

The witness is duly sworn on: 15.12.2025.

EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY ADVOCATE FOR DEFENDANT:-

I have filed my affidavit in lieu of examination in chief, which is prepared on my instructions. The contents of the affidavit are true and correct. The affidavit bears my signature.

I have produced the following documents in support of my case, which are marked as follows:-

Ex.D.10	SPA dt.03.12.2025.
Ex.D.11	Katha certificate dt.12.03.2024 in the name of defendant No.1
Ex.D.12	Assessment extract for the year 2023-24 in the name of defendant No.1
Ex.D.13	Letter dt.29.11.2022 given by Brijitha Prakash advocate to defendant No.1 and 3 regarding custody of original title documents of schedule property.
Ex.D.14	Office copy of legal notice dt.20.01.2024 by defendant No.3 to defendant No.1.
Ex.D.15	Copy of reply notice dt.29.01.2024 to Ex.D.14.
Ex.D.16	Copy of letter dt.14.03.2024 by defendant No.1 regarding handing over of original title documents.
Ex.D.17	Letter dt.16.02.2024 by defendant No.1 withdrawing the reply notice dt.29.01.2024.
Ex.D.18	Uttar Patra dt.04.05.2024 in the name of defendant No.2.
Ex.D.19	Katha certificate dt.04.05.2024 in the name of defendant No.2.
Ex.D.20	Assessment extract for the year 2024-25

	dt.04.05.2024 in the name of defendant No.2.
Ex.D.21	7 Tax paid receipts collectively marked.
Ex.D.22	Attested copy of sketch (subject to objection).
Ex.D.23	Deccan Herald dt.14.02.2024 page No.2 Paper publication .
Ex.D.24	Times of India dt.14.02.2024 page No.9 Paper publication .

Hence, i pray to dismiss the suit.

CROSS EXAMINATION:-Advocate for Plaintiff prays time for cross examination. Accordingly it is deferred.

(Typed to my dictation in open court).

R.O.I &A.C.,

**(B.P DEVAMANE)
I ADDL. CIVIL AND SESSION JUDGE,
BANGALORE.**

The witness is duly sworn on: 17.12.2025.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY ADVOCATE FOR PLAINTIFF:-

There are 4 share holders in defendant No.3 company. They are my father, mother, wife and myself. All of them are directors. I am not aware that, One. Mrs. P.S. Gurumurthy was lawyer for defendant No.1. It is false to suggest that, Mrs. P.S. Gurumurthy retired from defendant No.1 and appeared for defendant No.2 and 3. I am not aware that, on the date of filing of written statement by defendant No.1 her previous lawyer retired. I have gone through the written statement filed by defendant No.1. It is true to suggest that, defendant No.1 in para No.3(iii) of written statement stated that, she has sold the Suit Schedule property to defendant No.3. It is true to suggest that, there is no reference in the written statement of defendant No.1 regarding other agreements other than agreement of sale dt.07.11.2022. Witness volunteers that, there was revised agreement of sale dt.16.02.2024. It is true to suggest that, agreement dt.16.02.2024 is the new agreement between defendant No.3 and defendant No.1 and apart from this there is no agreement.

It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.14 is the notice issued by defendant No.3 to defendant No.1 asking to execute the sale deed. It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.15 is the reply of defendant No.1 stating that there was no agreement of sale dt.07.11.2022 but that was a nominal agreement for loan purposes.

It is true to suggest that, in Ex.D.15 defendant No.1 stated that, loan transaction was for an amount calculated at Rs.14.5 crores per acre. From the date of Ex.D.15 till 16.02.2024 there was no written communication between defendant No.1 to 3. Between these dates defendant No.1 to 3 were in discussion each other. It is false to suggest that, between these dates myself and my wife defendant No.2 were aware regarding earlier agreement of sale dt.13.03.2023 between Plaintiff and defendant No.1. It is false to suggest that, i and my wife were aware that, defendant No.1 had received Rs.70 crores as advance of sale price from Plaintiff No.1. It is false to suggest that, to deprive the Plaintiff from getting the property me and my wife defendant No.2 offered Rs.81 crores to the defendant No.1. It is false to suggest that, defendant No.1 over come by greed but wanting to protect herself, agreed to withdraw her reply notice subject to new agreement containing new terms. It is true to suggest that, as per new agreement of sale dt.16.02.2024 sale price was increased to Rs.81 crores. It is true to suggest that, under this agreement i paid additional amount of Rs.6 crores. It is true to suggest that, under this new agreement defendant No.1 agreed to execute sale deed in favour of nominee or assignee of defendant No.3. It is true to suggest that, under the new agreement dt.16.02.2024 transaction was to complete within 30 days.

