

Witness duly sworn on 06.03.2026

Cross-examination by Sri. G.S.G Advocate for defendants No.1 to 3

9. There is no signature of defendants in Ex.P 81 to 104. Witness volunteers that since the aforesaid exhibits are e-mails and invoices, signatures on the same is not required. It is true to suggest that the invoices will be sent to the defendants through transporter of the PW-2. Ex.P 81 to 104 are the office copies. It is false to suggest that the Ex.P81 to 104 are the photostat copies. It is true to suggest that Ex.P 81 to 104 are addressed to the plaintiff's employee S.S.Rao, who is working at Hydrabad branch office of the plaintiff. It is false to suggest that I have no right to issue certificate U/sec. 65 B of Indian Evidence Act as I am not recipient of the Ex.P 81 to 104. It is true to suggest that there is no whisper in the pleading with regard to Ex.P 81 to 104. Witness volunteers that since the defendants have filed the IA No.12 he has produced Ex.P 81 to 104. It is false to suggest that IA No.12/2025 is not filed to call for Ex.P 81 to 104. It is false to suggest that After facing cross examination in order to fill up the lacuna in the case of the plaintiff I have produced Ex.P 81 to 104.

10. It is false to suggest that the defendants are not liable to pay any amount to the plaintiff company. It is false to suggest that I have no personal knowledge regarding the transaction pertaining to this case.

Re-examination: Nil

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

Sd/-
Prl. District & Sessions Judge,
Uttara Kannada, Karwar.