



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 69 OF 2022

BETWEEN:

SHRI. SURAJ CHERIAN
S/O LATE SHRI. THOMAS C. CHERIAN
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
RESIDING AT ANRIYA APARTMENT,
NO.1504, NO.8, 5TH MAIN,
RMV II STAGE, BANGALORE - 560 094.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. AHMED SUHAIB, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. ROSA PARAMEL, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVATHI

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

AND:

MASTER SHEHAN
S/O SURAJ CHERIAN AND SHEELA BAJAJ
AGED ABOUT 18 YEARS,
REPRESENTED BY HIS MOTHER GUARDIAN
AND NEXT FRIENDS,
SMT. SHEELA BAJAJ



W/O SHRI. SURAJ CHERIAN
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO.182,
18TH A MAIN ROAD,
4TH CROSS, 6TH BLOCK,
KORAMANGALA, BANGALORE - 560 095.

...RESPONDENT

THIS RPFC IS FILED UNDER SECTION 19(4) OF FAMILY
COURTS ACT AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 17.12.2021 PASSED
IN C.MISC.No.363/2013 ON THE FILE OF THE II ADDITIONAL
PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, BENGALURU, PARTLY
ALLOWING THE PETITION FILED UNDER SECTION 125 OF
CR.P.C FOR MAINTENANCE.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA



ORAL ORDER

Sri.Ahmed Suhaib representing Sri. Rosa Paramel learned counsel on record for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not evincing any interest in the matter. Learned counsel also states that though the intimidation regarding retirement from the case was sent to the petitioner to the given address, the same could not be served. Learned counsel thereby seeks to pass necessary orders.

2. On 21.07.2025 following order was passed

"Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that they tried to contact the petitioner but the petitioner's whereabouts are not known. Hence, it is submitted that the petition may be dismissed.

Registry is directed to issue Court Notice"

3. Notice sent to the petitioner by the Court returned with an endorsement that the Door of the house as per the residential particulars furnished by the petitioner was found locked and on enquiry, the manager of the apartment informed the process server that the petitioner is in a foreign country.



4. Having filed a case, it is for the petitioner to pursue the matter diligently. In the case on hand, the counsel chosen and appointed by the petitioner himself as well as this Court could not trace out the petitioner. Therefore, this Court is of the view that there are no grounds to keep the revision petition pending.

5. Hence, the revision petition is dismissed for non prosecution.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

VS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 2