

Witness present and duly Sworn on 13.06.2025.

Further Cross examination by Sri. VSK advocate for plaintiff:

5). I am the owner of SLN Chicken center. I have produced the documents to show that I am the owner of SLN Chicken Center. It is true that, one has to apply for the permission by depositing requisite license fee to do business on Chicken before Grama Panchayathi and the Grama Panchayati will issue endorsement to that effect. I can produce the acknowledgment for applying for license and payment before the court relating to Ex.D1 and Ex.D2. It is false to suggest that, the Grama Panchayathi has issued an endorsement to the effect that there is no such license issued as per Ex.D1 and Ex.D2. It is false to suggest that, Ex.D1 and Ex.D2 are created for the purpose of the case.

Question: Do you know that you have stated on the previous date of cross examination that you will produce the books relating to the purchase of chickens ?

Answer: I have produced books whatever available before this court.

Question: Did you obtained the signature of the plaintiff or his employees for making payment ?

Answer: I have taken signature for making payment in the book maintained by me after I have suspected the plaintiff.

Question: Before you started suspecting the plaintiff did you obtained the signature of the plaintiff or his employee for making payment ?

Answer: Plaintiff was supplying chicken and I was making payment.

6). In the year 2012 or 2013 I have opened the Chicken shop.

Question: After opening the Chicken shop, did you deal with the plaintiff for purchasing Chicken ?

Answer: There were persons like Koli Seena and Eshwar in addition to the plaintiff.

7). It is false to suggest that, the plaintiff alone was supplying Chicken to me.

Question: You have stated that you were making payment within the credit period. Can you say what was the credit period to make payment ?

Answer: If I received the chicken today, then within one week I used to make payment.

Question: You mean to say you were making payment within one week of credit period in regard to the purchase of the chicken after the commencement of the business till the closure of the business and there is no balance ?

Answer: Yes.

8). I do not have any document to show that I have making payment within the credit period of one week for purchasing chicken from the date of commencement of the business till the closure.

Question: Did the book produced before this court shows the

payment within the credit period of one week for purchasing chicken from the date of commencement of the business till the closure.

Answer: I have already stated that, the book is maintained after I have suspected the plaintiff.

9). It is false to suggest that, I have made payment within one week from the date of purchase of chicken and as such I do not have any document and I am deposing falsely. It is false to suggest that, I have not regularly made payments towards the purchase of the chickens and made the payment in partial and as such I am liable to pay the suit claim as claimed by the plaintiff.

10). It is true that, after knowing the content of the document, I affix my signature on the same. It is true that, if the letter is addressed to Shivareddy, Iddilavarapalli village, Cheluru hobli, Bagepalli taluk then the same will be served on me. Now the witness is confronted with the acknowledgment which is the part and parcel of the Ex.P6 and the witness admits and the said acknowledgment and the same is marked as Ex.P6(a) and the signature of the witness is marked as Ex.P6(b).

Question: Did you have any issue in replying to notice at Ex.P6 ?

Answer: I have received the notice and kept the notice.

11). It is false to suggest that, the content of Ex.P6 is true and correct and as such I have not replied to Ex.P6. It is false to suggest that, Ex.P2 bears my signature. Witness volunteers that it may bears my name but the same is not his signature. It is false to suggest that Ex.P2 bears my signature and in spite of it, I am denying the said signatures to avoid the liability and deposing falsely.

12). Now the witness is confronted with the signature and the same is admitted. (It is pertinent to note that the signature confronted is on the vakalath dated 10.10.2023 and 30.09.2024 of the defendant). For the purpose of identification and the admission of the defendant, the vakalath of the defendant is marked as Ex.P7 and Ex.P8 and the signature of the defendant is marked as Ex.P7(a) and Ex.P8(a) respectively.

Question: Now the witness is shown Ex.P7 and asked can you say for which advocate you have entrusted the vakalath ?

Answer: On seeing Ex.P7, the witness says Advocate Maddareddy. Witness further says that, plaintiff Shankarareddy and Maddareddy have colluded together and due to which he had taken no objection vakalath and engaged another counsel.

Question: Now the witness is shown Ex.P8 and asked can you say for which advocate you have entrusted the vakalath ?

Answer: On seeing Ex.P8, the witness says Advocate Devaraj.

13). Advocate Maddareddy is not my blood relative.

Further cross examination: Deferred on request.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Typed to my dictation in Open Court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-

(N.V. BHAVANI)

Prl. District and Sessions Judge,
Chikkbhallapura.