

The witness is duly sworn on: 11.08.2025.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: V.B. Shivakumar ADVOCATE FOR DEFENDANT No.2:-

I was doing Real Estate Business. It is true to suggest that, while i was doing real estate business i was maintaining the account regarding purchase and sale of properties. I am a income tax assessee. I am an agriculturist and i owned agriculture lands. I am permanent resident of Bangalore. Suit Schedule properties are agriculture lands. It is false to suggest that, i used to lend money on financial constraints. Defendant No.1 drafted Ex.P.11 and 12 agreements. Defendant No.1 purchased the stamp papers to prepare Ex.P.11 and 12. One Lakshmikanth uncle of defendant No.1 prepared Ex.P.11 and 12 agreements. As per the stamp papers Ex.P.11 and 12 these stamp papers were purchased by me. Stamp duty for purchase of stamp papers paid by me. It is false to suggest that, Ex.P.11 and 12 agreements are drafted by me before obtaining the signatures of defendant No.1 on the said documents. Defendant No.1 gave me xerox copies of the property documents. It is false to suggest that, Ex.P.11 and 12 agreements both were taken as Real Estate Agent transaction. I have documents shown that, on 19.02.2022 i was having an amount of Rs.1,91,02,000/- as per Ex.P.11. I don't know as to whether there is any documents with me to show that, i was having an amount of Rs.1,96,02,000/- as on 25.02.2023 as stated in Ex.P.12.

It is true to suggest that, my all bank transactions taken place through Federal Bank, Banasavadi Branch. Witness volunteers that and South Indian Bank Shivaji Nagar Branch also. It is true to suggest that, as per Ex.P11 and 12, 6 months time was fixed for completion of the transaction. It is false to suggest that, i was not having requisite amount to complete these transaction. With in the period of 6 months i did make any correspondence in writing with defendant No.1. I did not inform in writing to the defendant No.1 within 6 months asking him to receive the balance amount and complete the transaction. Witness volunteers that, i informed orally. It is false to suggest that, after date of these documents i did not meet the defendant No.1. It is false to suggest that, these Ex.P11 and 12 documents are security documents towards the loan.

I did not verify the documents of the Suit Schedule property before execution of Ex.P11 and 12. It is false to suggest that, as on 19.02.2022 i paid loan of Rs.5,00,000/- to the defendant No.1. It is false to suggest that, on 19.02.2022 i did not pay larger amount to show my interest in purchasing of property. It is false to suggest that, i did not show my willingness to purchase the property. It is true to suggest that, payments mentioned Ex.P.12 are made on different dates. It is false to suggest that, since defendant No.1 availed loan from me and as a security of the same i took this Ex.P12 document. It is false to suggest that, within 6 months from the date of Ex.P12 i did not had balance of amount of

Rs.1,46,52,000/-. It is false to suggest that, i was neither ready nor willing to purchase the suit schedule property and this Ex.12 is a real estate document. It is false to suggest that, the signatures appearing on the last page of Ex.P11 as signatures of vendor are not the signature of defendant No.1.

I know the witness Lakshmikantha. From 1967 i know said Lakshmikantha. It is false to suggest that, said Lakshmikantha is also in real estate business. I do not know whether Lakshmikantha is the owner of the suit schedule property. It is true to suggest that, this Lakshmikantha brought this transaction to me. Witness volunteers that, Lakshmikantha told that, defendant No.1 is in problem and asked me to purchased a land. It is false to suggest that, Lakshmikantha did not know about sale of the schedule property. I don't know as to whether Lakshmikantha interacted with defendant No.1 regarding sale of the schedule property. I don't know, the cheque mentioned in the Ex.P.11 is a bearer cheque. I don't know that, the said cheque was encashed by Lakshmikantha as self cheque. I don't know the cash of Rs.50,000/- was also given to Lakshmikantha. I don't know who wrote the second endorsement on the last page (page No.24) of Ex.P.11. It is false to suggest that, the said endorsement is written by Lakshmikantha. I don't know who has signed the first signature below the second endorsement in last page (page No.24) of Ex.P.11. I don't know who has signed the third signature below the second endorsement in last page (page No.24) of Ex.P.11.

