

Witness called and duly sworn on: 14.07.2026

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

1. One Sri. Manikanta who is the informant is my brother. The said Sri. Manikanta is not an eye witness to the accident. immediately after the accident I was taken to Govt. Hospital, Beguru and I have narrated the history before the doctors at the time of my admission. At the time of accident I was going to Gundlupete from Nanjangudu for the purpose of attending some program. It is true to suggest that the said road is national highway as it is Mysuru – Ooty main road. The accident occurred near Hirekaate gate.

2. The averment in the FIS that the accident occurred when the driver of the passenger auto suddenly turned his vehicle to the right is proper and correct. It is false to suggest that Hirekaate village is situated towards the left when a person is proceeding from Nanjangudu to Gundlupete, witness states that Hirekaate village is situated towards the right when a person is proceeding towards Nanjangudu to Gundlupete. I have no impediment to produce the rough sketch prepared by the police at the time of spot inspection before this court. It is false to suggest that I have intentionally withheld production of rough sketch apprehending that if I produce the same it would go against my case. Though it is true to suggest that it is a straight road but near the spot where the accident occurred there is a designated opening in the median for the vehicles to take a turn.

3. At the time of accident I was proceeding on the left side of the road. I cannot say the width of the said road. It may be true to suggest that because it is a national highway the width of the said road is around 60 feet. It is true to suggest that on either side of the road there is space provided for the motorcycles to ply and the said part of the road is bifurcated by a white line. I was proceeding within the said white line. The offending auto came from Gundlupete side on one way road and suddenly turned his vehicle to the left and while doing so dashed against my vehicle.

4. It is false to suggest that as per the documents produced by me at the time of accident I was proceeding behind the auto and dashed my vehicle against the auto. It is false to suggest that inspite of being aware that the accident occurred entirely due to my negligence, I have set up a false case and have deposed false facts which are contrary to the contents of the documents produced by me. I did not observe as to which side of the auto was damaged in the said accident. My vehicle had sustained damages on the front left side. The front right side of the auto hit the front wheel of my two wheeler on the left side. It is false to suggest that as per the Ex.P5 IMV report, the auto had sustained damages on the right wheel mudguard on the rear side.

5. It is false to suggest that I have filed a false petition on the basis of created and concocted documents and have deposed false facts in support of the same as such the respondent No.2 company is not liable to pay any compensation to me if any awarded by this tribunal. It is false to suggest that the accident occurred entirely due to my

negligence and yet I have deposed false facts by suppressing the true fact just to claim compensation.

6. I underwent treatment at Suyog Hospital. I do not recollect the name of the treating doctor. It is true to suggest that as per the documents produced by me more particularly Ex.P7 discharge summary I was treated by Dr. Sri. Mohan Kumar C.R. and Dr. Sri. Vijay Kumar. I have no impediment to examine the said doctors regarding the nature of injuries sustained by me and the disability if any suffered due to same before this tribunal.

7. It is false to suggest that due to injuries sustained in the accident I do not have any issues in performing my day to day activities. Prior to the accident I was doing meson work. I last consulted the doctors at Suyog Hospital in respect of the injuries sustained by me in the accident about 2 months back. I am not doing any work now. Though the doctor has orally informed me that I would not be able to do any work but he has not issued any document in writing to that effect. It is false to suggest that I have not produced any documents regarding the income and loss of income suffered by me due to injuries sustained in the accident.

8. 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 have not suffered disability due to injuries sustained in the accident and yet I have deposed false facts just to claim higher

compensation. It is false to suggest that I am in a position to do all the work which I was doing prior to the accident and hence I am not entitled for any compensation.

9. I do not have any document to substantiate my contention regarding my avocation and income prior to the accident. It is false to suggest that even now I am doing the very same work which I was doing prior to the accident and I am earning more income than what I was earning prior to the accident and yet I have deposed false facts before this court.

10. It is false to suggest that I have not suffered disability due to injuries sustained in the accident and yet I have deposed false facts just to claim higher compensation. It is false to suggest that I am in a position to do all the work which I was doing prior to the accident and hence I am not entitled for any compensation. It is false to suggest that I have got lodged a false FIS and on the basis of created documents I have filed this false petition and deposed false facts in support of the same.

11. It is false to suggest that inspite of being aware that the accident occurred due to negligence on my part, I have lodged a false FIS and on the basis of created document I have filed this false petition and deposed false facts in support of the same. It is false to suggest that as the accident occurred due to my negligence, I am not entitled for compensation as sought for by me. The contents of the Ex.P9 and 10 more particularly regarding my date of birth are proper and correct. It

is false to suggest that as I have deposed against my own documents, it becomes evident that I have set up a false case as such I am not entitled for any compensation from the Respondent No.2 company.

RE - EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-
Prl.Judge,
Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru