

**In the court of Prl. Sessions Judge and Special
Judge, Kolar**

Spl. C. (P.C.) 04/2020

**PW:11 CW: 24
Date: 08-06-2026**

Name :: Srividya
Husband's name:: Divakar
Age :: 51 years
Occupation :: Asst. Director, FSL, Bengaluru
Place of residence:: Bengaluru

Duly sworn on 08-06-2026.

Examination in chief: by learned SPP.

1. Since 23-02-2004 I am serving in FSL, Bengaluru in various capacities. My education qualification is M.Sc., in Physics and Post Graduation Diploma in Forensic Speech Science and Technology. Since 2020 I am serving as Assistant Director, Physics Section, State FSL, Bengaluru.

2. A requisition was received through Manjappa.Y.M, CPC, on 17.11.2018 in our office from Dy.S.P., ACB, Kolar, in connection with Crime No. 20/2018 of Kolar ACB. The requisition was accompanied with 3 sealed articles containing Compact Discs. The seal on the articles were intact and tallied with specimen seal sent by the I.O., On 17.11.2018 itself I received said articles for examination. On opening the seal on the articles I found Compact Disc in each of them. The CD numbered as article No.(1) by the I.O., was said to contain conversational speeches of accused Suresh and complainant Mallikarjuna Reddy. The article at Sl. No.

(2) and (3) which were numbered as article No.(9) and (10) by the I.O., were said to contain sample speeches of accused Sri. Suresh A.S and of complainant Sri. Mallikarjuna Reddy respectively. The Compact Discs now show to me are the very compact discs sent for my examination. They are already marked at Ex.P.40, 41 and 42 respectively. Ex.P.40, 41 and 42 are played to witness and she identifies them

3. The audio recordings found in above said Compact Disc were physically and scientifically examined. The methods adopted for examination are auditory analysis and voice feature extraction method. After examination I am of the opinion that the respective speeches said to be of accused found in Ex.P-40 and sample speeches found in Ex.P-41 are similar and belong to same male speaker. The sample speeches said to be of accused found in Ex.P-41 are of natural flow of speeches and free from any type of disguise.

4. The respective speeches said to be of complainant Sri. Mallikarjuna Reddy found in Ex.P-40 and sample speeches found in Ex.P-42 are similar and belong to same male speaker.

5. The audio recordings found in Ex.P.40 contains audible two male speakers conversation speeches said to be of Suresh A.S and Mallikarjuna Reddy for audio duration 738.82 – 955.05 seconds.

6. The documents now shown to me are the test report along with audio file details, digital parameters, speech wave form and cepstrogram given by me. It is accompanied with certificate

under Section 65(b) and also sample seal, which was used to seal the articles while returning them. All those documents are jointly marked at Ex.P-45. The signature of witness on the report is marked at Ex.P-45(a). After examination the articles were returned on 19.03.2020 to the reception counter of our office.

Cross-examination by Sri. MH, Advocate for accused:-

7. When I was recruited I was sent for 3 months training at National Institute of Forensic Science and Criminology at New Delhi. I have also acquired specialized training to All India Institute of Speech and hearing Mysuru and acquired post graduation diploma in Forensic speech science and technology from said institute. They have issued certificate. I underwent said training at Mysuru in 2010. It is incorrect to suggest that I am deposing falsely that I underwent above said trainings and acquired above qualification. It is incorrect to suggest that I am not an expert in examining the voice.

8. I have not mentioned the number of Kannada words found in Ex.P.40. To the question that in your report at Ex.P.45 you have not extracted and mentioned the Telugu, Kannada and English language words the witness states that in my report I have not mentioned about extracting the words of said languages however while examination in the computer I have extracted all the words of said 3 languages. It is incorrect to suggest that my said explanation is false.

9. To the question that what was the duration of each word in Kannada, Telugu and English language in Ex.P.40 the

witness states that as per the working procedure manual prescribed by the State Forensic Science Laboratory the word count and the word duration are not specified in my report. To the question that between whom were the Telugu, Kannada and English language the witness states that the said conversation were between accused and complainant.

10. In the sample voices at Ex.P.41 and 42 speeches in Telugu, Kannada and English language were available. In Ex.P.41 the speeches are of same person in three languages and similarly in Ex.P.42.

11. The words selected for examination by me are mentioned at page No.3 of my report at Ex.P.45.

12. In Ex.P.40 there were speeches between one male and female in Tamil language. To the question that can you state to whom those speeches/voice belong to the witness states that the Investigating Officer had not given the sample voice of above persons in Tamil language and hence I cannot state to whom those speeches belong to.

13. It is true to suggest that some noise is also heard in Ex.P.40, the witness voluntaries that clear utteration of words were audible.

14. It is incorrect to suggest that I have not at all examined Ex.P.40, 41 and 42. It is incorrect to suggest that my opinion that the respective speeches of accused in Ex.P.40 and the speeches in

Ex.P.41 are similar is false. I do not agreed with the suggestion that to oblige the IO I have issued false report.

Re-examination: Nil.

(Typed to my dictation in open court as stated by witness. Read over to the witness and admitted by her to be correct.)

R O I & A C,

Sd/-

(V.M. Anandashetti)

Prl. Dist. & Sessions Judge
Kolar