

Witness is duly sworn on 03.04.2024.

Cross-examination of PW1: By learned counsel For respondent:

It is not true to suggest that I am not a member of respondent no. 4 Association. I became member of the association, when I purchased 1st flat in the 2005, another flat in the year 2013.

I can not answer the suggestion without seeing the letter which is suggested to me that I gave letter on 13.12.2014 to defendant no. 4 to become member of the association.

I am aware of the fact that deed of declaration was executed. But I am not aware of the fact that said declaration was registered or not.

I was member of managing committee of respondent no. 4. but, I can not recall during which period I was member of the managing committee. But, I was secretary of managing committee.

It is true to suggest that, I have taken active participation in the association till 2021.

It is true to suggest that, I am aware of the financial status and affairs of the association.

It is true to suggest that, I have been paying maintenance charges to association till passing of order on I.A.No. 4.

It is true to suggest that, respondent no. 4 association is non profit organization.

It is true to suggest that, all maintenance charges collected by association from the apartment owners is meant for well fare of the foot print apartment.

It is true to suggest that, in my examination in chief at para no. 12, it is wrongly mentioned as I.A.No. 1/2022 instead of I.A.No. 4/2022.

it is not true to suggest that, there is no violation of injunction order granted by this court as

per Ex.P3 by any respondents.

I am not aware of the fact that respondent no. 5 is acting in accordance with Ex.P4.

It is not true to suggest that, respondents till today have not disconnected any facilities to me. I have lodged police complaint with respect to disconnection of services to my apartments and also I made e-mail communications to respondents to restore services to my apartments. I have produced said e-mails. It is not true to suggest that, I have not produced any such e-mails.

It is true to suggest that, after issuance of Ex.P4, I have not paid any maintenance charges to respondent no. 4.

It is not true to suggest that, I am not entitled to get any services as I have not paid any service charges.

It is true to suggest that, I had filed I.A.No. 7 in

the original suit seeking an order against respondent no. 4 restraining him from cutting any services to my apartments.

(At this stage, Learned counsel for respondent prayed time for further cross of PW1.).

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R. O. & A. C.

IV ACC&SJ (CCH-21),
Mayo Hall Unit, Bengaluru.