

IN THE COURT OF PRL. JUDGE, COURT OF SMALL CAUSES AND
MACT., MYSURU.
MVC.NO.2344/2023

Witness Name	:	S.C.Harsha	RW.1
Father Name	:	Late Chandrappa	
Age	:	52 years	
Occupation	:	Driver cum Conductor, KSRTC	
Residence	:	Mysuru	

Witness called and duly sworn on: 23.02.2026

EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY: SRI. RK LEARNED COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT:

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.

Ex.R1	Authorization letter
-------	----------------------

2.Wherefore I pray that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to dismiss the petition as against respondent corporation in the interest of justice and equity.

CROSS EXAMINATION BY: SRI. NBR LEARNED COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER:

1. I have gone through the police records pertaining to the accident leading to the present case. It is true to suggest that with respect to the accident leading to the present case, I have been arrayed as the

accused in the FIR as well as charge sheet. It is true to suggest that I am facing trial in the criminal case arising out of the accident leading to the present case. It is true to suggest that I am on bail in said case. It is true to suggest that I had faced D.E. and was convicted and was punished with suspension for one month.

2. It is true to suggest that the accident occurred on a main road. At the time of accident the bus was proceeding from Hunsur to Mysuru. It is true to suggest that we are given time frame within which we are required to reach from one stage to another. I am not aware if the width of the said road is 24 feet, witness states that however I am aware that it is a state highway. It is false to suggest that as per the rough sketch there was 20 feet space available to my right which goes to the show that instead of proceeding on the left lane I was proceeding on the right lane at the time of accident.

3. It is false to suggest that the deceased could not have avoided the accident as there was only 4 feet space available for him towards his left as such the entire negligence is on my part. I have not challenged the charge sheet before any competent court. Upon being questioned whether there is any document in which it is mentioned that the rider of the motorcycle was trying to overtake a car and while doing so dashed his motorcycle against the bus, witness states that I have mentioned the same in the complaint given by me and the police have registered the same. I have given the said complaint to SHO, Bilikere P.S. I have not submitted the same before this tribunal.

4. It is false to suggest that had I lodged any such complaint I would have produced the same before this tribunal and the very fact that the

same is not produced before this tribunal goes to the show that I have deposed false facts just to wash off the liability of respondent corporation. It is false to suggest that inspite of being aware that the accident occurred due to my negligence, the respondent has set up a false defense and I have deposed false facts in support of the same just to wash off the liability of respondent corporation. I have not produced any document to support my claim that the petitioner was not wearing a headgear at the time of accident.

RE-EXAMINATION – NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-

Prl. Judge.

Court of SC., & MACT., Mysuru