It is true to suggest that, on 13.03.2024 sale deed was executed in favour of defendant No.2. It is true to suggest that, in

the said sale deed defendant No.3 was confirming party. There was no any deed of assignment between defendant No.3 and defendant No.2. There was no any written communication between defendant No.3 and defendant No.1 regarding assignment. It is true to suggest that, entire sale consideration for Ex.D.7 sale deed was paid by defendant No.3.

Q: The payment of cheques mentioned in 2.1(iii) to (x) mentioned in Ex.D. 7 sale deed is stopped by defendant No.3.

Ans: I have to check and verify.

(At this stage, The advocate for Plaintiff prays time for further cross examination, Accordingly, it is deferred.)

(Typed to my dictation in open court).

R.O.I &A.C.,

(B.P DEVAMANE)
I ADDL. CIVIL AND SESSION JUDGE,
BANGALORE.

The witness is duly sworn on: 18.12.2025.

FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY ADVOCATE FOR PLAINTIFF:-

I have paid TDS in respect of payment mentioned in para No.2.2 of Ex.D.7. I have got original receipt regarding the payment.

Q: Has defendant No.2 reimbursed sale consideration amount to defendant No.3 ?

Ans: I have to verify.

I have document to prove that, Rs.54 crores as mentioned in sale deed Ex.D.7 reached to the defendant No.1. Witness volunteers that, vendor / defendant No.1 has acknowledged the payment. It is true to suggest that, as on date of sale deed Ex.D. 7 the amount of Rs.54 crores mentioned in the Ex.D.7 was not credited to the account of defendant No.1. Witness volunteers that, sale deed taken place at about 4.30 P.M, hence on that day amount was not credited. The original title deed standing in the name of defendant No.1 is now with defendant No.3.

Defendant No.2 is director of defendant No.3 company and she is also my wife hence, the original title deeds are in the office of the defendant No.3 company.

Q: Are you holding the title deeds pertaining to the defendant No.2 as custodian ?

Ans: Me and my wife and our family members run the defendant No.3 company hence the documents are kept in the

office of defendant No.3 company.

There is no difference between defendant No.3 and our family members as we all family members hold shares in the defendant No.3 company.

It is true to suggest that, as per Ex.D. 16 defendant No.1 requested the lawyer Brijitha Prakash, DSK Legal to handover the title deeds to the purchaser being M/s. Anushka Construction Pvt. Ltd.,. Witness volunteers that, defendant No.2 is also our family member and director of defendant No.3 company.

It is true to suggest that, as on 14.03.2024 Brijitha Prakash was advocate for defendant No.3. Witness volunteers that, said advocate was custodian of the documents. Title verification was done, prior to entering into agreement of sale dt.07.11.2022. Advocate Brijitha Prakash verified the title documents. Advocate Brijitha Prakash gave title report. I have that title report. I can produce the said title. After the agreement dt.07.11.2022 i did not gave paper publication. Before the agreement i made spot inspection of suit schedule property. There was road access from rear side of the property, but i don't know the direction.

(At this stage, The advocate for Plaintiff prays time for further cross examination, Accordingly, it is deferred.)

(Typed to my dictation in open court).

R.O.I &A.C.,

(B.P DEVAMANE)
I ADDL. CIVIL AND SESSION JUDGE,
BANGALORE.

The witness is duly sworn on: 19.12.2025.

FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY ADVOCATE FOR PLAINTIFF:-

Dhrithi Vishwanath to whom Ex.D.17 is addressed is daughter of senior counsel of G.L. Vishwanath. It is true to suggest that, on Ex.D.17 Dhrithi Vishwanath has not put her signature. It is true to suggest that, on Ex.D.17 i have put my signature with rubber stamp. It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.17 was not addressed to me.

Q: What is the reason for signing Ex.D.17 with rubber stamp ?

