



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE P SREE SUDHA

RPFC NO. 41 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SRI. NITESH KUMAR @ NEETESH
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
R/A NO. 8, NAMMALVAR STREET,
3RD FLOOR, SOWCAARPET,
CHENNAI -600 079.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VISHWANATH SHENDGE., ADVOCATE(ABSENT))

AND:

SMT. SONAM JAIN @ SONU
W/O. NITESH KUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS
D/O. MANGILAL JAIN,
R/A 809, 1ST FLOOR, 1ST CROSS,
7TH MAIN INDIRA NAGAR,
BANGALORE-560 038.

...RESPONDENT

THIS RPFC IS FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY COURTS ACT, AGAINST THE ORDER DATED:22.07.2025 PASSED IN CRL.MISC.NO.502/2023 ON THE FILE OF THE PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, BENGALURU, PARTLY ALLOWING THE IA NO.2 FILED UNDER SEC.125(1) OF CR.P.C. FOR MAINTENANCE.

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

Digitally signed
by
PADMA SHREE
SHEKHAR DESAI
Location: High
Court of
Karnataka



CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE P SREE SUDHA

ORAL ORDER

Learned counsel for petitioner remained absent.

Office raised an objection regarding maintainability of the petition in view of section 19(4) of Family Courts Act, 1984 (since passed on I.A.), which reads as follows,

"The High Court may, of its own motion or otherwise, call for and examine the record of any proceeding in which the Family Court situate within its jurisdiction passed an order under Chapter IX of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974) for the purpose of satisfying itself as to the correctness, legality or propriety of the order, not being an interlocutory order, and, as to the regularity of such proceeding."

In the said act it was specifically stated that the RPFC is not maintainable on the order of the interlocutory application.

Therefore, this writ petition is **dismissed** as not maintainable.

**Sd/-
(P SREE SUDHA)
JUDGE**

AKV
CT:NR
List No.: 2 Sl No.: 3