

Duly sworn on

Date: 53-03-2025

Cross Examination of PW 1 : by Sri. CP counsel for the
defendant No.7-8 :-

It is true to suggest that, Timmayya has got 2 sons by name Rammana and Budenna. It is true to suggest that, Ramanna and Budenna have died. It is true to suggest that, I am the daughter of Timmayya. It is true to suggest that, Timmayya has died during the year 1955. It is true to suggest that, at the time of death of my father I was aged about 17-18 years. It is true to suggest that, during the life time of my father I was married. If it is suggested to me that, at that time of my marriage huge expenses have been included by my father and in the form of golden ornaments and cash, witness says that her marriage has been performed by her father. It is false to suggest that, at the time of my marriage my father Timmayya and his brother. If it is suggested to me that, at the time of my marriage I was given cash and other ornaments in the form of partition to me that and to my brothers Ramanna and Budenna, witness says that her marriage has been performed. It is true to suggest that, my daughter has been given in marriage to son of Ramanna. It is true to suggest that, defendant No.6 is my grand son. It is true to suggest that, defendant No.7-8 have filed suit for partition against me in OS No.74/2023 pending on the file of Ist Addl Civil Judge, Sr. Dn,

Raichur. I have filed the case against all the persons. I have filed the suit for partition since nothing has been given to me. I know in whose name the suit lands are standing and they are standing in the name Ramanna and Budenna and they have sold out. It is true to suggest that, the suit lands are standing in the name of purchasers. It is true to suggest that, purchasers are the owners and possessors of the suit lands. It is true to suggest that, after partition Ramanna and Budenna have sold out the suit properties. It is true to suggest that, I have not filed objections at the time of transfer of the suit lands in the name of purchasers. It is true to suggest that, after partition of the suit properties in the name of Ramanna and Budenna they have sold out the same in favour of purchasers. It is true to suggest that, the land Sy.No.13 measuring 10 acres 23 guntas jointly standing in the name of Ramanna and Budenna is not included in the present suit. It is true to suggest that, the purchaser of land Sy.No.13 measuring 10 acres 23 guntas is not impleaded as a party to the present suit. Jamalamma is my husbands sister. It is true to suggest that, the house No.14-1-154 situated at Yaklasapur standing in the name of Jamalamma is not included in the present suit. It is true to suggest that, after the death of Jamalamma the above said house property is transferred to the name of Eshwar. It is true to suggest that, my brothers Ramanna and Budenna have filed the suit for partition and it was decreed in OS

No.100/2010. I know the above said fact of filing of suit OS No.100/2010. It is true to suggest that, in land Sy.No.168/1 measuring to the extent of 1 acres 28 guntas in acquired for formation of road. It is false to suggest that, I have been given compensation along with my brothers Ramanna and Budenna with regard to acquisition of land for formation of road. It is true to suggest that, suit land Sy.No.168 comes within the jurisdiction of CMC Raichur. It is true to suggest that, the value of the land Sy.No.168 per acres fetches value of more than Rs.1,00,00,000/-. It is true to suggest that, for the family necessities Ramanna and Budenna have sold out the suit properties in favour of purchasers and I know the above said fact. Now I am aged about 85-90 years. It is true to suggest that, there is no any property in land Sy.No.168 and it has been sold out in favour of others and nothing remains for partition. It is true to suggest that, suit lands have been converted into non agricultural purpose and they have not remained for cultivation purpose. It is true to suggest that, though I know the above said fact even then I have filed a false case against defendant No.7-8. I know the fact of purchase of land Sy.No.168/*/3 measuring 3 acres 18 guntas by Yadala Shantilaxmi W/o Y.Hariprasad and Tambina Durgakrishna S/o Tambina Krishna and I have filed the objections for the same. It is true to suggest that, I have taken the objections back in view of family settlement taken place with my brothers

Ramanna and Budenna. It is true to suggest that, I have consented for mutating of suit lands in favour of defendant No.15-16. It is false to suggest that, I colluding with defendant No.6 has filed a false case against defendant No.7-8.

