

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: 18 (CW: 17)

Witness present and Duly Sworn on: 04.11.2025

Deposition of	:	Ravi Poojary
Father/Husband Name	:	Sanjeeva Poojary
Age	:	55 years
Occupation	:	Business
Resident Of	:	Chilimbi.

Examination in Chief by Public Prosecutor :-

1. In the year 2014, I was doing Stone Crusher business. Sathish Baikampady is my neighbor. There was no any friendship and relationship our family and Sathish Baikampady family. There was no financial transaction between us.

2. I do not know about death of Gangadhar Pangal. Sathish Baikampady did not seek any help from me with respect to death of Gangadhar Pangal.

(at this stage, at the request of Public Prosecutor this witness has been treated as hostile and permission is accorded for cross examination)

Cross-examination by Public Prosecutor:-

3. It is false to suggest that Sathish Baikampady was my friend, hence we both family used to attend family functions and also share problems, and also I had financial transaction with Sathish Baikampady. It is false to suggest that on 15.05.2014, Satish Baikampady call from his mobile number 94485456128 to my mobile number 9448878888 and told his friend who is government employee was facing some case and the police also making such of him in the said case and sought my help to contact any advocate, inturn I asked him to contact me in person but he did not come to me. It is false to suggest that thereafter the police have arrested Baskar Baikampady and his brother Harish Baikampady with Pushpraj with respect to Gangadhar Pangal and the same was told by waives of Baskar Baikampady and Sathish Baikampady and sought my help to engage a good advocate to save Sathish Baikampady from his arrest. It is false to suggest that I took Neetha Baskar Baikampady and Geetha Sathish Baikampady to advocate P P Hegde, after introducing an advocate I left the office of advocate. Statement is read over to witness he denied the same. Statement is marked as Ex.P-40.

4. It is false to suggest that even now I am in good relationship with family of Baikampady, I am deposing false to help the family.

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

Submits no cross-examination.

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

Submits no cross-examination.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerized to my dictation in the open court)

ROI & AC

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