

BEFORE THE ADDITIONAL MASTER-III
THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCE
HIGH COURT, MADRAS.
O.P.No.716 OF 2023

Date: 13.08.2025

Time: 12.50 P.M.

Name : Mrs.S.Radha (PW1)

Further cross examination by Ms.N.Nagu Sah, Learned counsel for the Respondents No.1 to 3.

Solemnly Affirmed:

Q94:I suggest to you that ever since the date of adoption till filing of OP, the minor child never visited you at Thalakanikuppam as stated by you?

A:I deny.

Q95:I suggest to you 3rd respondent Rani was not at all concerned with the adoption given by you to the 1st and 2nd respondents?

A:I deny.

Q96:I suggest to you 3rd respondent Rani was never in custody of the minor child and so she is an unnecessary party in this proceedings?

A:I deny. Witness adds: she is the necessary party.

Q97:Are you aware about the contents of the Counter Statement filed by 3rd respondent Rani in the above OP?

A:I do not know.

Q98:Are you aware in the Counter Statement filed by R3. She has categorically stated that she is not in custody of the minor child and she is unnecessary party in the above OP?

A:She is a necessary party.

Q99:I suggest to you that you have impleaded R3 as an unnecessary party in the above said OP and the OP is liable to be dismissed for misjoinder of R3?

A:She is a necessary party.

Q100:Did you ever visit the minor child after adoption at Chennai?

A:No. I visited and saw the minor child at Chennai once in 10 days.

Q101:Did you ever visit the school in which the minor is studying?

A:No.

Q102:At least, do you know the location of the school where the minor is studying?

A:I do not know.

Q103:I suggest to you the minor child is studying in Victoria Matriculation School, at Thiruvotriyur and not at Sheba School as stated by you?

A:Now only I come to know.

Q104:I suggest to you, your ignorance about the child's education shows that you have no interest and love and affection for the minor child and also about the welfare of the child?

A:I deny.

Q105:I suggest to you your ignorance about the welfare of the child clearly indicates that you never visited the child at Chennai ever since the date of adoption?

A:I deny.

Q106:Are you aware whose name was given as parents of the minor child in the school?

A:I am aware.

Q107:Whose name was given as parents of the minor child in the school?

A:Kumar and Bhuvneswari.

Q108:When did you come to know about the name of R1, R2 as parents of the minor child in the school?

A:After the filing of this case.

Q109:So, till the filing of the OP you were not aware of anything about the educational care of the minor child?

A:I am aware.

Q110:Your specific case is you have given the minor to R1, R2 casually. Did you raise any objection for giving the names of R1, R2 as parents of the minor child in the school?

A:No.

Q111:Since you have given the minor child in adoption to R1, R2, you did not raise any objection for R1, R2 to bring up the minor child as her adoptive parents in the school?

A:I deny. Witness adds: After filing of this case I came to know these details.

Q112:Now, at least after having come to know about these facts OP did you take any action till this date for the past 2 years?

A:No.

Q113:Do you know along with the above OP you have filed an application in A.No.5903 of 2023 for interim custody of the minor child?

A:Yes.

Q114:Are you aware that the interim application came before the Hon'ble Court for enquiry on 03.01.2024?

A:Yes. I am aware.

Q115:His Lordship held enquiry in the above said Application on 03.01.2024. Do you know?

A:Yes.

Q116: Is it correct to state that after enquiry of the minor child separately, the court came to the conclusion that the minor child shall continue to be in custody of Lakshmi pathi and Poorani and yourself and your husband shall have right to visit the child 2 days in the week.

A:I do not know. But it is informed that I have right to visit the child 2 days in the week.

Q117:Is it correct to state that after the order dated 03.01.2024 the minor child continued to be in the custody of Lakshmi pathi and Poorani?

A:I deny.

Q118:Do you mean to say that after the order dated 03.01.2024 whether the child was handed over to your custody?

A:No. Witness adds: the child was handed over to Rani Amma.

Q119:I suggest to you that R3 Rani was never given custody of the minor child by court?

A:I deny.

Q120:While the court has given visitation right to visit child at Chennai 2 days in a week, you have not exercised your right to visit the child as per court order. Is it correct?

A:I deny. Witness adds: I exercised my right and visited the child as per court order

Q121:I suggest to you to you that you never visited the child at Chennai as per court order

A:I deny.

Time : 01.35 P.M

Taken down in open Court, read over and explained to the witness and the same is admitted by the witness to be correct and signed before me.

ADDITIONAL MASTER-III