

Witness is present and duly sworn on 24.04.2026

Cross-Examination by Sri.S.B., learned counsel for accused Nos.2, 3, 5, 12, 14 & 16:-

1. It is true to suggest that as per Ex.P.204 total calls made through 8870503522 are 41 calls. It is true to suggest that as per Ex.P.204 through 9025240705 two calls are made. It is true to suggest that as per Ex.P.204 through 8807198724 one call is made. It is true to suggest that as per Ex.P.204 through 9994729443 two calls are made. Regarding mobile number 9025240705 IO has given me inputs that that number was used by accused No.9 and 13. Except the said mobile number i.e., 9025240705 I cannot say whether I received any inputs from the IO regarding the 41 calls from 8870503522 and one call from 9994729443.
2. It is true to suggest that based on Ex.P.204 I have not made analysis on 41 calls from 8870503522 and one call from 9994729443. It is true to suggest that the mobile number 9626489934 is also connected to IMEI number 356477040037800. IO did not provide me the details about the ownership of handset connected to the above referred IMEI number.
3. It is true to suggest that Microsoft xls software and Microsoft Office 2010 version are not forensic tools. It is true to suggest that till my report is submitted CDRs are not subjected to forensic expert analysis. The mobile service providers have not provided hash value of the call detail records (CDRs). It is true to suggest that Excel format can be edited. It is true to suggest that the soft copy of CDRs provided by the Nodal Officers were in Excel format.
4. It is true to suggest that when I sent a notice on 19.04.2013 to the mobile service provider via e-mail, I was working as police inspector. It is true to suggest that I am aware that the only Officer of the rank of Superintendent

of Police or DCP and above are authorized to seek details from telecom operators. Witness volunteers that since I was working as Nodal Officer, Head of Technical Center of City Crime Branch, Bengaluru I was explicitly authorized by the Commissioner of Police to obtain call records on behalf of Bengaluru City Police.

5. When the learned counsel puts a suggestion that the alleged explicit authorization given to you was not forwarded to the IO, Witness states that it was not forwarded because that authorization was not specific to this case. There is a rule of the government authorizing the Superintendent of Police and also the Nodal Officers of the Technical Centers to obtain CDRs. It is false to suggest that though there is no such rule of the government I am deposing falsely.

(At this stage learned counsel for accused Nos.2, 3, 5, 12, 14 & 16 requested to defer the further cross-examination till 02.45 pm submitting that he has urgent matter before the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka. Hence, further cross-examination is deferred till 02.45 pm at the request of learned counsel for accused Nos.2, 3, 5, 12, 14 & 16).

(TYPED IN OPEN COURT TO MY DICTATION)

R O I & A C

**(KEMPARAJU)
XLIX Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge &
Spl. Judge for trial of NIA cases,
Bengaluru.**

Witness is present at 03.00pm and duly sworn.

Further Cross-Examination by Sri.S.B., learned counsel for accused Nos.2, 3, 5, 12, 14 & 16:-

Question: Where was the tower location of mobile number 7708484043 on 14.04.2013 to 18.04.2013 as per your analysis report?

Answer: According to CDR Data the said mobile number was not used in the network after 12.03.2013, 9.56.25 hours.

Question: In which IMEI number it was connected to Between 16.02.2013 and 11.03.2013?

Answer: It was used in IMEI number 352938025211130 as per CDR.

Question: Any incoming or outgoing calls during that period?

Answer: On 20.02.2013 at 14.56.40 hours there is incoming SMS from service provider and at 14.56.45 hours there is incoming SMS from mobile number 8015950301 when the SIM card was at location Palayam Kottai, Thiruvanalveli, Tamil Nadu.

6. I cannot say in whose name the IMEI number 352938025211130 stands. I have not done analysis of IMEI number 352938025211130. It is true to suggest that the IMEI number 352938025211130 does not stand in the name of any of the accused persons. When the learned counsel for accused persons puts a suggestion that the IMEI number 352938025211130 was owned by Saddam Hussain, Witness states that on 20.02.2013 that IMEI number was used by SIM number 8015950301 as per Ex.P.197.

7. It is true to suggest that in 3rd row of table in Para No.4 of Ex.P.208 it is mentioned that the cell number 7708484043 was connected to IMEI number 352938025211130. It is true to suggest in 2nd row of table in Para No.4 of Ex.P.208 it is mentioned that cell number 7708484043 is

connected to IMEI number 352938025211130. It is true to suggest that the SMS mentioned in 2nd row of table in Para No.4 of Ex.P.208 was sent by service provider.

