

WITNESS CALLED AND DULY SWORN ON 09.11.2023.**FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY SRI.B.A.J., FOR THE ADVOCATE FOR THE PLAINTIFF:-**

7. It is true to suggest that, there is no reference about the A.V.Sudhakar, in the documents produced as complaint at Ex.D.1. It is true to suggest that, I have not mentioned about the suit agreement in the complaint at Ex.D.1. I have produced the documents along with complaint at Ex.D.1, out of that documents, Special Power of Attorney in which the name of Pulla Naidu is mentioned.

8. I have not mentioned in the complaint that Nagababu is representing Umadevi W/O Nagababu. I have given Special Power of Attorney to Bhaskar Reddy and said Special Power of Attorney produced along with complaint at Ex.D.1. In the complaint at Ex.D.1, I have mentioned that the amount lend to the Accused no.1 to 14 and also stated the amounts which was granted to them and adding the said amount it comes to Rs.5,75,00,000/-. I have not mentioned specifically Rs.5,75,00,000/- in the complaint at Ex.D.1. It is false to suggest that, Complaint which is attached to the FIR at Ex.D.1 is manipulated document. It is false to suggest that, the complaint which is produced before the court is different from original complaint filed before the Police Station. It is false to suggest that, the Ex.D.1 complaint is filed only with intention to escape from liability.

9. It is true to suggest that, O.S.8662/2013 is filed against me and same was compromised as per Ex.D.2 and 4. Witness

volunteers I have repaid the loan amount and compromised. It is true to suggest that, in compromise petition at Ex.D.2, there is no reference of loan.

Question: Are you stated in Ex.D.6, as it is loan transaction ?

Answer: I have not stated. But, I have stated that transaction is wholly different and the plaintiff has suppressed the true facts.

I have not stated in Ex.D.6 what are the true facts suppressed by the plaintiff. It is true to suggest that, in Ex.D.2, in para no.3 it is mentioned that, as per my request plaintiff is received back the amount under the agreement. It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.6 - W/S filed on 09.12.2014. I have not stated in W/S at Ex.D.6 regarding the FIR and complaint at Ex.D.1.

10. It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.8 – Special Power of Attorney executed by me in favour of Pulla Naidu. Original Special Power of Attorney – Ex.D.8 is in the custody of Pulla Naidu. It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.8 – Special Power of Attorney executed only for the purpose of registering schedule-A to schedule-E property. The said Ex.D.8 – Special Power of Attorney is now not in force and it was cancelled after settling the amount. I do not remember when the Ex.D.8 – Special Power of Attorney was cancelled.

11. It is true to suggest that, Ex.D.10 is deed of revocation of Special Power of Attorney executed in favour of Pulla Naidu. Contents of Ex.D.10 is correct. It is true to suggest that, in Ex.D.10 it is mentioned that, original Power of Attorney dtd.09.02.2010 returned to me. It is true to suggest that, I have not produced the

original Power of Attorney dtd.09.02.2010 and original of Ex.D.10
before this court.

FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION: DEFERRED.

(Typed to my dictation in open court.)

R.O.I & A.C.,

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