

Witness called and duly sworn on 28.01.2026.

Cross-examination by Sri.C..H.R Advocate for Defendant:-

It is false to suggest that, the averments stated in my examination chief are not pleaded in my plaint. It is false to suggest that, though I have not pleaded in my plaint I have stated many averments in my examination chief and yet deposing falsehood. Defendant no.1 is demised as of now and his legal heir is alive. Since it is not necessary to secure the legal heir of defendant no.1 and to obtain NOC from them as I had obtained NOC from defendant no.1. It is false to suggest that, since defendant no.1 is illiterate and that he has no worldly knowledge and that the alleged NOC was not at all given by defendant no.1 as contended by me.

I don't know as to what was the SR rate for 10 guntas as on 07.07.2004 when the sale deed was executed by my father in my favour. I have not ascertain the SR rate of the said 10 guntas land but who ever got the said property executed in my favour he was aware of the same. I don't know as to what was the market value in the year 2004 for the said 10 guntas. I paid Rs.1,00,000/- to my father as on the date of sale deed. It is false to suggest that, as of 2004 the 10 guntas of property was worth Rs.2,00,00,000/-. It is false to suggest that, the witnesses to Ex.P.16 are my family

members. Later on witness having gone through Ex.P.16 submits it is true that the witnesses are my family members. It is true to suggest that, as per Ex.P.16 the market value of the land is shown as Rs.4,00,000/-. It is false to suggest that, in order to defraud the Government though the property is worth more than Rs.4,00,000/- for 10 guntas, we have mentioned Rs.4,00,000/-. I don't know as to what was the stamp duty paid by me to the Sub-Registrar office as on the date of execution of Ex.P.16. It is true to suggest that, I have shown to have paid a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- by way of cash to my father and not by way of DD or cheque. It is false to suggest that, the said document is not genuine since the consideration is not pass through documents like DD or cheque. It is false to suggest that, as on 07.07.2004 the title was in dispute and under litigation and yet I have purchased the said property with litigation. As of today the said litigation is pending pertaining to the title of the said 10 guntas. I don't understand what is meant by "my intension to purchase the property" when the litigation was pending. It is false to suggest that, the schedule mentioned in the suit and the schedule mentioned in the 1973 sale deed that is Ex.P.2 are different. It is false to suggest that, the schedule mentioned at Ex.P.2, and the

schedule mentioned at Ex.P.16, 17 and sketch marked as Ex.P.19. It is false to suggest that, the said sale deed which is executed when the litigation was pending is void, sham and illegal. It is true to suggest that, there is a dispute among the family members of the 1st plaintiff in respect of the property mentioned at Ex.P.16 and 17. It is false to suggest that, they have filed objections with regard to denying my title.

Q: What was the purpose for getting executed Ex.P.17 a deed of confirmation dated 27.02.2013 after a lapse of 13 years?

Ans:- Since the litigation would not end they have got executed it.

It is false to suggest that, Ex.P.1 to 5 were produced by me initially based upon the GPA executed by Venkatasubamma.

In the year 1985 it was brought to my knowledge that the properties bearing survey number 6/2 and not survey number 9. It is true to suggest that, Ex.P.4 is in respect of the property purchased by me measuring 30 guntas of Kadarenahalli village. Witness volunteers it is an agreement it was of the year 1980. I have produced the sale deed in respect of the said 30 guntas. The said sale deed is marked as witness having gone through the

documents produced by him before the court for more than 2 minutes he is unable to locate the said document. It is true to suggest that, as per Ex.P.4 the schedule to the 30 guntas of land reflects towards the East, the existence of property of Venkatasubamma. It is true to suggest that, the said agreement is dated 21.03.1980. It is true to suggest that, as on 21.03.1980 I had the knowledge of the said survey number being erroneous. It is false to suggest that, as per Ex.P.3 the suit in O.S.3259/1985 is also filed after a lapse of 13 years from the date of knowledge. It is false to suggest that, I am making a wrong claim in respect of survey number 9 which is belonging to the legal heirs of defendant no.2 though I was sold the property in survey number 6/2. It is false to suggest that, I have not referred to Ex.P.5 to 15 in my examination chief. It is false to suggest that, Ex.P.5 to 15 about 8 sale deeds are got executed by my family members from Akkaiaamma. It is false to suggest that, I have not furnished either the Katha certificate or the tax paid receipts in supportive of Ex.P.5 to 15. It is false to suggest that, ever since 1980 we have not paid any single pie either to Gram Panchayath, Municipality or BBMP nor to Greater Bengaluru Authority. I have not obtained E-Katha. I have no documents to show my possession based upon Ex.P.5 to 15. It is false to suggest that,

Page No.29

neither myself nor plaintiff no.1 are concerned with the suit property and that we have filed a false suit and deposed falsely before the court.

Re-examination: Nil

(Typed to my dictation in the open court)

R.O.I. & A.C.

**[Smt. A.M Nalini Kumari]
XIV ADDL. CITY CIVIL JUDGE
BENGALURU CITY.**