

Duly sworn on
Date: 23-01-2026

**Further Examination in Chief of PW 1: by Sri. MAW
counsel for the petitioner:-**

1. Five LIC bonds are marked as Ex P 20 to 24.
2. Status report of policy No.656423379 is marked as Ex P .25

**Cross examination of PW 1: Sri. VS Counsel for respondent
No.1.**

I have studied upto PUC in Kannada medium. I can read and write English language. I do private work and also pastor at church. My brother name is Devadas. The wife name of Devadas is Merli Margaret Krupa Sathya. Devadas is my real brother. I have not produced the G-Tree before this court. Devadas and Smt. Prabhakar Merli Margaret Krupa Sathya were working in Railways. I have not produced the document before this court showing that, Smt. Prabhakar Merli Margaret Krupa Sathya and Devadas were working in Railways. Smt. Prabhakar Merli Margaret Krupa Sathya and Devadas is having only one daughter and her name Diveena i.e., petitioner. Pavithra Deena is the daughter of Devadas, witness volunteers that, now petitioner is called by name Diveena. I do not know whether in the petition it is mentioned the petitioner is called by name Diveena and also Pavithra Deena. In the petition also it is not mentioned, in the LIC bonds it is wrongly written as Pavithra Deena. I have not produced the G-Tree of

Devadas and Smt. Prabhakar Merli Margaret Krupa Sathya. It is false to suggest that, I am falsely deposing before this court and not truly deposing and I am hiding the true facts. Now Ex P.17 is shown to the witness, witness says that, there is no endorsement by the respondent No.1 to bring the succession certificate by us. It is true to suggest that, at Ex P.17 it is mentioned to bring the death certificate, KYC details. It is true to suggest that, in the G & WC petition as per Ex P.18 the present policies is not mentioned. It is true to suggest that, at Ex P.17 with regard to present policies is not mentioned. The G&WC petition was filed against Railways. It is true to suggest that, the present respondent No.1 is not the party in G&WC petition. It is true to suggest that, I have not submitted the documents before respondent No.1 which has been asked by them. It is false to suggest that, without getting the information I have filed a false petition against the respondent No.1. It is false to suggest that, I have filed a false affidavit and deposing falsely before this court.

Further Cross examination of PW 1: Nil.

(Typed by Typist in Open Court as per my dictation)

Prl. Sr.C.J. & CJM, Raichur.