

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

Sessions Case: 88/2021

PW: 25 (CW: 44)

Witness present and Duly Sworn on: 14.01.2026

Deposition of	:	Vinay
Father/Husband Name	:	Shivanna
Age	:	33 years
Occupation	:	Nodal Officer, Bharathi Airtel Ltd.,
Resident Of	:	Bangalore.

Witness present through V.C. On enquiry, it is revealed Naveen Kumar is the Co-ordinator. From here Bench Clerk is the Co-ordinator. From the witness side it is confirmed, the audio and video are clearly audible and visible to him before recording the evidence.

Examination in Chief by Public Prosecutor :-

1. Since 2018, I have been working as a Nodal Officer in Bharathi Airtel Ltd.

2. On 19.05.2021, our office received a requisition from office of the S.P. Dakshina Kannada requesting to furnish CAF and call details of mobile number 9591796055, for the period from 01.01.2021 to 28.02.2021 with reference to Crime No.22/2021 of Bantwala Rural Police Station.

3. I had verified with our records with respect to CAF

and Call Details of aforesaid mobile number. As per our records the SIM cards were issued by Airtel company. I generated data of CAF and CDR details of the mobile numbers for the period from 01.01.2021 to 28.02.2021. I sent aforesaid details with 65B certificate to the police on 01.09.2021.

4. The CAF in respect of Mobile No.9591796055 is in the name of Charan Kumar S/o. Kishor Kumar. He had furnished Aadhar Card for obtaining SIM card. I now see CAF along with copy of Aadhar Card. The same are together marked as Ex.P45. I now see CDR for the aforesaid mobile number for the aforesaid period and contains 74 pages. The same is now marked as Ex.P46.

5. I now see 65B certificate, it bears my signature. The same are marked as Ex.P47 and 47(a).

6. The radius of tower location from the tower point is 1-2kms. We furnish tower location codes to the IOs. As per the tower location codes mentioned in CDR, they would match tower locations to the said tower location codes in CDRs which were provided for analysis purpose.

Cross-examination by Sri. VRA Advocate for Accused Nos.1 and 2:-

7. It is false to suggest that SIM card does not belong to

Charan. It is false to suggest that Charan did not furnish Aadhar card to obtain SIM card. It is false to suggest that at the behest of police I have furnished Ex.P45 to 47.

Cross-examination by Smt. AN Advocate for Accused No.3:-

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.