

DATED: 03.03.2025 PW.1 PRESENT AND OATH IS ADMINISTERED.

FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY Smt.K.S ADVOCATE FOR DEFENDANT:

12. After the matter was settled for Rs.33,00,000/- we entered into MOU. It is true to suggest that earlier the figures Rs.35,00,000/- was incorporated in the MOU subsequently the same was altered to Rs.33,00,000/-. Witness volunteers that upon the request of 2nd defendant the said figure was altered. The parties to the MOU have affixed their signatures on the same day when it was prepared. On the same day the plaintiff Smt.Chandramathi has also signed upon MOU at Singanayakhalli. As per my memory the Plaintiff Smt.Chandramathi might have paid the stamp duty. Witnesses were present at the time of signing of MOU by the parties. The advocate who drafted MOU was not present at the time of execution of MOU. The plaintiff Smt.Chandramathi instructed her advocate to prepare the plaint. Among two witnesses to the MOU one is my son. The 2nd witness Sri.Ramakrishna Raju is none other than the employee of the defendant. It is true to suggest that upon our request the witnesses have

Com.O.S.186/2024

PW.1

U Suresh Kumar

signed on the MOU. I do not know what was the occupation of defendant No.2 Mr.Dhanaraju. Personally I do not know whether the defendant No.2 Mr.Dhanaraju was doing real estate business or not. It is not true to suggest that the plaintiff has not made any investment with the defendants No.1 and 2. It is not true to suggest that the plaintiff has filed a false case against the defendant. It is not true to suggest that the defendants No.1 and 2 are not liable to pay the suit claim or any part thereof.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Typed to my dictation in the open court.)

R O I & A C

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