



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 17<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 7808 OF 2024 (GM-FC)**

**BETWEEN:**

VASANTHA VIKAS  
S/O. ARUMUGACHAMY,  
AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,  
R/AT NO. 117/41  
KALIAMMANKOVIL STREET,  
VISWANATHAN ROAD,  
SIVAKASI TOWN,  
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT  
STATE OF TAMIL NADU - 626 123.

...PETITIONER

Digitally signed by  
AASEEFA  
PARVEEN  
Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA

(BY SRI. MOHAMMED RAYEEF, ADVOCATE FOR  
SRI. ZAMEER PASHA, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

SUJITHA  
D/O. D. MUREGESH @ MAHENDRA VARMA,  
HINDU,  
AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,  
R/AT NO. 28/43,  
KALIAMMANKOVIL STREET,



VISWANATHAM ROAD,  
SIVAKASI TOWN,  
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT - 626 123,

AT PRESENT RESIDING AT NO. 635,  
10<sup>TH</sup> E MAIN ROAD,  
6<sup>TH</sup> BLOCK,  
RAJAJI NAGAR,  
BENGALURU - 560 010.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. DILRAJ J. ROHIT SEQUERIA, ADVOCATE)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE  
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE  
IMPUGNED ORDER DTD. 19.12.2023 PASSED IN I.A. NO. II  
FILED U/S 12 AND 25 OF GUARDIAN AND WARDS ACT IN G  
AND WC NO. 275/2022 BY THE IV ADDL PRL FAMILY COURT AT  
BANGALORE VIDE ANNEX-A AN ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA



**ORAL ORDER**

Seeking the Court to set aside the order passed by the Court of IV Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bangalore on I.A No.II in G&WC No.275/2022 dated 19.12.2023, this writ petition is filed.

2. Heard Sri.Mohammed Rayeef who represents Sri.Zameer Pasha learned counsel on record for the petitioner as well as Sri.Dilraj J.R.S learned counsel for the respondent.

3. Petitioner who is the father of the minor children Sujant Vikas and Athina Vikas moved I.A No.II seeking Family Court to direct respondent to hand over the custody of those children to him till the disposal of the main petition. Family Court rendered orders upon considering the version of both parties.

4. The directions issued through the impugned order are as under:-

*"Applicant/petitioner is granted interim custody of the minor children i.e. Sujanth Vikas aged 13 years and Athina Vikas aged 9 years, as follows:*



- i. Every 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Sunday of the month from 10.30 a.m to 5.30 p.m in any mall or restaurant as per the choice of the children at Bangalore, which is near to the place of the residence of respondent.*
- ii. 25% of school declared winter vacation and summer vacation. Petitioner is permitted to take the children to his residence during the above referred vacation period.*
- iii. The petitioner is also granted right to talk to the minor children over phone through audio call or video call on every 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Sunday between 6.00 p.m to 7.00 p.m for 15 to 20 minutes with out affecting school activities of children. The children shall be picked up and dropped from and to the residence of the respondent by the petitioner.*

*When the minor children are in the custody of petitioner/father, respondent/mother has the right to interact and talk to the children over phone or in person.*

*The parents must ensure that the children does not feel uneasy or discomfort when the children are residing with one of the parents or while they are visiting the other parent.*



*Petitioner/father is directed not to give any ill advice to the children about the mother and make the child feel comfortable when they return to the custody of the mother.*

*The applicant/petitioner shall take the responsibility of bearing all the educational expenses of the children".*

5. Aggrieved by the denial to grant total custody, this writ petition is filed as submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner before this Court today. However, learned counsel for the petitioner also states that the main case will be disposed of soon and thus as of now petitioner is not much interested in prolonging the litigation through this writ petition. Learned counsel states that respondent is not obliging the directions issued through the impugned order and therefore necessary orders may be passed by this Court directing the respondent to oblige the conditions imposed.

6. *Per contra* learned counsel for the respondent states that petitioner/father met the children several times and interacted.



7. Considering the submission that is made by both the learned counsel and as learned counsel for the petitioner states that petitioner is more interested in disposal of the main case by the Family Court and he does not wish to pursue this writ petition, the writ petition is disposed of with the following:-

**ORDER**

The writ petition is dismissed.

In case petitioner moves an application seeking necessary directions for due execution of the impugned order i.e. the order on I.A No.II in G&WC No.275/2022 dated 19.12.2023, Family Court is directed to deal with such application, afford opportunity to both parties to submit their respective contentions and then to dispose of said application time bound preferably within a period of 3 weeks from the date of presentation of such application.

**Sd/-  
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)  
JUDGE**

VS  
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 0