Ans: It is signed by vendor / defendant No.1 hence i have also signed.

Myself and defendant No.1 were together when this Ex.D.17

was prepared.

It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.14 legal notice is signed by advocate Dhrithi Vishwanath. It is true to suggest that, advocate Dhrithi Vishwanath has filed vakalath for defendant No.1 on 25.03.2024 in O.S. No.1453/2024. After retiring from the vakalath of defendant No.1 advocate Dhrithi Vishwanath filed vakalath for defendant No.2 and 3 on 26.03.2024. I am not aware when advocate Dhrithi Vishwanath retired from the vakalath of defendant No.1. It is true to suggest that, as on 26.03.2024 advocate Dhrithi Vishwanath was representing defendant No.1 to 3.

I am not aware that on 20.07.2024 advocate Dhrithi Vishwanath retired from the vakalath of defendant No.1. Since last 2 years i engaged the services of senior counsel of G.L. Vishwanath and advocate Dhrithi Vishwanath is daughter of senior counsel of G.L. Vishwanath.

Q: How the money paid by defendant No.3 to defendant No.1 on behalf of defendant No.2 is shown in the books of account of defendant No.3 ?

Ans: Defendant No.2 is director of defendant No.3 company and has sufficient advances in the company and it is legitimate transaction reflected in the books of accounts.

This amount is shown as loans and advances to the directors. This amount alleged to be paid reflects in the balance sheet as on 31.03.2024. I can produce the authenticated

balance sheet of the defendant No.3 company. On the date of sale deed Ex.D.7 defendant No.3 had an amount of Rs.54 crores in the bank account in Jammu and Kashmir Bank. I can produce the documents to that effect.

It is true to suggest that, suit schedule property is 4 acre 32 guntas + 7 guntas B karab. It is true to suggest that, as per Ex.D.5 both the parties i.e., defendant No.1 and 3 would go to the planning authority about nalas on the property, the extent and location.

Defendant No.1 and 3 appointed Mr. Amith Pujary lysining person to check the location of the nalas and we ascertained 7 guntas to be left towards nala which is not to developable.

Q: Do you have any report from Mr. Amith Pujary lysining person and planning authority regarding location and extent of the nala ?

Ans: I will check.

It is true to suggest that, sale price agreed under Ex.D.7 was for land to the extent of 4 acre 32 guntas + 7 guntas B karab. It is true to suggest that, in Ex.D.5 it is mentioned that, the area of nala would be excluded and sale price proportionately reduced. On the date of Ex.D.5 i was aware about the area of nala as 7 guntas. I was not aware about the location of nala. I found the nala in the village map. I am not aware about the direction of the nala. It is false to suggest that, there is no person by name Mr. Amith Pujary and i have not obtained

report from this person or planning authority.

It is true to suggest that, as per legal notice Ex.D.14, it is the duty of defendant No.1 to identify and locate the nala passing through suit schedule property. Defendant No.1 did not locate and intimate me about the nalas. It is true to suggest that, boundaries of the schedule in Ex.D.7 are the boundaries of 4 acre 32 guntas and nala area of 7 guntas.

It is true to suggest that, defendant No.1 had obligation to get access road to the suit schedule property from Whitefield road. It is true to suggest that, towards the south of Suit Schedule property my another property in Sy No.129/1A situated. It is true to suggest that, towards the south of my property in Sy No.129/1A the property of Plaintiff No.1 trust in Sy No.130 situated. It is false to suggest that, both to suit schedule property and my land in Sy No.129/1A the only access to Whitefield main road is through Sy No.130.

I am not aware that defendant No.1 is the trustee of Plaintiff No.1 trust. To the east of suit Schedule property, the property of TATA ELEXSI situated through which i try to get access to Whitefield road. Defendant No.1 did not do anything for getting the access road. Defendant No.3 started communicating TATA ELEXSI and distributor for HP Gas for access road. As on today i have not got any permission for access road. I do not have any written communication with TATA ELEXSI or distributor for HP Gas regarding access road. Witness

volunteers that, it is only oral communication. It is false to suggest that, there is no communication between defendant No.3 and TATA ELEXSI and distributor for HP Gas for access road. As on today suit schedule property does not have access road to Whitefield road. Witness volunteers that, there is access road from rear side i.e., northern side. That road is called Sadaramangala road.

