

-6-

IV ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE HASSAN
(SIT AT CHANNARAYAPATNA)
MVC No. 1455/2025

PW: 1

Witness present and duly sworn on : 20.02.2026

Cross-examination by Sri. ML Advocate for the respondent
No.3 :

1) On the date of accident I was proceeding on the bike purchased by me, but the documents of the bike had not been transferred in my name. I have Driving License to ride the Motorbike. I have produced the my Driving License before this court. It is false to suggest that I had no Driving License and not produced before the court. On the date of accident, I was proceeding from Tiptur side to Bengaluru highway through underpass. It is true to suggest that there were vehicles moving in front and back of my vehicle. It is false to suggest that I have suddenly taken right turn without observing the passing vehicles and caused accident. It is false to suggest that accident occurred due to my sole negligence. It is false to suggest that there was no fault of driver of the Ape Auto in causing the accident.

-7-

2) After the accident I was taken to govt hospital, Channarayapatna and then shifted to Punya hospital, Channarayapatna. I have given details of the accident to the doctors of govt., hospital. I was admitted as inpatient in Punya hospital for a period of 8 days. The accidental injuries are healed, but now also I am taking medicines. It is true to suggest that I have not underwent any surgeries at Punya hospital.

3) I was and is running Tea shop and also doing agriculture. The RTCs produced by me stands in my name. It is true to suggest that now also I am doing agricultural operations. I was supplying milk in my wife's name. I have not got documents to show that my monthly income from dairy farming and agriculture was Rs.40,000/-.

4) My educational qualification is SSLC. I know Kannada and English language. I have read the contents of the charge sheet filed by the police. It is true to suggest that in the charge sheet there is mention that the driver of the Ape Auto was not holding Driving License. It is true to suggest that the owner of the Ape Auto was also arraigned as accused in the

-8-

criminal case for handing over the Auto to a person not holding Driving License. It is false to suggest that since the driver of the Auto was not holding Driving License at the time of accident, the 3rd respondent is not liable to pay the compensation.

Cross-examination by Sri. MGS Advocate for R1 and 2:

5) It is false to suggest that Ape Auto was proceeding in front of me. I do not know that Exp6-report states that there is no damages to the Ape Auto. It is true to suggest that RTO officials have given a report that right side parts of my bike are damaged. It is false to suggest that accident was not due to the fault of the driver of the Ape Auto. It is false to suggest that I was riding the bike negligently and with high speed and dashed the Ape Auto from the hind side and caused the accident. It is false to suggest that R1 and 2 are not liable to pay the compensation.

(Seeks permission to adopt the cross-examination done by Sri. ML for R3, permitted).

-9-

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerized to my dictation in the open court)

ROI & AC

IV Addl. District and Sessions Judge
Hassan (Sit at Channarayapatna)