

Witness present and duly sworn on 17.02.2021.

**FUTHER CROSS-EXAMINATION by Sri.KRR Advocate
for Defendant:**

It is true all the oil seeds transaction of Mysore was look out by the one Ramanuja, Deputy Manager, Marketing Mysore area. It is false to suggest that all the recoveries of Mysore branch done by the Deputy Manager Ramanuja. It is true under the supervision of Deputy Manager namely

Ramanuja the Branch office of Mysore has been maintaining under the supervision. Witness volunteers there are 2 indirect Sales Representatives are working under the Deputy Manager. It is true I have not stated either in the plaint not in the notice that 2 indirect Sales Representatives were working under the Ramanuja. It is not true to suggest Ramanuja and 2 indirect sales Representatives were used to collect the money by way of cash, DD and cheque. It is false to suggest I am aware that the Ramanuja and 2 indirect Sales Representatives were used to collect the money by way of cash from Male Mahadeshwara Agencies. It is not true to suggest since there was no agreement in between Head office situated at Bengaluru and Male Mahadeshwara Agency, thereby Ramanuja and 2 indirect Sales Representatives were collecting the cash from the Male Mahadeshwara Agency.

It is true I have not produced any document before the Court to show there was a business transaction with Male Mahadeshwara Agency. It is not true to suggest Ramanuja used to collect the cash not only from Male Mahadeshwara Agencies and also other Agencies and damaged his name in the area of Mysore. It is not true to suggest the Proprietor of Male Mahadeshwara Agency has been brought to my notice regarding receipt of cash from Male Mahadeshwara Agencies, even then we have not taken any action against

Ramanuja. It is true only 2 years business transaction was taken place with Male Mahadeshwara Agencies. It is true we have filed cheque bounce case against Male Mahadeshwara Agencies, which is still pending. It is true initially cheque case has been filed at Mysore Court. It is true cheque case has been filed against Male Mahadeshwara Agencies through Ramanuja. Witness volunteers the said Ramanuja has been retired. It is true legal notice has not been issued through Ramanuja but it has been issued through office i.e., through Managing Director. It is true in the instant case Ramanuja is made as Plaintiff. Witness volunteers Ramanuja has been retired thereby he has not been impleaded as plaintiff. It is not true to suggest if the Ramanuja implead as plaintiff the truth would have come out, thereby he has not been impleaded as plaintiff.

It is not true to suggest we have intentionally filed the suit only after retirement of Ramanuja. It is true in the reply notice the defendant has stated that they have paid the entire amount by way of cash but it is false. I do not know before commencement of business with Male Mahadeshwara Agencies Ramanuja had received 2 cheques for the security from Male Mahadeshwara Agencies. I do not know out of the 2 cheques, one cheque is with the company and the case has been filed through another

cheque by the Ramanuja on behalf of the Company. I do not know the defendant had requested the Ramanuja to return the 2 cheques in between 2010-2012. I do not know when the defendant asked for return of 2 cheques, then only we have filed the cheque case by misusing the cheques. I do not know all the money has been paid by the defendant by OD account but we have received the amount from the defendant by way of cheque and RTGS.

(At the request of the defendant counsel further cross examination of PW.1 is deferred, for further cross of PW.1)

(Typed to my dictation in open court.)

R.O.I & A.C.,

(P.J. SOMASHEKARA)
LXXXVIII ADDL. CITY CIVIL & SESSIONS JUDGE,
BENGALURU.