DEPOSITION OF WITNESS

(Chapter XXIII code of Criminal Procedure)

In the Court of XI Additional Special Judge for CBI Cases

(CBI Cases Relating to Banks and Financial Institutions)

Chennai - 600 001.

Calendar Case	: C.C.No. 27 /2015
Deposition of witness for	: PW-36 (LW-2)
Name of the witness	: Mr.T.R.Raghavan

Solemnly affirmed in accordance with the provisions of Oaths Act, 1969 (Central Act 44 of 1969) on the 1st day of August 2025.

(A1, A5 are present. A3 charge abated. A6 split up in CC.NO.8/2024. Others absent. Petition filed and allowed).

Cross Examination by A5:

I have conducted the Audit as usual. I conducted audit during May 2014. At the time of audit, Mr. Sridhar was not available in the Office as Chief Manager since he was transfered. I do not know whether Mr.Viswanathan made endorsement in the KYC Documents for verification. I deny the suggestion that I have stated in my report that the due diligence was not adopted while entertaining the KYC documents without any basis. I do not know whether Mr.Kannan, Manager had got MOD registered in favor of Central Bank of India, Mylapore Branch after verifying the documents and title deeds in respect of the properties given by the borrowers. At the time of audit, I have seen the MOD documents available with bank. I have perused the EC available with bank regarding the MOD. I did not meet Mr. Srinivasacharlu during the visit. At the time of audit, I have gone through the Valuation Report. It is incorrect to state that Valuation report given by Panel Valuers only based on the further process of sanction of loan was done. During my audit, I have seen the valuation report and the survey numbers mentioned in the valuation report and MOD documents are same. I do not know whether Mr.Sridhar had visited the property with one of the valuer Mr.Balasubramanian and borrower who had identified the properties. I do not know whether Mr.Balasubramanian and borrower had identified the properties to Mr.Sridhar. In Ex.P111, there was no any specific adverse remarks to notice against the borrower.

Q: Balance sheet furnished by the borrower, should the chief Manager verify personally the auditors office and subject to satisfaction the balance sheet given by such office is then taken to records for every loan process, is there any rules framed by Central Bank of India?

A: The visit to the auditor office is not necessary in all cases. However, it is duty of the Manager to ensure that the balance sheet are in order and genuine. If any infirmities noticed, the Manager has to visit the Auditor Office.

Cent Mortgage is done through system and all initial process is being done only through the system. The Subordinate Officers will handle the system and the Manager also has to verify the important datas relevant for loan transactions. I am not aware whether the loan process started from September 2013 and for 4 months process was taken place. I unable to remember the exact date of valuation report and legal opinion. It is incorrect to say that the subject loan was processed meticulously and for that, 4 months were taken. I had perused the concurrent audit report. I do not remember whether in the concurrent audit report, it is observed that the Pre-sanction Inspection Report was not submitted. It is correct to say that Pre-sanction Inspection Report is the basic document for processing any loan. I cannot say that Pre-Sanction Inspection Report was not available at the time of my audit due to the reason that it was misplaced. I am not aware of the complaint given by Srivasancharlu to Zonal and Regional Office regarding his property being mortgaged to the Central Bank of India and that based on that, the vigilance enquiry was conducted and report was submitted. I deny the suggestion that I have submitted my audit report on the line of vigilance report by knowing the contents of the vigilance report, dated 21.02.2014 . I deny the suggestion that my audit report is incomplete and biased one and to safeguard the Officers by name 1. Mr.Kannan, 2. Mr. Viswanathan and 3. Mr.Krishnakumar Selvam who were really involved in the processing of the above said loans, who failed to perused the documents properly and misled the Office Rule to lend said loan. I deny the suggestion that I have given evidence only on instruction given by the CBI to suppress the above 3 named Officers. I further deny the suggestion that I have given adverse observation against Mr.Sridhar at instigation of CBI.

(Learned Counsel for the A2 and A4 has no cross examination)

Taken down before me in the open court read over to the witness and acknowledged by him/her to be correct.

VADIVELU T P Digitally signed by VADIVELU T P

01.08.2025 XI Additional Special Judge for CBI Cases.