

Witness present and duly sworn on 19/01/2026.

Further Cross Examination by advocate for defendant no.3.

3. The property in survey no. 9/1B originally belongs to Thammappa. I do not know the father's name of said Thammappa. I do not know how said Thammappa acquired the said property. I have produced the Khatha in respect of site no. 34 as per Ex.P.2. I do not know who is having the Khata of the said property prior to the execution of sale deed Ex.P. 1 in the year 1980. I have not produced the Khata of the year 1980. I do not know there is a Khata in respect of the property between 1980 to 1998. I have not paid tax till 1998 and paid tax after the year 1998. I have produced the copy of NCR for having been lodged the complaint against defendant no.3. It is false to suggest that I have not produced any such documents to the court. When it is questioned to the witness that you have not produced any endorsement issued by the Police stating that the dispute is civil nature ; the witness said the Police have not issued the endorsement and not closed the case. I have no documents to show that my mother approached the BBMP for necessary plan.

4. It is true that there is a Church near the suit schedule property. I do not know that there is vacant site on the western side of Church. It is false to suggest that my site on the western side of

Church. It is false to suggest that I am falsely claiming right over the suit schedule property though my site was on the western side of Church. I do not know the width of road exists on the western side of Church. The width of the road on the northern side of the suit schedule property may be 25 feet. I do not know the width of road exists on the Eastern side of property. The road existed on the northern side of suit schedule property runs of Jalahalli cross to Chokkasandra . When it is questioned to the witness that whether the said Northern road is a main road ; the witness said that it is a normal road. I have not produced any layout plan to show the existence of Northern and Eastern side road. There is no such plan which discloses the existence of those roads. The site no. 34 is a vacant site therein Garbage are stacked is there. I have not produced any such photographs. When it is questioned to the witness that in the suit schedule property, the defendant put up a shed and parking his four wheeler vehicle ; the witness said he has not seen those things when he recently visited but he do not know what is there as on today. The witness further stated that TT was parked. I do not know that the defendant no.3 is parking the his vehicle in the said place. It is false to suggest that the said property belongs to defendant no.3 and he is in actual possession and

enjoyment of the same. I have not enquired about the TT found in the suit schedule property. I have not lodged any complaint regarding the parking of TT. It is false to suggest that as the suit schedule property belongs to defendant no.3 as such I have not objected the defendant no.3 for parking the vehicle in the said property. It is false to suggest that though my property is different from the suit schedule property, I have filed the suit by creating the documents.

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.