



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.I.ARUN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B. MURALIDHARA PAI

MISCELLANEOUS FIRST APPEAL NO. 100015 OF 2025 (FC)

C/W

MFA CROSS OBJ NO. 100063 OF 2025 (FC)

IN MFA NO.100015 OF 2025:

BETWEEN:

SHRI PRASAD
S/O. MAHANTESH BAILWAD,
AGE. 40 YEARS, OCC. BUSINESS,
R/O. #7, PLOT NO.9+10/1,
VAISHWANI COLONY,
NEAR SIDDESHWAR MATH,
GOPPANKOPPA,
HUBBALLI - 580 023.

... APPELLANT

(BY SRI R.H. ANGADI, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI SANTOSHKUMAR M. PATIL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT. PAVITRA W/O. PRASAD BAILWAD,
BFORE MARRIAGE PAVITRA
D/O. GURURAJ NEELAKANTHANAVAR,
AGE. 33 YEARS, OCC. HOUSEHOLD WORK,
R/O. #C-54/867, TIMMASAGAR ONI,
HUBBALLI-580 023.

... RESPONDENT

(BY SRI S.S. NIRANJAN, ADVOCATE)

THIS MFA IS FILED UNDER SECTION 19(1) OF FAMILY COURTS
ACT, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT IN M.C.
NO.186/2024 DATED 30/11/2024 AND DECREE DATED 09/12/2024,
BY THE 1ST ADDITIONAL PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT,



NC: 2026:KHC-D:2600-DB
MFA No. 100015 of 2025
C/W MFA.CROB No. 100063 of 2025

HUBBALLI, BY ALLOWING THE APPEAL AND CONSEQUENTLY ALLOW THE PETITION FILED BY THE RESPONDENT HEREIN UNDER SECTION 9 OF HINDU MARRIAGE ACT TO MEET THE ENDS OF JUSTICE AND ETC.,

IN MFA CROB NO.100063 OF 2025:
BETWEEN:

SMT. PAVITRA W/O. PRASAD BAILWAD,
BFORE MARRIAGE PAVITRA
D/O. GURURAJ NEELAKANTHANAVAR,
AGE ABOUT 33 YEARS,
OCC. HOUSEHOLD WORK,
R/AT: C/O. #C-54/867, TIMMASAGAR ONI,
HUBBALLI, DIST. DHARWAD-580 028.

... CROSS OBJECTOR

(BY SRI S.S. NIRANJAN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SHRI PRASAD S/O. MAHANTESH BAILWAD,
AGE ABOUT 40 YEARS, OCC. BUSINESS,
R/O. #7, PLOT NO.9+10/1,
VAISHWANI COLONY, NEAR SIDDESHWAR MATH,
GOPPANKOPPA, HUBBALLI,
DIST. DHARWAD-580 023.

... RESPONDENT

(BY SRI R.H. ANGADI, ADVOCATE)

THIS MFA CROB IN MFA NO.100015/2025 IS FILED UNDER 41 RULE 22 OF C.P.C., PRAYING TO ALLOW THE CROSS APPELLANT TO FILED THIS CROSS APPEAL; MODIFY THE JUDGMENT PASSED BY THE 1ST ADDITIONAL PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, HUBBALLI IN M.C. NO.186/2024 DATED 30.11.2024 INSOFAR FINDINGS ON ISSUE NO.3 AND ALSO ON RETURN OF GOLD AND SILVER ORNAMENTS OF THE CROSS APPELLANTS AS PER PARA NO.3 OF THE M.C. PETITION IN M.C. NO.186/2024 IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY AND ETC.

THIS MFA AND MFA CROB ARE COMING ON PRONOUNCEMENT AND THE SAME HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR JUDGMENT ON 03.02.2026, THIS DAY, **B.MURALIDHARA PAI J.**, DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:



CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.I.ARUN
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. MURALIDHARA PAI

CAV JUDGMENT

(PER: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B. MURALIDHARA PAI)

1. The Respondent in M.C. No.186/2024 on the file of learned I Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Hubballi (hereinafter referred to as 'family court') is the Appellant in MFA No.100015/2025. He has maintained this appeal praying to set aside judgment and decree dated 30.11.2024 passed therein.

