

Witness present and duly sworn on 22.06.2026
Cross examination by Sri.RSSR Advocate for
Respondent no.1:-

Manjula was my wife. Petitioner no.2 is my daughter. It is false to suggest that petitioner no.2 is not residing with me. It is false to suggest that petitioner no.2 has got married and she has settled with her matrimonial house. Witness voluntary states that she is a student. I have not produced any documents to substantiate that petitioner no.2 is a student and is residing with me. It is false to suggest that though petitioner no.2 is not residing with me, in order to get more compensation, I deposed falsehood to that effect.

2. On 06.03.2025 my wife went to the duty. Accident took place while she was returning from the work place with my neighbor Manjunath. Manjunath was riding the motorcycle, my wife was a pillion rider. Accident occurred at Bommasandra flyover. I was not an eye witness to the incident. I had not lodged the complaint.

3. It is false to suggest that accident occurred due to negligence on the part of rider of Manjunanth. I have not produced any documents to substantiate that both rider and pillion riders were wearing helmet. It is false to suggest that at the time of accident, Manjunath was not possessing the valid DL. It is false to suggest that though Manjunath was not having DL, I deposed falsehood to that effect. It is false to

suggest that the accident did not occur due to negligence on the part of driver of the offending lorry, rather, it occurred due to negligence on the part of rider of the motorcycle.

4. It is false to suggest that as per Ex.P-4 the accident occurred in the middle of the road. It is false to suggest that the rider and pillion rider themselves fell on the road, therefore Ex.P-4 did not mention the vehicle numbers. It is false to suggest that in order to get compensation, one Shivakumar had lodged a false complaint against the offending lorry. It is false to suggest that we are not entitle to get any compensation, because I deposed falsehood before this court.

5. My wife was working in Spoorti PU college. She worked there nearly 3 years. I have not produced any documents to substantiate that my wife was working nearly three years in Spoorti PU college. It is true to suggest that the date of issuance is not mentioned in Ex.P-13. It is false to suggest that in order to get compensation, after accident I have got created Ex.P-13.

6. It is false to suggest that I have not produced any documents to substantiate that the salary which were reflected in Ex.P-14 pay slips had been credited in Ex.P-13 bank statement. It is false to suggest that I falsely stated that the deceased was getting salary of Rs.23,500/- per month. It is

false to suggest that the deceased was not a permanent employee in Spoorti PU college.

7. I am working in Bengaluru Tough Club. It is false to suggest that deceased was depending upon my income and I never dependent upon her income. It is false to suggest that if court awards any compensation, only my children will entitle to get compensation and not me. It is false to suggest that I falsely stated that as we spent Rs.1,00,000/-towards funeral expenses. It is false to suggest that accident occurred due to negligence on the part of rider of motorcycle, hence we have to seek compensation from insured and insurer of motorcycle and not from the Respondent no.1.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerised to my dictation in the Open Court).

R.O.I. & A.C.

IIAddl. Judge