

Witness called and duly sworn on: 04.04.2025

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

8. It is false to suggest that the averments in my petition as well as my affidavit regarding my avocation and income are false. It is false to suggest that since the accident occurred due to my negligence, the respondent No.2 company is not liable to pay any compensation to me.

9. At K.R. hospital the doctors examined me and I was advised to take treatment elsewhere. At Victoria hospital I was treated by Dr. Sri. Suman and Dr. Sri. Santhoshkumar. It is false to suggest that I was discharged from the hospital after I had recovered from the injuries, witness states that I underwent treatment as an inpatient once again on 06.07.2024 and was admitted for five days. I have produced the documents pertaining to my second admission before this court.

10. I have been consulting the doctors for follow-up treatment and have produced documents in that regard. It is false to suggest that after being discharged from the hospital, I have not consulted doctors again for follow-up treatment.

11. The FIS was lodged about three days after the occurrence of the accident. The police have enquired with me about the accident and have recorded my statement. Upon being suggested that had it been true that the accident occurred due to negligence on the part of lorry driver, I would have lodged the FIS immediately, witness states that I had lost consciousness and was under treatment for the injuries sustained in the accident. Since my family members were concerned

about my medication and health as I was serious, they could not lodge the FIS immediately.

12. My vehicle was insured at the time of accident and I have produced the same before the court. It is false to suggest that I have obtained insurance amount from the insurer of my motorcycle. It is false to suggest that neither have I sustained any injuries in the accident nor have I suffered any permanent physical disability and yet I have filed false petition and have deposed false facts in support of the same. It is false to suggest that the documents got exhibited by me are no where concerned to the present case or the alleged accident. It is false to suggest that even to this day I am doing the same work which I was doing prior to the accident as such I am not entitled for any compensation.

RE - EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-
Prl.Judge ,
Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru