

Witness called and duly sworn on: 23.03.2026

FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. BGK LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.3:

8. Upon being suggested that as per the Ex.P4 the accident occurred when a car hit me while I was proceeding as a pedestrian where as per the Ex.P1 and 2 I was proceeding as a pillion rider in a motorcycle when a Bolero hit the motorcycle which one is the correct version, witness states that the facts stated in the FIS given by the said Sri. Girish are true and correct. The accident occurred when the Bolero hit the motorcycle from the rear side while I was proceeding as a pillion rider.

9. In the said accident the rear side of the motorcycle and the front side of the Bolero had sustained damages. It is true to suggest that the spot shown in the rough sketch is situated on a straight road. I cannot say if the said road was 20 feet wide, witness states that as per my knowledge it could be around 15 feet wide. I cannot say if point of impact is situated at a distance of about 5 feet from left edge of the road which goes to the show that there was 5 feet space available to the left. It is false to suggest that the alleged accident occurred due to actionable negligence on the part of the said Sri. Girish as such the respondent No.3 company is not liable to pay any compensation.

10. It is false to suggest that though the Bolero vehicle was not involved in the accident it was falsely implicated to project a case of self fall as an accident involving Bolero just to maintain this claim petition. It is false to suggest that the said Sri. Girish rode the

motorcycle at a high speed resulting in me falling off and yet the actual facts were twisted. It is false to suggest that with the sole intention of suppressing the true facts the rough sketch and spot panchanama have not been produced before this tribunal. It is false to suggest that the very fact that the Bolero had not sustained any damages when the IMV inspector inspected the same goes to the show that the said vehicle was not at all involved in the accident.

11. I am working as a Scooter mechanic even now. I own the Garage. It is false to suggest that since the case is based on cooked up facts, I am not entitled for compensation as sought for by me.

RE - EXAMINATION : NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

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