

**IN THE COURT OF PRL. JUDGE, COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AND
MACT., MYSURU.**

MVC.NO. 845/2023

Witness Name	:	M.D.Thammanna	RW.1
Father Name	:	Late Devarajegowda	
Age	:	62 years	
Occupation	:	Retired ASI	
Residence	:	Ilawala, Mysuru	

Witness called and duly sworn on: 05.12.2025

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

I have served as ASI at Bilikere P.S. from 17.07.2017 to 31.05.2023.

2. I received the summons issued by this court directing me to appear in this case and depose with regard to Crime No.59/2023 of Bilikere P.S. In the said crime, I have registered the FIR and have investigated the case and have also filed the charge sheet.

3. During the court of investigation I have issued notice under section 133 of MV Act to respondent No.1 who was the rider cum owner of the motorcycle bearing No.KA-09/HV-6979 directing him to produce his D.L. as on the date of accident, the policy copy pertaining to the vehicle and RC details. In response to the notice issued by me, the respondent No.1 filed his reply stating that he was riding the motorcycle at the time of accident and he did not possess a D.L. Rest of the documents sought for by me were produced before me by respondent No.1. I am herewith producing the copy of the notice issued under section 133 of MV Act to respondent No.1 so also the reply submitted by respondent N.1.

4. As the respondent No.1 was found to be riding the motorcycle without a D.L. at the time of accident, I have invoked section 181 R/w section 3 of MV Act along with section 279 and 338 of IPC in the charge sheet.

Ex.R1	Copy of the notice under section 133 of MV Act issued in Crime No.59/2023 of Bilikere Police Station
Ex.R2	Copy of the reply issued by respondent No.1 to Ex.R1 notice

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. BRG LEARNED COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER:

5. I did not inquire with RTO, Mysuru or RTO, Hunsur regarding whether or not the respondent No.1 did not possess a D.L. witness states that as the respondent No.1 himself had admitted in his reply marked as Ex.R2 that he was riding the motorcycle and he did not possess a D.L., I did not deem it necessary to inquire with RTO.

6. It is false to suggest that I have invoked section 181 R/w section 3 of MV Act against respondent No.1 solely on the ground that the respondent No.1 did not produce the D.L. when he was called up on to do so by me despite the fact that he did possess a D.L. at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that I have not investigated the case properly and have mechanically invoked the said provisions against respondent No.1 though he possessed a D.L.

7. It is false to suggest that I did not provide sufficient time and opportunity to the respondent No.1 to produce his D.L. and submitted the charge sheet in haste.

RE-EXAMINATION: NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

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