

Witness called and duly sworn on: 27.11.2025

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

1. At the time of accident the petitioner was proceeding with her father. The petitioner has discontinued her studies after the accident. Prior to the accident she was studying at a school at BBC Colony. I have not produced any document to show that the petitioner has discontinued her studies. It is true to suggest that my husband has also filed a petition seeking compensation.

2. At the time of accident the petitioner was proceeding on the motorcycle which was manned by her father. I am not an eye witness to the accident. Immediately after the accident the petitioner was taken to Hunsur Govt. Hospital and from there she was brought to a Hospital at Mysuru and thereafter she was taken to Bengaluru for higher treatment. It is true to suggest that I have not produced to show that the petitioner was initially taken to Govt. Hospital, Hunsuru for treatment. I cannot say if in the medical records issued by K.R. Hospital as well as Cheluvamba Hospital the details of the vehicle involved in the accident are mentioned or not.

3. The FIS was lodged by my brother Sri. Manju on the date of accident itself. It is true to suggest that as per Ex.P1 and 2 the FIS was lodged 3 days after the occurrence of the accident. It is false to suggest that with the sole intention of falsely implicating the vehicles the FIS was lodged belatedly by twisting the actual facts. The said Sri. Manju is not an eye witness to the accident. It is false to suggest that the very fact that in none of the medical records the details of the offending

vehicle are not mentioned goes to the show that the same was falsely implicated. I do not know as to against whom the I.O. has filed the charge sheet. It is false to suggest that the said Sri. Manju in collusion with the respondent No.1 and police has falsely implicated the motorcycle insured with respondent No.2 company at my behest just to maintain this claim petition.

4. It is false to suggest that perusal of Ex.P5 gives an impression that the negligence was entirely on the part of my husband who was riding the motorcycle on which the petitioner was proceeding as a pillion rider. It is false to suggest that my husband did not possess a valid and subsisting D.L. at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that our vehicle was uninsured at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that the petitioner was not wearing helmet at the time of accident.

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 the petitioner has 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 the petitioner is in a position to do all the work which she was doing prior to the accident and hence she is 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.

6. It is false to suggest that inspite of being aware that the accident occurred due to negligence on the part of my husband, I have got 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 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 the petitioner 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**