

Witness recalled and duly sworn on 13.01.2020.

Further Cross Examination by Sri. ADR Advocate for accused :-

It is true to suggest that, details of the our company is available in the public domain. It is not true to suggest that, as on 24.01.2014 my wife by name Sree Venkatesh was the additional Director of M/s Nobel Software Pvt.ltd. It is true to suggest that, as on 31.10.2002 I am the Managing Director of the said company and Michel Samuel as Director of the said company. From 1999 to January 2012 Sree Venkatesh was alternative Director of the said company on different periods. You have document show who are all directors and alternative Director of the company from 2002 to 2015. I have document to show that my wife Sree Venkatesh was alternative Director of the said company. I do not know except the present complaint the company against the accused. As per my knowledge earlier private compliant bearing no.6910/2013 was filed before this court, but the court has return the same with a direction to file it before the jurisdictional police. Accordingly , the present complaint filed before the jurisdictional police. The document now shown to were all pertains to the earlier PCR. The same is marked as ExD1 (Consisting of 180 pages). It is true to suggest that, in the course of business the company has to authorized one Director to take action before the court of law by holding meeting. The document now shown to me might me to aware

Mrunal singh was authorized to initiate criminal proceedings against the accused, which is one such document is ExD1. It is not true to suggest that , the above said Mrunal singh alone was authorized to initiate criminal proceedings against the accused as per resolution date.11.02.2013. It is true to suggest that , the said resolution is not signed by Michel Samuel. I am not aware who are all directors present and where the said meeting was held to take decision to authorized or nominate person to initiate criminal proceedings against the accused.

It is true to suggest that, I was appointed by Mrunal Singh to conduct a enquiry against the accused. It is true to suggest that, I have initiated such enquiry on 03.02.2013. The document now shown to me is one such document came to into existence during my enquiry which bears my signature as well as Mrunal Singh dated.02.03.2013. The said document is at page 14 of ExD1.

Further – cross Examination :- Deferred at the request.

(Typed to my dictation in open court).

R O I & A C.

I A C M M.