

Witness recalled and duly sworn on : 18-11-2019

Cross examination by KBD the counsel for defendant :

I gave instruction to prepare my affidavit in lieu of examination-in-chief. I do not remember survey numbers of suit 1(A), 1(H), 1(I) and 1(K) properties. At the time of registration of sale instrument both parties have invited me to sign the instrument. It is not true to suggest that, all suit properties are joint family properties of plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 6, 9 and 10. I do not remember when the brother of the defendant No.1 namely Subhas has died. It is not true to suggest that, suit properties were lying jointly in the name of above said brother of the defendant No.1 and defendant No.9 and 10. It is true that, the defendant No.1 and defendant No.9 and 10 belong to same branch. It is true that defendants No.7, 8 and 12 represents the branch of the Ramanna. It is not true to suggest that, suit schedule 1(A) to 1(P) properties were standing in the name of deceased Tippanna.

2. It is true with respect to the recovery of loan amount by Union Bank of India Bammanahalli branch I have been sent to the Civil prison for the period of 21 days. Witness volunteers that, now I have repaid entire loan amount of above said bank.

3. I do not know oral or written partition effected in between plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 6, 9 and 10 with respect to the suit schedule properties. It is true also I do not know family affairs held among plaintiff and above said defendants No.1 to 6, 9 and 10. Witness volunteers that, I know the sale transaction held through defendant No.1. It is not true to suggest that, on the date of above said sale transaction all suit schedule properties were under joint possession of plaintiff and defendants No.1 to 6, 9 and 10.

4. Seetavva is the wife of the Ramanna relating to Tippanna. It is not true to suggest that, above said Seetavva got created false and fictitious mutation entry No.122 to show division of the properties among herself and the Tippanna in order to deprive the plaintiff and

other defendant to claim right over those properties. It is not true to suggest that, there is no sale transaction executed in between defendant No.1 and purchasers defendant No.8 and the disputed sale deeds have not been acted upon, even though at the instance of defendant No.1 I am deposing false evidence against the plaintiff. It is not true to suggest that, defendant No.1 was not having sole right to enter into sale transaction with defendant No.8 with respect to the suit schedule properties. It is not true to suggest that, even though in order to help the defendant No.8 I filed false affidavit and deposing false evidence against the plaintiff. It is not true to suggest that, without payment of sale consideration amount the disputed sale instruments have been got created through defendant No.1 as he was addicted for bad vices and same has been mis used by the defendant No.8. It is not true to suggest that, plaintiff has got legitimate right in the suit schedule properties.

Re-Examination : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court as per deposition of the witness)

R O I & A.C.

Sr.Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Hangal.

Signature of witness.