

Witness called and duly sworn on: 21.11.2025

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. DM LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.1:

1. At the time of accident I was proceeding in a KSRTC bus as a passenger. I have not lodged the FIS instead the same was lodged by someone else. It is true to suggest that the owner of the other bus involved in the accident is also arrayed as a party to the petition. I am aware that the case was registered against the driver of the other bus involved in the accident as well. It is false to suggest that the KSRTC is only a formal party. Witness states that I was proceeding in the KSRTC bus and there was negligence on the part of drivers of both the buses.

2. It is false to suggest that I have fully recovered from the injuries sustained in the accident. Witness states that I am not in a position to do any work though I can move around. It is false to suggest that despite the fact that I have recovered fully, I am falsely deposing that I have suffered disability due to injuries just to claim higher compensation.

3. I do not have any document to substantiate my contention regarding my avocation and income prior to the accident. I used to sell milk to customers who ever came to me for purchasing milk but I cannot say their names. It is false to suggest that negligence was on the part of driver of the bus bearing No. TN-30-AM-3399. Witness states that drivers of the buses were negligent. I last consulted the doctors for follow up treatment about 2 months back. I have produced the document in that regard before this tribunal. It is false to suggest that I have not produced any such document and yet I am deposing false facts.

4. Upon being suggested that the respondent No.1 corporation has released Rs.20,000/- as interim compensation on humanitarian grounds, witness states that only Rs.5,000/- was given by respondent No.1 corporation. It is false to suggest that I have not incurred medical expenses to the extent forthcoming from the medical bills, yet the Ex.P7 to 10 have been got created to suit my claim for higher compensation. It is false to suggest that the very fact that the Ex.P9 bills do not bear signatures of the doctor or the seal of the Hospital goes to the show that the same are created for the purpose of this

case. The respondent No.3 company has not released any compensation till date.

5. It is false to suggest that the respondent No.1 corporation is not liable to pay any compensation to me as I did not sustained any injuries from the same. I was initially admitted to Manipal Hospital and thereafter I was admitted to Nagarajegowda Hospital. It is false to suggest that I am deposing false facts in support of false petition filed be me just to claim higher compensation. I do not know if the FIS is lodged belatedly. It is false to suggest that the respondent No.1 corporation is not liable to pay any compensation to me.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. PAS LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.3:

6. It is true to suggest that at the time of accident I was proceeding in a KSRTC bus as a passenger. It is true to suggest that one other Innova car was also involved in the accident. Upon being suggested that the KSRTC bus hit the Innova car and the other bus, witness states that it was the other bus which hit the Innova car and KSRTC bus.

7. It is false to suggest that taking advantage of the fact that the owner and driver of the bus bearing No. TN-30-AM-3399 were not conversant with Kannada language, a false FIS was lodged projecting as if the negligence was on the part of bus bearing No. TN-30-AM-3399 and thereby falsely implicated the same though the negligence was entirely on the part of driver of the KSRTC bus.

8. It is false to suggest that bus bearing No. TN-30-AM-3399 was not at all involved in the accident and yet it was falsely implicated just to

maintain this claim petition. It is false to suggest that I have ensured that false charge sheet is filed against drivers of both the buses involved in the accident just to claim higher compensation from respondent No.1 and 3.

9. It is false to suggest that only the respondent No.1 corporation is liable to pay compensation to me. Witness states that respondent No.1 and 3 are liable to pay compensation to me.

10. I was admitted to Nagarajegowda Memorial Hospital from Manipal Hospital. At Nagarajegowda Memorial Hospital I was treated by Dr. Sri. Karunakara. It is false to suggest that I had fully recovered by the time I was discharged from the Hospital. Witness states that even now I am consulting doctors for follow up treatment.

11. It is false to suggest that as I have fully recovered I have not consulted any doctors for further treatment. I do not know if the doctors has issued any document in writing informing me that I would not be in a position to do any work.

12. It is false to suggest that I have not suffered disability due to injuries sustained in the accident and yet I have deposed false facts just to claim higher compensation. It is false to suggest that I am in a position to do all the work which I was doing prior to the accident and hence I am not entitled for any compensation. It is false to suggest that the bills got exhibited by me are fabricated and inflated. It is false to suggest that respondent No.1 and 3 are not liable to pay any compensation to me. It is false to suggest that to the sole intention of

making unlawful gain at the expense of respondent No.1 and 3 I have filed false petition. It is false to suggest that respondent No.3 company is not liable to pay any compensation to me.

RE - EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-
Prl.Judge ,
Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru