

DATED: 24.03.2025 PW.1 PRESENT AND OATH IS ADMINISTERED.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY Smt.D.S. ADVOCATE FOR DEFENDANT:

11. I am working as a Sales Executive in the plaintiff company. I have been authorized by the plaintiff company to represent the plaintiff company. It is not true to suggest that Ex.P.20 is an invalid document. It is not true to suggest that I have no authority to represent the plaintiff company in this case. The defendant has not placed any written request or written purchase orders. We have imposed the terms and conditions in the invoices. It is true to suggest that there is no seal of the defendant is not found on any of the invoices. It is not true to suggest that we have not delivered the goods narrated in its Ex.P.2 to Ex.P.14 invoices to the defendant. It is not true to suggest that the E-way bills are required to transport the goods worth more than Rs.25,000/-. Witness volunteers that the goods supplied in the present case are non taxable therefore, there was no need to issue E-way bills.

12. It is true to suggest that the plaintiff herein had filed Com.O.S.1083/2022 against the defendant herein. Witness volunteers that in the said matter the defendant got the matter compromised to the plaintiff. It is true to suggest that the claim of Com.O.S.1083/2022 was Rs.6,00,000/-. It is true to suggest

Com.O.S.845/2024

PW.1

Nataraju N R

that the said matter was settled for Rs.4,00,000/- payable by the defendant. Learned counsel for defendant confronted the witness, the joint memo filed in Com.O.S.1083/2022. Having gone through the contents the witness admitted the document. The said document marked as Ex.D.1. I admit the contents of the said document. It is true to suggest that through Ex.D.1 the plaintiff has also got the matter settled with the defendant with respect to the claims of SC.No.650/2022. Out of the said amount of Rs.4,00,000/- the defendant has paid Rs.3,51,000/- and Rs.49,000/- is still in due. It is not true to suggest that in terms of the settlement arrived between the parties, the defendant has paid Rs.4,44,000/- to the plaintiff. It is not true to suggest that though the defendant is not liable to pay the suit claim or any part thereof we have filed the present false case against him only in ordered gain unlawful.

(Upon the request of advocate for defendant further cross examination deferred)

(Typed to my dictation in the open Court.)

R O I & A C

**(JITHENDRANATH C.S.)
LXXXVI ACC & SJ, BENGALURU.**