Witness duly sworn on 05.02.2026

Cross Examination by Sri.SPD, Advocate for defendant:

When we attempted to take repossession of the hypothecated goods, the bank realized that there was no such shop in the name of M/s. Immanuel Medicals. This was about one month prior to declaring the account as NPA. It is false to suggest that, bank has not made any attempt to take repossession.

2. It is false to suggest that, the defendant has repaid a sum of Rs.2.10 lakhs. The witness volunteers that, as the loan in question is a cash credit account, there is no question of repayment as term loan and it is yearly review of account. It is false to suggest that, the instant loan being lent under MUDRA scheme of Central Government, the same is secured by way of an insurance.

3. It is false to suggest that, bank has to avail the credit guarantee from the central Government. The witness volunteers that, even if the bank avails credit guarantee under the CGTMSE scheme, the bank is not precluded from instituting suit for recovery of amount. We have initiated the process of availing credit guarantee in the instant case. It is false to suggest that, we have instituted false case against the defendant.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Typed to my dictation in the open court.)

R.O.I. & A.C.,

I Addl. District & Sessions Judge,
Mangaluru, D.K.