

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

MVC.NO. 845/2023

Witness Name	: Manoj C.M.	RW.2
Father Name	: Mahadevappa	
Age	: 28 years	
Occupation	: Assistant Legal Manager	
Residence	: Mysuru	

Witness called and duly sworn on: 13.01.2026

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

Now I see the affidavit filed in lieu of my examination in chief, the same bears my signatures. The same is prepared as per my instructions and I am aware of the contents of the same. The contents of the affidavit is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Ex.R3	Authorization letter
Ex.R4	Copy of Insurance policy bearing No.3361/01074457/000/00 pertaining to new vehicle for the period 17.04.2019 to 16.04.2024

Wherefore I pray that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to dismiss the petition as against respondent No.2 company in the interest of justice and equity.

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

2. Upon being questioned whether respondent No.2 company has inquired with the RTO regarding whether or not the respondent No.1 possessed a valid and subsisting D.L., witness states that since the charge sheet is clear regarding the same, the respondent No.2

company has not verified the said fact with the RTO. Since the respondent No.1 did not possess a D.L. the question of respondent No.2 company procuring extract from the RTO does not arise.

3. Except for the charge sheet the respondent No.2 company has not produced any other document which suggests that the respondent No.1 did not possess a D.L. at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that the I.O. has invoked section 3 R/w section 181 of MV act against the respondent No.1 without properly investigating the matter despite the fact that the respondent No.1 possessed a valid and subsisting D.L. at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that in order to wash off its liability the respondent No.2 company has set up a false defense and I have come before the court to deposed false facts in support of the same.

4. Upon being suggested that the respondent No.1 possessed D.L. at the time of accident, witness states that if he had a D.L. he would have produced the same before 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