

Witness recalled and duly sworn on 08-03-2022.

Further examination in chief by the counsel for Sri. BH:

Ex.P2 to 10 were being marked through PW1, hence requested to consider the same. The following documents are marked on the behalf of the plaintiff.

Ex. P11	Power of Attorney.
Ex. P12	Certified copy of Sale deed dt: 04-06-1973 with a direction to furnish typed copy.
Ex. P13	Certified copy of Sale deed dt: 21-11-1974 with a direction to furnish typed copy.
Ex. P14	Certified copy of Sale deed dt: 31-03-1975 with a direction to furnish typed copy.
Ex. P15	Certified copy of Sale deed dt: 25-08-2006.
Ex. P16	Certified copy of Sale deed dt: 23-02-2007.

For further chief of PW2 is deferred at the request.

(Typed to my dictation in the Open Court).

R O I & A C

(C.D. Karoshi)

V ACC & SJ, Bengaluru.

Witness called out and duly sworn on 23-01-2023.

Cross examination on behalf of the defendant No.1 and 3 by Sri. RPK Advocate :

When I was at Bangalore when at the time of execution of Ex.P11 power of attorney. Ex.P11 power of attorney executed at the office of Advocate at Bangalore. I am not an employee of plaintiff company. I did not see the property when at the time of purchase of the property by the plaintiff. Persons who are participated in the sale when at the time of purchase of the property were all dead.

Q: Apart from the Ex.P3 sale deed in pertains to the suit schedule property which are all document that you perused?

A: Old deed.

I do not remember who are all executed document in favour of whom upon the suit schedule property. I did not see the layout plan in which the suit property situated.

Further cross examination PW2 deferred at the request to defendant counsel.

(Typed to my dictation in the Open Court).

R O I & A C

(Onkarappa R.)

V ACC & SJ, Bengaluru.

Witness is recalled and duly sworn on 20.02.2023.

**FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY SRI. RPK
ADVOCATE FOR THE DEFENDANT :**

It is true I give the evidence on behalf of the plaintiff on the basis of payment made by the plaintiff to me. Except the payment that I don't have any other connection with the plaintiff company. I have the knowledge that the plaintiff under the defendants are fighting for one and the same immovable property under this litigation.

Question : The plaintiff claimed the ownership over the property as No.61/1 and defendant claims the ownership over the property as No.96 ?

Ans: We claimed the property No.61/1.

It is true property No. 61/1 and property No.96 carved in the land Katriguppe Sy.No.10 owned by Narasinga Rao. It is true Narasinga Rao sold Property No.96 to one Smt. Parimala Bai on Virtue of sale deed dated 7.5.1969. I do not know when Narasinga Rao sold the property No. 61/1. I do not know whether it was sold by Narasinga Rao during the year of 1973.

O.S 8556/2012

PW-2

(At this stage further cross examination of PW.2 deferred
at the request of defdendant counsel)

(Typed to my dictation in the Open Court).

R O I & A C

(Onkarappa R.)

V ACC & SJ, Bengaluru.