2. The Petitioner in M.C. No.186/2024 has preferred MFA Crob. No.100063/2025 praying to enhance the permanent alimony awarded by the family court apart from directing the Respondent to return the gold and silver ornaments of her, by modifying the impugned judgment and decree dated 30.11.2024.

3. The parties to these proceedings are referred herein with their original ranking before the family court.

4. Brief facts leading to these appeals are as under:

4.1 The Petitioner namely Smt. Pavitra maintained a petition in M.C. No.186/2024 under Section 13(1)(ia) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 seeking dissolution of the marriage



with the Respondent, which had taken place on 10.02.2023 and for permanent alimony of Rs.20,00,000/-.

4.2 Similarly, the Respondent maintained a petition in M.C. No.352/2024 under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act for the relief of restitution of conjugal rights against the Petitioner.

4.3 Both these petitions were pending before the family court and they were tried together. In these proceedings, the Petitioner adduced her evidence as PW-1 and got marked documents at Ex.P1 to P14. The Respondent adduced his evidence as RW-1, examined one more witness and got marked documents at Ex.R1 and R2.

4.4 Thereafter, the family court heard the submissions of both sides, considered the materials placed on record and disposed of these petitions on merits of the case vide judgment and decree dated 30.11.2024. The family court partly allowed the petition in M.C. No.186/2024 and granted the decree of divorce as prayed in the petition and directed the Respondent to pay a sum of Rs.7,00,000/- to the Petitioner by way of



permanent alimony. The said court dismissed the petition maintained by the Respondent for restitution of conjugal rights.

5. Being aggrieved by the judgment and decree passed in M.C. No.186/2024, the Respondent has maintained MFA No.100015/2025 praying to set aside impugned judgment and decree and consequently to allow his petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act. However, during the course of argument Sri R.H.Angadi, learned Counsel for Respondent submitted that the Respondent restricts his challenge to the impugned judgment and decree to extent of seeking reduction in quantum of permanent alimony ordered in the case.

6. Learned Counsel for Respondent submitted that the Respondent is running a small business in stationary items and he is hardly getting monthly income of Rs.2,000/- to Rs.3,000/-. He further submitted that the Respondent has the responsibility of maintaining his aged parents, who are depending upon him. Thus, he contended that the Respondent is a poor man and he does not own any property. In the above circumstances, he submitted that the family court has erred in directing the Respondent to pay a sum of Rs.7,00,000/- by way of permanent



alimony to the Petitioner, without taking into consideration his financial capacity and standard of living.

7. *Per contra*, Sri S.S. Niranjan learned Counsel for Petitioner vehemently submitted that while answering Point No.3 the family court has concluded that the Respondent has got sufficient income but failed to award just and reasonable amount for the maintenance of the Petitioner by way of permanent alimony. As such, he sought this Court to allow the cross objection and enhance permanent alimony apart from directing the Respondent to return the gold and silver ornaments received by him at the time of the marriage.

8. We have given our anxious consideration to the grounds urged and arguments canvassed by both sides before this Court. Thereby, the following points would arise for our consideration:

- a) Whether the permanent alimony amount awarded by the family court to the Petitioner is just and reasonable?



- b) Whether the Petitioner has made out valid ground to seek for enhancement of permanent alimony? If so, what amount?

Point Nos. (a) and (b):

9. Section 25(1) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 reads as under:

"25. Permanent alimony and maintenance.—(1) Any court exercising jurisdiction under this Act may, at the time of passing any decree or at any time subsequent thereto, on application made to it for the purpose by either the wife or the husband, as the case may be, order that the respondent shall pay to the applicant for her or his maintenance and support such gross sum or such monthly or periodical sum for a term not exceeding the life of the applicant as, having regard to the respondent's own income and other property, if any, the income and other property of the applicant, the conduct of the parties and other circumstances of the case, it may seem to the court to be just, and any such payment may be secured, if necessary, by a charge on the immovable property of the respondent."

10. In ***Parvin Kumar Jain Vs Anju Jain*** [2024 INSC 961], Hon'ble Apex Court of India, while reiterating the factors that needs to be considered in order to arrive at a just, fair and reasonable amount of permanent alimony, held that –

"31. There cannot be strict guidelines or a fixed formula for fixing the amount of permanent maintenance. The quantum of maintenance is subjective to each case and is dependent on various



circumstances and factors. The Court needs to look into factors such as income of both the parties; conduct during the subsistence of marriage; their individual social and financial status; personal expenses of each of the parties; their individual capacities and duties to maintain their dependents; the quality of life enjoyed by the wife during the subsistence of the marriage; and such other similar factors. This position was laid down by this Court in Vinny Paramvir Parmar v. Paramvir Parmar, and Vishwanath Agrawal v. Sarla Vishwanath Agrawal.

32. This Court in the case of Rajnesh v. Neha (Supra), provided a comprehensive criterion and a list of factors to be looked into while deciding the question of permanent alimony. This judgment lays down an elaborate and comprehensive framework necessary for deciding the amount of maintenance in all matrimonial proceedings, with specific emphasis on permanent alimony. The same has been reiterated by this Court in Kiran Jyot Maini v. Anish Pramod Patel (Supra). The primary objective of granting permanent alimony is to ensure that the dependent spouse is not left without any support and means after the dissolution of the marriage. It aims at protecting the interests of the dependent spouse and does not provide for penalizing the other spouse in the process. The Court in these two judgments laid down the following factors to be looked into:

- i. Status of the parties, social and financial.*
- ii. Reasonable needs of the wife and the dependent children.*
- iii. Parties' individual qualifications and employment statuses.*
- iv. Independent income or assets owned by the applicant.*



v. Standard of life enjoyed by the wife in the matrimonial home.

vi. Any employment sacrifices made for the family responsibilities.

vii. Reasonable litigation costs for a non-working wife.

viii. Financial capacity of the husband, his income, maintenance obligations, and liabilities.

These are only guidelines and not a straitjacket rubric. These among such other similar factors become relevant.

33. This Court in Kiran Jyot Maini (Supra), while discussing the husband's obligation to maintain the wife and the importance of his financial capacity in deciding the quantum, observed that:

"26. Furthermore, the financial capacity of the husband is a critical factor in determining permanent alimony. The Court shall examine the husband's actual income, reasonable expenses for his own maintenance, and any dependents he is legally obligated to support. His liabilities and financial commitments are also to be considered to ensure a balanced and fair maintenance award. The court must consider the husband's standard of living and the impact of inflation and high living costs. Even if the husband claims to have no source of income, his ability to earn, given his education and qualifications, is to be taken into account. The courts shall ensure that the relief granted is fair, reasonable, and consistent with the standard of living to which the aggrieved party was accustomed. The court's approach should be to balance



all relevant factors to avoid maintenance amounts that are either excessively high or unduly low, ensuring that the dependent spouse can live with reasonable comfort post separation."

11. In ***Rajnesh Vs Neha and another***, reported in MANU/SC/0833/2020, Hon'ble Apex Court while restating the criteria for determining quantum of maintenance, has held that –

"... A careful and just balance must be drawn between all relevant factors.

The test for determination of maintenance in matrimonial disputes depends on the financial status of the respondent, and the standard of living that the applicant was accustomed to in her matrimonial home.

The maintenance amount awarded must be reasonable and realistic, and avoid either of the two extremes i.e. maintenance awarded to the wife should neither be so extravagant which becomes oppressive and unbearable for the respondent, nor should it be so meager that it drives the wife to penury. The sufficiency of the quantum has to be adjudged so that the wife is able to maintain herself with reasonable comfort. ..."

12. While the determination of maintenance or permanent alimony lies within judicial discretion, it must be exercised judiciously, guided by principles of equity and fairness. Courts should consider factors such as the parties' social status, standard of living, income and assets of spouses, their liabilities



and dependents, and the parties' overall conduct, to arrive at a just, fair, and reasonable amount.

13. In the case on hand, Para 55 to Para 61 of the impugned judgment contains the discussion and reasons assigned by the family court, for arriving at quantum of permanent alimony at Rs.7,00,000/-. On appreciating the materials available on record, the family court, at Para 57 of the judgment recorded its finding as follows:

"... In the light of the above said admission given by the R.W.1 coupled with the said photo copy of the property which is produced under Ex.P13, the respondent is having lakhs together income per month out of all the business. In other words, he is having sufficient property as well as business to generate sufficient income to maintain the petitioner. ...".

