

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 13.10.2022 ರಂದು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯನ್ನು ಕರೆಸಿ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಿಸಲಾಯಿತು
ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯು ನನಗೆ ಅಂಗ್ಲ ಬಾಷೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ತಿಳಿದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಕಾರಣ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಯ ಪಾಟೀ
ಸವಾಲನ್ನು ಅಂಗ್ಲ ಬಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಪಾಟೀ ಸವಾಲು ಅರೋಪಿ ಪರ ಶ್ರೀ.ಐ.ಎಸ್.ಡಿ. ವಕೀಲರಿಂದ:

it is false to say that I am not the relative of complainant. It is true to say that in my complaint nowhere it is mentioned I am the relative of the complainant but witness volunteers and says I am the SPA holder of complainant. I am doing business of shares and mutual funds in the name of Shreenathji Enterprises and I am the proprietor of the firm. I am doing the said business since 15 years and same is located at Gandhinagar, Bengaluru. My working time is between 9-5 but it may also vary if I have to meet somebody or some other personal works. It is true to say that I am completely engaged with my work and I am not employee of any other concern. It is true to say that the complainant of this case Vinay P Ahuja is hale and healthy. It is true to say that the said complainant Vinay P Ahuja at the time of filing the complaint was residing at Bengaluru but witness volunteers and says right now he is in Mumbai. It is false to say that he is having residential house at Bengaluru. It is false to say that the said complainant Vinay p Ahuja is not having any difficulty to personally conduct this case. It is false to say that the said complainant Vinay P Ahuja is not having any difficulty to file the complaint personally. It is false to say that there is no reason mentioned in the documents at Ex.P19 to appoint me as SPA executed by complainant in my favour. It is true to say that the document at Ex.P19 is not signed and witnessed by any individual. It is fgalse to say that complainant Vinay P Ahuja is not

residing at Bengaluru but he is residing at Bombay I have not produced any document to prove the same. It is false to say that in order to avoid the truth he is not coming personally before the court to give evidence. It is false to say that the complainant has not executed any SPA but the said document at Ex.P19 is concocted by me. It is false to say that in the document at Ex.P.19 the signature of Complainant Vinay P Ahuja are not similar and different from one another. It is true to say that there is no document before the court to show the original signature of the complainant Vinay P Ahuja but witness volunteer and says the I can produce the same. The said complainant Vinay P Ahuja at the time of filing the complaint was at Bengaluru and doing the business of Shares and real estate. It is true to say that the said complainant Vinay P Ahuja was doing the business of buying and selling the immovable properties further witness volunteer says that it was not his main business. I don't know the name of the employees who were working under the complainant. He was doing the business with the help of 2-3 employees but I do not know the names. Complainant was having his office at Gandhinagar, Bengaluru. It is false to say that there was no nexus between complainant business and my business. It is true to say that other than stock trading and real estate business we don't have any other common business. It is true to say that I have not made any business or transaction personally with the accused. It is true to say that the complainant Vinay P Ahuja was well aware about the business and transactions with the accused. It is false to say that I don't know when the complainant has visited the office of the accused. It is false to say that none of the accused persons have visited the

complainants office situated at Gnaghinagar, Bengaluru. I am not sure whether I have not mentioned in my complaint the place of alleged business transactions taken place between the complainant and accused but witness volunteer and says that the dates have been mentioned. Before filing complaint I have verified with the complainant as to who has issued the chueques produced by me in this case. I have ascertained with ROC who are the board of directors of the accused No.1 Samruddhi Reality Ltd co., I don't remember at the time of obtaining the ROC of accused company whether I have verified the MOA or AOA of accused company. It is true to say that I have not produced any document to show the accused No.2 to 8 are the board of directors or the Authorized signatories of the A1 company. It is true to say that we have filed complaint against A2 to 8 board of directors of A1 company. A8 is shown as the accused in this case because he is also one of the board of director of A1 company. It is true to say that Since A4 to 8 are board of directors of A1 company for which they are arrayed as formal parties to this case. It is true to say that A4 to 8 have not issued any chques to the complainant company but witness volunteers and says they are also the Authorized signatories of the accused company. It is true to say that I have not produced any document to show that A4 to 8 are the authorized signatories of A1 company. It is true to say that in our complaint we have not mentioned the specific role of A4 to 8 with A1 company. It is true to say that A4 to 8 have not made any individual transactions with the complainant company on behalf of A1 company but witness volunteers and says as per the case they have made the transactions with the complainant. Without seeing the documents

whether A4 to 8 have signed the sale agreement on behalf of A1 company with the complainant. It is false to say that we have not produced the document of agreement of sale taken place between complainant and A1 company. It is true to say that we have not produced any document to show that amount has been transferred to A1 company account by the complainant with respect to sale agreement but witness volunteers and says I can produce the same.

ಆರೋಪಿ ಪರ ವಕೀಲರು ಮುಂದುವರಿದ ಪಾಟೀ ಸವಾಲಿಗಾಗಿ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೋರಿದ್ದು ನೀಡಲಾಯಿತು.

(ನನ್ನ ಉಕ್ತಲೇಖನದಂತೆ ತೆರೆದ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆರಳಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಸಲಾಯಿತು.)

ಓ ಹೇ ಕೇ ಸರಿ ಇದೆ

17 ನೇ ಅಪರ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಧೀಶರು
ಮತ್ತು ಎಂಎಸಿಟಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರು