

Witness present and duly sworn on 31.01.2026**Cross examination by Sri.VSN Advocate for R-2:**

I have seen the accident. It is true to suggest that accident occurred at Chittoor high way road. It is false to suggest that we were going on three vehicles. Witness voluntary states that Jagmohan had been alone on his vehicle, me and Somashekar were traveling on the other motorcycle. Lakshmipathi was not traveled with us. Prior to accident, we did not know about Lakshmipathi. The distance from my vehicle to deceased vehicle was about 200mts.

2. It is true to suggest that accident occurred at the night. Witness states that there were street lights and Gram Panchayat office near the incident place. Ex.P-3 spot sketch was not drawn in my presence. It is true to suggest that the mango groove were there either side of the alleged road. It is true to suggest that in the sketch, it was not mentioned about street lights. Witness states that street lights were there but it was not mentioned in Ex.P-3.

3. It is true to suggest that Ex.P-4 is not mentioned about Gram Panchayat office. We were going from our village towards Puttur side. I have seen the offending vehicle at the distance of 100mtrs to 200mtrs.

4. Jagamohan was my brother's son. Jagamohan had DL. I will produce the same. It is false to suggest that we were not wearing helmets. The motorcycle on which deceased was traveling belongs to Meshak. The said motorcycle was insured. I will try to produce insurance policy of the motorcycle.

5. It is true to suggest that the only front portion of motorcycle sustained damages. I saw the alleged incident

clearly from the distance of 100-200mts. The motorcycle of Lakshmipathi and the motorcycle of deceased were going side by side. The motorcycle of Lakshmipathi was left side of deceased motorcycle. There was 5ft gap between Lakshmipathi vehicle and deceased vehicle. Lakshmipathi's motorcycle was 4ft far from edge of the road.

6. It is true to suggest that the front and back side of deceased motorcycle, other vehicles were plying. The motorcycles were plying between deceased motorcycle and my motorcycle. It is true to suggest that the offending Innova car sustained right door damages. It is true to suggest that there were white lines between the road. It is true to suggest that alleged road was about 20ft.

7. The motorcycles were plying ahead of the offending car. The head lights were put in the offending car. It is true to suggest that the said head lights were reflected to oncoming riders. It is true to suggest that the riders were unable to see the oncoming vehicles due to head lights. It is false to suggest that Jagamohan and Lakshmipathi were riding their motorcycles at high speed. The offending car was coming slowly from Puttur to Chittoor side. It is true to suggest that offending car as well as other vehicles which were going ahead of the car were on their routes.

8. It is true to suggest that initially the accident took place between offending car and deceased motorcycle. It is false to suggest that thereafter the collision between two motorcycles, thereby the deceased fell down on the road.

9. We lodged complaint on next day of the incident at 10.00a.m. It is false to suggest that the accident occurred

due to negligence of deceased and not on the part of driver of offending car. I have a documents to substantiate that I took deceased to the hospital. It is false to suggest that I was not an eye witness to the incident. It is false to suggest that next day we lodged the false complaint against the car.

10. It is false to suggest that there is a lot of variance between chief affidavit averments and Ex.P-3 & 4 documents, therefore I was not an eye witness to the incident. It is false to suggest that the deceased was my relative, thereby in order to help the petitioners, I am deposing falsehood before this court by filing this false affidavit.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerised to my dictation in the Open Court).

R.O.I. & A.C.

II Addl. Judge.

