

IN THE COURT OF II ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS
(SPECIAL) JUDGE MANGALURU, D.K.

Sessions Case: 93/2014

C/w

Sessions Case: 99/2014

PW: 28 (CW: 59)

Witness present and Duly Sworn on: 15.12.2025

Deposition of	:	Smt. C. Srividya
Father/Husband Name	:	Divakar
Age	:	50 years
Occupation	:	Asst. Director, Physics Forensic Science Laboratory, Bengaluru.
Resident Of	:	Bengaluru.

Examination in Chief by Public Prosecutor :-

1. Since February 2004, I have been working in FSL, Bengaluru. As of now I have furnished morethan 1000 reports and gave evidence in morethan 500 cases.

2. On 24.06.2014, I received sealed articles from Panambur police station pertains to Crime No.98/2014 through Chidananda, HC-1807 in reception counter and took the articles to the section and found that the seals were intact and tallied with sample seal. The description found on the articles correspond to that of those present in the invoice.

3. On opening of the articles for examination, I found following:

1. Blood and colorless fiber pieces.
2. Orange, maroon, colorless fiber pieces.
3. Maroon, red, black color fiber pieces.
4. Black color fiber piece.
5. Maroon, red, black, colorless fiber pieces and colorless & shiny glass pieces.
6. Black color soil
7. Black color soil
8. Grey color cement
9. Two maroon color fiber pieces, one colorless fiber piece along with soil particles
10. Grey and black color particles
11. Grey color particles
12. Number plate along with black color fiber pieces.
13. Two black color fiber pieces

4. All the articles were subjected to scientific examination. I assigned marking as per the IO marking. Method of analysis has been furnished in my report. After examination, I issued test report with an opinion that;

1. The black color radiator pieces marked as articles B, G and R physically match to form part of one and the same radiator piece.

2. The black color radiator pieces marked as article B, G and R may belong to any four wheeler vehicle.
3. The maroon color fiber piece found in article F and maroon color fiber piece found in article N are similar.
4. The black color soil samples marked as articles K and L are similar.
5. The black color soil samples marked as articles K and L could not be compared with grey color cement sample marked as article M.
6. The black color radiator pieces marked as article G and R are similar.
7. The black color scrapped particles collected from articles G and R are similar to black color particles found in article O.
8. The colorless fiber piece found in article B is similar to colorless fiber piece found in article N.
9. The grey color cement particles marked as article M is similar to grey color particles found in article P.
10. The colorless fiber piece found in article B and N physically match to form part of one and article P.
11. The black color fiber piece found in articles B and Q physically match to form part of one and the same fiber piece.

5. Accordingly, I sent my report along with articles to the concerned police after repack with sample seal.

6. I now see test report dated 26.11.2014, it bears my signature. The same are marked as Ex.P54 and 54(a). I now see sample seal, it bears my signature. The same are marked as Ex.P55 and 55(a).

7. I can identify articles which were examined by me. Except Sl.No.11 witness identifies all the articles. They are already marked at MO.2, 3, 20, 10, 5, 17, 18, 19, 9, 22, 6, 16 respectively. One sealed cloth packet is produced, the same is permitted to be opened. On opening of the cloth packet, witness identifies grey colour particles. The same is now marked as MO.23.

Cross-examination by Sri. RKG Advocate for accused Nos.1, 3 and 4:-

8. I was not the Director of FSL on 24.06.2014. It is false to suggest that I did not receive articles on that day directly. Witness states in the reception whatever articles are received is on behalf of director only. I have made an endorsement that articles were received on behalf of director. I have not enclosed acknowledgment for receipt of articles along with report. Witness states acknowledgment will be given to concerned police for receipt of articles. I have not mentioned IO seal details and sample seal details in my report. We cannot come to conclusion the parts of the vehicle belong to

particular vehicle by examining few parts of the vehicle. Since IO did not seek opinion that the parts of the vehicle to be examined belong to particular vehicle, I did not think vehicle is to be examined. I have not mentioned questionnaire of IO in my report. I have enclosed copy of the IO requisition along with my report. It is true along with report, now I have seen, IO requisition is not forthcoming. It is false to suggest that I have not sent copy of IO requisition along with my report.

9. I conducted examination of parts through instruments. I have not enclosed photos and analysis of instrument along with report. I have not seen the document to show when the incident took place. I have not enquired with IO what were the safety measures taken by IO from the date of seizure of articles till the date of sending the articles to us.

10. I have examined the articles in November, 2014. I have not mentioned duration of examination of articles. I have given report with respect to all the articles which were examined by me. In the report, there is no opinion with respect to article 'C' and 'J'. Article 'G' one surface is black colour. In so far as examination of parts of the vehicle if those articles fit on examination, other dimensions are colour of the part is not necessary, that itself is conclusive proof. In my report I have mentioned article 'G' as black colour. It is true word similar is not conclusive proof. As per IO questionnaire, I

have given answer in my opinion. Based on questionnaire, by examining the articles we furnish opinion.

11. I have prepared report on 26.11.2014. I have not enclosed entire test along with my report. It is false to suggest that I have not conducted any test. It is false to suggest that I have not compared the parts. I did not find sufficient grey colour scrapped particle in articles 'O'. I have not mentioned the same in my report. It is false to suggest that we have not received any articles and I have not conducted examination on any articles. It is false to suggest that since I did not conduct any examination, hence no such test reports and documents are forthcoming in the report. It is false to suggest that only on the request of police, to suit their convenience I have prepared false report on 26.11.2014.

Cross-examination by Sri SPAM for Advocate for Accused No.2:-

Adopts the aforesaid cross-examination.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerized to my dictation in the open court)

ROI & AC

II Addl District and Sessions Judge,
Mangaluru, D.K.