

*Witness called and duly sworn on: 21.02.2025*

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

1. I am not an eye witness to the accident. Upon being suggested that since I am not an eye witness, I cannot say as to how the accident occurred and who was at fault, witness states that I was informed about the accident and also as to how it transpired. At the time of accident the minor petitioner was studying 8<sup>th</sup> standard at Hemmaragala village at my parental house.

2. I am a resident of Karalapura village. I have not document to show that the minor petitioner could not attend her classes for six months due to injuries sustained in the accident. Witness states that she has not resumed her studies as she is unable to walk around and there are implants in her body.

3. I have produced documents to show that the petitioner was doing milk vending and was earning income from the same. It is false to suggest that the very fact that no such document is produced goes to show that the minor petitioner had no source of income of her own and my assertion regarding her avocation and income are false.

4. It is false to suggest that even the rider of the motorcycle on which the petitioner was proceeding at the time of accident had contributed to the accident by being negligent. My husband possessed a valid and subsisting D.L. at the time of accident. It is true to suggest that the FIS is lodged on 04.04.2023 whereas the alleged accident occurred on 03.04.2023 as such there is delay of one day.

5. It is false to suggest that the very fact that there is a delay in lodging the FIS goes to show that the car bearing No.KA-09-MH-2558 is falsely implicated as the actual vehicle which caused the accident could not be traced. It is false to suggest that the documents annexed to the charge sheet have been created to suit the false case foisted by the minor petitioner to make unlawful gain and the records have been manipulated accordingly.

6. It is false to suggest that if the Ex.P4 rough sketch is carefully analyzed it becomes evident that the negligence was entirely on the part of my husband. It is false to suggest that with sole intention of claiming higher compensation, I have filed a false case on the basis of created documents and have deposed false facts in support of the same.

7. It is false to suggest that the petitioner has completely recovered from the injuries and has not suffered permanent physical disability as is being alleged by me. It is false to suggest that since the present case is based on created documents the petitioner is 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