

**Witness is present and duly sworn on.21.09.2022**  
**Further cross examination by Sri. BRS Advocate for plaintiff**

It is false to suggest that the plaintiff was providing quality service. It is true to suggest that on 18.09.2014 the meeting was held between plaintiff and defendant. It is false to suggest that on 18.09.2014 the defendant has given letter to plaintiff with respect to quality service provided by them. It is true to suggest that in the meeting dated 18.09.2014 it was agreed between the plaintiff and defendant to measure the exact area of house keeping service and clear the outstanding. The defendant has measured the exact area of house keeping of service. Witness volunteers that they have also paid the outstanding amount. Witness states that he is not aware that when the defendant measured the house keeping area whether the plaintiff was summoned. It is false to suggest that I have not summoned the plaintiff to measure the house keeping area and also not paid the outstanding amount to the plaintiff. It is false to suggest that as per Ex.P.2 the outstanding amount has not been paid. Witness volunteers that the amount for the period December 2013 to June 2014 has been paid with deducted area. It is true to suggest that the defendant after making part payment also the plaintiff has continued the service till termination of the contract. It is true to suggest that as per Ex.P.2, 32 invoices has not been fully cleared. It is false to suggest that the defendant is liable to pay 16,76,458/- to the plaintiff as per Ex.P.2 invoices. It is false to suggest that even though we have to pay 16,76,458/- I am deposing falsely before the court.

(Typed to my dictation in open court)

R O I & A C

**O.S. No.8122/2017  
DW1**

**(Hemanth Kumar C.R)**  
LXV Addl. CC & SJ,  
Bengaluru.