

*Witness called and duly sworn on: 19.11.2025*

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

1. The FIS was lodged by my father and my uncle. The accident occurred on 27.08.2021. At the time of lodging the FIS I was undergoing treatment at Hospital. I do not know if one Sri. Rajesh has lodged the FIS pertaining to the accident leading to the present case.

2. At the time of accident I was returning from Mallimavathuramma temple to K.R.Nagar to go to my village. The accident occurred at a distance of about 4 KM from K.R. Nagar. The the spot where the accident occurred is not adjoining any village. One Sri. Rajesh is my brother and he was the rider of the motorcycle. It is false to suggest that the said Sri. Rajesh possessed a valid and subsisting D.L. I have no impediment to produce the same before this court. It is false to suggest that the vehicle on which I was proceeding was uninsured at the time of accident.

3. I was admitted to Cauvery Hospital at Hunsuru and not Mysuru. It is false to suggest that in my petition and affidavit I have averred that I was admitted to Cauvery Hospital, Mysuru. I underwent treatment as an inpatient at Cauvery Hospital from 27.08.2021 to 30.08.2021. Even the said Sri. Rajesh was undergoing treatment in the same Hospital.

4. It is false to suggest that I have not incurred medical expenses to the extent forthcoming from the medical bills, yet the bills have been procured to suit my claim for higher compensation. It is false to suggest that I had only sustained simple injuries as such the bills

produced by me have been got procured for the purpose of this case. It is false to suggest that few of the bills produced by me do not bear the signature of the doctor as such the same is created for the purpose of this case.

5. It is false to suggest that the accident was not caused by the vehicle belonging to respondent No.1 instead it occurred due to negligence on the part of rider of the motorcycle on which I was proceeding as it was raining and the rider lost control over the motorcycle. It is false to suggest that the respondent No.1 was following all the traffic rules and was proceeding on the left side of the road.

6. I have sustained injuries on the right leg. It is false to suggest that since the accident occurred due to negligence on the part of rider of the motorcycle on which I was proceeding, the respondents are not liable to pay any compensation to me. I do not have any document to substantiate my contention regarding my avocation and income prior to the accident.

7. 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.

8. It is false to suggest that even now I am doing the very same work which I was doing prior to the accident and I am earning more income than what I was earning prior to the accident and yet I have deposed false facts before this court.

9. 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 I have got lodged a false FIS and on the basis of created documents I have filed this false petition and deposed false facts in support of the same.

10. It is false to suggest that inspite of being aware that the accident occurred due to negligence on my part, I have lodged a false FIS and on the basis of created document I have filed this false petition and deposed false facts in support of the same. It is false to suggest that as the accident occurred due to my negligence, I am not entitled for compensation as sought for by me.

11. It is false to suggest that I have filed a false petition on the basis of created and concocted documents and have deposed false facts in support of the same as such the respondent No.2 company is not liable to pay any compensation to me if any awarded by this tribunal.

**RE - EXAMINATION : NIL**

**(Typed to my dictation in the open court)**

**R.O.I. & A.C.**

**Sd/-**

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