



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 5TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 8737 OF 2025 (GM-FC)

BETWEEN:

SRI. VINAY RAVINDRA MASUTAGE
S/O SRI. RAVINDRA LAKSHMAN
MASUTAGE
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
RESIDING AT IM ALTEN
HOF 3, 50169 KERPEN, GERMANY
NOW AT BENGALURU.

...PETITIONER

(BY SMT. NIREEKSHANA K. EDA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT. PADMINI V
W/O SRI. VINAY RAVINDRA MASUTAGE
D/O SRI. VINOD KUMAR
R/AT NO. 150, 12TH MAIN ROAD,
76TH A CROSS, 6TH BLOCK,
RAJAJINAGAR,
BENGALURU - 560 010.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. SHAHNAWAZ M. MAMADAPUR, ADVOCATE)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE
IMPUGNED ORDER DTD 14.10.24, PASSED BY THE HONBLE IV
ADDL. PRL. FAMILY JUDGE, AT BENGALURU, IN M.C NO.
294/22 ANNEX-A AND ETC.,

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 Ms.Nireekshana K Eda learned counsel for the petitioner who appears physically before this Court as well as Sri.Shahnawaz.M.Mamadapur who appears through video conference and represents the respondent.

2. This writ petition is filed seeking the Court to set aside the order at Annexure A passed by the Court of IV Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bangalore on I.A No.II in M.C No.294/2022 dated 14.10.2024.

3. As per the submission that is made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the order that is passed by the Family Court which is assailed through this writ petition contains only 5 paragraphs and the same is at Annexure-A of the writ petition. Thus, the order which is impugned as per the version of the petitioner reads as under:-

"I.A No.II filed by the applicant/petitioner u/s
24 of Hindu Marriage Act, is allowed in part.



The petitioner is entitled for interim monthly maintenance of Rs.20,000/- pendente lite from 06.03.2023 i.e., the date of filing of her affidavit for disclosure of assets and liabilities.

Arrears of interim maintenance shall be paid within 2 months from the date of this order.

Further interim maintenance shall be paid on or before 5th of every succeeding month.

For cross examination of PW-1 call on 16.11.2024".

4. When learned counsel for the respondent started his submission regarding the merits of the matter he referred to different paragraphs of the impugned order on that this Court questioned learned counsel for the respondent about the existence of such material in the impugned order. On that, learned counsel for the respondent submitted that the order referred to by learned counsel for the petitioner is only the operative portion and indeed a detailed order running to 24 pages was passed by the Family Court, Bangalore and he enclosed the said order along with his statement of objections.

5. On a query posed by this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that she was under an impression that



entire order is the one at Annexure A and she had no knowledge about passing of such detailed order by the Family Court. A perusal of grounds urged in the writ petition discloses absence of any mention about any of the findings and observations made by the Family Court in the impugned order. General points are urged, disclosing the version of the petitioner. Thus, when the petitioner himself has no knowledge about the reasons basing on which the impugned order was passed, he cannot agitate the validity of the said order through this writ petition. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the writ petition deserves dismissal.

6. Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed. Consequently, the proceedings in I.A No.1/2026 are closed.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

VS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 6