

AS PER ORDER DATED 18.06.2025 PW.1 RECALLED AND OATH IS ADMINISTERED DATED: 28.11.2025.

FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION BY Sri.MMD ADVOCATE FOR RESPONDENTS:

It is true to suggest that I am the shareholder and also was the Director of respondent No.2. I am not aware of the suggestion you suggested that respondent No.2 is closely managed company. It is true to suggest that the another Director of respondent No.2 company was Mr.Sawhney. I am not aware who are the present Directors of respondent No.2 company. I am not aware of the fact you suggested that till now Mr.Sawhney is managing the company as a Director. I am not aware what is the business or profession of Mr.Sawhney. After the notices are being affixed on the property, in order to know the position I made communications with Mr.Sawhney through Ex.P.3 mails. Now I have seen Ex.P.4 & P.5. Now I have read these emails and I admit the contents therein. Mr.Sawhney had dealt with Sobha Iris while I was purchasing the flat somewhere early 2000. I am not aware of the fact that how many purchasers were being represented by Mr.Sawhney before Sobha Iris. I am not aware of the suggestion you suggested that on behalf of many purchasers like me, Mr.Sawhney was transacting with Sobha Iris. It is not true to suggest that on behalf of me and other purchasers Mr.Sawhney interacted with Sobha Iris. I have no knowledge of the suggestion you suggested that the prospective buyers of Sobha Iris became the shareholders of respondent No.2 company. Probably from September 2014 to April 2015 I was the Director

of respondent No.2 company. During my tenure as a Director I never participated in the Board meeting infact I do not know whether the Board meeting was held or not. Before I became the Director of respondent No.2 company I did not verify the constitution records of the said company. The moto of respondent No.2 company was to promote an Apartment Hotel. I had paid Rs.15 lakhs to Sobha Fiorella to book 15 apartments. Subsequently Mr.Sawhney took over the building from Sobha. Subsequent thereto Mr.Sawhney intimated that he converted my Rs.15 lakhs into shareholding. I am not aware of the suggestion that Mr.Sawhney completed the project through Sobha. It is true to suggest that Mr.Sawhney was talking to Sobha Iris on my behalf. Witness volunteers that I was directly making payments to Sobha Iris. In the year 2015 I got the sale deed executed by Sobha Iris, but I came in possession in the year 2018. It is true to suggest that between 2008 and 2014 the relationship between me and Mr.Sawhney was normal. It is not true to suggest that along with respondent No.2 I had issued a reply notice as per Ex.R.5 to the Sobha Developers. Since early 2015 I never met Mr.Sawhney. I have no idea that when actually the handing over of Sobha Iris was completed. It is not true to suggest that between 2015 and 2022 I was regularly in touch with Mr.Sawhney. I am not aware of the fact you suggested that Mr.Sawhney had informed me that he would take care of the proceedings of suit OS No.9593/2015 on behalf of the defendant No.1 company in which I am having shares. It is not true to suggest that after the said suit being decreed I started communicating with

Mr.Sawhney inquiring about the liabilities of company and my liabilities. It is not true to suggest that even before the sale deed was executed in my favour I had taken possession of flat in Sobha Iris. It is not true to suggest that soon after I taken over possession I handed it over to Mr.Sawhney. In between 2015 & 2018 Mr.Sawhney was occupying the flat in Sobha Iris. I did not take any steps to evict Mr.Sawhney from the flat in between 2015 & 2018. It is not true to suggest that since my relationship with Mr.Sawhney was cordial I allowed him to be in possession over the flat. It is not true to suggest that in between 2005 & 2016 myself and Mr.Sawhney being in good terms have executed many documents and deeds in favour of Sobha Developers. It is not true to suggest that after the decree is passed I and Mr.Sawhney being colluded with each other have filed the present false petition. It is true to suggest that the defendant No.2 company is under liquidation. It is not true to suggest that I colluding with Mr.Sawhney in the name of the respondent No.2 company defrauded many companies, persons and financial institutions. It is not true to suggest that the suit summons were duly served upon me to the address owned by me.

RE-EXAMINATION:- NIL

(Typed to my dictation in the open Court.)

R O I & A C

**(JITHENDRANATH C.S.)
C/c LXXXVIII ACC & SJ, BENGALURU.**