

- 25 -

Witness recalled an duly sworn on 22.04.2022.

Further Cross-Examination by Sri ADR for accused :

It is false to suggest that our Nobel Software Private Limited was financial weak from August 2012 to February 2013. Witness volunteers but payments were delayed by customers. I can produced documents to show outstanding payments by clients at that period. I can also produce on going projects of that time. Generally payments of employees of our company was delayed by 20 days. I do not know if full salary was not payed to employees at once. Our company has no impediment to produce salary details of A1 to 3 from August 2012 to Feb 2013. I do not know if salary was paid in installments. It is false to suggest that during said period employees of our company were not given any job and they were not paid salary. It is true to suggest that I was not present in said company during said period and I did not know as to what was transpiring in said company at that period. After joining back in the month of January 2014 I came to know that there were projects in company at that

-26-

period. I am not sure if my name was disclosed in Nobel Software Private Limited Company from date of my joining till January 2014. It is false to suggest that my wife was Associate Director of Nobel Software Private Limited. She was Alternate Director. I do not remember period of her said post, but I can produce documents in that regard. I do not if she was alternate Director from August 2012 to February 2013. It is true to suggest that our Administrator can open the system and observe the work of any employee. I am not sure if he can observe such work only when employee is present. I do not know whether our company can take note of an e-mail of employee, if it is opened some where else.

I do not know if our company administrator has hacked e-mail of Vijay Kumar 10.02.2013 and taken screenshots as per page no. 107. I am not aware if said document was produced before me, when I was enquiry officer. I have attested said page by comparing with original. I may not remember the documents produce by Nobel Software Private Limited before me during enquiry at this stage. I cannot say

-27-

said fact by seeing documents now. I am not aware of original of said page no. 107 bears my signature and seal. It is true to suggest that I have verified said document with original. Said document is marked as Ex.D7 as per request of Sri ADR. It is true to suggest that what ever is seen in Ex.D7 should be in original. I do not know when Accused persons lastly worked in our company. It is true to suggest that similarly I have attested page no. 103 by comparing with original. I do not know if page no. 103 to 105 screenshots were also hacked by Nobel Software Private Limited Company when A3 was not present in our company. I do not if on 02.09.2013 A3 was not working in our company. I do not know on which said screenshot was taken. It is true to suggest that five screenshots were produced by company. It is true to suggest that page no. 95 screen shot bears my signature and verified signature. I myself have produced page no. 101 to 107. I do not remember whether page no. 101 was produced during enquiry or not. I do not if said page was not produced during enquiry. I do not remember as to when it was produced and when I have verified it. It is true to suggest that page no. 101,

-28-

102 and 105 do not bear signature of A3 and page no. 103, 104, 106 and 107 bears his signature. I do not remember if aforesaid page no. 101, 102 and 105 documents were not produced during enquiry and I have intentionally added it with police complaint. It is not necessary that charge sheet documents pertains to my enquiry report. I do not remember necessary documents of enquiry obtained by me, which were not produced with charge sheet. I do not remember who has given page no. 101, 102 and 105 to me. It is true to suggest that said three pages bear my original verified signatures. It is true to suggest that said documents are in custody of our company. I do not know if our MD has also not signed said three pages. It is true to suggest that said pages do not bear his signatures. It is true to suggest that charge sheet given to Accused is duly indexed and acknowledgment is received. It is true to suggest that page no. 18, 64 and 90 documents bear signatures of A1 to 3 respectively with regard to receipt of documents of enquiry on 02.03.2013. Page no. 64 is already marked as Ex.P34. Page nos. 18 and 90 are marked as Ex.D8 and D9 as per request of Sri. ADR. It is true to suggest that

-29-

said letters were given by A1 to 3. I do not remember if said documents were given at the time of enquiry. I do not remember if documents given by Accused were produced before labor court.

I do not remember if page no. 23 shown to me was produced by me. It is true to suggest that it bears my verified signature. I do not remember if said page was also not produced during enquiry. It is prepared by office. It was not available in enquiry. System Administrator has prepared it.

It is true to suggest that page no. 24 is signed by our MD and A1. It is true to suggest that page no. 23 list of documents pertains to A1. It is true to suggest that page no. 69 relates to A2. It is true to suggest that the list does not show any dates and in and out time.

It is true to suggest that page no. 95 list of documents pertains to A3. It is true to suggest that the list does not show any dates and in and out time.

-30-

I am not sure if a diary is maintained with regard to in and out of employees. I do not know working hours of employees in the year 2012-13. I do not know working hours of System Administrator at that time.

At this stage further cross examination of witness is deferred due to posting of other matters.

(Typed to my dictation in open Court).

R O I & A C

I ACMM, Bengaluru.