

WITNESS CALLED AND DULY SWORN ON 16.02.2026.**FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY SRI.B.A.J., FOR THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PLAINTIFF:-**

56. I know the contents of Ex.D.93 to Ex.D.108. To ascertain whether the plaintiff has mentioned the loan amount in IT records as paid to us, for that purpose we have called IT records. It is true to suggest that, the statement showing in Ex.D.108, page No.23 is pertains to the details of Sri.Chandrashekar Reddy i.e. 2nd Defendant. It is true to suggest that, as per the statement in Ex.D.108, page no.23 pertains to Rs.28,00,000/- was shown Plaintiff paid to Defendant for the purpose of purchase of Suit Schedule Property.

57. I do not know after 2013-14 onwards, IT department has changed filing of IT returns from manual to online. It is false to suggest that, there is a format to file IT returns, there is no any provision to upload with details of balance sheet. In generally the parties should file all the details of balance sheet along with their IT returns. I have declared the amount received from the plaintiff in my IT returns as loan. I have also declared repayment of amount to the plaintiff in my IT returns. I have not produced IT returns document before the court. It is false to suggest that, since I have not paid loan amount to the plaintiff, therefore I have not produced the IT returns document before the court. It is false to suggest that, Ex.D.93 to Ex.D.108 are not relevant for this case, but I have called those records to prolong the case.

RE-EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in open court.)

R.O.I & A.C.,

sd/-

(VIDYADHAR SHIRAHATTI)

LXXXII ADDL. CITY CIVIL & SESSIONS JUDGE,
BENGALURU.