



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 1204 OF 2026 (GM-FC)

BETWEEN:

M. MANJUNATH
S/O MUNIVENKATAPPA
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
RESIDING AT BEERJENAHALLI,
KAIVARA HOBLI,
SANTHAKALLAHALLI POST,
CHINTAMANI TALUK,
KOLAR DISTRICT,
KARNATAKA - 563 128

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. PONNANNA M.B., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. B. MAMATHA
W/O M.MANJUNATH,
AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS
2. KUMARI SUSHMA
D/O M. MANJUNATH
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS



3. KUMARI SMITHA
D/O M. MANJUNATH
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS
ALL ARE RESIDING AT
GANGAMMAGUDI ROAD,
3RD CROSS, M.V. EXTENSION,
HOSKOTE TOWN,
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT - 562 114

...RESPONDENTS

(NOTICE TO RESPONDENT DISPENSED WITH
VIDE ORDER DATED 19.02.2026)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
IMPUGNED ORDER DATED 28.11.2025 PASSED BY HONBLE
PRL. CIVIL JUDGE AND JMFC, HOSAKOTE AT (ANNX-A) AND
ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA



ORAL ORDER

Heard Sri.Ponnanna.M.B learned counsel for petitioner.

2. Having gone through the entire material that is brought on record including the impugned order and on hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the view that the writ petition can be disposed of without service of notice to respondents. Hence, notice to respondents is dispensed with.

3. This writ petition is filed seeking the Court to issue a writ of certiorari and to set aside the order that is rendered by the Court of Principal Civil Judge, Hosakote dated 28.11.2025.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is husband of respondent No.1 and father of respondent Nos.2 and 3. Respondents claimed huge sum as maintenance from petitioner. Indeed respondent No.1 has got various sources of earnings. To establish the financial status



of respondent No.1, petitioner is required to file relevant income tax returns and he should further examine himself as RW.1. Therefore, petitioner filed a petition to recall the evidence of RW.1 for the purpose of further chief examination. But the said application was dismissed and aggrieved by the same, this writ petition is filed. Learned counsel thereby seeks to quash the impugned order.

5. Petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. was filed by respondents herein in the year 2013. More than 12 years passed, but the case is still pending. In the impugned order, the Court made a clear mention that petitioner herein took more than one year time to complete his evidence. The contents of impugned order also reveals that petitioner had filed an application under Section 311 Cr.P.C. earlier and the same was allowed and thereby he was further chief examined and further cross-examined as RW.1. Petitioner also addressed the arguments and when the main petition was posted for orders, petitioner filed another application under Section 311 Cr.P.C. He also filed an application under Section



294 Cr.P.C. With an observation that there are no grounds to entertain those applications, both those applications were dismissed. No ground is accorded as to why petitioner could not produce the relevant record at the earliest. Even when he filed an application under Section 311 Cr.P.C., which was allowed through order dated 23.06.2025, he has not taken the contention that is raised in the subsequent application. Proceedings cannot continue in eternity. There should be an end to litigation. Having perceived the fact that there are no grounds to entertain both the petitions, the Court through the impugned order has dismissed both the applications. The Court passed a reasoned order narrating all the details of the case and the manner in which petitioner conducted the proceedings. Having gone through the contents of the impugned order and perceiving the fact that petitioner availed number of opportunities to project his version, this Court is of the view that there are no grounds for interference. Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of with the following:-



ORDER

- i) Writ petition is dismissed.
- ii) As the writ petition is disposed of without service of notice to the respondents, the Court of Principal Civil Judge, Hosakote is directed to forward a copy of this order to respondents only for the purpose of giving notice to respondents about filing of this writ petition and its disposal.
- iii) Registry to forward a copy of this order to the concerned Court forthwith.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE