

IV ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE HASSAN
(SIT AT CHANNARAYAPATNA)
MVC No. 2030/2024

PW: 1

Witness present and duly sworn on : 25.10.2025.

Further Cross-examination by the Sri. BCM Advocate for the
Respondent No.1 :

7) I do not know the contents of the complaint filed by my father in law. My husband had got DL and I have produced the same before the court. The lands mentioned in the RTCs produced by me are depending on the Rain, witness further states that there is well facility to the said lands. It is false to suggest that my husband has not harvested any crops in the said lands. My husband had used to take the milk to the

-9-

Thirumala dairy. It is false to suggest that I have created the medical bills and ExP10-Statement for the purpose of this petition. It is false to suggest that the accident taken place due to the fault of my husband who was riding the bike under intoxicated state. It is false to suggest that my husband has gone in a wrong side and hit the bike coming from the opposite side. It is false to suggest that my father in law has taken undue advantage of 1st respondent in unconscious state and filed a false complaint against him. It is false to suggest that I am deposing falsehood to get compensation.

Cross-examination by Sri. ML on behalf of R2:

8) At the time of accident, I was in home. It is true to suggest that I have not personally witnessed the accident. It is false to suggest that my husband was not wearing helmet at the time of accident. It is true to suggest that as per the ExP8-Post mortem report, the death of my husband is due to grievous head injury. It is false to suggest that my husband suffered severe head injury for the reason of non wearing of helmet.

9) The bike which caused accident to my husband was rode by Manjanna. It is false to suggest that respondent No.1

-10-

belongs to our village. I have not read the charge sheet completely. It is true to suggest that the respondent No.1 was not holding valid DL at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that since the rider of bike I.ed R1 was not holding any type of DL at the time of accident, R2-Insurance Company is not liable to pay compensation.

10) At the time of accident, my husband was aged 40 years. He has studied Automobile Diploma. I can produce the school documents of my husband to show correct age. It is false to suggest that at the time of accident my husband was aged more than 50 years. It is false to suggest that I am deposing false regarding the age of my husband to get more compensation.

11) The RTCs produced before the court were standing in the name of my husband and now transferred to my name. It is false to suggest that now also we are cultivating in the said lands. It is false to suggest that I have not produced any documents to show that my husband had income of Rs.50,000/- per month. It is false to suggest that since the accident taken place due to the negligence of my husband and

-11-

on that 1st respondent was not holding any type of DL at the given time, R2 is not liable to pay compensation.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Computerized to my dictation in the open court)

ROI & AC

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