



DATED: 02.02.2026 PW.1 PRESENT AND OATH IS ADMINISTERED.

FURTHER EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY ADVOCATE FOR PLAINTIFF:

Today, I have filed my affidavit in lieu of examination in chief and the contents therein are true and correct, it bears my signature.

I have filed following documents in support of the case. They are marked as under:

Ex.P.15	Printout of the certificate of the registration of witness. (marked after comparing it with the original and found correct)
Ex.P.10(a)	Signature of the witness on Ex.P.10.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY SRI.BSN ADVOCATE FOR DEFENDANT:

I visited the site probably in the month of September 2024 around 11 a.m. to 12.00 noon. I was in the site about 1 to 1.5 hours the execution plan and the copy of the construction agreement was given to me. I have taken the measurements at the site. Before undertaking measurements in the site I have not looked into the documents showing the measurements of the site. The measurement of the property as found in the

construction agreement has been mentioned in the report. It is true that in the report site measurement is shown as 30 x 50 feet. At the time of site inspection Mr.Manoj from the plaintiff and defendant No.2 were present. I have not obtained the signature of the site owner to my report as report was sought by the plaintiff. The report is not prepared in the presence of either of the parties.

2. Since 2010 I have been undertaking valuation. Ex.P.10 is the 1st valuation report I have given to the plaintiff. Ex.P.10 is only the valuation report given by our company to the plaintiff. If it is suggested that there is no mention in the report regarding the specification of the areas inspected by me, I say details of the areas examined have been mentioned in my report. At the time of inspection I did not find any defects in the strength of the pillars or plinth. The photographs of the building inspected by me are the one now shown to me (already marked as Ex.D.3). It is true that as per the said photographs (page 59 of Ex.D.3) there is hole appearing in the concrete. If it is suggested that such kind of defects are left unattended it would lead to corrosion of the steel.

3. Witness is shown Ex.D.4 and it is asked that there is no mention of the sump drawing in the said plan witness says as a normal person she does find the sump drawing in it but as a valuer she is not competent to say about it. It is false to suggest that the expenses shown in the valuation report is at a higher side mentioned to the convenience of the plaintiff. It is false to suggest that without undertaking proper measurements on the site I have issued a false report to help the plaintiff. It is false to suggest that as the plinth is put on the footing founding the cost would be on the lessor side but I have mentioned the cost on the higher side. It is false to suggest that at the time of inspection the strength of the foundation and the pillars were not adequate. It is false to suggest that to help the plaintiff to make a wrong claim I have given a report at Ex.P.10. It is false to suggest that to help the plaintiff I am deposing falsely before the court.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Typed to my dictation in the open court.)

R O I & A C

**(ARJUN S MALLUR)
LXXXV ACC & SJ, BENGALURU.**