However, at the end, in Para 61 of the judgment the family court proceeded to hold that

"... In the case on hand, looking to the income of the respondent and considering the age of the petitioner who now lost her marital life due to alleged act of the respondent and considering the social status of the respective parties and coupled with the huge income of the respondent, it is just and necessary to grant permanent alimony of Rs.7,00,000/- which would reach both the ends of justice...."



Thereby, it is evident that the family court has not determined the quantum of permanent alimony in the case, having regarding relevant factors for consideration.

14. Undisputedly, the marriage of the Petitioner and the Respondent was solemnized on 10.02.2023 as per the custom prevailing in their community. Thereafter, within a short period both of them maintained the petitions in M.C. Nos.186/2024 and 352/2024, i.e, on 19.04.2024 and 31.07.2024 respectively. As on the date of these petitions, they were aged about 32 years and 39 years respectively. Thus, the materials on record indicate that they had lived together hardly for about five months after the marriage. They have no children born in wedlock.

15. It is the specific case of the petitioner that she is unemployed, lacks any independent income, and currently resides with her parents. She further contended that the respondent earns Rs.1,00,000/- per month from his business, along with rental income from a prime commercial complex in Ramdurg and additional properties, including a house and adjacent shops in Hubballi. In the said circumstances, she sought for a direction requiring the respondent to pay her permanent



alimony of Rs.20,00,000/-. Whereas, the Respondent contended that he is doing a small stationary delivery work and earning Rs.2000/- - Rs.3000/- p.m. and he has to maintain his aged parents. He claimed that he has no other source of income. Further, he did not whisper anything about the education, employment, earning capacity, income of the Petitioner or the property owned by her.

16. In her evidence, the petitioner reiterated the averments in the petition regarding the financial conditions of both herself and the respondent. However, during her cross-examination, the respondent made no effort to deny or dispute such statements made by the petitioner on oath. On the contrary, during his cross examination the Respondent has given certain unambiguous admissions, which go to root of his defense, as under:

“...ನಾನು ದ್ವಿತೀಯ ಪಿಯುಸಿ ವರೆಗೆ ಓದಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಸೀಸ್, ಪೆನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಹಾಗೂ ಇತರ ಸ್ಟೇಶನರಿ ವಸ್ತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ...

2. ...ನನ್ನ ತಾಯಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಂತ ಮನೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಮನೆ ಮುಗಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮದುವೆಯಾಗುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ತಾಯಿ ಹಿರಿಯರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಳು. ಸದರಿ ಮನೆ ಗೋಪನಕೊಪ್ಪ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಮನೆಗೆ ತಾಗಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಮನೆ ಹಾಗೂ ರಸ್ತೆಯ ಪುಟಪಾತಗೆ ತಾಗಿಕೊಂಡು 3



ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳು ರಸ್ತೆಗೆ ತಾಗಿಕೊಂಡು ಇರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ... ಧಾರವಾಡದ ಹೊಸಯಲ್ಲಾಪೂರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಬೈಲವಾಡ ಎಂಟರಪೈಸ ಇದ್ದು ಅದು ಟೋಕ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರದ ಅಂಗಡಿ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ತಾಯಿ ಆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿರಿಯರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಳು ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ, ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಮುಂದುವರೆದು ನುಡಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು...

3. ...ನನ್ನ ತಂದೆ ತೀರಿಹೋದ ಮೇಲೆ ಕುಟುಂಬದ ಆಸ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಭಾಗ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಮದುರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕರ್ಮಶಿಯಲ್ ಕಾಂಪ್ಲೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಂಪ್ಲೆಕ್ಸ್ 2 ಅಂತ್ಯಸ್ಥಿನಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಕಾಂಪ್ಲೆಕ್ಸ್ ಮುಖ್ಯ ರಸ್ತೆಗೆ ತಾಗಿಕೊಂಡು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ಕಟ್ಟಡಕ್ಕೆ ಮಹಾರಾಣಿ ಬೇಕರಿ ಬಿಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ಬೇಕರಿಯ ಪ್ರೋಟೋ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದು ಅದನ್ನು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿದ ಕಾರಣ ನಿಪಿ-13 ಎಂದು ಗುರುತಿಸಲಾಯಿತು...