8. The tower location of mobile number 9629419962 from 13.04.2013 to 17.04.2013 was at Palayam Kottai. The tower location of mobile number 9626489934 from 13.04.2013 to 17.04.2013 was at Bharathi Complex, Melupalyam, Thirunalveli. Witness volunteers that after 09.31 am on 17.04.2013 it has moved towards Vannarapettai, Thirunalveli, at 13.58 hours it was at Happy Colony, Ambasamuthiram Road, Thirunalveli and at 21.32 hours it was at Railway Station Road, Chettipalayam, Coimbatore.

Question: Did IO forward you Tower Dump Data related to any tower within the state of Tamil Nadu?

Answer: No.

Question: Did IO forward any Tower Dump Data within the vicinity or Jurisdiction of Bengaluru?

Answer: No.

9. It is false to suggest that no mobile / SIM number (CAF) stands in the name of accused No.3 Kitchen Buhari.

10. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9786997481 stands in the name of Kaasi. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 8148731013 stands in the name of Shivaswami.

11. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 8695701119 stands in the name of Babita. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 7812066573 stands in the name of Krishnammal.

12. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9787867223 stands in the name of Asan.
13. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9600850502 stands in the name of Faruka.
14. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 7871861444 stands in the name of Mohammed Rafiq.
15. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9786961792 stands in the name of Mohammed Buhari.
16. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 7418372250 stands in the name of Abdul Rahman.
17. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 8124504106 stands in the name of Pushpa K.
18. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 8608836766 stands in the name of Krishnaswami.
19. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9626933117 stands in the name of Rabiya.
20. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9787979748 stands in the name of Sufidar.
21. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9567558583 stands in the name of Rasheed.

22. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9952828380 stands in the name of Mohammed Azarudeen.
23. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9626317580 stands in the name of Ganaraj S.
24. It is true to suggest that the SIM number 9994503569 stands in the name of Ramasamy.
25. It is false to suggest that the SIM number 9159808522 stands in the name of Buhari S not Kitchen Buhari.
26. It is true to suggest that Ex.P.217 indicates Buhari S not Kitchen Buhari.
27. It is true to suggest that the Mobile number 9786961792 mentioned in Ex.P.345 does not stand in the name of Pana Ismail (accused No.8). It is true to suggest that as per the inputs of the investigating officer about the use of the said mobile number by Pana Ismail, I have mentioned in Ex.P.345 the said mobile number is under Pana Ismail's name.
28. It is true to suggest that based on the inputs provided by the investigating officer I have drawn the call pattern which are marked at Ex.P.345 to Ex.P.373.
29. It is true to suggest that I have no personal knowledge whether mobile number 7708484043 belongs to Mr. Rajesh Nair. It is true to suggest that I was not provided any document to show that the said mobile number was stolen. It is true to suggest that all the 12 reports submitted by me to the IO are based on the inputs provided by the IO.

30. It is false to suggest that though I know the inputs provided by the IO was absolutely wrong I have given false report as desired by the IO to file a false charge sheet targeting minorities of Tamil Nadu to please his political masters in Karnataka.

Re-examination by learned SPP:

31. I have issued notice to Nodal Officer to provide Hard copies of call records and address proof. As per the government mandate the service providers do not store the original customer application forms and proof of address of subscribers. Instead they maintain only Soft copies of CAF and address proof which they provide when we ask. The call pattern analysis is stored in office computer. The said call pattern analysis report and call records are available in the office computer.

Further Cross-Examination by Sri.S.B., advocate for accused Nos.2, 3, 5, 12, 14 & 16:-

32. It is false to suggest that based on the Hard copies of CDR, analysis cannot be done in the Excel format.

Further cross-examination by Sri.GK., for Sri.CRP., advocate for Accused No.8 to 10:

33. Learned counsel for accused No.8 to 10 submits no further cross-examination.

Further cross-examination by Sri.C.P., for Sri.SA., advocate for Accused No.6 and 11:

34. Learned counsel for accused No.6 and 11 submits no further cross-examination.

Further cross-examination by learned counsel for Accused No.7:

35. Learned counsel for accsued No.7 is absent. Accused No.7 has adopted further cross-examination done by Sri.SB., advocate for Accused No.2, 3, 5, 12, 14 and 16.

Further cross-examination by learned counsel for Accused No.13:

36. Learned counsel for accsued No.13 is absent. Accused No.13 has adopted further cross-examination done by Sri.SB., advocate for Accused No.2, 3, 5, 12, 14 and 16.

Further cross-examination by learned counsel for Accused No.18:

37. Learned counsel for accsued No.18 is absent. Accused No.18 has adopted further cross-examination done by Sri.SB., advocate for Accused No.2, 3, 5, 12, 14 and 16.

(TYPED IN OPEN COURT TO MY DICTATION)

R O I & A C

(KEMPARAJU)

**XLIX Addl. City Civil & Sessions Judge &
Spl. Judge for trial of NIA cases,
Bengaluru.**