

Witness is present and duly sworn on 06.06.2026.

Further Cross-examination by learned counsel for the accused Nos.1, 4 to 6:-

30. Our company i.e., Enabler Property Services Private Limited Company used to pay monthly salary of Rs.15,000/- to accused No.1 – Ferdous in cash. I personally appointed accused No.1 – Ferdous to discharge his duties of taking care of the said labour sheds which were built in the said land. Before accused No.1 – Ferdous was appointed I did not verify his documents. It is false to suggest that I verified the documents of accused No.1 – Ferdous and after satisfaction that he was Indian accused No.1 – Ferdous was appointed. The family members of accused No.1 – Ferdous were staying in the shed which was in the land of Srinivas Reddy. Accused No.1 – Ferdous collected Rs.1,500/- from each family as a monthly rent and would spend the said amount towards the charges of maintenance of electricity, water supply and utilities. The said transactions were taken place in cash.

31. It is false to suggest that accused No.1 – Ferdous used to pay the said amount of Rs.90,000/- collected from the families as monthly rent to me. One or two times there was money transactions between me and accused No.1 – Ferdous. It is true to suggest that I am aware that the KYC documents are required for opening of bank account.

32. I never received any complaint against accused No.1 – Ferdous from any authority, agency or police from 2018 to 2023. I appointed accused No.1 – Ferdous to collect rent from the families stayed in the sheds as I believed that he was an Indian. Some times I used to visit the 60 families who were staying in the sheds. At no point of time any person staying in the sheds told me that accused No.1 – Ferdous was Bangladeshi National.
33. It is true to suggest that publicly the daughter of accused No.1 – Ferdous was going to school and his wife residing with him in the shed. At no point of time accused No.1 – Ferdous absconded or hidden from me. I never suspected accused No.1 – Ferdous's loyalty and he never mishandled financial transactions. It is true to suggest that only after the NIA arrested accused No.1 – Ferdous, I came to know that accused No.1 – Ferdous was alleged to be Bangladeshi National. I know the wife of accused No.1 – Ferdous by name Nupur. I just know the wife of accused No.1 – Ferdous as accused No.1 told me that she is his wife.
34. During these 3 days when accused No.1 – Ferdous was not seen I went to the shed of accused No.1 – Ferdous. It is false to suggest that I was not aware that accused No.1 – Ferdous was picked up by the NIA. Before visiting Smt.Nupur the wife of accused No.1 – Ferdous I had heard the news that he was picked up by the NIA and it was alleged by the NIA agency that he was Bangladeshi National and when I visited his wife I asked her the

same and she said that there is no truth in the allegations, and also she said that she did not know where her husband was taken to. Thereafter, when I had doubt, our field officer Ramaswamy and I went to the shed of accused No.1 – Ferdous when Ramaswamy was standing outside I alone entered the shed to check the documents. When I entered the shed, the wife and 5 years old son of accused No.1 – Ferdous were in the shed. It was around 07.30 to 08.00 pm. I remained 15-20 minutes in the said shed. I inspected the shed of accused No.1 – Ferdous. When I inspected the shed of accused No.1 – Ferdous, 7-8 documents including Aadhaar card, Passport, one slip, voter ID like document were found in the shed of accused No.1 – Ferdous. Those documents were one gold purchase slip written in Bengali language, Indian Aadhaar card, Bangladesh Passport, Bangladesh voter ID card, train tickets. I have not handed over train tickets to NIA agency. I decided which were main documents and which were not main documents. According to me the main documents are Aadhaar card, Passport, Voter ID. The Voter ID was Bangladeshi. I myself took those documents in the presence of Smt. Nupur the wife of accused No.1 – Ferdous. The wife of accused No.1 – Ferdous speaks Bengali language and little bit of Hindi language.

Question: Who authorized you to enter the shed of accused No.1 – Ferdous?

Answer: Since I have given the labour shed thinking that I will be land up in trouble I entered the shed alone, wherein the wife and 5 years old son of accused No.1 – Ferdous were alone in the said shed.

35. I did not seek permission from anybody to take the documents from the shed of accused No.1 – Ferdous. Smt. Nupur, the wife of accused No.1 – Ferdous co-operated for taking the said documents. Smt. Nupur, the wife of accused No.1 – Ferdous was aware of the documents which were taken by me. After I have taken the xerox copies of those documents, returned the original documents to Smt. Nupur. I understand these documents were important, relevant and main documents. After the said documents get xeroxed, I returned the original documents to Smt. Nupur. I did not verify those main documents from any government authority, embassy or police or I did not hand over the same to the police.

