

In the Court of XLIX Additional City Civil & Sessions Judge
[Special Court for trial of NIA Cases], Bengaluru

Spl.C.187/2024

WITNESS FOR PROSECUTION

Duly sworn on 10.08.2026

PW.19 / CW.122

Deposition of : Sri. Lavan Kumar

Father's name : Sri. Gurusidda

Age : 32 years

Occupation : Constable, NIA, branch office Bengaluru

Residence : Adugodi, Bengaluru

EXAMINATION-IN-CHIEF BY THE LEARNED SPECIAL P.P:-

1. From 2023 I have been working in NIA, Bengaluru on deputation. Previously I was working in Karnataka State Police ISD Technical Wing. I am B.A., graduate. I have undergone various trainings regarding CDR analysis, IPDR and computer operating. I have the experience of 8 years in CDR analysis. In several cases I have done CDR analysis in NIA.
2. In this case as per the directions of SP, NIA, I assisted Chief Investigating Officer to analyze CDRs of accused in respect of mobile No.7259563361 pertaining to Kabir Khan, mobile No.7899624458 pertaining to Md. Badal Houldar, mobile No.8105779253 pertaining to Zakir Khan, mobile No.8453717697 pertaining to Amol Das, mobile No.8951339457 pertaining to Mohammed Bashir Hosen, mobile No.9148164785 pertaining to Sajal Houldar, mobile No.9606847122 pertaining to Mohammed Oli Ullah, mobile No.9741405891 pertaining to Md. Bilal, mobile No.9972580907 pertaining to Suhag, mobile No.

9980791796 pertaining to Masud Abdullah. I prepared interconnectivity chart of the above stated mobile numbers. In the said interconnectivity chart mobile No.9110284673 of Naveed Abrar is also shown. The mobile No.8453717697 pertaining to Amol Das has the interconnectivity with all the mobile numbers shown in the interconnectivity chart as per the said interconnectivity chart of the mobile numbers. Mobile No.7899710348 pertaining to Firdose Bepari has connectivity with Hasan. Mobile No.9738667475 pertaining to Souidi Zakir has connectivity with Firdose Bepari. In the analysis it is found that the mobile No.9148164785 pertaining to Sajal Houldar having 74 individual Bangladeshi contacts, mobile No.8105779253 pertaining to Zakir Khan was having 2 Bangladeshi contacts, mobile No.9606847122 pertaining to Md. Oli Ullah was having 18 Bangladeshi contacts, mobile No.8453717697 pertaining to Amol Das was having 141 Bangladeshi contacts, mobile No.9980791796 pertaining to Masud Abdullah was having 14 Bangladeshi contacts, mobile No.9741405891 pertaining to Md. Bilal was having 39 Bangladeshi contacts, mobile No.7899624458 pertaining to Badal Houldar was having 14 Bangladeshi contacts, mobile No.7259563361 pertaining to Kabir Khan was having 1 Bangladeshi contact, mobile No.8296968460 pertaining to Md. Mirazul was having 23 Bangladeshi contacts, mobile No.8951339457 pertaining to Md. Bashir Housen was having 12 Bangladeshi contacts, mobile No.9738667475 pertaining to Souidi Zakir was having 27 Bangladeshi contacts. The analysis was done for about one week. I handed over CDR analysis report along with interconnectivity chart to CIO. Witness identifies interconnectivity CDR (10 pages) and his signature on it. Hence, said interconnectivity CDR

is marked as **Ex.P.73** and signature of the witness is marked as **Ex.P.73(a)**.

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

3. I have not done Computer Science Degree or Degree related to Information Technology. Witness volunteers that I have completed PUC in Science and I have undergone Computer Basics training and I have knowledge about CDR analysis for about 8 years. I have undergone CDR analysis and IPDR analysis training conducted by Karnataka State Police. Based on my experience I was directed to assist the IO for CDR analysis. I do not remember whether direction by the SP, NIA to assist the CIO was in writing.

4. It is true to suggest that my job was to assist in technical capacity. It is true to suggest that whatever analysis done by me was based on the request of the CIO. Telecom Service Provider provided the information. The Telecom Service Provider provided the information based on the request of the CIO. It is true to suggest that I have not discovered independently any mobile numbers through personal investigation. Maybe in the month of January or February of the year 2024 I was directed to assist CIO for CDR analysis.

Question : On which particular date each particular mobile number was supplied to you?

Answer : CIO secured mobile numbers, CDRs from Telecom Service Provider.

Question : On which date you personally received mobile numbers?

Answer : Maybe in the month of January or February of the year 2024.

5. I do not remember whether there is any direction or order or log entry about receiving CDRs from CIO. I do not know the name of Nodal Officer of Telecom Service Provider who supplied CDRs. It is true to suggest that I cannot say the genuinity of generation and correctness of CDRs. Witness volunteers that I have done analysis and given report on the basis of request of the CIO.

6. On the basis of CDRs I have prepared interconnectivity chart. When the learned counsel puts a suggestion that you have not produced any raw data base on the basis of which the interconnectivity chart is prepared, witness states that I have not produced raw data base. i Cube i 9 software tool was used to analyze the CDRs. It is true to suggest that the interconnectivity CDR chart is only my analysis. When the learned counsel puts a suggestion that Interconnectivity chart does not reflect who was physically holding any particular mobile phone at any particular time, witness states that on the basis of data given by the CIO based on the mobile phone and name of the accused, the report and interconnectivity chart has been prepared.

Question : Whether the CDR contains the contents of the conversation between the subscribers?

Answer : Contents of conversation not available in the CDRs.

7. It is true to suggest that interconnectivity chart is not GPS location report. Exact location of the particular handset is not mentioned in the report. Learned counsel confronted a xerox copy of interconnectivity CDR to the witness and witness admitted that the said xerox copy is the copy of interconnectivity CDR prepared by him and also admitted his signature on it. Hence, the said xerox copy of the interconnectivity CDR is marked as **Ex.D.1**

and signature of the witness is marked as **Ex.D.1(a)**. The signatures which are marked at Ex.P.73(a) and Ex.D.1(a) are my signatures. When the learned counsel puts a suggestion that working at NIA you are putting different kinds of signatures on different documents so the genuinity of the documents cannot be ascertained, witness states that both signatures are my signatures.

Cross-examination by learned counsel for the accused Nos.13:-

Learned counsel for accused No.13 adopted the cross examination done by learned counsel for accused No.1, 4 to 6.

Cross-examination by learned counsel for the accused Nos.14:-

Learned counsel for accused No.14 submits no cross-examination. Hence, cross-examination by Learned counsel for accused No.14 is taken as nil.

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

Learned proxy counsel for accused No.7 adopted the cross examination done by learned counsel for accused No.1, 4 to 6.

Cross-examination by learned counsel for the accused No.2, 3 and 8:-

Learned counsel for accused Nos.2, 3 and 8 adopted the cross examination done by learned counsel for accused No.1, 4 to 6.

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.**