

**II ADDITIONAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT, BENGALURU**

Spl. Case No. 259/2022

PW.9 CW.24

Witness Name : B. Jayaramaiah
Father's Name : Bukkappa,
Age : 56 years,
Occupation : AE, BDA,
Residence : JP Nagara, Bengaluru.

Witness duly sworn on 17.03.2025

CHIEF EXAMINATION : BY SPECIAL PP

I was working as Assistant Engineer in PWD of Anekal from 2018 to December 2022. On 24.01.2022 a letter of Anekal DySP was received in our Office, with request to prepare and give sketch of spot of offence in this case. At that time I was serving as Assistant Engineer in the said office. On same day this case was assigned to me by AEE to prepare the sketch.

2. On 04.03.2022, the PC 1108 of Hebbagodi PS took me to the spot of offence ie Sy No.350, Gomala Land, Hulimangala, Anekal Taluk. There was Neelgiri groove and rock in the said spot. Accordingly I inspected the spot and prepared notes on spot and thereafter came to the Office and prepared

Sketch of scene of offence. The requisition sent by DySP is marked as Ex.P.17. The document now shown to me is the Sketch drawn by me. It is marked at Ex.P.18 and the signature of the witness is now marked at Ex.P.18(a).

3. Later on AEE of our office has submitted these sketch along with covering letter to the investigating officer. I can identify signature of AEE. The witness identifies the signature of AEE B. Venkatesh on the covering letter. The said covering letter is now marked at Ex.P.19. I put my initials under the signature of AEE. The said initial signature is marked as Ex.P.19(a).

Cross examination: Sri. CM advocate for accused no.1

4. I have not given any note sheet or order or any letter issued by AEE deputing me to inspect the spot and prepare hand sketch. I have not secured any document from Revenue Authorities to ensure that the spot bears Sy No. 350 of Hulimangala Village. The location or existence of Neelgiri groove is not disclosed and shown in Ex.P.18 sketch. It is false to say that the area shown in oval shape is not rock. The boundaries of the spot are not disclosed in Ex.P.18 sketch. It is true to say that constable can not tell whether the spot in question comes under Sy No. 350 and only

Revenue Authorities can confirm the said fact. The witness volunteers to state that I had used Dishank App to confirm Survey number of the said spot. I had no difficulty to secure Revenue document in respect of Sy No.350 from Police or from Revenue Authority. It is false to say that there was water collected in the quarry on the spot in January 2022. It is false to say that though I have not inspected Sy No.350 of Hulimangala village, I have prepared false sketch as per Ex.P.18 in the office to facilitate the investigating officer. I visited the spot at 11 a.m. There were no other persons except myself and PC 1108. It is false to say that though there is no topography as shown in Ex.P.18, I have prepared false sketch.

Cross examination: Sri. VK advocate for accused no.2:

Counsel for accused no.2 submits that he will adopt the cross examination of accused no.1.

Re-examination : Nil.

(The statement of witness is recorded in the open court as stated by him and it contains true account of his statement and is read over to him and admitted by him to be correct)

R.O.I. & A.C.

(K. Guruprasad)

II Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Bengaluru Rural District, Bengaluru.