

In the Court of XLIX Additional City Civil & Sessions Judge
[Special Court for trial of NIA Cases], Bengaluru.

Spl.C No.595/2021

WITNESS FOR PROSECUTION

Duly sworn on 23.04.2026

PW.22/ CW. 8

Deposition of : Sri. Syed Wasim Rabbani

Father's name : Sri. Syed Khasim

Age : 44 years

Occupation : Marketing in Imagine India Company

Residence : Mathikere, Bengaluru

EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY THE LEARNED SPP:-

1. I met Anas Furrug in 2010 in Indiranagar Masjid during collecting charity funds. So both of us became good friends. 2-3 years later maybe somewhere in the year 2012 or 2013 maybe in the month of September or October in the year 2012 or 2013, Anas called me and asked me Rs.1 lakh for credit. I asked him why he wants, he said he is going for search of jobs in Dubai or Qatar. So I took 2-3 days time and paid him cash of Rs.1 lakh. He told me to keep his Car and RC card of car. So when I went to give him cash, I did not take the car because I trusted him but for my safety I took only RC card. He promised me that he would return the amount in 2 or 3 months. After that he left India. During that time I was doing my house construction, so I was in need of my money back. So I called him, he was not reachable. So I texted him for my money, he replied me that he was coming back shortly. After one month he came to India and he called me near ESI Hospital, Rajajinagar. When I saw him his hands were in bandage. He said sorry

for not returning the amount on time. He promised me again that he would pay me back in two installments. He told me that he met with an accident. Looking at his condition, I agreed. He paid me back my money of Rs.1 lakh in two installments.

2. In the month of September 2020 I gave statement before the NIA officer in this regard.

(At this stage, the learned SPP seeks permission to treat this witness as partly hostile and seeks permission to cross-examine. Perused case file. The learned SPP is permitted to cross-examine witness by treating the witness as partly hostile.)

CROSS EXAMINATION BY THE LEARNED SPP:-

3. When the learned SPP puts a suggestion that Anas told you that he is going to Turkey in search of job, witness states that he went to Dubai or Qatar. It is false to suggest that when Anas left for Turkey I informed his father that Anas borrowed a sum of Rs.1 lakh from me and over that his father got angry and his father paid Rs.1 lakh in two installments. It is false to suggest that from Turkey Anas called me and informed me that he was fighting with Shias. It is false to suggest that when I met Anas near ESI hospital, Anas told me that he sustained injuries to his hand because of bullet firing.
4. It is false to suggest that I have given statement before the IO that “After Anas Furruq left for Turkey, I told his father about Rs.1,00,000/- borrowed by Anas Furruq and asked him to return. His father got angry upon me but returned my money in two installments of Rs.50,000/- each in cash. I returned the RC of car to his father”. The said portion of the statement is marked as **Ex.P.93**.

5. It is false to suggest that I have given statement before the IO that “After 2-3 months one day Anas called me from Turkey/Syria and told that he is fighting with Shias”. The said portion of the statement is marked as **Ex.P.94**.
6. It is false to suggest that I have given statement before the IO that “Around 6 months later after Anas Furruq returned from Turkey/Syria, he called me and met me in his father’s hospital, where I found his hands were wrapped behind bandage and he was having injuries in his hands. He told that during fights with Shias, he sustained bullet injuries”. The said portion of the statement is marked as **Ex.P.95**.
7. It is false to suggest that though I know these facts, I am deposing falsely to help accused persons.

Cross-Examination by Sri. VKJ., learned counsel for accused No.1 and 3:-

8. It is false to suggest that I never paid Rs.1 lakh to Anas. I do not know the registration number of the RC card of the car. It is false to suggest that Anas never met me and also never asked me for Rs.1 lakh. It is true to suggest that since I was constructing house I was in need of money. Witness volunteers that I was in need of my money back. It is true to suggest that since I was constructing house I was financially very tight.

Cross-Examination by Sri. CRP., learned counsel for accused No.5:-

9. I did not drop Anas Furruq when he was going to Dubai or Qatar. I do not remember exactly when Anas Furruq went to Dubai or Qatar. It is

true to suggest that Anas Furruq went to Dubai or Qatar for the purpose of job. Maybe in the year 2020 the NIA officer called me to the office. Anas Furruq was in Dubai or Qatar for about 2-3 months. Witness volunteers that Anas Furruq returned to India from Dubai or Qatar after 2-3 months. From 2012 in between 7-8 years no police officer called me. Since I did not tell my family about Anas Furruq going to Dubai or Qatar, my family does not know it.

10. When Anas Furruq returned to India from Dubai or Qatar I did not go to Airport to pick him. I did not tell my family about I paid Rs.1 lakh to Anas Furruq. It is true to suggest that I have not maintained receipt or any document about lending of Rs.1 lakh to Anas Furruq. After lending Rs.1 lakh to Anas Furruq from 2012 for about 7-8 years I did not tell anybody about the same. It is false to suggest that I never paid Rs.1 lakh to Anas Furruq.

Cross-Examination by Sri. AMA., for PU., learned counsel for accused No.2:-

11. Learned counsel for accused No.2 adopted the cross-examination done by learned counsel for accused No.1, 3 and 5.

Re-examination: Nil.

(TYPED IN OPEN COURT TO MY DICTATION)

R O I & A C

**(KEMPARAJU)
XLIX Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge &
Spl. Judge for trial of NIA cases,
Bengaluru.**