

IN THE COURT OF THE 3rd A.D.J., AT HOSPET

Spl.C.No.06/2016

P.W. 04

Duly Sworn on : 10-02-2021

Further Cross-examination by Sri.R.R.P., advocate for accused

I have not verified structural design of building nor police furnished any such design. It is false to suggest that unless structural design is verified, I cannot evaluate the property. It is true that 01 cubic feet of concrete could be constructed with 80 Kg steel. It is true that we cannot assess the quantum of steel used from looking with bare eye. I have not prepared any sketch regarding water line and electric line. It is true that I cannot say what quantity of wire and switches used to that house. I have not conducted any quality test of any samples. I have not verified scientifically as to what quantity of steel is used to that building. I have prepare elevation plan. It is true that as per the S.R. of 2009 and 2010 I have valued. I have used plinth area calculation method. I have submitted those sheets also. It is false to suggest that the valuation made by me is based on Sub-register S.R. rate. It is true that to value a building we have to verify the age of a building. I have not verified any sale deeds or commencement certificates. It is true that since I have not verified the quality of steel, quantity of material used, my valuation is approximate. I have applied S.R. value for the materials used and not the existed market value. It is false to suggest that there will be 07 and half percentage depreciation for sanitary articles. It is true that the construction before 2015 the sand was amply available. I cannot say if you suggest that the

sand was available for free during that period. It is true that P.W.D. S.R. method is more accurate than plinth area valuation. It is false to suggest that except plinth area I have not measured anything. It is true that I have considered depth of plinth. It is true that without considering depth area accurate valuation cannot be made. It is true that if the construction is other than 2009 and 2010 the valuation would be different. It is true that once in 02 years P.W.D. S.R. rates will be increased. It is false to suggest that I have not authority to use Sub-register valuation. It is false to suggest that, that valuation is only to collect stamp duty. It is true that neither A.E. nor A.E.E. personally inspected the property. It is false to suggest that I have given unscientific report at the request of Lokayuktha police.

(Typed to my dictation in the open Court)

R O & E A

3rd A.D.J., HOSPET