

Witness present and duly sworn in on:07.08.2018.

Chief Examination by Sri. Advocate for Petitioner.

I have filed my affidavit in lieu of my examination-in-chief and the contents of the said affidavit are true and correct and it bears my signature.

Today I have produced the following documents in support of the case:

- Ex.P.1 True copy of FIR
- Ex.P.2 True copy of FIS
- Ex.P.3 True copy of spot mahazar
- Ex.P.4 True copy of sketch
- Ex.P.5 True copy of inquest
- Ex.P.6 True copy of IMV report
- Ex.P.7 True copy of PM report
- Ex.P.8 True copy of police intimation
- Ex.P.9 True copy of charge sheet
- Ex.P.10 Notarized copy of adhaar card of the deceased (original verified and returned)
- Ex.P.11 Notarized copy of adhar card of the petitioner no.1 (original verified and returned)
- Ex.P.12 Notarized copy of rental agreement (original verified and returned)
- Ex.P.13 original 7th marks card of the deceased.
- Ex.P.14 letter issued by employer of the deceased
- Ex.P.15 death certificate of deceased mother

Cross examination by Sri. advocate for Respondent .

The accident occurred in the morning hours. I am acquainted with the accident road. After accident , I went to spot. It is true to suggest that accident road is straight road. It is true to suggest that at morning hours the traffic is more. The road may be approximately measuring 30 feet. There is no median. Police informed me about the accident. It is false to suggest that after accident the lorry was found on left side of the road. It is false to suggest that as per the sketch there is more space of 18 feet from the spot. It is false to suggest that my son was negligent and at high speed dashed the lorry. The motor cycle is in my name. It is false to suggest that at the time of accident my vehicle was not insured. It is false to suggest that my son did not have valid DL. I have understood the charge sheet. It is false to suggest that my son is first accused in the charge sheet. It is true to suggest that my son was charge sheeted for not holding DL and vehicle was uninsured. It is false to suggest that I am A.3 in the charge sheet. I am Mr.Mani S/o Natesh, seen in charge sheet Ex.P.9.

It is true to suggest that 2nd petitioner is married and living separate. I was mason and now I am unemployed. Police recorded my statement at the time of inquest. It is true to suggest that in my statement I stated i am mason and I earn from it for livelihood. I don't have my son bank passbook. It is

false to suggest that I only stated my son doing chicken business but I did not state about him working in J & G construction during inquest. My son studied upto 10th but I don't have SSLC marks card, I have his 7th marks card. My son did not do civil construction course. It is false to suggest that since I am coolie under J&G construction and therefore I am able to create Ex.P.14. I can examine the J&G construction company. It is false to suggest that except chicken business my son is not working in J&G constructions.

It is false to suggest that despite of my son negligence the lorry was falsely implicated. It is false to suggest that my son was not earning and I deposed false evidence. It is false to suggest that I am not a dependant on the deceased and I am earning. It is false to suggest that in order to get more compensation, I am deposing false evidence.

Re examination : Nil

(Evidence deposed by the witness is computerized to my dictation in the open court).

R O I & A C

***V Addl. Court of Small Causes
Judge,
Member MACT & 24th ACMM.***