

Witness called and duly sworn on: 11.11.2025

**CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. MM LEARNED COUNSEL FOR
RESPONDENT NO.1 AND 2:**

1. The accident occurred at around 3.30 PM. At the time of accident I was riding the motorcycle and was accompanied by my wife. We were returning from the Hospital. It is true to suggest that at the time of accident the deceased had recently delivered and I had taken the deceased to the Hospital to get the sutures removed.

2. I did not observe if there was any Tractor in the stationary condition at the time of accident. I did not observe the registration number of the offending car. The said car was coming from Chamarajanagar towards Nanjangud. It is false to suggest that the offending car was coming from the opposite direction, since there was a tractor, my wife observing the offending car approaching and the tractor in stationary condition panicked and jumped off from the moving motorcycle leading to the accident. It is true to suggest that there is a ditch at the spot where the deceased fell and the same resulted in the sutures coming off from the stomach of the deceased leading to profuse bleeding which resulted death.

3. It is false to suggest that the deceased succumbed to the injuries which she sustained upon falling into the ditch and not upon being hit by the car. Witness states that the car dashed against the deceased. Upon being suggested that had it been true that the car had hit my motorcycle, even I should have sustained injuries, witness states that even I had sustained injuries. Upon being questioned whether there are any documents to show that I had sustained injuries, witness

states that I had sustained minor injuries. Even I had obtained treatment for the injuries sustained in the accident at JSS Hospital.

4. Even my motorcycle had sustained damages in the accident. I do not know if the car had sustained damages in the accident or not. It is true to suggest that I have been arrayed as accused No.2 in the criminal case arising out of the accident leading to the present case. It is true to suggest that the said case is pending on the file of learned JMFC., Nanjangud.

5. It is false to suggest that the accident occurred due to my negligence and also due to negligence on the part of the deceased and there was no negligence on the part of driver of the car. It is false to suggest that the driver of the offending car ensured that the deceased and I get treatment for the injuries sustained in the accident. It is false to suggest that since the accident occurred due to negligence on my part and on the part of the deceased I am not entitled for any compensation.

6. I do not have any document to substantiate my contention regarding the avocation and income of the deceased. It is false to suggest that despite the fact that the deceased had no source of income of her own, I have asserted false facts just to claim higher compensation. It is false to suggest that the respondent No.1 is not liable to pay any compensation to me or other petitioners. It is false to suggest that I have deposed false facts in support of false petition filed by me just to claim compensation.

**CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SMT. KLS LEARNED COUNSEL
FOR RESPONDENT NO.3:**

7. The FIS pertaining to the accident was lodged by my brother in law. The same was lodged on the date of accident itself. The informant is not an eye witness to the accident. It is false to suggest that I did not possess a valid and subsisting D.L. at the time of accident. I have no impediment to produce the same before this court. It is false to suggest that I did not possess a valid and subsisting D.L. as I did not know to ride a motorcycle as such the accident occurred due to my negligence.

8. I have produced document pertaining to the age of the deceased. I do not recollect as to what document I had produced. The deceased had studied upto SSLC I do not have impediment to produce the school records of the deceased to show her exact date of birth.

9. I am doing meson work for my livelihood. I was doing the same work even prior to my wife's death. It is true to suggest that I was managing the affairs of the family from my income. Even to this day I am looking after my sons and I am meeting their expenses from my income. It is false to suggest that neither me nor the other petitioners were dependent on the income of the deceased. Even the deceased used to contribute towards expenses of the family from her income. It is false to suggest that the deceased was a homemaker as such she had no source of income of her own and yet I have deposed false facts before this tribunal.

10. It is false to suggest that since the accident did not occurred due to negligence on the part of the driver of the car and since neither me nor the other petitioners were dependent on the income of the deceased we are not entitled for any compensation.

RE - EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-

Prl.Judge ,
Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru