

Witness present and duly sworn on 30.07.2025
Cross examination by Sri.MAP Advocate for Respondent:--.

I do have knowledge regarding averments of my chief affidavit. It is true to suggest that I deposed evidence on behalf of my son. It is true to suggest that there was one day delay in lodging the complaint. I can produce MLC before this court. As on date of accident we were proceeding from K.R. Road to National College. The width of alleged road is about 30ft. There is no divider. It is true to suggest that the white stripes put in between the alleged road. At the time of accident, the motorcycle was having effective insurance policy. I can produce insurance policy and RC of the motorcycle.

2. It is true to suggest that as per Ex.P-5 the accident occurred in between four roads. I was coming from west to east as per sketch. It is false to suggest that as per Ex.P-5 rough sketch, I was going towards right side of the road without following the traffic rules. I know the traffic rules as per IMV Act. It is true to suggest that as per IMV Act, only two persons should travel on the motorcycle.

3. It is true to suggest that at the time of accident four persons were traveling on motorcycle. Witness voluntary states that I, my wife and my children aged about 12 and 7 years were traveling on the motorcycle. It is true to suggest that my son was sitting front of me. It is false to suggest that

we were not wearing helmet at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that I violated the traffic rules and we were traveling four persons on the motorcycle. It is false to suggest that if four persons were traveling on the motorcycle, there would less chances to control balance of the motorcycle. It is false to suggest that I was unable to control my motorcycle, myself dashed against the offending car.

4. It is true to suggest that as per E.xP-9 the accident occurred head on collision. It is false to suggest that I was not going within the prescribed line and prescribed speed, myself dashed against the offending car, thereby the accident occurred. It is false to suggest that petitioner was sitting front of me, due to lack of visibility, myself dashed against the offending car and there was no negligence on the part of driver of offending car. It is false to suggest that I in active collusion with police, falsely implicated the offending vehicle.

6. It is false to suggest that accidental injuries did not effect my son's educational academic year. My son sustained right hand fracture and he was unable to write as he wrote prior to the accident. Petitioner did not insure under health insurance. It is false to suggest that I have not incurred Rs.50,000/-towards my son's medical expenses. It is true to suggest that some of medical bills do not bear seal and signature of concerned hospital. It is false to suggest that I

have got created medical bill for this case. It is false to suggest that the accident has not occurred due to negligence on the part of driver of offending vehicle rather it occurred due to my negligence. It is false to suggest that accident occurred due to my negligence, thereby I and my insurer are liable to pay compensation to my son.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerised to my dictation in the Open Court).

R.O.I. & A.C.

IIAddl. Judge