

Witness recalled an duly sworn on 24.02.2022

Further Cross-Examination by Sri ADR for accused :

It is false to suggest that if in the absence of any employee, whose e-mail is opened and if System Administrator taken the screen shot of such E-Mail it

-21-

amounts to hacking of such E-Mail. If E-Mail is opened by an employee and screen shot is taken by System Administrator, it is not hacking. I am not sure if date and time of taking screen shot appears on it. It is true to suggest that page no. 107 is screen shot produced in enquiry. It is true to suggest that it disclosed date as 20.03.2010 at 3.00 PM. The said documents is marked as Ex.D6 as per request of Sri ADR. Witness volunteers it is date and time of sending E-mail. It is true to suggest that at the time of sending said E-Mail in the year 2010 I was working in Nobel Softwares. I am not sure if said E-mail is not where concerned to alleged enquiry from July 2012 to January 2013. I do not know if 10.02.2013 falls on Sunday. Witness volunteers there is nothing wrong in working on Sundays. It is false to suggest that taking Ex.D6 printout amounts to hacking of E-Mail of A3. I am not sure if the said statement is written by A3 in my presence during enquiry between A3 and Nobel Softwares. Ex.D6 document pertains to enquiry report, which is submitted by MD of the company. It is true to suggest that MD of the company has

-22-

signed Ex.D6. Letter dated 05.02.2013 of Nobel Softwares itself is a charge sheet. Nobel Softwares has visited only Subramanyanagar police station with regard to enquiry and no other police stations. It is false to suggest that the matter was also taken to Rajajinagar police station. To the question that your company had filed memo to transfer the case from Rajajinagar police station to Subramanyanagar police station, witness states that the Magistrate himself directed to approach Subramanyanagar police station and accordingly said police station was approached by the company. Witness further states the court stated that it is Civil nature and software related and case was thrown out. Our company did not approach any Cyber police station. Witness volunteers we lodged complaint before Police Commissioner. I do not remember said date. I had approached Commissioner office after re-joining the company.

It is true to suggest that Nobel Softwares company will be in possession of bills of softwares purchased by it and

-23-

such bills are audited. Such bills will be available is said company. Bills of paid softwares can be produced before court. I am not sure as to which software was used by the employees and whether it was stated in enquiry or not. Necessary softwares are purchased, depending upon the work of the company. I am not sure as to which softwares were used by employees. I am not sure if Nobel software company had used same softwares form July 2012 to January 2013, which were in existence from more than one decade. The some of major softwares available in our company were Autocad, ESRI. It is false to suggest that Autocad software is generally available every where. Witness volunteers our software were licensed one. I do not know when said Autocad and ESRI software was purchased and what was its cost. I do not whether said softwares are valued in thousands or lakhs. Cost of a computer system of company ranges from Rs. 40-50 thousand. Cost of laptop of our company ranges from Rs. 80,000/- to Rs. 2,00,000/-. I am not sure if bills of such systems and laptops are available with company. It is true to

-24-

suggest that during enquiry bills of such system and laptops were not produced. Witness volunteers it was not necessary. I do not know if salary of employees of our company was Rs.2,500/- per month in the year 1999. I do not remember salary paid to A1 to 3 during my period. I do not remember salary paid to A1 to 3. It is true to suggest that such salary is audited and documents can be produced. I do not know if salaries were not regularly paid in time in the year 2012. I do not if salary of A2 was paid on 21.12.2011 i.e., a sum of Rs. 15,730/-. I do not know if on 17.07.2011 salary of A2 was paid.

At this stage further cross-examination of witness is deferred as other cases are posted for evidence.

(Typed to my dictation in open Court).

R O I & A C

I ACMM, Bengaluru.