

WITNESS CALLED AND DULY SWORN ON 29.05.2023.**FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY SRI.R.P.K., ADVOCATE FOR THE DEFENDANT NO.9:-**

7. **Question:** Did you verify whether you have entered into agreement with defendant no.9 on 04.06.2010 by paying Rs.1,25,00,000/- along with J.Madhusudan Tadipathri ?

Answer: I did not verified the document since I din't find time.

It is false to suggest that, I have formed syndicate along with Sudhakar A.V., B.Veeranjaney Reddy, Kotramallikarjuna, Pulla Naidu, G.Praveen Kumar, J.Suresh Kumar, Madhusudhan, T.Vasanth Kumar, Rangadevarajulu, Siruguppa Krishna Prasad, Nagababu, Smt.P.Umadevi and Bhaskar Reddy and doing money lending business. It is false to suggest that, myself and above said persons, while advancing the loan used to take agreement of sale. I have not not holding money lending license. I do not know above said persons are holding money lending license.

8. I do not know that G.Praveen Kumar and G.Sai Pradeep are brothers.

Question: Advocate for the defendant no.9, confronted the agreement of sale dtd.13.12.2011 and suggested, it contained your photographs and signature ?

Answer: Signature and photographs are not clear, so I cannot identify.

Question: Have you know Kotramallikarjuna. mentioned in sale agreement dtd.08.02.2021 ?

Answer: I know the Kotramallikarjuna, but I do not know the same person name is mentioned in sale agreement dtd.08.02.2021.

Question: Advocate for the defendant no.9, confronted the agreement of sale dtd.08.02.2021 and suggested, it contained the photograph of the Kotramallikarjuna whom you know ?

Answer: Photographs are not clear, so I cannot identify.

Question: Advocate for the defendant no.9, confronted the agreement of sale dtd.08.02.2021 and suggested, it contained the signature of the Kotramallikarjuna whom you know ?

Answer: I cannot ascertain.

Question: Advocate for defendant no.9 confronted the sale agreement dtd.08.02.2010, 04.06.2010, 09.02.2010, 04.06.2010 and sale deed dtd.14.07.2016, 25.03.2013 and suggested that, these sale agreements and sale deed executed between defendant no.9 and your associate persons ?

Answer: They are not my associates. It is false.

9. Ex.P.8, I.T. returns was filed on 23.02.2013.

Question: When the Ex.P.8 I.T. return was filed, U.D.I. number was not prevailing ?

Answer: Yes. U.D.I. number is given only to the statement attached to the returns, not to the I.T. returns. I have brought my statement from the auditor before filing to this court.

It is true to suggest that, the Ex.P.8 does not contained the date on which the chartered accountant has signed. It is true to suggest that, On Ex.P.8, there is no certification of chartered accountant that

the Ex.P.8 is true copy of the same which was filed before the I.T. department. It is true to suggest that, sundry creditors details is not available in Ex.P.8. It is false to suggest that, to avoid the truth, intentionally I have removed the details of sundry creditors and produced Ex.P.8 before this court. I am not able to recollect who are the sundry creditors and creditors mentioned in Ex.P.8.

It is false to suggest that, in Ex.P.8, Capital and liability statement, in properties and assets column, I have inserted two entries of Rs.14.00lakhs each, under the name ADV Sampoorna V.V.Puram and Rs.28.00lakhs sundry creditors and creditors as per details for the purpose of this suit.

Question: Rs.28.00lakhs shown under the sundry creditors and creditors transaction is it cash transaction or account transfer ?

Answer: It is neither in cash nor through account. The sundry creditors of Rs.28.00lakhs is an adjustment entry from my wife account.

In Ex.P.8, under property and asset statement I have show Rs.14.00lakhs each, ADV Sampoorna is paid by cash only. It is false to suggest that, in previous year balance sheet of Ex.P.8, I does not shown availability of cash of Rs.28.00lakhs me.

10. It is true to suggest that, the Ex.P.11 does not contained the date on which the chartered accountant has signed. It is true to suggest that, On Ex.P.11, there is no certification of chartered accountant that the Ex.P.11 is true copy of the same which was filed

before the I.T. department. It is true to suggest that, Ex.P.11 I.T. returns filed after filing of this suit. It is true to suggest that, I am not the author of the Ex.P.11. It is false to suggest that, the entries of statement of affairs of Ex.P.11 are concocted entries. In Ex.P.11 the U.D.I. number written by the person from the chartered accountant office. It is true to suggest that, Ex.P.8 and 9 purported to be signed by two different chartered accountants. It is true to suggest that, Ex.P.9 also filed after filing of this suit.

Question: Chartered accountant has not mentioned date in Ex.P.9 and also not certified it as true copy ?

Answer: It is dated it, but not certified as true copy.

It is false to suggest that, the entries in Ex.P.9 under properties and assets, two entries of Rs.14.00lakhs each are concocted entries. It is true to suggest that, Ex.P.9 does not contained the details of unsecured loan. It is false to suggest that, I have intentionally avoided to filing the details of unsecured loan in Ex.P.9.

11. My wife is not having any trade license. My wife is owner of multi-stored building at Ananthapuram. It is true to suggest that, Ex.P.10 is not dated and also not certified it as true copy. It is true to suggest that, sundry creditors and creditors details are not enclosed with Ex.P.10. It is false to suggest that, there are no sundry creditors and creditors in respect of my wife, the entries Rs.29.00lakh in respect there off, entries Rs.14.0lakhs and Rs.15.00lakhs under properties and assets are concocted entries.

**FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION: DEFERRED AT THE
REQUEST OF ADVOCATE FOR DEFENDANT NO.9.**

(Typed to my dictation in open court.)

R.O.I & A.C.,

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