

Witness present and duly sworn on 11.02.2025.

Further Cross examination by Sri. CAA Advocate for the Plaintiff :

I do not know in which period Shankar have run the hotel at in the suit schedule property. It is not correct to suggested, prior to running the hotel at in the suit schedule property by Shankar the plaintiff have been ran the hotel at in the suit schedule property. Just prior to hand over the suit schedule property to the plaintiff for running the hotel, that I have been ran the hotel. I had been ran the hotel in the suit schedule property for a period of 4 to 5 years. Except Shri Krishna Sagar Hotel that I had no owned any of the hotel. In every day I use to earned 40 to 50 thousand from the hotel business. About 8 to 8 ½ months the plaintiff have run the hotel business at in the suit schedule property. From July 2018 the plaintiff had ran the hotel in the suit schedule property for a period of 8 months. After the plaintiff left the suit schedule premises that I had ran the hotel at in the suit schedule property for some period. From the month of March 2019, I had been ran the hotel in the suit schedule property. It is not correct to suggested, the plaintiff pay sum of Rs.5000/- and above in every day, the plaintiff paid to me. It is not correct to suggested, as per Ex.D5 bank

statement the plaintiff have paid upto Rs.11,000/- and above to me. To the month of January and February of the year of 2019, the plaintiff failed to pay the amount to me. It is not correct to suggested, as per Ex.D5 bank statement the plaintiff paid all the money to me as per the terms of agreement. That I have not produced the ledger account to show the deficiency of amount ought to be paid by the plaintiff. It is not correct to suggested, the plaintiff have no liability to pay any kind of money to me. It is not correct to suggested, the plaintiff paid the more money to me than to agreed amount. In the hotel nearly 18-20 workers was working. It is not correct to suggested, the plaintiff have no liability to pay any of the salary of workers who are working in the hotel. It is not correct to suggested, at in the hotel workers whoa respondent worked under me were not an workers under the plaintiff. I do not remember the name of all workers who are working at the hotel. Workers who working under me were not an workers under the plaintiff, despite I am deposing falsely in this respect. It is not correct to suggested, that I have manipulated Ex.D11 and 12 vouchers to make helpful to my case. I have no difficulty to examined the workers as an witness at before the court in support to my case. It is not correct to

suggested, at in the Ex.D13 water bill no date, month and year have mentioned. It is not correct to suggested, at Ex.D13 water bill no recital to say for how much of period water bill was due. It is not correct to suggested, just to define my case I manipulated Ex.D13 water bill. True, at Ex.D15 service bill GST number have not been mentioned. By the cash that I paid the money, as it mentioned in Ex.D15 service bill. It is not correct to suggested, that I manipulated Ex.D15 service bill to my case. True, the plaintiff have one cheque bounce case in against to me in CC No.677/2019. True, the same case has been decreed in against to me.

Further cross examination deferred on request.

(Typed to my dictation in open Court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

(R. Onkarappa)
V ACC & SJ, Bengaluru.