

**IN THE COURT OF PRL. JUDGE, COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AND
MACT., MYSURU.**

MVC.NO.2203/2024

Witness Name	: Chethan	PW.2
Father Name	: Mahesh	
Age	: 22 years	
Occupation	: Temporary employee at TVS Factory	
Residence	: Harohalli village, Jayapura hobli, Mysuru taluk and District	

Witness called and duly sworn on: 24.02.2026

**EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. MKS LEARNED COUNSEL FOR
PETITIONER:**

Now I see the affidavit filed in lieu of my examination in chief, the same bears my signatures. The same is prepared as per my instructions and I am aware of the contents of the same. The contents of the affidavit is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

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

2. It is true to suggest that the deceased herein was also working at TVS factory and we were colleagues. It is true to suggest that the rider of the offending vehicle by name Sri. Keerthi had also sustained injuries in the said accident. I am aware that even the said Sri. Keerthi was working at TVS factory.

3. The accident occurred on Kadakola – Jayapura main road. It is true to suggest that Ex.P5 rough sketch reveals that immediately next to the spot the road gets curvy. It is true to suggest that since the road is a bit curvy the vehicles coming from the opposite direction would not

be generally visible. It is false to suggest that at the time of accident instead of concentrating on the road we were conversing with each other thereby resulting in the accident.

4. It is false to suggest that as per the records, at the time of accident the deceased was under the influence of alcohol. I am not aware whether it is mentioned in the records that the extent of alcohol in the blood of the deceased was 47.6 MG per 100 ML of blood. Even I had sustained injuries in the said accident and even I underwent treatment at K.R. Hospital. I underwent treatment as an outpatient but was regularly consulting the doctors for about 10 days.

5. It is false to suggest that the accident occurred due to negligence on the part of the deceased in riding the motorcycle under the influence of alcohol and conversing with me instead of focusing on the road and yet I have deposed falsely that the accident occurred due to negligence on the part of rider of the motorcycle bearing No.KA-10-EB-9585. I have not filed any claim petition. Both the vehicles had sustained damages on the front side in the said accident. It is false to suggest that inspite of being aware of the true facts I have come before the court to depose false facts to support the claim of the petitioners who are the family members of my deceased colleague.

RE-EXAMINATION: NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

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