

Witness Recalled as per order dated 17.09.2025 and duly sworn on 13.11.2025.

Cross Examination by Sri. Counsel for accused no.2:-

6. I was working in film Industry earlier and now doing Hotel business at- Bengaluru. I have not produced any film but directed short films. It is true to suggest that, any person willing to direct film or produce film, he should register himself in Film chamber. It is true to suggest that, for remake of film there shall be agreement with person having original rights of the film. The original rights of Renigunta Movie were with one Chandan gowda or Shekhar at present I do not remember properly. This Chandan gowda / Shekhar had purchased the rights and they told that, I should direct the movie. I informed them that, only if they get the original rights then I will direct the movie. I did not purchase the original rights of Renigunta movie directly. I had registered the name of movies Anikeri

Beedi, Mandya to Mumbai in the film chamber through producers. In this regard I have not given documents to the CBI Officers showing that, the movie name was registered. Except the document for purchasing remake rights, I do not have any other documents to show that, who is the producer of above mentioned movie. I do not remember the names of person between whom the agreement for purchasing the rights of remake exist as it is long ago.

7. Before directing the above mentioned movie I had only directed short films. In the said movie which I have directed one Sabhakumar was the Cinema-Autographer. It is true to suggest that, I do not have any records to show from which source myself, Production Manager and Cinematographer received the amount. Witness says, it was given in cash. Accused No.2 is known to me since 2011. Before directing the movie I met accused No.2 for three times, one at- Mandya, 2nd one at- Konark Hotel and 3rd one at- My Studio. He came to my studio to watch the original movie. One Rohan gowda was also known to me one month before I met accused No.2. He

was artist in the Reality shows of “Pyate Mandi Kaadige bandru”.

8. This Rohan gowda is also called by name- Manjunatha gowda. He was not producer but the movie was produced in his name. Except the 1st payment of Rs.5,00,000/- which was given in my presence by accused No.2. I have not seen other payments. This amount was given by accused No.2 at- his Office, which is just behind the Konark Hotel. The amount given to Cameraman, Production Manager was given by this Rohan gowda. When I enquired where he is getting the money, this Rohan gowda has told that, he is getting the money one “Future Well Company”. I have stated before CBI that, this movie was produced under “Future Well Arts” Banner.

9. I know Venkatesh Prasad, who was the driver of Future Well Company vehicle. I had visited the Office of Future Well around two to three times. I do not remember exactly. I visited both new and old offices. I met this Venkatesh Prasad near Future Well Office when I visited. I do not know to suggest that, this Venkatesh Prasad was having one HITACHI.

I do not do the business of selling the cars but I have friends circle in that. We did not go to Pondicherry, the car was brought here. The amount was given through DD. I do not remember the name of the owner of that car. I had gone to the Office of accused No.2 behind the Konark Hotel. It is false to suggest that, myself and Venkatesh Prasad were dealing the selling of cars by purchasing from Pondicherry. It is false to suggest that, with apprehension that, I may get involved in this case for Rs.8,00,000/- DD. I am deposing falsely against accused No.2. It is false to suggest that, there is no person by name- Rohan gowda and it is only fictitious character created by us. It is false to suggest that, I have only disclosed today that, this Rohan gowda is also called by name- Manjunath gowda and it is not stated earlier to this. Witness says, it was not asked by anyone, hence not told.

10. To the Question that, there was no problem for accused No.2 to produce movie in his name, Witness answered that, as he expressed he may face tax problems it was not

produced in his name. In this regard I have not stated that,
before CBI has not asked.

**(Typed to my dictation on computer in the open court as
stated by the witness.)**

R.O.I & A.C.

**(SANTHOSH S PALLEDH)
XLVI Addl. C.C & S.J., & Spl.
Judge for CBI cases, Bengaluru.**