4. ...ಸದರಿ ಕಾಂಪ್ಲೆಕ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ನಾನು, ನನ್ನ ತಾಯಿ ಹಾಗೂ ನನ್ನ ತಮ್ಮ ಮಾಲೀಕರು ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ಕಟ್ಟಡಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಇರುವ ಉತಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರುಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ...

14. ...ಗೋಪನಕೊಪ್ಪ ಹುಬ್ಬಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ನಮಗೆ ಎರಡು ಮನೆಗಳು ಇವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ಎರಡು ಮನೆಗಳು ಎರಡು ಬೆಡರೂಮಿನ ಮನೆಗಳು ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ಮನೆಯ ಹಿಂದುಗಡೆಗೆ ಮೂರು ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿ. ಸದರಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಗೂ ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ವಂತ ಸಂಪಾದನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಸದರಿ ಮನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಲು ಸುಮಾರು 60 ಲಕ್ಷ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಆದಾಯಕರ ಕಟ್ಟುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಲು ನಾನು ಸಾಲ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಮುಂದುವರೆದು ನುಡಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ ನಾನು ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು..."



17. The respondent's clear, unequivocal, and unconditional admissions fundamentally undermine the core of his defence, rendering his position untenable without further evidence. These admissions establish that the respondent and his family own two houses and three shops in Gopankoppa Village, one shop in Hosayellapur (Dharwad), and a two-floor commercial complex in Ramdurg. Although the respondent claimed his mother and younger brother also hold rights in these properties, he did not deny his right therein. The materials on record indicate substantial rental income from these properties for the respondent and his family. Moreover, during cross-examination, he explicitly admitted being an income tax assessee, who regularly pays taxes. Despite these disclosures, he failed to produce any documents evidencing his actual income. This deliberate withholding of material evidence amounts to suppression of relevant facts from the court's consideration. Consequently, an adverse inference has to be drawn against the respondent under Section 114(g) of the Indian Evidence Act.



18. In the light of above narrated factual aspects of the case and particularly the status of the respondent, his financial condition including the assets owned by him as well as the lack any independent income to the Petitioner and her present dependency on her parents, we are of the considered view that the quantum of permanent alimony needs to be enhanced to Rs.15,00,000/- in place of Rs.7,00,000/- awarded by the family court.

19. Ex.P14 is a yadi (list) detailing items agreed to be given by the bride's family to the bridegroom at the time of marriage. This document records an undertaking to provide Rs.60,000 in cash and 40 grams of gold to the respondent. The petitioner formally marked this document by confronting the respondent during evidence, who did not deny its correctness or authenticity. Despite this unchallenged evidence establishing the respondent's obligation, the family court failed to direct its return while granting other reliefs. Hence, an appropriate direction needs to be issued requiring the respondent to return the specified cash equivalent and gold to the petitioner, in addition to permanent alimony.



20. In the result, this Court proceeds to pass the following:

ORDER

- (i) The appeal in MFA No. 100015/2025 is dismissed.
- (ii) The cross appeal in MFA CROB. No.100063/2025 is partly allowed.
- (iii) The judgment and decree dated 30.11.2024 passed in M.C. No.186/2024 by learned I Addl. Prl. Judge, Family Court, Hubballi, is modified.
- (iv) The respondent is directed to pay a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- to the petitioner by way of permanent alimony in place of Rs.7,00,000/- as ordered by the Family Court, within a period of sixty days from the date of this judgment.
- (v) The respondent is further directed to return Rs.60,000/- and 40 grams of gold to the Petitioner, which was received from her family under Ex.P14.



NC: 2026:KHC-D:2600-DB
MFA No. 100015 of 2025
C/W MFA.CROB No. 100063 of 2025

- (vi) Draw a decree accordingly.
- (vii) The amount in deposit, if any, along with the Trial Court records shall be transmitted to the concerned Family Court forthwith.

Sd/-
(M.I.ARUN)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(B. MURALIDHARA PAI)
JUDGE

VB, BVV
CT:BCK
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 4