

IN THE COURT OF THE I ADDL CHIEF
METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE BANGALORE

CC No. 3599-2012

Deposition of	:	S.S. Basavaraj	CW:96
Father's Name	:	S.V.Sadashivappa	PW:17
Age	:	45 years	
Occupation	:	Business	
Residence	:	Shikaripura, Shimoga Dist.	

Duly Sworn on 12.09.2022.

Examination in Chief by Sr. APP:

I know A1 present before court. In the year 2006-07 I had approached A1 to his office by name Aishwarya Projects for purchasing 4 sites, i.,e 1 in my name, 2 sites in the name of my father and another site in the name of my mother. Out of said sites, two sites were situated in Aerozonaa and other two were situated in Global City. We had paid Rs. 2,70,000 each for two sites and Rs. 3,75,000/- each to other two sites. Totally we had paid Rs. 12,90,000/- towards said sites. We had paid said amount through 4 separate cheques and A1 had issued 4 agreements executed by him in that regard. However

-2-

despite assuring to register the sites within one and a half year, Accused did not register the same till 2011 and he started evading and avoiding the same. Hence I lodged complaint before CCB. Now I see said complaint, it is marked as Ex.P36 and signature as Ex.P36(a). Now I see 4 receipts and 4 agreement issued by A1 towards above sites, same are together marked as Ex.P37.

Cross Examination by Sri SH for BS Advocate for A1:-

I came to know about said sites through a person known to me. I had personally visited the layouts to see the sites. It is true to suggest that, Accused had agreed to allot the site after conversion of land into NA Land. I do not if in the year 2007-08 process of conversion of NA lands was stopped to government. I have not issued any legal notice to Accused seeking refund of advance amount. I have not filed any other case before Civil Court and Consumer Forum against Accused. It is false to suggest that, due to our complaint documents of Accused were seized and formation of layout was delayed. It is true to suggest that, receipts are

-3-

not signed by A1. But agreements are signed by A1. It is false to suggest that, there is no fault on part of A1 and he has not cheated us. It is false to suggest that, I am deposing falsely by giving false complaint.

Counsel for A2 absent. hence cross-examination on behalf of A2 taken an nil.

Re-Examination : Nil

(Typed to my dictation in open Court).

R O I & A C

I ACMM, Bengaluru.