



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 8TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 6 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SRI. K.R. KRISHNAMURTHY,
SON OF RAMAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
RESIDING AT DODDAKORATI VILLAGE,
NANDAGUDI HOBLI, HOSAKOTE TALUK,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT - 562 114.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. NARENDRA BABU H.L, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. PUNITH C, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT. MANJULA V.,
WIFE OF KRISHNAMURTHY,
DAUGHTER OF VENKATAPPA,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
RESIDING AT VOKKALERI VILLAGE AND HOBLI,
KOLAR TALUK, KOLAR DISTRICT - 563 130.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. S.B. TOTAD, ADVOCATE)

THIS RPFC FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY
COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 10.07.2025
PASSED IN CrI. Misc NO.33/2023 ON THE FILE OF PRINCIPAL
JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, KOLAR, PARTLY ALLOWING THE
PETITION FILED UNDER SEC.125 OF Cr.P.C., FOR
MAINTENANCE.

Digitally signed by
AASEEFA
PARVEEN
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY,
ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL ORDER

Heard Sri.Narendra Babu.H.L who represents
Sri.Punith.C learned counsel on record for the petitioner as
well as Sri.S.B.Totad learned counsel for respondent.

2. Challenge in this revision petition is the order that
is rendered by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court,
Kolar in CrI.Misc.No.33/2023 dated 10.07.2025.

3. Respondent who is the wife of the petitioner
herein filed a petition invoking Section 125 of Cr.P.C.
seeking maintenance of Rs.25,000/- per month from the
petitioner. Family Court through the impugned order
directed the petitioner herein to pay respondent a sum of
Rs.10,000/- per month towards her maintenance.
Aggrieved by the same, this revision petition is filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
respondent works at the MVJ Hospital, Hoskote and earns



around Rs.20,000/- per month. Petitioner produced sufficient proof in respect of the occupation and earnings of the respondent. That apart it is the respondent who voluntarily left the matrimonial home. Family Court without considering the occupation of the respondent and her earnings and also the financial status of the petitioner, directed petitioner to pay respondent huge sum of Rs.10,000/- towards maintenance and aggrieved by the same this revision petition is filed. Learned counsel thereby seeks to allow the revision petition and thereby modify the order passed by the Family Court by which petitioner was directed to pay respondent a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month.

5. On the other hand learned counsel for the respondent states that respondent was working earlier but due to the injury sustained to her spinal cord she stopped working. Petitioner works in Forest Department and earns around Rs.1,00,000/- per month. Petitioner without obtaining a decree of divorce, married again and begot a child. Petitioner is living happily with his second wife and



child. On the other hand respondent is taking shelter at her parents house and she has no source of earnings. Therefore, this revision petition is not maintainable.

6. A meticulous perusal of the relevant material that is brought on record goes to show that both parties suppressed the details in respect of their occupation and earnings. However there is no denial of the fact that petitioner works in Forest Department. As per his contention he is a daily wage worker. The case of the respondent is that the petitioner is a permanent employee. Petitioner neither produced any details in respect of his occupation nor his salary. At para 21 of the impugned order there is a mention that as per the endorsement in Ex.P-12, the petitioner herein has not given his consent for issuance of his salary slip. Petitioner should have given sufficient details with regard to his occupation and earnings. But he has not done so.

7. Petitioner produced proof to show that respondent works at Volvo Group India Private Limited and she earns Rs.20,270/- per month.



8. As that of the petitioner, respondent also failed to produce details with regard to her earnings. There is no material on record to show that respondent sustained injury to her back bone as contended by her counsel and that she left the job. Therefore, taking into consideration the totality of facts and circumstances and the evidence produced, this Court is of the view that petitioner can be directed to pay the respondent a sum of Rs.8,000/- per month towards maintenance. Thus, the sum granted towards maintenance by the Family Court is excessive as rightly contented by learned counsel for the petitioner. Therefore, the revision petition is disposed of with the following:-

ORDER

- i. The revision petition is allowed in part.
- ii. The order that is rendered by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Kolar in Crl.Misc.No.33/2023 dated 10.07.2025 is modified.



- iii. Petitioner/husband is directed to pay respondent/wife a sum of Rs.8,000/- per month towards maintenance till the lifetime of respondent/wife or until further orders by the competent Court.
- iv. Rs.10,000/- granted towards one time litigation expenses by the Family Court should also be paid.
- v. All arrears to be cleared within 3 months.
- vi. In the light of the disposal of the revision petition, the proceedings on I.A No.1/2026 are closed.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

VS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 13