It is false to suggest that there is no Sadaramangala road, but it is only village boundary. I do not have any documents to show that there is Sadaramangala road on the rear side of suit schedule property, but i can apply and collect the documents. I did not request the owner of Sy No.130 to provide access road. I am not aware if defendant No.1 requested for access road in Sy No.130.

Defendant No.3 deposited Rs.4,62,85,120/- between 21.12.2023 and 28.12.2023 towards stamp duty and registration charges as mentioned in para No.5 of Ex.D.14 notice.

As per Ex.D.7 on 21.12.2023 defendant No.2 deposited an amount of Rs.3,93,24,000/- towards stamp duty and other charges. On 14.03.2024 defendant No.2 made payment of Rs.69,61,120/- through E-payment. Power of assignment was available to the purchaser under Ex.D.5 agreement and reaffirmed under supplementary agreement Ex.D.6. As on the date of payment of Rs.4,62,85,120/- i was nominated my wife defendant No.2 for the purpose of sale deed.

Q: When did the board of directors resolved to purchase the suit schedule property in the name of defendant No.2 ?

Ans: I will verify.

For the registration of property katha in the name of vendor is required. I am not aware that, katha of the schedule property was not standing in the name of defendant No.1 in December-2023.

Q: Katha was transferred in the name of defendant No.1 one day prior to sale deed Ex.D.7 ?

Ans: I will verify.

It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.15 is the reply of defendant No.1 to Ex.D.14 notice. It is false to suggest that, in Ex.D.15 defendant No.1 stated that, she never executed agreement of sale but it was loan transaction.

It is true to suggest that, at the time of agreement Ex.D.5 transaction was handled by real estate agent. The said real estate agent signed Ex.D.5 as witness. Witness identified signature of the said witness as per the request of advocate for Plaintiff same is marked as Ex.D5(c). I am not aware about the other witness to Ex.D.5. It is false to suggest that, before Ex.D.5 i did not know defendant No.1. Witness volunteers that, he know her and her husband from 2015 and had breakfast in her house. It is true to suggest that, defendant No.1 is daughter of Aadikeshavalu.

B.M. Kumar witness to Ex.D.5 is not in the court premises today. In November-2022 defendant No.1 gave original title deeds to DSK Legal. Mother deed and other relating documents are in custody of defendant No.3. I have no impediment to produce them. It is false to suggest that, as per reply notice Ex.D.15 defendant No.1 terminated the agreement of sale Ex.D.5 and asked me to come to Sub-Registrar office for cancellation of Ex.D.5. It is false to suggest that, defendant No.1 was ready and willing to return back the Rs.21 crores to me.

Q: You did not send reply to Ex.D.15 ?

Ans: We had cordial relationship defendant No.1, reconciled our differences and came to understanding for revised supplementary agreement in perusance to earlier agreement of sale dt.07.11.2022.

It is true to suggest that, the original title deeds were in ESCROW with DSK Legal. DSK Legal was my lawyer and handling my other property matters. It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.16 do not contain the signature of the addressee Brijitha Prakash. Witness volunteers that, the original letter was handed over to Brijitha Prakash, she confirmed through phone with defendant No.1 and later handed over the original documents to defendant No.3.

Q: How do you know what transpired between Brijitha Prakash and defendant No.1 ?

Ans: I was present when defendant No.1 called Brijitha Prakash hence i know about that.

It is false to suggest that, i was not present with Brijitha Prakash when the alleged conversation take place with defendant No.1 and Brijitha Prakash. This conversation happened at about 4.30 to 5.00 P.M. on 14.03.2024. It was telephonic conversation, i did not go and meet Brijitha Prakash at about 4.30 to 5.00 P.M., on 14.03.2024.

(At this stage, The advocate for Plaintiff prays time for further cross examination, Accordingly, it is deferred.)

(Typed to my dictation in open court).

R.O.I &A.C.,

(B.P DEVAMANE)
I ADDL. CIVIL AND SESSION JUDGE,
BANGALORE.

The witness is duly sworn on:05.01.2026.

FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY ADVOCATE FOR PLAINTIFF:-

For preparation of Ex.D.5 sale agreement, lawyer appearing on my behalf was Brijitha Prakash of DSK Legal. I don't know the lawyer for defendant No.1 at the time of preparation of Ex.D.5.

For preparation of Ex.D.6 supplementary sale agreement lawyer appearing on my behalf was Brijitha Prakash of DSK Legal. I don't know the lawyer for defendant No.1 at the time of preparation of Ex.D.6.

For preparation of Ex.D.7 sale deed lawyer appearing on my behalf was Brijitha Prakash of DSK Legal. Document vetted by senior counsel G.L. Vishwanath. I don't know the lawyer for defendant No.1 at the time of preparation of Ex.D.7. At the time of sale deed Ex.D. 7 defendant No.1 was not accompanied with any advocate. Ex.D.5 sale agreement was drafted by advocate Brijitha Prakash. The draft was approved by defendant No.1. I don't have the written acknowledgment regarding approval of the draft sale deed. At the time of registration of Ex.D.5 sale agreement, advocates of either of the parties not accompanied to the Sub-Registrar office. I am not aware that on 07.11.2022 as on the date of Ex.D.5 sale agreement katha of the Suit Schedule property was not standing in name of defendant No.1. I am not aware as to in whose name Khatha of the suit schedule property was standing as on the date of Ex.D.5. I am not aware that as on

the date of Ex.D.5 tax of the suit schedule property was not completely paid.

Q: On 12.03.2024 one day before the execution of sale deed khatha of the Suit Schedule property was changed in the name of defendant No.1.

Ans: I will check.

I don't know as to when and who made application for change of khatha of suit schedule property in the name of defendant No.1. It is true that, without Khatha in the name of vendor, sale deed will not be executed. Brijitha Prakash of DSK Legal noticed that there was no khatha in the name of vendor and asked to get the khatha in the name of the vendor. I asked the defendant No.1 to get the khatha in her name. From 07.11.2022 i was asking defendant No.1 to get the khatha. I am not aware since 07.11.2022 there was no khatha in the name of defendant No.1. It is false to suggest that, on my instruction advocate Brijitha Prakash taken steps to get the khatha in the name of defendant No.1. It is true to suggest that, Brijitha Prakash was not the lawyer for defendant No.1. Lawyer Brijitha Prakash and the vendor / defendant No.1 taken steps in registering katha in the name of defendant No.1.

From the year 2020-21 Brijitha Prakash has been the lawyer for defendant No.3 company. My wife defendant No.2 has filed O.S. No.2897/2024. Vishwanath and Manasa Legal firm appeared for Plaintiff in O.S. No. 2897/2024. It is true to suggest

that, Suhas, Gurumurthy and Drithi are the advocates in Vishwanath and Manasa Legal firm. From 2021 Vishwanath and Manasa Legal firm is representing defendant No.2 and 3.

After reply notice Ex.D.15 myself and defendant No.1 had negotiations and there was no lawyer with us. I don't remember the exact date on which myself and defendant No.1 arrived at settlement. My lawyers Brijitha Prakash supervised by senior counsel G.L. Vishwanath and Mr. Jagadheesh for defendant No.1 advised us regarding documentation of the settlement. It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.17 letter is not addressed to Sri. Jagadheesh advocate for defendant No.1 and it also do not contain the signature of Jagadheesh to show that he received the said letter. I have not received any letter from Jagadheesh advocate withdrawing Ex.D.15 reply notice. Witness volunteers that, vendor has written letter as per Ex.D.17. It is false to suggest that, i have obtained the signature of defendant No.1 on blank paper and then created Ex.D.17. There is no signature of advocate Drithi Vishwanath on Ex.D.17. Witness volunteers that, she is the addressee of the letter, hence her signature is not necessary. I received the letter Ex.D.17 from defendant No.1 and gave it to advocate Drithi Vishwanath. Immediately after registration Ex.D.6. Ex.D.17 letter is given. It is false to suggest that, Ex.D.17 was created for the purpose of this case. It is true to suggest that, advocate Drithi Vishwanath came in contact with defendant No.1 merely because of this transaction. Senior

counsel G.L. Vishwanath introduced advocate Drithi Vishwanath to defendant No.1 as he knew defendant No.1. I don't know when she was introduced to defendant No.1.