**Cross Examination of PW 1 : by Sri. SKP counsel for
the defendant No.9-11 :-**

The suit land bears Sy.No.168. I do not know the extent of land Sy.No.168. It is true to suggest that, my brothers Ramanna and Budenna have sold out land Sy.No.168 in favour of defendant No.9-11. I do not know the extent of land sold out by my brothers in favour of defendant No.9-11. I do not know during which year the lands are sold out in favour of defendant No.9-11. For what amount the lands are sold out in favour of defendant No.9-11, I do not know. I do not know what are the total hissas in land Sy.No.168. I do not know which hissas are sold out by my brothers in favour of defendant No.9-11. It is true to suggest that, my brothers children's have signed to the sale deed executed by my brothers Ramanna and Budenna in favour of defendant No.9-11. The Government has acquired 1 acre and odd guntas. I do not know how much of the compensation is paid by the Government. I have not mentioned in my plaint averment as to who have acquired the suit land and how much compensation is paid. In the plaint

averment it is not mentioned as to how much compensation amount is paid. I do not know in whose favour defendant No.9-11 have sold out the suit property. I do not know what is the extent of land purchased by defendant No.9-11. I do not know what is the extent of property sold out by defendant No.9-11 in favour of others. I do not know why have impleaded defendant No.12 and deceased defendant No.14. I know the fact of sale of suit properties in favour of defendant No.9-11. It is true to suggest that, at Yaklasapur village we have got one house. It is true to suggest that, the above said house situated at Yaklapur village is not included in the present suit. It is false to suggest that, the defendant No.9-11 have purchased the suit properties and I know all the above said fact, hence I am not having any share in the property purchased by defendant No.9-11.

(At this stage learned counsel for defendant No.9-11 SKP submits he will adopt the cross examination conducted by counsel for defendant No.7-8)

Cross Examination of PW 1 : by Sri. MN counsel for the defendant No.15-16 :-

It is true to suggest that, I reside at my husbands house at Appandoddi village and I have got house and landed properties at Appandoddi village. I do not know how many

lands and houses were standing in the name of my father Timmayya. It is true to suggest that, as per the sale of properties by my brothers Ramanna and Budenna the respective purchasers are in possession. I have not objected at the time of sale of suit properties in favour of defendant No.15-16 and I was knowing the fact of sale of suit properties in favour of defendant No.15-16. It is true to suggest that, Ramanna and Budenna are having another land Sy.No.13 and it has been sold out by Ramanna and Budenna in favour of other purchasers. It is true to suggest that, I have not impleaded the purchasers of land Sy.No.13 in the present suit. It is true to suggest that, my brothers Ramanna and Budenna were having the house properties at Ekklaspur village. It is true to suggest that, after the death of Budenna the house property has been mutated in the name of defendant No.6. It is true to suggest that, I have not impleaded the acquisition of land Sy.No.168 to the extent of 1 acre 28 guntas as a party to the present suit. It is true to suggest that, I do not know the boundaries of the suit lands. It is true to suggest that, my brother Ramanna and his children's have sold out the land Sy.No.168/3 measuring 3 acres 18 guntas in favour of defendant No.15-16 for their family necessities. I have not objected for mutating of the land Sy.No.168/3 for mutating in the name of defendant No.15-16. It is true to suggest that, I have taken back the objection and stated that, dispute is

resolved, hence taken back the objections. It is true to suggest that, the land Sy.No.168/3 is the self acquired property of my brother Ramanna, hence I am not having any kind of right over land Sy.No.168/3 measuring 3 acres 18 guntas. It is true to suggest that, 1 acre land has been converted into NA in land Sy.No.168/3. It is false to suggest that, I am not having any kind of right over land Sy.No.168/3 measuring 3 acres 18 guntas and I colluding with defendant No.6 has filed a false suit against defendant No.15-16.

(At this stage learned counsel for defendant No.15-16 MN submits he will adopt the cross examination conducted by counsel for defendant No.7-8)

Further cross examination of PW 1: MG advocate prays time, hence deferred to 3 PM.

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

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

Duly sworn on

Date: 5-03-2025

**Cross Examination of PW 1 : by Sri. MG counsel for
the defendant No.17-18 :-**

It is false to suggest that, land Sy.No.168/8 measuring 1 acre is non agriculture land. It is true to suggest that, defendant No.6-8 were the owners of land Sy.No.168/8 measuring 1 acre. It is true to suggest that, since defendant No.6-8 were the owners of the land Sy.No.,168/8 measuring 1 acre, hence they have sold defendant No.17-18. It is true to suggest that, I am not any kind of right over the land Sy.No.168/8 measuring 1 acre. It is false to suggest that, defendant No.17-18 have purchased the above land after verifying the documents and they are the bonafied purchasers. It is true to suggest that, defendant No.17-18 are the owners and in possession of the Sy.No.168/8 measuring 1 acre. It is false to suggest that, the above said land has been converted into NA and it fetches more value. It is true to suggest that, defendant No.6-8 have sold out the above said Sy.No. for their family necessity. It is false to suggest that, though I know the above said fact even then I have filed the false case agaisnt defendant No.17-18.

(At this stage learned counsel for defendant No.17-18 GAG submits he will adopt the cross examination conducted by counsel for defendant No.7-8)

Cross examination of PW 1: defendant No.12-13 and 19 SAY advocate called out, remained absent, hence taken as nil.

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

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