

Witness called and duly sworn on: 16.10.2025

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

1. At the time of accident I was alone and was not accompanied by any other person. It is false to suggest that I was standing on the road at the time of accident. It is false to suggest that the place where I was standing was not a designated place for pedestrians to stand. There is a bus stop at the spot. It is false to suggest that I was standing on the road and not on the place provided for pedestrians as such the accident occurred due to my negligence.

2. I do not recollect the registration number of the offending vehicle and the name of driver of the vehicle. The accident occurred at around 5.30 p.m. The FIS was lodged by my brother Sri. Mahadeva. Though the said Sri. Mahadeva was not with me but he was near the spot and came to the spot immediately after the accident. The place where the said Sri. Mahadeva was standing is situated at a distance of about 50 feet from the spot where the accident occurred. He came to the spot after hearing the sound of accident.

3. After causing the accident the driver of the offending vehicle tried to flee away however the bystanders were able to catch him and procured his details. It is false to suggest that the Bolero Maxitruck bearing No.KA-09-B-1910 was not at all involved in the accident instead the accident was caused by some unknown vehicle which went away after causing the accident. It is false to suggest that the actual vehicle which caused the accident could not be traced as such Bolero Maxitruck bearing No.KA-09-B-1910 was falsely implicated to maintain this claim petition.

4. One Sri. Mahadeva S/o Late Sri. Sannaiah resides in the neighboring village and I knew him even prior to the accident. The said Sri. Mahadeva S/o Late Sri. Sannaiah was not present at the spot at the time of accident. The said Sri. Mahadeva S/o Late Sri. Sannaiah is working as a home guard. It is true to suggest that Sri. Mahadeva S/o Late Sri. Sannaiah is a resident of Kumbarakoppalu Village.

5. Immediately after the accident I was taken to K.R.Nagar Govt. Hospital. I have informed the doctors at K.R.Nagar Govt. Hospital as

to how exactly the accident occurred. I was taken to K.R.Nagar Govt. Hospital by my elder brother, younger brother and my wife. From K.R.Nagar Govt. Hospital I was admitted to K.R. Hospital, Mysuru. I underwent entire treatment at K.R. Hospital, Mysuru. Witness states that I underwent all 3 surgeries at K.R. Hospital, Mysuru itself. I was treated by Dr. Sri. Patil at K.R. Hospital, Mysuru.

6. I was working as a Mason prior to the accident. Currently I am not in a position to do any work due to injuries sustained in the accident. The police inquired with me about the accident while I was undergoing treatment at K.R. Hospital, Mysuru.

7. My date of birth mentioned in the Ex.P15 is proper and correct. I do not have any document to substantiate my contention regarding my avocation and income prior to the accident. I have not produced any document to show that I have suffered loss of income due to injuries sustained in the accident.

8. It is false to suggest that the accident occurred due to my own negligence in standing on the road instead of standing on the side of the road. It is false to suggest that the accident was not caused by Bolero Maxitruck bearing No.KA-09-B-1910 and yet it is falsely implicated just to maintain this claim petition. It is false to suggest that I in collusion with the informant and police officials have got the said vehicle falsely implicated so as to maintain this claim petition.

9. It is false to suggest that I have not incurred medical expenses to the extent forthcoming from the medical bills, yet the bills have been procured to suit my claim for higher compensation. It is false to

suggest that I am not entitled for reimbursement of medical expenses. It is false to suggest that I am not entitled for any compensation as I have filed a false petition alleging false facts.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. PLK LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.1:

10. It is false to suggest that the Bolero Maxitruck bearing No.KA-09-B-1910 was not at all in K.R.Nagar instead it was at Mangaluru when the alleged accident occurred which goes to the show that the said vehicle is falsely implicated. It is false to suggest that at the instigation of the informant Bolero Maxitruck bearing No.KA-09-B-1910 is falsely implicated just to make unlawful gain.

Learned counsel for the respondent No.1 submits that the respondent No.1 adopts cross examination done by learned counsel for respondent No.2 on all material aspects other than liability.

RE - EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

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