

Witness present and duly sworn on 02.02.2024
Cross examination by Smt.LNA Advocate for Respondent no.1:-

It is false to suggest that on 24.10.2022 at 10.30a.m. I was in the office. It is true that the two wheeler bearing n.KA-03-KC-9374 is the Royal Enfield. It is true that this motorcycle weighs about 180 to 200kgs. It is true that at 11.20a.m. on the same day I was near Hennur Bridge. It is true that at Hennur Bridge, I met with an accident. It is false to suggest that the said accident was a hit and run case. It is true that at Horamavu under pass there is a metro work going on.

2. It is false to suggest that there are path holes. It is false to suggest that while going on Hennur Bridge I fell on the path holes. It is false to suggest that when I fell down my finger got stuck with my vehicle, and I sustained injury. It is false to suggest that Fender of the offending car is damaged. Witness says that his finger stuck with the tale lamp and got injury. It is true that I was going behind the offending car.

3. I have not given any statement to the doctor when I was initially examined as I was unconscious hospital at North Bengaluru hospital. It is true that now here I have stated either in the complaint or in any other records that I was unconscious when I was initially taken to hospital. I can produce the

admission records of North Bengaluru hospital. It is false to suggest that the wound certificate is written as per my instructions. It is false to suggest that I have stated before the doctor that the incident has occurred at 11.20a.m. at Hennur bridge as per my wound certificate.

4. It is true that my vehicle is got examined by RTO inspector. It is false to suggest that while riding the motorcycle I fell on the path hole and the 1st Respondent who was proceeding in car helped me and took me to the hospital. It is true that the 1st Respondent has given expenses of my treatment. It is true that he has paid ₹.2,00,000/- for my treatment. It is false to suggest that I have given false complaint against the 1st Respondent tin order to get compensation for the injuries.

5. It is false to suggest that since the 1st Respondent is an IT official, after obtaining money from him, I am troubling him by filing false complaint and petition on him.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerised to my dictation in the Open Court).

R.O.I. & A.C.

IIAddl. Judge