

Witness present and duly sworn on 25/03/2026.

Cross Examination by advocate for Defendant no.1 and 2 .

The extent of property in survey no. 52/1 of Mahadevapura Village is 3 acres 9 guntas. I do not know Mahadevapura was a originally Inam land as per records. I do not know that defendant no.1 was cultivating the properties since from his grand father as a tenant under Inamdar. I do not know that defendant no.1 after filing the necessary application for grant , obtained grant of land in his name. It is true that property in survey no. 52/1 was agricultural land. The witness volunteers that sites have been formed in the said land and sold. I do not know that the defendant no.1 is a agriculturist and belongs to agricultural family. It is false to suggest that defendant no.1 is continue to cultivate the land in survey no. 52/1 .

2. The defendant no.1 formed sites in the year 1984. I do not know about the conversion of land in survey no. 52/1 as non agricultural land. It is false to suggest that even today the revenue records stands in the name of defendant no.1 and continued to be shown as agricultural land. The defendant no.1 had formed 79 sites. I do not know about the obtaining of

any permission of formed the sites from defendant no.1. I had a plan regarding the formation of site. When it is questioned to the witness that have you produced the said site plan to the court ; the witness said he has given to his advocate.

3. It is true that adjoining properties of suit schedule properties are developed properties. It is true that defendant no.1 had a put up a compound wall to the entire property in survey no. 52/1. When it is questioned to the witness that there is a road on the western side of entire property in survey no. 52/1 ; the witness said there is a road on western side and Eastern side of entire property. It is true that there is a gate to the entire compound having access to the western side road. When it is questioned to the witness that defendant no.1 has put up a shops adjoining to the western side road ; the witness said after snatching the property from the other, he has put up the shops. I do not know from whom the defendant no.1 snatched the said property. There may be 7-8 such shops. I do not know that defendant no.1 has rented out the said 7-8 shops premises to the others. It is true that some people are doing the business in the said 7-8 shops premises. I do not

know from which direction numbers to the sites were given and which site last number site exist.

4. Defendant No.1 – Sri. C. Narayanappa site sold to me. I have paid the sale consideration money to defendant no.1. I have not paid money to father of defendant no.3 namely Chinnappa. There is a document to show the payment of money to defendant no.1. Myself instructed to advocate to prepare the plaint and evidence affidavit. I have not instructed my advocate Chinnappa has purchased the property.

Further cross examination : Deferred .

(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.