

WITNESS IS PRESENT AND DULY SWORN ON 16.02.2026

(Learned SPP orally seeks permission for further examination in chief of PW.6 submitting that today PW-6 has brought certificate u/S.65B(4)(c) of Indian Evidence Act and the same is required to be marked in evidence. Permitted.)

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

8. Now I can identify the certificate u/S.65B(4)(c) of Indian Evidence Act, 1872. Witness identifies the said certificate u/S.65B(4)(c) of Indian Evidence Act and also identifies her signature on it. Sri.CRP., learned counsel for accused No.3, 11, 16 and 19 orally objected to mark the said document stating that the said certificate is not produced in the proper manner. The said objection is kept open. The said certificate is marked as **Ex.P.32** subject to objection of learned counsel for accused No.3, 11, 16 and 19. Signature of witness is marked as **Ex.P.32(a)**.

Cross-examination by Sri C.R.P., Adv for the accused No.3, 6, 11, 16 and 19:-

9. It is true to suggest that CD (Ex.P.22) was not password protected. When the NIA police sent requisition to us, the NIA police did not send the CD alongwith requisition. It is true to suggest that in our office a stock register is maintained with the administration team with regard to stationery. It is true to suggest that the stationery items and CDs are maintained by the administration persons. The NIA officers did not ask for copy of stock register before or after CD (Ex.P.22) is given to IO. After I issued CD, the NIA officer did not ask me to conduct analysis of numbers. The IO did not send any analysis report to me for re-verification.

10. It is true to suggest that the CDRs are saved in server. The CDR server is situated at Pune. The IO did not ask me for server logs regarding these numbers. It is true to suggest that I have no physical access to the server situated at Pune. I do not know the server contains the persons access to the server purpose and date on which it was accessed. It is true to suggest that those kind of server logs are maintained by the technical team. It is true to suggest that I do not control the Data base stored in the server. It is true to suggest that with regard to this case at no point of time I visited the said server center situated at Pune. There is a separate technical team to maintain hardware. The Pune based server uses Oracle application. The IO did not request in writing to provide the copy of maintenance register regarding hardware and software at Pune.
11. It is true to suggest that in Ex.P.20 there is no mention that the CD is not password protected. It is true to suggest that any expenditure towards stationery is accounted. The Investigating Officer did not ask for issue of receipt for CD. It is true to suggest that I am aware that the Excel document can be edited. It is true to suggest that I cannot say the change of custody of the CD, after I handed over CD (Ex.P.22) to the IO. It is true to suggest that when I handed over CD (Ex.P.22) to the IO, it was not in sealed condition. It is true to suggest that on CD (Ex.P.22), there is no mention of date below my signature. It is true to suggest that there is no signature of person on Ex.P.19 who received it.
12. When the IO made requisition for issue of CDRs, he did not requested to provide Hash value report. After Ex.P.25, Ex.P.28 and Ex.P.31 are issued, IO did not submit any analysis report for cross verification.

13. When the learned counsel for the accused put suggestion that IO had not collected Ex.P.32 (certificate u/S.65B(4)(c) of Indian Evidence Act) from you, witness states that today I brought and produced it. It is true to suggest that with regard to the numbers mentioned in Ex.P.27, the requisition was sent by IO on 25.05.2020. It is false to suggest that Ex.P.32 and Ex.P.27 are concocted for the purpose of this case. Witness volunteers that I issued Ex.P.27 on 26.05.2020, but the date was by oversight mentioned as 12.05.2020 on Ex.P.27 and hence today I have brought Ex.P.32. The Investigating Officer has not asked for explanation from me about the date mentioned in Ex.P.27 as 12.05.2020 from May 2020 till this date. Witness volunteers that on the last date of my chief examination, it was brought to my notice and the IO also high-lated to me about the date mentioned in Ex.P.27. The Investigating Officer did not gave separate requisition to me to produce Ex.P.32. I did not ask the Investigating Officer to submit copy of Ex.P.27 to me while preparing Ex.P.32.
14. It is false to suggest that Ex.P.20, Ex.P.24 and Ex.P.32 are mechanically prepared as Investigating Officer asked for them. It is true to suggest that in Ex.P.20, Ex.P.24 and Ex.P.32 there is no mention about the generation of Hash value.

Que: Is there any reference about the Pune server in your certificate which is marked at Ex.P.32?

Ans: There is no requirement to make reference about the Pune server in certificate u/S.65B of Indian Evidence Act. However, I have mentioned as stored in the servers of our Company.

15. It is true to suggest that the certificate u/S.65B of Indian Evidence Act is issued in the format maintained by our Company. The Investigating Officer did not collect my attendance certificate from our company for

the dates mentioned in the certificates u/S.65B of Indian Evidence Act. It is false to suggest that I am not competent person to provide call details. It is false to suggest that I am not competent person to issue certificates u/S.65B of Indian Evidence Act as Datas are stored in server at Pune. It is false to suggest that I do not have personal knowledge about the documents. It is false to suggest that to help the NIA I have issued concocted documents.

Cross-examination by learned counsel for the accused No.4, 5 and 7:-

16. Learned counsel for accused No. 4, 5 and 7 submits that he has adopted the cross-examination done by learned counsel for accused Nos.3, 6, 11, 16 and 19.

Cross-examination by learned counsel for the accused No.1, 2, 8 to 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20, 22:-

17. Learned counsel for accused Nos.1, 2, 8 to 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20 and 22 submits that he has adopted the cross-examination done by learned counsel for accused Nos.3, 6, 11, 16 and 19.

Re-examination: Nil

(TYPED IN OPEN COURT TO MY DICTATION)

ROI & AC

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