

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

Special Case: 157/2020

PW: 26 (CW: 33)

Witness present and Duly Sworn on: 11.12.2025

Deposition of	:	Rama Poojary
Father/Husband Name	:	Jalappa Poojary
Age	:	56 years
Occupation	:	ASI, CCB, Mangaluru.
Resident Of	:	Mangaluru.

Examination in Chief by Public Prosecutor :-

1. From 2019 to 2024, I had worked in Bajpe P.S.

2. On 02.06.2020, the IO-CW.41 deputed me, CW.32, CW.34 for search of accused. When we were in search of accused, PI received credible information about accused that the accused were at Kalavaru burial ground. The said information was passed to us, accordingly we went there at 11.30 a.m., near burning chimni, we found Prashanth Poojary, Suhas Shetty, Deepesh, Mokshith, Dhanraj and Megharaj, on seeing us they made an attempt to escape, CW.32 warned them to surrender, they surrendered and boarded police jeep. We brought them to police station and produced before CW.41 along with report of CW.32 at 12.00

noon.

3. I can identify Prashanth Poojary, Suhas Shetty, Deepesh, Mokshith, Dhanraj and Megharaj. Today three accused present before the court. Witness identified from left first person as Deepesh and Second person as Mokshith. On enquiry with them Rathnakar and Mokshith. Accused No.5 absent, counsel files EP and submits she has no objection regarding identification of Accused No.5. (IO has submitted requisition to issue B/W against Accused No.1 as Accused No.1 was arrested in another case. The IO is directed to produce accused no.1 through V.C at present.) Through V.C. one accused is produced. Witness identifies him as Prashanth Poojary. On enquiry with him, he reveals his name as Prashanth.

4. Accordingly, I gave statement before IO.

Cross-examination by Smt. SA Advocate for Accused Nos.1, 3 to 5 and 7:-

5. We left police station at 9.00 a.m. The distance between our police station and the place where we received information is 4kms. I, CW.32 and 34 went in search of accused in Ertiga vehicle. Within half an hour we reached police station after apprehending the accused.

6. It is false to suggest that we did not go to apprehend accused and did not apprehend the accused and did not produce before IO. It is false to suggest that I did not give statement before IO. It is false to suggest that I have no acquaintance and knowledge of Accused. It is false to suggest that since I have no clear facial acquaintance of accused, today I did not identified accused properly.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerized to my dictation in the open court)

ROI & AC

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