Witness present and duly sworn on 18.06.2026
Further examination in chief by Advocate for R-2:

Due to over sight, in para-3 of my chief affidavit, the date of accident mentioned as 15.11.2023 instead of 14.11.2023. I request your goodself kindly read as 14.11.2023 in the place of 15.11.2023.

Cross examination by Advocate for petitioner:-

We have conducted investigation and have collected available documents through our investigator. It is true to suggest that we have issued the policy to the offending vehicle. Witness voluntary states that as on date of accident, we have not issued any policy, the owner of the offending vehicle has obtained policy on 15.11.2023 and it covered from 15.11.2023 midnight 0.01hrs to 14.11.2025.

2. The owner of the offending vehicle obtained policy through online. It is true to suggest that as per Ex.R-4, issuance of date mentioned as 14.11.2025. Witness voluntary states that subject to period covered from 15.11.2023 midnight 0.01hrs to 14.11.2023. It is false to suggest that as per Ex.R-4, the policy was in force at the relevant point of time. Since we have not taken any legal action against Ex.R-1 document. It is false to suggest that Ex.R-1 is a genuine document, hence we have not taken any legal action against the said document.

Question: AS per Ex.R-1 the premium was received on 13.11.2023. Isn't it?

Ans: I can't comment on Ex.R-1, because it was fabricated.

3. It is false to suggest that in order to escape from our liability, I am deposing falsehood before this court by filing this false affidavit.

Cross examination by Advocate for Respondent no.1:-

I am working in Respondent no.2's company for the past ten years. The company has issued authorization letter. I have not produced the said authorization letter before this court and have no impediment to produce the same. There are differences to obtain online policy as well as offline policy subject to production of valid documents and vehicle inspection.

2. It is true to suggest that policies obtained via online or offline are valid policies. Witness voluntary states that subject to production of valid documents and information. The said general question is not applicable to this case. We issued both online and offline policies.

Question: The policy number and vehicle number mentioned in Ex.R-1 & Ex.R-4 are the same. Isn't it?

Ans: I can't comment on Ex.R-1, because it was fabricated.

2. It is false to suggest that policy number, chassis number, date of issuance and time mentioned in Ex.R-1 and Ex.R-4 are the same. After marking Ex.R-1, we came

to know about that Ex.R-1 was fabricated. I do not know while filing written statement, Respondent no.1 has produced Ex.R-1. It is false to suggest that Ex.R-1 is genuine document, hence, we have not taken any legal action against Ex.R-1. It is false to suggest that in order to escape from our liability, I am deposing falsehood before this court by filing this false affidavit. It is false to suggest that though as per Ex.R-1 the policy was in force at the relevant point of time, I deposed falsehood to that effect. It is false to suggest that the date of issuance of policy and date of accident are the same.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerised to my dictation in the Open Court).

R.O.I. & A.C.

II Addl. Judge.