

Witness is called and duly sworn on 27.02.2026

Cross-examination by Sri R.N.T. Advocate on behalf of the petitioner:

1. It is true that petitioner No.1 trust is a registered trust under the Bombay Public Trust Act. It is true that said trust was established on 12.02.1987. It is true that from 1987 one Shivappa Bhimappa Rokkadakatti was running the trust as a sole trustee till his death on 06.03.2008. One Cambridge English Medium school is being run under the petitioner No.1 trust.

2. When it was suggested to the witness that after the death of Shivappa Rokkadakatti his children were become the trustees of the petitioner No.1 trust, witness said that it was run by her husband Suresh and husband's brother Mahantesh. It is true that all the four children of Shivappa Rokkadakatti. are become the trustees of the petitioner No.1 trust after the death of Shivappa. It is true that Shivappa left behind two sons and two daughters. They are my mother Nandini, Mahantesh, Suresh and Rajeshwari.

Misc 63/2022
RW-1

3. It is true that wife of Shivappa Rokkadatti predeceased him. I was given in marriage to my maternal uncle Suresh Rokkadatti. I do not know that during the life time of Shivappa Rokkadatti petitioner No.1 was a sole trust and after his death it become hereditary trust.

4. When it was suggested to the witness that after the death of Shivappa Rokkadatti his sons and daughters have filed a petition before the IX A.D.J., Belagavi to make them as trustees of the petitioner No.1 trust, witness said that she came to know about the same after the death of her husband. It is true that in Misc No.238/2013 all the children of Shivappa were declared as the hereditary trustees of the petitioner No.1 trust.

5. I do not know that thereafter the petitioner No.2 was made as the Chairmen of the petitioner No.1 trust. It true that my husband died on 12.11.2017. Respondents No.2 to 4 are our children. It is true that after the death of the my husband we filed Misc No.123/2018 to make me as the trustee of the petitioner No.1 trust. I do not know that in the said

petition I have not made the petitioners No.2 to 4 as a parties. It true that I have not made respondents No.2 to 4 as a party to the said petition. I can not say that I have filed that petition in my individual capacity. It is true that after obtaining the orders in the said petition I have lodged the complaint before various authority including the police and Education Department and Deputy Commissioner. It is true that Deputy Commissioner and the DDPI has directed me to act in accordance with law.

6. It is true on 10.01.2022 I have received reply from the DC, DDPI and BEO in this regard. It is true that I have filed application under the RTI to get the information from the petitioner trust relating to salary and other particulars of my husband. It is true that I have lodged the police complaint against the petitioners No.2 to 4. It is false to suggest that I along with one Mehaboob Nadaf and Mahammad Shafi have went to the office of the trust to enquire about the salary and other particulars of my husband. It is false to suggest that I along with those two persons have pressurized to make me as a Administrator of the trust. It is false to suggest that I along with those two

persons have threatened the petitioners No.2 to 4 to close down the school if they fail to make me as the Administrator. It is false to suggest that I have taken one Sharada K.D. and Rajeshwari to the office of the petitioner trust. It is false to suggest that I told the staff of the school that I have appointed those two ladies and asked the other staff not come to the school. It is false to suggest that I have come to the school run by the petitioner trust along with Mehaboob Nadaf, Mahammad Shafi, Sharada K.D. and Rajeshwari. It is true that I am appearing the photos now shown to me. Those photos are marked as per Ex P-26 to P-28. It is false to suggest that I use to come to the school of the petitioner trust and created the problems repeatedly.

7. It is true that WP No.101080/2022 is pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka challenging the orders passed in Misc No.123/2018. Witness said that I have not aware about the said case and not appeared the before Hon'ble High Court. I do not know that the notice has been served on me in respect of the said Writ Petition. It is false to suggest that on basis of the orders passed in Misc

Misc 63/2022
RW-1

No.123/2018 I use to threaten the petitioners and caused obstructions to them.

Re-Examination: Nil.

(Typed to my dictation in the Open Court)

R.O.I.&A.C.

(Manjunath Nayak)
Prl. Dist.& Sessions Judge,
Belagavi.