

**IN THE COURT OF THE III ADDL. DISTRICT AND  
SESSIONS JUDGE, MYSURU**

**Spl.C No. 156/2021**

DEPOSITION OF	: Shruthi	P.W. : 8
HUSBAND NAME	: Vikyath	Addl. witness
AGE	: 35 YEARS:	
PROFESSION	: Assistant Director, Physics Section, FSL, Bengaluru.	
RESIDENCE	: Bengaluru.	

**WITNESS DULY SWORN ON 09.02.2026**

**EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR :**

I am working in the FSL Bengaluru at Physic Section on various designation since March -2014 till date.

On 01.08.2019 I have received requisition for anti-corruption Burro, Mysuru in Crime No. 6/2019 along with requisition I have received 4 sealed articles through Yogesh B.V CPC. The seals where intact and tallied with sample seals. I opened the sealed articles I have found the following articles. The said articles were numbered by the I.O. Article No.4 is one CD said to contain before complainant conversational speeches of complainant and accused. 2) Article No.17 One CD said to contain before trap conversational speeches of complainant and accused. 3) Article No.18 One CD said to contain samples speeches of complainant 4) Article No.19 One CD said to contain samples speeches of complainant.

I have subject to the said article for examination from 21.05.2021 to 24.05.2021. I have adopted the method of analysis of auditory analysis which contain perception, listening and aural. I have also adopted method of voice feather extraction. The method is cepstrum.

After examination of the said articles I have submitted my opinion. I have opined that, comparison of speeches based on auditory and feather extraction method have revealed that,

1) They respective speeches said to be of accused P. Manjuntha found recorded in CD's marked as article No.4, 17 and samples speeches found recorded in CD marked as article No.19 are similar and belongs to same male speaker.

2) The respective speeches said to be of complainant H.C. Basavaraju found recorded in CD marked as article No.4, 17 and samples speeches found recorded in CD marked as article No.18 are similar and belongs to same male speaker.

After that, I have signed the said report with seal on the said report was dispatched on 25.05.2021 and the said report was sent by Director. Witness identifies the report, same is marked as Ex.P.53. Signature of witness is marked as Ex.P.53(a). The Ex.P.53 contain audio file detail, speech way form and Cepstrum analysis. Witness identifies the sample seal, same is marked as Ex.P.54. Signature of the witness is marked as Ex.P.54(a).

I can identifies the articles which are subjected to examination. Witness identifies article No.4 PS/311/2019 same is marked as Ex.P.55. Signature of witness is marked as Ex.P.55(a).

Witness identifies article No.17, PS/311/2019 same is marked as Ex.P.56. Signature of witness is marked as Ex.P.56(a).

Witness identifies article No.18 PS/311/2019 same is marked as Ex.P.57. Signature of witness is marked as Ex.P.57(a).

Witness identifies article No.19 PS/311/2019 same is marked as Ex.P.58. Signature of witness is marked as Ex.P.58(a).

I have completed M.Sc in physics. One month foundation course in forensic science. 4 years I have assisted to Senior scientific officer in voice analysis. I have assisted senior scientific officer in more than 600 cases. I have independently conducted voice analysis. I have given evidence in more than 80 cases. Hence, I have qualified to examine the article and submit report accordingly.

I have also issued 65-B Certificate along with the report. Witness identifies the report, same is marked as Ex.P.59. Signature of the witness is marked as Ex.P.59(a).

**CROSS EXAMINATION BY ADVOCATE FOR ACCUSED:**

It is true to suggest that, I have not mentioned in the report amplitude of Eco-voice. It is true to suggest that, I.O is not sent original input device for examination. It is false to suggest that, without examining the voice in original input device, I can not exactly analysis amplitude of Eco-voice in the CD's.

It is true to suggest that, when the CD's were sent for examination, on the CD only it is mentioned that, the CD contains voice of accused and the complainant.

It is false to suggest that, since the I.O already has mentioned the voices of accused and complainant on the CD's which article contain whose voice. I have blindly issued report without any scientific examination.

It is true to suggest that, in the audio files details, you have not mentioned which is the voice of the accused and which is the voice of complainant and duration of speech of both accused and complainant. Witness further voluntarily that, it is mentioned in the cepstrum analysis. Have you examined age of voice in cepstrum analysis. It is not possible to examine the age of voice in cepstrum analysis.

It is false to suggest that, I have given false report as per say of I.O to help the I.O in the case.

**Re examination:** Nil

*(Typed to my dictation in the Open Court)*

R. O. I. & A. C.,

**III ADDL. DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
MYSURU.**