(At this stage, The advocate for defendant 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: 08.09.2025.

**FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY: V.B. Shivakumar
ADVOCATE FOR DEFENDANT No.2:-**

It is true to suggest that, sale transaction was required to be completed from 19.02.2022. I have not do any attempt of calling the defendant to execute the sale deed within the specified time, in writing. It is false to suggest that, as it was a money lending transaction, hence i did not do any attempt of calling the defendant to execute the sale deed within the specified time. It is false to suggest that, i paid amounts to the defendant as and when he demanded as debt. It is false to suggest that, i am having other immovable properties, other than suit schedule property. It is false

to suggest that, defendant No.1 never mentally prepared to execute Ex.P11 and 12 agreements of sale. It is false to suggest that, defendant No.1 prepared to give me loan documents. It is false to suggest that, i compelled the defendant No.1 to sign Ex.P11 and 12 as loan documents and promised him that, i will enforce these documents towards properties. It is false to suggest that, i never interested in purchasing the suit schedule property. It is false to suggest that, they was no understanding or arrangement for buying selling the property. It is false to suggest that, i have filed this suit only to recover the amount and not for the property. It is false to suggest that, i never intended to buy the property except interest on loan. It is false to suggest that, i will not be put to any inconvenience if sale deed is not executed in respect of suit schedule property.

RE-EXAMINATION: NIL

(Typed to my dictation in open court).

R.O.I &A.C.,

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

As per the order on I.A. No10 and 11 dated 14.11.2025 witness recalled.

The witness is duly sworn on: 10.12.2025.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: Sri. Madan ADVOCATE FOR DEFENDANT No.1:-

It is true to suggest that, i am in real estate business. I came to know defendant No.1 through his uncle Lakshmikanth. It is false to suggest that, Lakshmikanth is not the uncle of defendant No.1 and he is also a real estate agent. Lakshmikanth is a Central Government Employee. It is false to suggest that, along with real estate i am also in money lending business. It is false to suggest that, Lakshmikanth introduced defendant No.1 to me for lending money. It is false to suggest that, Ex.P11 agreement is executed for the security of the loan. Market value of the suit schedule property as on date of Ex.P.11 was Rs.800 per sq.ft. It is true to suggest that, as on date of Ex.P11 guidance value of the suit schedule property was Rs.3.3 crores per acre. Survey numbers of schedule in Ex.P12 are 137/3 measuring 30 guntas, 141/2 measuring 22.5 guntas and 141/7 measuring 20 guntas.

Schedule property of Ex.P. 11 agreement is Sy No.141/2. Sale consideration of all the three lands was Rs.1,96,20,000/-. I am not aware that, as on date of Ex.P.12 guidance value of the Schedule property more than Rs.5 crores per acre. It is false to suggest that, i have created Ex.P.12 by including other 2 properties without knowledge of defendant No.1. It is false to suggest that, as on date of Ex.P.12 though value of the suit schedule property was more than

Rs.5 crores per acre, i have created Ex.P.12 citing the market value as Rs.1,96,20,000/-. It is false to suggest that, Ex.P.12 document is created only for the security of loan and not for sale. I am not aware that, boundaries of the schedule property in Ex.P.11 and 12 are the same. It is false to suggest that, i have copied the Ex.P.11 on Ex.P.12 to nock the schedule property and cheat the defendant No.1. It is false to suggest that, me and Lakshmikanth created Ex.P.11 and 12 documents to make wrongful gain. It is false to suggest that, defendant No.1 never executed agreement of sale but he has executed document for the security of loan. It is false to suggest that, i have filed this false suit for harassing the defendant No.1. It is false to suggest that, i am entitled for only recovery of loan and not for property. It is false to suggest that, i managed to register sale deeds Ex.P.15 and 16 in the name of defendant No.2.

RE-EXAMINATION: NIL

(Typed to my dictation in open court).

R.O.I &A.C.,

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