

*Witness called and duly sworn on: 19.11.2025*

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

1. The accident occurred on 27.08.2021. At the time of accident I was returning from Mallimavathuramma temple to K.R.Nagar to go to my village. The accident occurred near Mavathuru village between Margonalli and Mavathuru villages. It is true to suggest that on the day of accident it was raining. 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 my part as it was raining and I 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.

2. 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 the vehicle on which I was proceeding was uninsured at the time of accident. immediately after the accident I was admitted to Govt. Hospital, K.R.Nagara and from there I was taken to Cauvery Hospital, Hunsuru.

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 for 3 days from 27.08.2021 to 30.08.2021.

4. The police came to Cauvery Hospital and took my complaint. It is false to suggest that in the FIS it is mentioned that I personally went

to police station on 28.08.2021 to lodge the FIS. It is false to suggest that the very fact that as per the records I personally went to the police station goes to the show that I did not undergo treatment as an inpatient and the documents were created for the purpose of this case.

5. 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.

6. My current income is around Rs.20,000/- per month. I do not have any document to substantiate my contention regarding my avocation and income prior to the accident. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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**