

Witness recalled, present and Duly Sworn on: 30.07.2026

Cross-examination by Sri. BJK Advocate for Accused:-

7. It is false to suggest that my son was doing Narsanna work. My son used to visit temple as a bull keeper in the temple only at the time of Jathras. My son never went to Haladangady Temple. My son was consuming alcohol. Witness states her son was not giving any trouble or nuisance to anybody. It is false to suggest that I had displeasure against my son as he was consuming over alcohol.

8. I came to know about incident at 2.00 p.m. When I went to house at 2.00 p.m, my son was in the house and came to know about the incident. I was member of Panchayath. At that time I did not think to lodge complaint against the accused. The complaint was prepared in the police station. The police prepared complaint. I do not know if police prepared complaint in writing or through computer. Witness states the police prepared complaint as per her say. Ex.P1 is the complaint prepared by police. Thereafter I have not visited police station. Thereafter I have not given statement to the police.

9. I have not seen the incident.

10. Since I have not joined with my son to Dhanvanthri Hospital, Ashwini Hospital and SDM Hospital, I do not know

what had taken place in the hospitals.

11. We have two houses one is made of Mangaluru tiles and another is Cement terrace. My son used to be in both houses. It is false to suggest that my son always be in Mangaluru tile house.

12. It is false to suggest that the accused did not assault my son.

13. It is false to suggest that the accused did not take my son to Mangaluru hospital.

14. It is false to suggest that I have not seen CCTV recording of Vaishnavi lodge.

15. I have not studied.

16. The police have read over contents of complaint after preparing it. It is false to suggest that the police did not read over complaint. It is false to suggest that first time I am deposing before the Court the brother of accused did not permit me to lodge complaint against the accused.

17. CW.8-Harish was not visiting our house regularly. Harish is known to my daughter-in-law. Witness further states Harish is from her daughter-in-law's village. It is false to suggest that Harish did not come to our house on that day.

18. My daughter-in-law called me at 2.00 midnight and told my son died. It is false to suggest that I, my daughter-in-law and Harish after discussing lodged false complaint. It is false to suggest that whatever stated by me in the chief examination is false. It is false to suggest that the accused has no nexus for the death of my son.

19. My son was follower of the then MLA Vasantha Bangera.

20. I came to know about incident from my son directly. It is false to suggest that I came to know about the incident from my daughter-in-law.

21. It is false to suggest that the accused has no nexus with the case.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerized to my dictation in the open court)

ROI & AC

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