

Witness called and duly sworn on: 29.05.2025

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

1. The vehicle on which I was proceeding at the time of accident is a hero honda motor cycle and the same belonging to me. I have no impediment to produce documents pertaining to my vehicle before this tribunal. It false to suggest that the very fact that I am unable to recollect the model name and registration number of the motor cycle on which I was proceeding at the time of accident goes to show that I was not proceeding on the motor cycle.

2. It is false to suggest that the very fact that in none of the medical records the details of the vehicles involved more particularly the registration number of the offending vehicle is not mentioned goes to show that the motor cycle bearing No. KA-10-EC-0947 was not involved in the accident. It is false to suggest that in the medical records it is shown that I was not proceeding on the motor cycle instead I was proceeding as a pedestrian which goes to show that the actual facts have been twisted to maintenance this claim petition.

3. It is true to suggest that the FIS is lodged after delay of 13 days from the date of occurrence of the accident. The informant by name Sri. Lokesh is my brother-in-law. It is true to suggest that the said Sri. Lokesh is not an eye witness to the accident. My family members did not have any impediment to lodge the FIS immediately.

4. I have produced the copy of the insurance policy pertaining to my

vehicle and my D.L before this tribunal. It is false to suggest that I have not produced any such document. It is false to suggest that as I did not possess D.L at the time of accident, I have not produced the same before this tribunal.

5. At the time of accident I was proceeding alone on the motor cycle. I had worn helmet at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that since the I.O has not seized the helmet from the spot goes to show that I was not wearing helmet at the time of accident.

6. The I.O has filed the charge sheet against the rider of the offending vehicle, but I do not know his name. I do not know the respondent No.1. I also do not know if the I.O has invoked Sec. 181 of MV Act against the respondent No.1 for riding the motor cycle without D.L. I do not know if I had any impediment to implead the insurer of my vehicle in this case.

7. I do not know the name of the doctor who treated me for the injuries sustained in the accident. I underwent treatment at K.R. Hospital, Mysuru for about 11 days. It is false to suggest that at the time of accident I was aged 49 years, witness states that at the time of accident I was aged around 41 years. I have produced my Adhar card to show my age before this court.

8. I have not produced any document to substantiate my contention that I was earning Rs. 25,000/- per month prior to the accident. It is false to suggest that I have made false assertions regarding my age

avocation and income at the time of accident just to claim higher compensation. It is false to suggest that I in collusion with respondent No.1 and the police got registered false case to suit my claim and I have come before the court to depose false facts on the basis of created documents.

9. 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.

10. It is false to suggest that the petitioner has not incurred medical expenses to the extent forthcoming from the medical bills, yet the bills have been procured to suit his claim for higher 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**