

Oath is administered to the
witness on 03/06/2025

RW1

Cross examination by Sri. M.G., Advocate for claimant.

I was working in construction department in South-Western Railways Department, Hubli. Now, I am working at Munirabad Mehaboob Naragar Rail way line project. Our higher authority is Deputy Chief Engineer VI Hubli, Construction Hubli. It is false to suggest that only our higher authority had knowledge about the acquisition of the land in this case. It is false to suggest that I had only knowledge about in construction only. Further, witness volunteers that I having a knowledge about acquisition of land of the project. It is false to suggest that I had no power to acquisition of land. It is false to suggest that only Special Land Acquisition Officer had power to acquire the land. It is true to suggest that only Revenue Authority had power to ascertain the market value of the land. I had only knowledge about the present case regarding the acquisition of land bearing survey number. No complaint is made against the Ex.P.16 to 18, 25, 26, 38, 39, 45, 52 to 56 before the competent authority regarding creation and fabrication of the document. It is false to suggest that I had not produced the relevant documents regarding non development of the plots. It is true to suggest that Gangavathi Sy. No. 32/1/B2 was converted the NA

land in the year of 1999. It is false to suggest that by taking the permission of the competent authority, the land owner had made developments in the said survey number. It is false to suggest that as per Ex.P.23, the lay out has been made as well as some developments has been made in the said survey number. It is true to suggest that Gangavathi Sy. No. 32/1/B2 is situated at ward No. 9 of Gangavathi. It is true to suggest that APMC, Gangavathi is situated at ward No. 9, witness volunteers the acquired land is far away from the APMC. It is false to suggest that the land owners plots are situated near the State Highway No. 29. It is false to suggest that towards the southern side of the said plots, the State Highway No. 23 is situated. It is false to suggest that Ex.P.16 to 18 are the sale deeds showing the market value of the said area. It is false to suggest that the said plots valuation is more than 2200 per sq.ft. It is false to suggest that we had given 2200 per sq. ft. in the case of LAC No. 10/2014, further witness volunteers that this case is totally different from that case. I had no knowledge about the LAC No. 10/2014. I had idea about the acquisition of plots in Sy. No. 32 of Gangavathi. I had no idea about the whether our Railway Authority has paid the amount as per the order of Hon'ble Apex court passed in SLP No. 36861/2024 dated 09-09-2024 or not. It is false to suggest that the plots acquired in LAC No. 10/2014 and in this case are one and same. It is false to suggest that in order to

avoid the proper payment to the acquired plots, I am deposing the falsely before the court. As per the Rules, any construction within 30 mtr from the railway boundary, NOC to be taken from Railway Department. It is false to suggest that remaining portions of the plot No. 112, 111, 110 have been damaged due to land acquisition made by the Railway Authority. It is false to suggest that our Railway Authority is liable to pay market value of Rs. 2200 per Sq. ft.

Re-Examination: Nil.

(Computerised to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I.A.C.

Sr. Civil Judge & JMFC,
Gangavathi.