

Witness recalled and duly sworn on 07.07.2025
Further Chief Examination: Sri.KBS

1. I am the petitioner, I am filing affidavit in lieu of chief examination evidence, the contents are true and correct. I have affixed my signature. I have produced documents pray to mark.

Ex.P.1	Certified copy of FIR No.13/2022
Ex.P.2	Certified copy of complaint
Ex.P.3	Certified copy of mahazar with sketch
Ex.P.4	Certified copy of final report
Ex.P.5	Certified copy of Motor vehicles accident report
Ex.P.6	My wound certificate certified copy
Ex.P.7(series)	29 Medical bills in series
Ex.P.8	In patient bills
Ex.P.9	Discharge summary
Ex.P.10(series)	Medical prescriptions in series
Ex.P.11(series)	8 Advance payment receipts in series

Cross Examination:Sri.CAY Advocate for respondent No.1 &2

2. Accident was not happened on the middle of the road. It incorrect to suggest that I have not spent Rs.1,20,388/- towards medical expenses and other expenses. It incorrect

to suggest that I did not had income of Rs.20,000/- per month. I have not produced documents regarding my income. It incorrect to suggest that there is no rash and negligence part of respondent No.1. It is true Gonikoppa-Virajpet road is busy road. It is true that there is a one way road in the place of incident at that time. It is true the police have placed barricades. It incorrect to suggest that vehicles cannot in speed in the place of incident.

Cross Examination: Smt.AB Advocate for respondent No.3

3. It incorrect to suggest that the accident was occurred due to my part. It incorrect to suggest that I have not spent the amount for medical expenses as stated in my evidence. It incorrect to suggest that I am not having any disability, there is no need for further treatment.

4. It is true I am a retired BSF soldier, I am drawing pension every month. It incorrect to suggest that I was not working in any of the company as a security man. I was working in

Payyauru, Kerala. Sanya is owner of company. I have not produced documents to show that I was worked in the said company and received salary. I do not know respondent No.1 has no driving license, respondent No.2 allowed respondent No.1 to drive the vehicle and charge sheeted against them. It is incorrect to suggest that respondent No.3 is not liable for payment of compensation, as there is no license to respondent No.1 to drive the vehicle and respondent No.2 violated the policy conditions.

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

ROI & AC

Sd/-

II Addl.District & Sessions Judge,
Kodagu-Madikeri(Sitting at Virajpet)