

Witness present and duly sworn in on:03.11.2023

Cross examination by Smt. TS Advocate for Petitioner.

I know the contents of the written statement. It is true to suggest that, in MLC RTA two wheeler v/s two wheeler is mentioned and in OPD history of RTA skid and fall from bike. It is true to suggest that, MLC and OPD are recorded on same day. It is true to suggest that, history of RTA is differs from MLC to OPD. It is true to suggest that, petitioner was pedestrian and unknown two wheeler as hit as per FIR. It is true to suggest that, the rider of the two wheeler shifted the petitioner to the Swastha hospital in the auto as per complaint. Witness voluntarily says that, it is wrongly mentioned.

2. It is false to suggest that, name of the person or informer is not mentioned in MLC. Witness voluntarily says that, attendant Shivaraj as given the information. It is true to suggest that, charge sheet is filed against insured vehicle driver. It is false to suggest that, false charge sheet is filed. We have not challenged the charge sheet. It is false to suggest that, accident took place due to negligence of rider of the our vehicle. We have issued the notice to owner but it is unserved, owner is not secured. I do not know the result of the criminal case. It is false to suggest that, I am deposing falsely that,

accident took place due to negligence of petitioner to avoid the liability.

Re-examination: NIL.

(Evidence deposed by the witness is computerized to my dictation in the open court).

R O I & A C

XV ASCJ, Bengaluru