

Witness called and duly sworn on: 21.02.2026

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SMT. RL LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.2:

1. The motorcycle bearing No.KA-10-AE-0469 belongs to me. At the time of accident I was proceeding alone on the motorcycle. At the time of accident I was proceeding from Gumballi check post towards Biligiri Ranga hills as I was posted at Biligiri Ranga hills. It is true to suggest that the road on which I was proceeding was a curvy road. The offending vehicle came from the opposite direction. It was a car bearing No.KA-09-MC-5866.

2. It is false to suggest that since the road is curvy, the riders / drivers proceeding from the opposite direction could not have seen the vehicles approaching. It is false to suggest that I sustained injuries due to self fall as the vehicle came from the opposite direction and I got startled due to which I applied sudden break resulting in me falling off from the motorcycle.

3. The RFO was informed about the accident by my colleagues who were also proceeding on the same road and were at a distance of about 200 meters from the spot when the accident occurred. My colleagues who reached the spot did not have any impediment to inform the police about the accident immediately. The FIS was lodged by my brother on the very next day after the occurrence of the accident.

4. Immediately after the accident I was admitted to Govt. Hospital, Yalandur. I have informed the doctors at Govt. Hospital, Yalandur as

to how the accident occurred. I did not undergo any treatment at K.R. Hospital, Mysuru for the injuries sustained in the accident. Witness further states that though I was taken to K.R. Hospital, Mysuru I did not undergo any treatment there and from there I was taken to JSS Hospital. I was taken to JSS Hospital on the date of accident itself and I was admitted to the said Hospital on the same day.

5. It is false to suggest that though the accident occurred due to my own negligence and due to sudden application of brake, I have falsely contended that the accident occurred due to negligence on the part of driver of the car bearing No.KA-09-MC-5866. It is false to suggest that since I was aware that the accident occurred due to my negligence, I did not lodge any FIS on the same day nor did I undergo treatment at any Hospital as deposed by me above.

6. It is false to suggest that I was admitted to JSS Hospital on 17.02.2024 and not on 16.02.2024 as deposed by me. Witness states that I was admitted to JSS Hospital at around 7 PM on 16.02.2024. I was discharged from JSS Hospital on 17.02.2024. In the said accident I had sustained fracture on my right hand and right leg. I underwent treatment as an inpatient during which I underwent surgery on my right hand but I was treated conservatively for my right leg fracture. It is false to suggest that I have not undergone any surgery on my right hand instead only POP was applied. I have no impediment to produce documents to show that I underwent surgery on my right hand for the injuries sustained in the accident.

7. I last consulted the doctors about 6 months back with regard to injuries sustained in the accident. I have document in that regard but I have not produced the same in this tribunal. It is false to suggest that I have fully recovered from the injuries sustained in the accident. Witness states that even now I am experiencing pain on my right hand.

8. Prior to the accident I was working as Beet forest and even now I am doing the same work. At the time of accident I was drawing salary of Rs.34,000/- and now I am drawing salary of Rs.36,000/-. Witness states that I was on leave for 4 months. It is true to suggest that I have not produced documents pertaining to the period for which I was on leave as well as my salary as on the date of accident and my present salary. Though it is true to suggest that I could have got the medical expenses reimbursed from my department, as I had handed over the documents to my counsel in the present case I have not claimed any reimbursement from my department.

9. Upon being suggested that I have not produced corresponding medical bills in respect of the IP bill dated 17.03.2024 exhibited by me at Sl. No.1 of Ex.P10 series. Witness states that I have handed over the documents to my counsel. It is false to suggest that the said IP bill is no where concerned to the injuries sustained by me in the accident and yet I have got produced the said bill just to claim higher compensation.

10. 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 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. witness states that I am not in a position to work in the manner which I was doing prior to the accident. The doctor has not issued any certificate advising me to undergo another surgery, witness states that but I am experiencing severe pain on my right hand.

11. It is false to suggest that despite the fact that no other vehicle was involved in the accident, 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. 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.

12. 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. BKR LEARNED COUNSEL FOR
RESPONDENT NO.1:**

Learned counsel for the respondent No.1 submits that the respondent No.1 adopts cross examination done by learned counsel for respondent No.2 on all material aspects other than liability.

RE - EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-

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