

*Witness called and duly sworn on: 03.05.2025*

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

1. I am an illiterate. However, I can affix my signature. The FIS was reduced to writing by the police officials at the police station as per my narration. I was informed about the accident by one Sri. Nagaraju. The said Sri. Nagaraju is not an eye witness to the accident. Though I do not know one Sri. Ravi personally, but I do not have any impediment to examine him as a witness in this case.

2. I am not conversant with the place where the accident occurred. I am a resident of Janathanagara, which is situated near Kamakshi hospital, Mysuru. I am not aware if to reach fire brigade office, one has to pass through swimming pool road if the person is proceeding from North to South. I cannot say if as per the contents of the FIS, the vehicle on which my husband was proceeding and the passenger auto were not proceeding in the same direction. The contents of the FIS are true and correct.

3. I cannot identify the spot which is shown in the rough sketch exhibited as Ex.P5. I am not aware of the contents of Ex.P6 IMV report more particularly with regard to damages sustained by the vehicles. However, I am aware that the vehicle of my husband had damages on the front side more particularly front wheel. It is false to suggest that the fact that in Ex.P6 it is shown that the back left wheel mud guard of the auto had damages goes to show that my husband had caused the accident by dashing his vehicle against the auto on the rear side.

4. I am not aware if the vehicle movement near the spot is comparatively less during early morning hours when compared to the vehicle movement during the day. At the time of accident the deceased was coming from our house at Janathanagara to do flower vending business. I am not aware of the contents of the documents got exhibited by me.

5. My husband possessed a valid and subsisting D.L. which authorized him to ride a motorcycle at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that since the accident occurred due to negligence on the part of deceased himself, neither me nor the other petitioners are entitled for any compensation. It is false to suggest that inspite of being aware that the deceased himself was negligent, I in collusion with police officials got filed a false charge sheet by twisting the actual facts to suit my claim.

6. I have no document to substantiate my contentions regarding avocation and income of the deceased. The RTC pertains to the property which is standing in the name of my father-in-law. It is false to suggest that no where in my petition or my affidavit I have specified that my husband was cultivating the property which was standing in his father's name. It is true to suggest that perusal of RTC, reveals that even during the year when my husband demised the property was cultivated.

7. It is false to suggest that I have made false assertions regarding monthly and yearly income of my husband from various sources. I am a home maker. I have specified in my petition and affidavit the

petitioner No.2 herein is my daughter. It is false to suggest that there is no such averment in the petition or affidavit. It is false to suggest that I have falsely asserted that my son-in-law i.e., husband of petitioner No.2 has suffered stroke and has no source of income. It is false to suggest that had the contention been true, I would have produced documents in that regard.

8. It is false to suggest that the petitioner No.4 is residing at her matrimonial house, witness states that even petitioner No.4 was being looked after by my husband. It is false to suggest that inspite of being aware that both my children are residing with their respective husbands and were not dependent on deceased, I have asserted false facts just to claim higher compensation.

9. Upon being suggested that as per the Adhar card got exhibited by me as Ex.P16, the place of residence of petitioner No.3 is Chamaraja Nagara, witness states that even the petitioner No.3 is residing with us. The petitioner No.4 has begotten four issues. The other son of petitioner No.3 is residing at Bengaluru. It is false to suggest that the petitioner No.3 is not residing with us and the other petitioners were also not dependent on the income of the deceased and yet I have deposed false facts.

10. It is false to suggest that since the deceased himself responsible for the accident, neither me nor the other petitioners are entitled for any compensation as such the petition shall liable to be dismissed. It is false to suggest that considering the fact that the deceased was aged more than 55 years, he was suffering from age related issues as such

the accident occurred due to his own negligence. It is false to suggest that I have filed false petition on the basis of false documents just to claim 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