

IN THE COURT OF THE I ADDL CHIEF
METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE BANGALORE

CC No.3599-2012

| | | | |
|----------------------|----------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Deposition of | : | Govinda Bhatt | CW:99 |
| Father's Name | : | Sham Bhatt | PW:15 |
| Age | : | 77 years | |
| Occupation | : | Medical Sales Man | |
| Residence | : | Mangalore | |

Duly Sworn on 30.11.2021

Examination in Chief by Sr. APP:

I know A1. In the year 2007 I had been to his office as he was developing sites in Global City. I had agreed to purchase two sites in said area and I had paid advance amount of Rs. 3 Lakh each to said sites. A1 had executed two agreements in that regard, agreeing to sell sites after its development. Despite lapse of two years he did not sell the sites. Hence in view of buy back of condition, I address a letter to him for buy back offer. Later on repeated approach, A1 repaid Rs. 1,65,000/- to me in different installments. Thereafter on repeated approach, office of A1 was closed. Hence I approached CCB Police and gave complaint. Now I see said complaint, it is marked as Ex.P30, signature of witness Ex.P30(a), two notarised copies of agreements are marked as Ex.P31 and 32. I can identify A1 if shown to me. Counsel for A1 submits that there is no dispute with regard to identification of A1.

-2-

Cross Examination by Sri SH for BS Advocate for accused:-

The accused had circulated brochures of advertisement. A1 had shown me a land saying that development process is going on. A1 was in due of Rs. 4,35,000/- to me. I did not issue any notice to A1. It is false to suggest that as I could not fulfill terms of agreement, I have filed false case against accused. It is false to suggest that as in the year 2007-08, Government stopped conversion of lands into NA, accused could not form layout in above land. It is false to suggest that A1 has not caused any delay in performing his part of agreement. It is false to suggest that due to our CCB complaint, the police seized relevant documents and as such accused could not develop above land. Witness volunteers we lodged complaint after two and a half years. It is false to suggest that I have given false requisition and deposing falsely to suppress my own negligence. It is false to suggest that A1 is innocent.

Sri NJ for A2 submits no cross-examination.

Re-Examination : Nil

(Typed to my dictation in open Court).

ROI & AC**I ACMM, Bengaluru.**

CC.No. 3599-2012