

Witness present and duly sworn on 18/03/2024.

Cross Examination by Sri. V.S. Advocate for Respondent.

Above 3 years back photographs at Ex.P. 1 & 8 has been taken. I have verified the boundaries of plaint schedule item no. 2 property. It is false to suggest that Ex.P. 1, 8 and other photographs have been taken in order to file the complaint. It is false to suggest that Ex.P. 1 to 9 documents are subsequent to the filing of this miscellaneous petition. I have verified and confirmed the boundaries of the property allegedly sold respondent. It is false to suggest that there is no nexus between the suit schedule property / property claimed by me and the property sold the by the respondent. It is false to suggest that boundaries to the properties stated in Ex.P. 7 including the survey number is different from the plaint schedule item no.2 in O.S. 4909/2018. It is true that I have given a representation to the Deputy Commissioner as per Ex.P. 4 stating that there is an order that the land can not be converted. It is false to suggest that though there in no order to convert the land in to non agricultural land, I have given false information to the Deputy Commissioner stating that there is prohibition order not to convert the order. It is false to

suggest that I have given false information to the Tahsildar as per Ex.P. 5. It is false to suggest that while filing the representation at Ex.P. 3 to 5 for the first time I have claimed that there was a interim order in respect of survey no. 115/1 to 115/8. When it is questioned to the witness that you have filed the suit in respect of property in survey no. 115 ; the witness said that the property is bearing only survey no. 115. I have verified the records in respect of survey no. 115 prior to the filing of the suit. When it is questioned to the witness that do you know about the plotting of property in survey no. 115 ; the witness said she do not know the date. I came to know about the plotting of the property about 6 yeas back. I have stated about the knowledge of plotting of property in the suit. It is false to suggest that Ex.P. 1 to 8 I am not in existence while filing this petition. It is true that temporary injunction order obtained by me in the suit in respect of survey no. 115. It is false to suggest that I am not in a possession of suit item no. 2 property. It is false to suggest that the defendants have sold the property belong to them as per Ex.P. 7. It is false to suggest that I can not say till the passing of judgment I am the owner of property claimed by me. It is false to suggest that I

have not made any allegation against the present respondent in Ex.P. 4 to 6 and the allegation only against Sunitha. It is false to suggest that the respondent has not violated any court order. It is false to suggest that in order to harass the respondent I have filed this false petition.

Re-examination Nil.

(Typed to my dictation in open court, as the deposition is proceeded with).

R.O.I. & A.C.

(Padma Prasad)
II Addl. City Civil & Sessions
Judge, and Spl. Judge,
Bangalore City.