36. It is false to suggest that after entering the shed of accused No.1 – Ferdous, his wife and 5 years old son were alone in the said shed and I placed those documents which does not exist in the said shed with intimidation and undue influence.

37. It is false to suggest that I have handed over the documents which were not in existence to the NIA. It is false to suggest that I am giving evidence before the court as tutored by the NIA officers.

38. After taking the xerox copies of those documents, I went to Indiranagar office. First I went to local police station i.e., Marathahalli police station and informed the police of Marathahalli police station about those documents and the news telecast in the television and then the Marathahalli police told me to go Indiranagar office. I did not give the copies of those documents to the local police. NIA did not summon me. I went to Indiranagar office and handed over the xerox copies of those documents to the officer by name Raju. When I handed over the xerox copies of those documents to the officer by name Raju, my statement was recorded by him after the arrest of accused No.1 – Ferdous. The statement was typed to my dictation and then I signed it. The statement was not in my own handwriting. It is true to suggest that the statement was prepared and I signed it. Witness volunteers that after reading the statement I signed it.
39. It is false to suggest that I cooperated with the NIA agency before I was summoned by the investigating officer. There was no case or enquiry against me with regard to employing alleged immigrants. I never helped anybody for creation of documents such as Aadhaar card, PAN card, Indian Voter ID for illegal immigrants. When the Learned counsel puts a suggestion that after the arrest of accused No.1 – Ferdous the NIA agency did not seize Bangladeshi Passport, Indian Voter ID and Aadhaar card from your possession, witness states that I voluntarily went to the NIA office and handed over the said documents to NIA officer. The NIA officer by name Raju typed the production cum seizure memo

- dated 21.11.2023 on the laptop. The contents of production cum seizure memo were not in my handwriting. It is true to suggest that after seizure memo is prepared by Raju, NIA officer I signed it. Witness volunteers that after seizure memo is prepared by NIA officer the same was handed over to me and I read the same and signed it. It is false to suggest that no independent public witnesses were present at the time of seizure in my presence. Witness volunteers that two independent public witnesses were present but I do not know the names of those two independent public witnesses.
40. It is true to suggest that I had no personal knowledge about where those original documents originally came from to the shed. It is true to suggest that before accused No.1 – Ferdous was arrested by the NIA agency, I was not knowing about the Bangladeshi Passport or other documents. When the Learned counsel puts a suggestion that before obtaining your signature, the NIA officer explained the contents of production cum seizure memo to you, witness states that I myself read the contents of production cum seizure memo. It is false to suggest that the original documents were shown to me by the NIA officer.
41. When the Learned counsel puts a suggestion that you cannot say whether those documents were in the position of NIA officers before you came to the NIA office, witness states that I do not know. It is true to suggest that I did not know the alleged passport or ID documents were recovered by the NIA. It is true to suggest

that I cannot say the original documents which I have seen in the shed of accused No.1 – Ferdous were recovered by the NIA.

Question: Whether video recording of the alleged production cum seizure memo was made in your presence?

Answer: I do not know.

Question: Have you ever seen accused No.1 – Ferdous and his wife Smt. Nupur travelled to Bangladesh?

Answer: I do not know.

42. After the arrest of accused No.1 – Ferdous when I approached his family and met his wife Nupur and at that time she said that she and Ferdous belongs to Bangladesh and showed copy of Bangladeshi ID card and Bangladeshi Passport of Ferdous. Smt. Nupur did not give me any written declaration about Bangladeshi citizenship. It is true to suggest that the alleged disclosure about Bangladeshi citizenship by Smt. Nupur was oral in nature in my presence. It is true to suggest that in the shed when I took the documents no independent panch witnesses were present in the said shed.

Cross-examination by learned counsel for the accused No.2:-

Learned counsel for accused No.2 adopted the cross-examination done by Learned counsel for accused Nos.1, 4 to 6.

Cross-examination by counsel for the accused No.7:-

Learned counsel for accused No.7 is absent. Hence, cross-examination by accused No.7 is taken as nil.

Cross-examination by Smt. Nagarathna G., Adv for the accused No.3 and 8:-

Learned counsel for accused No.3 and 8 is absent. Hence, cross-examination by accused No.3 and 8 is taken as nil.

Cross-examination by Sri.HMS., Adv for the accused Nos.13 and 14:-

Learned counsel for accused No.13 and 14 is absent. Hence, cross-examination by accused No.13 and 14 is taken as nil.

Re-examination: Nil.

(TYPED IN OPEN COURT TO MY DICTATION)

R O I & A C

(KEMPARAJU)

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