

Witness present and duly sworn on: 07.02.2024

Further cross Examination by: Sri.TRV., Advocate for Defendant No.1, 2, 12 and 13:

Revenue authorities have not asked me to mention the father name in the RTC. I don't know generally father name will mention in the RTC. Except the property bearing sy. No. 45 measuring 3 acres no other property holding by me. I am having one dwelling house measuring 28 X 70 ft. I have not added the Sy. No. 45 and house property situated at C. Gundlahalli in this suit. It is true to say that my sister name shown in the cause title and family tree as Devamma. Devamma and Dyvamma are one and the same person. It is true to say that H. Devamma is mentioned in the mutation register extract. Advocate for defendant No.1 ,2,12 and 13 shown the mutation register extract vide No. 179-6/1999-2000 to the witness. Witness identified name of H. Devamma shown in the said mutation register extract, same is marked as Ex D 1.

Devamma filed the application before school authorities and collected Ex P 40. It is true to say that as per say of school authorities we have pasted the photo in Ex P 40. It is false to suggest that I have created Ex P 40 for the purpose of this case and generally father name will mention in the school records and not the grandfather's name. The persons by name Hanumanthappa might be in the village. My father died in the year 1998 at Bengaluru and he has buried in our village by name Avalamarakalakatte. My mother died in the year 1995 and she buried at C. Gundlahalli.

I don't know as per the customs the wife will be buried besides her husband's tomb. I have no difficulty to bury the body of my mother beside my father's tomb. It is false to suggest that Hanumanthappa S/o Kemppaih and name of Hanumanthappa shown as my father are different. It is false to suggest that the name of Hanumanthappa shown in the plaint is the resident of C. Gundlahalli Hanumanthappa. It is false to suggest that the suit property and defendants are not related to our family. It is false to suggest that the suit schedule properties are the self acquired properties of Narayanappa. It is false to suggest that Parvathamma is the wife of Hanumanthappa.K. It is false to suggest that I have no right over the suit properties and to harass the defendants I have filed false suit against defendants. I know the contents of the affidavit filed before the court.

Advocate for defendant No. 4 to 7 submitted that no cross examination. Hence cross examination of PW1 by defendant No. 4 to 7 is taken as NIL.

(Typed to my dictation in the open court, corrected and then signed by me)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Prl. Civil Judge & JMFC.,
Mulbagal.