

**WITNESS – PW-1 IS RECALLED AND DULY SWORN
ON 12-03-2026.**

**Further cross Examination by Defense Counsel
Sri.R.K:-**

Q: You have not produced any documents to show that you have tried to stop Amalgam RX from developing software Isage?

A: I need to verify it.

Q: Since, Isage is not a replica product of Blue Star Software not related to Blue Star Software in any manner you have not taken any legal action to stop them from developing the software Isage.

A: Isage applications are similar to Welldoc software Blue star application.

Q: What are the documents have been produce to show that Blue Star application and Isage applications are a similar?

A: We have made submission that it is white label product. I have to go through the documents. Skype chat reference would show that there was a conversation between the Mattiprasad and accused No.1 to 4 and Rian Sisko that they replicated the product.

It is false to suggest that entire Skype chart do not contain conversation regarding Replication of product.

Q: You have not filed any suit against accused No.14 to in seeking any injunction reliefs from developing the software in any manner you have not taken any legal action to stop them from developing the software Isage?

A: I have not filed any suit except the present criminal case.

It is false to suggest that Alop Soft / Amalgam Rx have not violated the software related laws, hence I have not filed any suit against the same seeking any injunction.

Q: Ex.P2 and P3 and P4 to 7 there are no such conversation record about data theft or divulging of confidential of proprietor information of Welldoc Software Pvt. Ltd?

A: I need to look at it. I don't remember.

Q: Ex.P23 inquiring report is not conducted in accordance with law?

A: Enquiry was conducted as per best of our knowledge.

It is false to suggest that accused No.1 to 4 are not part of enquiry report.

I felt Ex.P23 is a valid document to be produced along with complaint so I have produced it along with complaint before the court. Ex.P23 is the part of the complaint. Witness as volunteered that Ex.P23 is

produced before the court to see whether it is relevant or not for the case.

Defense counsel has posed a question that no notice of enquiry or charge-sheet is issued to the accused No.1 to 4 for the purpose of conducting enquiry.

At that time advocate appearing for the complainant has raised objection contending that the accused persons challenged the termination from the employment. Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka modified the judgment passed by the Hon'ble XII Additional City Civil and Sessions Judge, Bengaluru (CCH-27) by allowing RFA. While disposing the petition Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka ordered that finding that termination was arbitrary set aside. The question before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka was whether the termination of the accused was illegal.

Defense counsel has made submission that no findings recorded by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka regarding the termination of the accused and a SLP No.122/2024 preferred before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and also there is specific averment in the para 17 of complaint about the enquiry conducted. Hence, he may be permitted to put the questions about enquiry conducted.

Advocate appearing for the complainant has pointed out the finding recorded by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka para 12 of the judgment. It reads as follows: Termination cannot be branded arbitrary or wholly unjustified.

I have gone through the judgment passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in RFA No.604/2023 dated 29.08.2025. This was a regular first appeal preferred by the complainant company questioning the judgment passed by the Hon'ble City Civil Court holding that termination of accused No.4 is arbitrary.

Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka came to the conclusion that finding recorded by the Hon'ble City Civil Court that termination was arbitrary set aside and ordered termination held to be valid under clause 13 Ex.D.5, but procedurally defective for want of enquiry. There by, core subject matter before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka regarding the procedures undertaken by the complaint company while terminating the accused. Defense counsel said that the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka is under challenge in special leave petition. As the as answer regarding the dispute pertaining to the procedures undertaken by the complaint company while terminating the accused is under challenge before the higher forum. Permission is denied to ask any questions regarding the procedures

undertaken by the complaint company while terminating the accused.

Q: Whether you have challenged the judgment passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka in RFA No.604/2023 dated 29.08.2025?

A: I have to consult my lawyer.

Further cross examination of PW1 is deferred as requested.

(Typed to my dictation in the open Court)

ROI & AC

IV ACJM, Bengaluru