I sent Ex.D.14 notice to defendant No.1 on the advise of my lawyer Sri. G.L. Vishwanath. I can recognize the case papers on seeing. It is true to suggest that, in suit i.e., O.S. 1453/2024 advocates Manasa B Rao, P.S. Gurumurthy, B.R. Ravindra, V.C. Raju and Drithi Vishwanath appeared for defendant No.1. Ex.D. 8 is the declaratory affidavit filed by defendant No.1. It is true to suggest that, Mr. Suhas advocate in the office of Vishwanath and Manasa identified the defendant No.1. The said signature of advocate Suhas is marked on the request of the advocate for Plaintiff as Ex.D.8(a). It is true to suggest that, the said Ex.D.8 affidavit is notarized by P.S. Gurumurthy advocate and notary in the office of Vishwanath and Manasa. It is true to suggest that, i introduced defendant No.1 to senior counsel G.L. Vishwanath and i was the link.

Witness identified the E-mail printout furnished along with memo of retirement as per order dt.20.07.2024. As per the request of counsel for Plaintiff same is marked as **Ex.P.22**. It is true to suggest that, on 26.03.2024 Vishwanath and Manasa Legal firm filed vakalath for defendant No.2 and 3 along with impleading application. It is true to suggest that, on the same day i.e., on 26.03.2024 Vishwanath and Manasa Legal firm filed

vakalath for defendant No.1 also.

It is true to suggest that, I.A. No.3 was filed by defendant No.1 in O.S.No. 2897/2024 to implead herself as defendant in that suit. It is true to suggest that, this impleading application was filed after the registration of sale deed Ex.D.7. It is false to suggest that, in the affidavit supporting I.A. No.3 in O.S. No.2897/2024 defendant No.1 alleged that i have induced and forced her to execute the sale deed Ex.D.7.

It is true to suggest that, para No.4.6 of Ex.D.5 contains the clause regarding reduction of price to the extent of nala. The nala is to the extent of 7 to 8 guntas. The final price shown in the sale deed is after deducting the extent of nala. The original title deeds deposited with DSK Legal is now in my custody. Witness volunteers that, as on the date of sale deed documents are handed over.

Q: The District Registrar Shivaji nagar by communication dt.05.03.2024 addressed to Sub-Registrar of Indiranagar, Varthur, Bidarahalli, Banasavadi and Mahadevapura prohibited registration of any document regarding suit schedule property.

Ans: I am unaware about it.

It is true to suggest that, agreement of sale Ex.D.5 registered in the office of Sub-Registrar, Indiranagar, Bengaluru. It is true to suggest that, sale deed Ex.D.7 registered in the office of Sub-Registrar, Shivaji Nagar, Bengaluru. It is false to suggest that, me and my agents knew about the communication

dt.05.03.2024 and found amenable Sub-Registrar and got the sale deed registered. I have not verified the suit register of City Civil Court and Mayo Hall Court before 13.03.2024.

I have not got copies of arrangements referred in clause 2(iv) of Ex.D.5. Witness volunteers that, it was on trust. I am unaware that, no arrangement was made by defendant No.1 as mentioned in clause 2(iv) of Ex.D.5. I did not seek extension of time in writing. Witness volunteers that, i orally sought and it was extended. It is false to suggest that, i orally sought extension of time and it was extended. Defendant No.1 did not demand return of original documents after 1 year. Brijitha Prakash did not seek my instruction to return of documents after 1 year. Witness volunteers that, i was constantly interacting with defendant No.1. Defendant No.1 was never hostile towards me and there was cordial relationship.

Q: How has your wife treated this transaction in her books of account?

Ans: Shown as purchase of property.

It is true to suggest that, my wife defendant No.2 has shown as she has purchased the property. Defendant No.1 was aware that, her lawyer Driti Vishwanath was also my lawyer. It is false to suggest that, advocate Driti Vishwanath was aware about injunction order passed in this suit. It is false to suggest that, i was aware about order of injunction before execution of sale deed.

(At this stage, The advocate for Plaintiff prays time for further cross examination, Accordingly, it is deferred.)

(Typed to my dictation in open court).

R.O.I &A.C.,

**(B.P DEVAMANE)
I ADDL. CIVIL AND SESSION JUDGE,
BANGALORE.**