



CNR: KAHC010168412025

NC: 2026:KHC:39150
RPFC No. 69 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 28TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO.69 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

B. H. HARISH KUMAR @ B. H. AMBARISH
S/O. HANUMANTHARAYAPPA
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS
R/O. JINKE BACHAHALLI VILLAGE
DODDA TUMKUR POST
DODDABALLAPUR TALUK-562 203
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI VENUGOPALA G. M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. A. N. SANJANA
W/O. B. H. HARISH KUMAR
@ B. H. AMBARISH
D/O. G. NARAYANASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS
2. KUM. DHANYASHREE H.
D/O. B. H. HARISH KUMAR
@ B. H. AMBARISH
AGED ABOUT 6 YEARS

SINCE THE 2ND RESPONDENT IS MINOR
REPRESENTED BY HER MOTHER-CUM
NATURAL GUARDIAN SMT. A. N. SANJANA

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



CNR: KAHC010168412025

NC: 2026:KHC:39150
RPFC No. 69 of 2025

BOTH ARE R/AT JINKE BACHAHALLI VILLAGE
DODDA TUMKUR POST
DODDABALLAPUR TALUK
BENGALURU RURAL DISTRICT

NOW RESIDING AT
AMMANALLUR VILLAGE
VEMGAL HOBLI
KOLAR TALUK-563 102

...RESPONDENTS

(R-1 IS SERVED,
R-2 IS MINOR REPRESENTED BY R-1)

THIS RPFC IS FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 12.09.2024 PASSED IN CRL.MISC NO.132/2022 ON THE FILE OF PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, KOLAR, PARTLY ALLOWING PETITION FILED UNDER ORDER 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

Heard Sri.Venukopala.G.M learned counsel for the petitioner. Respondents have not chosen to contest the case. Proof of service of notice is on record.

2. Being aggrieved by the liability imposed through the orders that were rendered by the Court of



CNR: KAHC010168412025

Principal Judge Family Court, Kolar dated 12.09.2024 in Crl.Misc.No.132/2022, this revision petition is filed.

3. It is not in dispute that respondent No.1 is the wife and respondent No.2 is the minor daughter of the petitioner herein. Respondents filed a petition invoking Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking a direction to the petitioner to pay them a sum of Rs.25,000/- per month towards maintenance. The Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Kolar decided the case and rendered orders directing petitioner to pay respondent No.1/wife a sum of Rs.3,000/- per month and respondent No.2/daughter a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards maintenance. Aggrieved by the same, this revision petition is filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner suffers with skin disease and thus, he is unable to do anything. Respondent No.1/wife is a B'com graduate and she works somewhere. Therefore, there is no



CNR: KAHC010168412025

NC: 2026:KHC:39150
RPFC No. 69 of 2025

necessity for her to claim maintenance. Learned counsel thereby seeks to allow the revision petition.

5. No material whatsoever was produced by the petitioner to show that respondent No.1/wife is a working woman. At para of 22 of the impugned order, Family Court highlighted the aspect regarding the earnings of respondent No.1/wife and the points elicited during the course of cross-examination, wherein she stated that she earns Rs.50/- to Rs.60/- per day by doing coolie work.

6. The Court also discussed with regard to the health condition of the petitioner and the ailments he projected. The documents he produced reveals that he suffered with stones in the kidney and took treatment for the same and that he suffers with skin disease. Liability vests upon the petitioner to maintain his child, who is under the care and custody of her mother. Family Court taking into consideration the totality of facts and circumstances directed petitioner to pay respondent



CNR: KAHC010168412025

NC: 2026:KHC:39150
RPFC No. 69 of 2025

No.1/wife a sum of Rs.3,000/- per month and respondent No.2/daughter a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards their maintenance. Amount thus granted is neither excessive nor exorbitant.

7. Family Court discussed each and every aspect of the case including the agricultural land which the family of the petitioner is holding and the status of parties. This Court does not find any grounds to interfere with the observations made or the findings given. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the revision petition lacks merits.

Resultantly, the revision petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

DS
CT:VC
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 20