

Witness called and duly sworn on: 19.08.2025

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. JSK LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.2:

1. I have produced few documents before this tribunal and few medical records are available with me at my home. I have no impediment to produce the same before this court. I had been working with Lemiera company since 2018-2019. Around 100 persons work in the said company. I was informed that I would be eligible for PF and ESI after 2 years of service. The Ex.P7 is signed by the owner of the company. It is false to suggest that Ex.P7 is created for the purpose of this case.

2. It is false to suggest that the Director of the company has not signed Ex.P7 as such it does not appear to be a genuine document. I hold a bank account at Bank of Baroda and the salary was getting credited to the said account. It is false to suggest that even to this day I am working for the said company. Witness states that I have not been working for the said company from the past 2 years. It is false to suggest that Ex.P7 is created for the purpose of falsely showing that I have stopped working at the said company. It is false to suggest that the very fact that Ex.P7 is issued in a blank paper instead of the company letter head and even the date is mistyped shows that the same is created.

3. It is false to suggest that I have got type the Ex.P7 elsewhere and in collusion with official from the company got the seal affixed and have forged the signature for the purpose of producing before this court. I

have no impediment to produce my bank account statement and my payslips before this court.

4. I was treated by Dr. Sri. Ravikumar. The said doctor has not issued any document certifying that I would not be able to continue the work which I was doing prior to the accident. 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. I last consulted the doctors with regard to injury sustained in the accident about one and half year back.

5. The motorcycle on which I was proceeding at the time of accident belonged to my friend by name Sri. Anjan. The accident occurred on service road near a petrol bunk. I did not observe the offending vehicle approaching prior to the accident, as it came from the rear side. The driver of the bus turned his vehicle towards the petrol bunk. It is false to suggest that the bus never came in contact with my vehicle. I was admitted to the Hospital by some bystanders.

6. The FIS was lodged by my brother Sri Pruthvi Gowda. The informant is not an eye witness to the accident. The CW.3 in the charge sheet is my relative and even he is not an eye witness to the accident. The CW.3 was informed about the accident on the same day by me. My family members had impediment to lodge the FIS immediately as I was undergoing treatment and only my brother had come upon coming to know about the accident. the spot is situated at

a distance of about 100 K.M. from my hometown. I am unaware if the said Sri Anjan had applied for the claim with the insurance company for the purpose of getting his vehicle repaired. The said Sri Anjan took the vehicle from me after about 20 to 25 days of occurrence of the accident from my house.

7. It is false to suggest that I sustained the injuries upon falling from the vehicle due to skidding of the vehicle. It is false to suggest that the bus never caused any accident as alleged by me and yet the same is falsely implicated just to claim compensation. It is false to suggest that as per the information given by the insured, the CCTV footages reveal that the bus never came in contact with the motorcycle. I am aware of the fact that the accident is captured in the CCTV camera but the angle from which the video footage is available does not clearly reveal as to what exactly happened.

8. I have not given any information to the I.O. that the CCTV footages do not clearly reveal the actual cause for accident because of the angle from which it is recorded. I have not personally seen the CCTV footages but was informed about the same by my brother. It is false to suggest that very fact that there is a delay of two days in lodging the FIS goes to show that the bus is falsely implicated by twisting the actual facts to suit my claim. It is false to suggest that I in collusion with respondent No.1 got filed the objections to suit my claim. It is also false to suggest that I have got created the IMV report in collusion with the police officials to suit my claim.

9. It is false to suggest that as the bus was never involved in the accident and the same is no where concerned to the accident, the respondent No.2 company is not liable to pay any compensation. 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 all the medical bills and records have been created for the purpose of this case so as to claim higher compensation. 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.

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

Deferred for cross examination of PW.1 at the request of learned counsel for respondent No.2 on cost of Rs.200/-.

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

sd/-

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

