

DEPOSITION OF WITNESS
(Chapter of XXIII, Criminal Procedure Code)

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENNAI.
CC.No.14/2017

PROSECUTION WITNESS No.2

Name : Naidu Amrutesh Reddy
Father's Name : Naidu Adhikesavalu Reddy
Age :
Address :

Solemnly affirmed in accordance with provision of Act X of 1873 on the
10th day of July, 2025.

Accused Present.

Chief Examination:—

I am residing at 13/A, Astalakshmi Nagar, Valasaravakkam, for the past 12 years. I am in the business of warehousing for the last 25 years. The property in question is two streets away from my house. I.e., at Devikuppam Main road, Valasaravakkam Village, of an extent of 68 cents. A broker by name Dharmaraj, who had earlier transacted my present house informed me about the above said property. I met the owner, Mr.Suruli Andavar (A3 since deceased). We agreed upon sale price of 4.33 Crore for the said property. I obtained copies of the title documents and got legal opinion from my lawyer. Thereafter as a matter routine

practice adopted by me and my company, I caused the public notice in the newspaper. I paid advance sale consideration of Rs.10 lakhs and entered into a registered sale agreement on 25.04.2011, registered as document no.2261/2011 in the office of the sub-registrar of Virugambakkam. Since, Patta for the above said property was not stand in the name of the vendor and he is in possession through his tenent, three months time was fixed for completion of sale deed. However, orally we agreed for six months. The certified copy of the said sale agreement is shown to me and the same is marked as **Ex.P4**. On 10.11.2011 the sale deed was executed between me and A3 and registered the same as document no.6266/2011 in the office of the sub-registrar virugambakkam. The total sale consideration of Rs.4 Crore 33 lakhs was paid within the said six months before registration of sale deed. The certified copy of the sale deed is shown to me and the same is marked as **Ex.P5**. There was a firewood shop in the said premises. One Mr. Ramesh Raj (A2) owned the said firewood shop. I paid a sum of Rs. 20Lakhs by way of cheque for vacating the said premises. After one and half years, a civil case was filed by one Mr.Nagarajan, claiming title over the said property before the Poonamalle court. 4 years after that, around 2016 I got the summons from ED for enquiry. On 19.07.2016, I appeared before the Assistant Director Mr.V.Saikumar. He made caution about the truthfulness of the statement and I gave my statement

u/s.50 of PMLA. The said statement is shown to me and the same is marked as **Ex.P6**. I identify my signature found in all 4 pages and in the last page I endorsed that, I accept and confirm that the statement which has been typed as deposed by me. The Assistant Director ED, had also affixed his signatures in all pages with the seal at the last page. Until, I receive summons from ED, I not aware the CCB Case filed against me and a charge sheet filed against me. The complaint based on which, CCB Case was registered is even prior to my purchase. Later, by way of further investigation my name was included in the charge sheet. Further, I was arrayed as an Accused in this case also. I approached the Honorable High Court of Madras, in CrI.O.P No.5099/2018 and the Honorable High Court, by order dated 14.03.2022 quashed the case against me in this Sessions Case. The said order is shown to me and the same is marked as **Ex.P7**. Thereafter, I approached the Honorable High Court of Madras, in CrI.O.P No.10307/2017 and the order dated 25.04.2022, the Honorable High court was pleased to quash the supplementary complainat filed by CCB in C.C. No.66/2013 on the file of S.M.M. land grabbing case II, Perimedu against me. I also filed an affidavit before the Honorable High Court, relinquishing all my rights over the above said property. I handed over taken possession to Mr.Nagarajan. The Said affidavit dated 14.03.2022 forms part of Ex.P7 order. In

Ex.P7, the Honorable High court has permitted the ED, to examine me as a witness before this court in this case. Accordingly I depose.

Cross Examination by A2 and A4:—

The counsel for A2 & A4 is not ready to cross examine the witness as his senior is not available. Hence, the cross of A2 and A4 is dispensed with as per clause (c) of IV proviso to section 309 of Cr.P.C.

Typed to my dictation in my presence and hearing and under my personal dictation and superintendence and interpreted to the witness in the presence of the accused and admitted and signed by the witness to be correct.

Principal Judge