

**Witness Duly sworn on: 06.01.2025**

**Cross-examination by Sri. HRA counsel for respondent no. 3**

- 1) I have gone through the documents produced on my behalf and I know the contents. I have not produced the G-tree of the family of deceased Dinesh. I have produced the aadhar card of my husband deceased Dinesh. At the time of accident he was aged about 41 years. The contents of complaint lodged before the police are all true. It is true to suggest that, the offending motorcycle KA-14/EU9470 was carrying 3 persons. It is true to suggest that, my husband Dinesh was also riding motorcycle No. KA-26/K-3759. The rough sketch prepared in the place of incident is correct. It is true to suggest that, on perusal Ex.P-8 rough Sketch the accident occurred on the middle of the road. I do not know that, the respondent no.1 Mubarak had no driving license. But it is true that, the charge-sheet is filed against him by alleging that he had no driving license. It is true to suggest that, the charge-sheet has been filed by alleging that, the respondent no. 2 had permitted her son who had no driving license. I do not know that, my husband deceased Dinesh has been shown as accused no. 3 in the charge-sheet alleging that he drunk and drive the vehicle. The documents produced by me shows that, the quantity of alcohol in the blood of deceased

Dinesh was 92.46 mg/100mg. It is not true to suggest that, since my husband had the habit the consuming alcohol and as he had driven the motorcycle by consuming alcohol the accident was taken place. It is not true to suggest that, the accident was not occurred due to the negligence of respondent no. 1.

- 2) It is true to suggest that, I have not produced any document to show that, the decease Dinesh was working as painter and was earning Rs. 1,000 per day. It is not true to suggest that, I have falsely pleaded in the petition that, he was earning Rs. 1,000/- per day. I have not produced school certificate relating to deceased Dinesh to show his age. It is not true to suggest that, my petition is barred by time. It is not true to suggest that, since the respondent no. 1 had no driving license at the time alleged accident the respondent no. 3 is not liable to pay the any compensation as claimed in the petition.
- 3) My mother-in-law is alive. She is not arrived as party in this matter. It is not true to suggest that, for getting compensation I deposing falsehood.

**Cross-examination by Sri. ARF counsel for respondent no. 1 and 2**

- 4) It is true to suggest that, at the time of filing complaint I had requested the police to take action against Nasrulla. In the petition he is not the party. In criminal

case one Santosh Naik and Babu have deposed before the trial court. It is not true to suggest that, after intoxication mu husband had driven the vehicle and he himself fallen down, the respondent no. 1 and 2 are not liable to pay any compensation in this matter.

**Re-examination: NIL**

(Typed to my dictation in open court.)

R.O.I and A.C.

Sd/-

III Addl. District and Sessions Judge,  
and member MACT-III, Shivamogga.