

Witness present and duly sworn on 24/04/2025.

Cross Examination by advocate for Respondent.

I am claiming right over the property in survey no. 185/2 measuring 13 guntas of Rajapura Village. The said property originally granted in favour of my grand mother – Smt. Parvathamma by the land tribunal. The said Parvathamma is the maternal aunt of my father Sri. Virupaksha Odeyar. The witness volunteers said Parvathamma had no issues and his father has been adopted by said Parvathamma. Marisiddaiah was the husband of said Parvathamma. Aforesaid Sri. Virupaksha Odeyar is the son of Siddappa. Marisiddaiah was the brother of Siddappa. It is true that I have not produced any G-Tree. I studied up to 10<sup>th</sup> Standard. I know the reading and writing of Kannada Language. My evidence affidavit is in English Language that has been prepared on my instructions. I am claiming compensation in respect of property bearing survey no. 185/2A measuring 13 guntas. I have produced the copy of the Land Tribunal order to show that property has been granted by land tribunal. It is false to suggest that the extent of property granted to Parvathamma specifically mentioned in the order.

2. It is false to suggest that I have not produced any document to show that the Parvathamma bequeathed the property to me by executing a Will. It is true that I have not produced Probate and Succession Certificate on basis of Will claimed by me. It is true that the name of V. Muniraju has been mentioned in the Notification in respect of property in survey no. 185/2A at Sl.No. 27. The said document is marked as Ex.R. 1 and the relevant portion is marked as Ex.R.1(a). It is true that property in survey no. 185 and 185/2 was originally Inam Land of Tattekere Mahadeshwara Swamy Temple. The witness volunteers that Rajpura Mata has given the said property to Tattekere Mahadeshwara Swamy Temple.

3. Smt. Parvathamma executed a Will in favour of Kanakamma, Mudduprasad and Mari Raju. Kanakamma was the daughter in law of Parvathamma. Mudduprasad and Mari raju are the children of Kanakamma. Parvathamma adopted Virupakasha Odeyar as her son. I have not produced any document to show that Parvathamma adopted Virupakasha Odeyar as her son. When it is questioned to the witness that there is no document to show that Virupakasha Odeyar is either the adoptive son or foster son of Parvathamma ; the

witness said there was a reference in partition deed. The partition deed claimed by me was executed between Siddappa and Parvathamma. The said partition deed was not registered partition deed. I have not produced the said partition deed to the court. I can produce the said partition deed to the court. It is false to suggest that no notification has been issued in my name in respect of property involved in this case. It is false to suggest that I am not entitle for any compensation. The witness volunteers that there was a mistake in mentioning the name in the notification. I have filed a application to rectify the mistake of my name in the notification. I have not produced the copy of the said application filed before the LAO to rectify my name in the notification. I have filed application before the LAO / respondent for payment of compensation amount. I have not produced any document to show that I have filed application before the LAO seeking compensation. It is false to suggest that as I have not produced any document to show my title over the acquired property before the LAO, compensation has not been paid to me and reference has made to this court. It is true that I have not produced original

land grant order to the court. It is false to suggest that I have make a false claim in this case.

**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.