Witness called and duly sworn on: 04.04.2026

FURTHER EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. MVG LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.2:

2. Wherefore I pray that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to dismiss the petition as against the respondent in the interest of justice and equity.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY:SRI. BSS LEARNED ADVOCATE FOR PETITIONER:

1. I am not an eye witness to the accident. The respondent No.2 company has not challenged the chargesheet with respect to the person cited as accused in the chargesheet as the respondent No.2 company is not a direct party to the criminal proceedings. It is false to suggest that as the respondent No.2 company was aware that the IO has shown the correct person as the accused, the respondent No.2 company did not prefer to challenge the chargesheet. Witness states that one Sri. Santhosh respondent No.1 was riding the motorcycle at the time of accident.

2. It is false to suggest that the person cited as accused in the chargesheet was indeed the rider of the offending vehicle at the time of accident and yet the company has taken up false defense to wash off its liability. It is false to suggest that I have deposed false facts in support of the false defense set up by the company. It is false to suggest that the IO has filed the chargesheet after thorough investigation as such the contention taken by the respondent No.2

company is an attempt to wash off its liability. Witness states that the IO has not investigated the case properly.

RE-EXAMINATION: NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.
Sd/-
Prl. Judge.
Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru