

-6-

Duly sworn on 30.06.2026.

Further Cross examination by Sri. A.D.R., advocate for accused
No.1 to 3.

As per the report, since July 2012 to 14.03.2013, the said incident was happened. The CW-1 has produced the audit report at the time of lodged the complaint. Witness voluntary stated that, at the time lodged the complaint, complainant has produced the enquiry report not audit report. It is true to suggest that, on 08.12.2016 I have called the CW-2 and CW-3 to the police station. I was not called the CW-1. I didn't called the CW-1 to enquiry report. It is true to suggest that, the Ex.P.1 to 32 are submitted by the complainant, which were part of the CrI.P.No.214/2016. It is not true to suggest that, I have not received the original documents. I have not verified any original documents of Ex.P.1 to 32. It is true to suggest that, I have only signed the Ex.P.44. My previous investigation officer has started the investigation at 2012. Further, my previous investigation officer was started the investigation on 02.12.2015. My previous investigation officer was handover the case records in the year October 2016. It is true to suggest that, I have mentioned the case dairy. I have took the case records for further investigation on 08.12.2016. I was concluded the investigation the same day after recorded the witness statements. It is true to suggest that, I have recorded the statement of CW-1 to 5 on 08.12.2016 and also the same day I have received the copies of documents from CW-1. It is true to suggest that, I had relied up witness statement and inquiry report for submit the charge sheet. It is true to suggest that, the CW-1 was the complainant and also inquiry officer. It is true to suggest that, I

-7-

have verified the inquiry report in independently. It is not true to suggest that, I have not made any investigation independently. It is true to suggest that, As per the order sheet the recording the inquired was started on 03.02.2013. Witness voluntary stated that, the inquiry officer was put the signature on 02.03.2013. It is not true to suggest that, I have not made properly verified the documents. I have not inquired the CW-1, Mrununal kumar Singh and S.Partha. I have not inquired Venkatesh.G.R. It is not true to suggest that, I have not independently inquired regarding documents. It is not true to suggest that, I don't know the Ex.D.1. I don't know, who was took the photo copy of the Ex.D.1. I didn't investigated the regard copies of documents produced by the CW-1. I don't know the original documents. I don't know the copies of documents belongs to whom. I didn't inquired regarding Ex.P.24. The said Ex.P.24 is blank paper.

2. It is not true to suggest that, As per the investigation Rs.25 lakhs was loss to the Noble Software company. In the complaint it is mentioned the loss of Rs.32 lakhs. On the basis of statements of CW-2 and CW-3 I have concluded there is loss of Rs.25 lakhs to the Noble Software company. I didn't collected any audit records regard of loss of Rs.25 lakhs to the Noble software company. I didn't took any expert opinion, regarding Information Technology Act. I didn't recovered any materials from the computer and also hardware. I didn't inquired the CW-1 about loss of Rs.50,000/- dollars. I didn't inquired how much salary to the accused persons. I didn't collected the attendance report about accused persons. I didn't inquired the American companies. I didn't inquired the owner of Noble Software company. I didn't

-8-

inquired the Mrunal Kumar Singh. I didn't collected the records regarding the loss. I didn't inquired and verified American Clients. It is true to suggest that, I have collected all the documents contents in the Ex.P.44. I didn't inquired the CrI.P.No.214/2016. I didn't inquired the Ex.P.5 to 32. The Ex.P.32 document shows against the accused persons. I have concluded my investigation on the basis of inquiry report and statements of CW-2 and CW-3. It is not true to suggest that, the CW-2 and CW-3 have not given any statement before me. It is not true to suggest that, I have created the statements of CW-2 and CW-3.

3. I have not inquired each pages on the inquiry report. It is not true to suggest that, I have not collected any original documents. I don't know how much hours wasted by the accused persons. I have collected the only copies of the documents from the CW-1. I have not collected the any documents of loss of opportunity to the company did parallel business by having communication with the company clients. I don't know, where the CW-1 was collected the documents. I don't know the P.C.R. No.6910/2013. CW- 1 was not given any statement regarding P.C.R.no.6910/2013. I have no objection to summon the previous officer and also C.D. I don't know the accused persons have registered the case against the CW-1, Myckal Shymual, Mrunal Kumar Singh. After lodging the F.I.R. the charge sheet should be filed on or before 60 days with permission it can be extended 90 days. I have not inquired the previous investigation officer regarding delay of investigation. It is true to suggest that, when I have took the case records, only complaint and mahazer records in the file. I don't know the previous I.O. has filed the CrI.P.

-9-

No.4561/2016 for cancellation of bail. I have not received any information about CrI.P. No.4561/2016. I don't know who is Mrunal Kumar Singh. I don't know, Myckal Shymual is the owner of the company. It is not true to suggest that, it is inhumanly filed the charge sheet running page No.1 to 148 and to verified the contents of the charge sheet which, compresses of the only copies and submit the report to the court. I can't say who much cases I have concluded my investigation within a day. It is not true to suggest that, except this case concluded investigation any other cases. Whether, any objection to summon all my investigation. The witness stated that, I can't say with regard to that question. I have inquired the CW-1 and complaint on the basis of case facts registered by previous investigation officer. I didn't asked previous investigation officer regarding the CW-1. It is true to suggest that, I have verified the case dairy and station house dairy. It is not true to suggest that, when I have verified the case dairy, the accused person are lodged the complaint against CW-1 and Myckal Shymual. I know that, CW-1 is the M.D. of company. But, I don't know the He and his wife having shares. I didn't thought, who is the owner of the company.

4. I don't know, the CW-1 was informed me, Mrunal Kumar Singh was M.D. of the company and he had registered the complaint against the accused and asked me to conduct the inquiry. Witness voluntary stated that, the CW-1 submitted the inquiry report. I didn't found that, Mrunal Kumar Singh was appointed the inquiry officer i.e. CW-1. I don't know the inquiry report based on the Mrunal Kumar Singh. I don't know any thing about Mrunal Kumar Singh inquiry report. It is true to suggest that, the complainant

-10-

as well as investigation can't registered the complaint. It is true to suggest that, in the present case the CW-1 is the complainant and also investigation officer. I don't know the, labour dispute regarding this case. I didn't found, how much amount loss by the each accused persons. It is not true to suggest that, I have colluded with CW-1, Mrunal Kumar singh and Myckal Shymaul and filed charge sheet against persons with in 24 hours. I don't know regarding the Criminal petition before Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka and the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka has rejected the petition.

Re-examination:Nil.

(the statement of the witness is records in the open court)
ROI & AC.

III Addl.C.J.M., Bengaluru.

PW-5
ಸಿಸಿನಂ.845/2017

