

DULY SWORN ON: 02-07-2025

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY Sri. BRP THE COUNSEL FOR R-1 to R-3:

27. I have seen the video which is there in the CD produced by me at Ex. P2. R1 to 3 are not seen in the said video. It is true to suggest that the photographs produced by me at Ex. P1 are taken from the same video. I am also not there in the said video.

28. It is false to suggest that Ex. P1 and P2 are created for the purpose of this case. It is true to suggest that I do not have personal knowledge of the said video. Witness volunteers, since I was not physically present, I do not have personal knowledge, but my team have appraised the facts to me. I do not remember if it is suggested to me that date & time is not embossed on the video file.

29. It is true to suggest that the petitioner tried to dispossess Respeodnet No. 1 to 3 on the strength of interim order passed by this court by taking police help. (This answer is given by the witness after the question was explained for the second time since the first time witness did not understand this question.)

30. I know Mr. RAguram and Ms. Padmaja since they were employees of the petitioner. It is true to suggest that the police complaint was given by Mr. Raghuram. It is false to suggest that myself and Mr. Rajshekar did not go to police station. Witness volunteers, myself, Rajshekar and

legal head went together to police station. I am not aware of the designation of Mr. RAgurram in the Petitioner company.

31. I do not remember since how long Raghuram is working in petitioner company. If I am asked in what capacity Raghuram has given police complaint, I say he was looking after the project. I say that he was looking after orange shelf storage project. He was in charge of carrying out fitment activities in the project.

32. If it is suggested to me that as per the averments of the police complaint, Raguram has given complaint on my instructions which means that I did not personally go to police station. I say that myself and Rajshekar went personally to police station. Raghuram is not there in the video at Ex. P2.

33. It is false to suggest that the contents of the complaint and interim order were not shown to respondent No. 1 to 3 in the police station. I have document i.e. RPAD Acknowledgement to show that copy of the interim order was served on respondent 1 to 3, but I do not have any document to show that the copy of the police complaint was shown to respondent 1 to 3. Witness volunteers the police complaint along with the interim order was shown to R1 to 3 in the police station.

34. It is false to suggest that the alleged statement of R1 which is produced as Exhibit P5 was taken from R1 against his will and without

bringing the contents of said statement to the notice of R1. It is false to suggest that the said statement was taken from R1 under the guise of inspection of the property to verify whether there is construction or not. It is false to suggest that I am misusing the statement of R 1 in this case.

35. Question, I suggest to you that there was no obstruction by respondents because petitioner was never in possession of the property.

Answer, we were in possession and when we tried to take some material to the property, we were obstructed by the security guard.

36. It is false to suggest that there was no material belonging to the petitioner in the property. I have to verify and presently I do not know whether there is any document to show existence of material belonging to the petitioner in the property. I do not remember if it is suggested to me that there was no impediment to state in the present petition when and from whom petitioner took possession of the property. It is false to suggest that since petitioner never took possession of the property, I have not stated the date of taking possession in the present petition. It is false to suggest that Ex. P5 is a false complaint which was made only to harass the respondents.

37. It is false to suggest that I have filed the present petition only to harass the respondents. It is false to suggest that I have given false evidence.

Re-examination : NIL

(Computerized to my dictation in the Open Court as deposed by the Witness)

R.O.I.& A.C,

(SUDINDRANATH.S.)

LXXXIII ADDL. CITY CIVIL & SESSIONS JUDGE,
BENGALURU.