1 was dis location of the joint and it is not necessary for a skin to get peel.

It is true to suggest that if a person is hit on his ring finger with a object like MO 1 there are possibilities of injuries of nature like swelling and deformative.

At the time when I treated CW2 her whole teeth was ex-foliated, fresh bleeding socket was present and she was treated by a Dentist. The said treatment was got mentioned in the case sheet.

In respect of said injury as per the report received by me no X-Ray was done. Only one teeth of the injured was ex-foliated as per my examination.

MO 2 is a half broken tooth. Witness deposed that he is not the expert. It is to be deposed by Dentist. It is false to suggest that generally there is possibility of causing damage on either side tooth when one tooth is completely ex-foliated.

MO 2 was not brought by patient at the time she visited hospital for treatment. As such it is not possible for me to say that MO 2 was the tooth which was broke down at the time of said incident. Witness deposed that I

have not mentioned about it in my report.

Are there any possibilities of injured sustaining swelling and causing damages to the other side teeth if hit by an object like MO 1. To this witness deposed that CW2 has reported that she was hit with hands and feet to her all over body.

I have observed no blood clotting on injured body at the time of her visit for treatment. It is not necessary for either side tooth to get damage if suppose a person is hit with punch. CW2 has not specifically informed me as to she hit by so and so accused to her tooth.

It is false to suggest that there is possibilities of causing cut injuries as sustained by CW3 if scratched by any hard substance.

It is true to suggest that there is every possibilities of CW2 sustaining injuries sustained by her in the present case if she falls on a hard surface facing towards mouth.

ಮರು ವಿಚಾರಣೆ - ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

(ನನ್ನ ಉಕ್ತ ಲೇಖನದ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಬಹಿರಂಗ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆರಳಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.)

ಓ ಹೇ ಕೇ ಸ ಇದೆ ಎಂ

(ಗಾಯತ್ರಿ)

ಹೆಚ್ಚುವರಿ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು,  
ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರದನ್ಯಾದಂ., ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ನಗರ