

WITNESS CALLED AND DULY SWORN ON 14.10.2024.**FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY SRI.B.A.J., FOR THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PLAINTIFF:-**

57. It is true, in Page No.44 of Ex.D.67 in 3(d), Rs.12,81,476/- is mentioned. I do not have any details mentioned in 3(d), since it is submitted by the Plaintiff. It is true, in Page No.283 of Ex.D.74 in 3(ii), Rs.45,30,767/- is mentioned. I do not have any details mentioned in 3(ii), since it is submitted by the Plaintiff. It is true, in Page No.344 of Ex.D.75 in 3(ii) under sundry debtors, Rs.2,37,942/- is mentioned. I do not have any details mentioned in 3(ii), since it is submitted by the Plaintiff. It is true, in Page No.618 of Ex.D.79 in 3(ii) under sundry debtors details mentioned in balance sheet is Rs.2,37,942/-. I do not have any details mentioned in 3(ii), since it is submitted by the Plaintiff.

58. It is true to suggest that, the amount mentioned in Page No.344 of Ex.D.75 in 3(ii) under sundry debtors and in Page No.618 of Ex.D.79 in 3(ii) under sundry debtors are one and same. It is true, in Page No.407 of Ex.D.76 in 3 of current assets Loans and advances mentioned in balance sheet is Rs.1,71,87,202/-.

59. 'Pioneer Developers' and 'Sampoorna Builders' are my business concerns. There is specific rules and Form for filing Income Tax returns. I do not know that, any rule to specify that, I.T. returns has to file in specific manner. Witness volunteers, assessee has to give all the details of balance sheet. It is true to suggest that, UDI Number is mentioned in balance sheet filed by the Plaintiff to Income Tax department. It is true to suggest that, the same UDI

Number is mentioned in the Ex.P.7 and Ex.D.79 at Pg no.619. Witness volunteers in Ex.D.79 pg no.619, UDI Number is hand written and no date, in Ex.P.7, UDI Number in the balance sheet it is typed and date is mentioned.

60. It is true to suggest that, In pg no.619 at Ex.D.79 and Ex.P.7, the total amount of Rs.3,65,29,638/-, balance sheet in assets is one and same. Witness volunteers the break up shown in Ex.P.7, i.e. the payment made to Defendant is not available in the Ex.D.79. It is false to suggest that, the amount of Rs.1,71,87,202/- mentioned in Ex.D.79 includes Rs.28,00,000/- paid to Defendant as shown in Ex.P.7.

61. It is false to suggest that, through the plaintiff has paid sale consideration amount, without executing the sale deed in favour of plaintiff, with intention to trouble him, we have called for the documents. I do not have any difficulty to produce my I.T. returns in this regard. It is false to suggest that, I have not produced the I.T. returns only with intention to avoid the truth.

RE-EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in open court.)

R.O.I & A.C.,

sd/-

(SUMANGALA S. BASAVANNOUR)
LXXXII ADDL. CITY CIVIL & SESSIONS JUDGE,

BENGALURU.