



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 11TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 70 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

SRI. M.A. VENU
S/O LATE APPAJIGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS
R/AT MALAGARANAHALLI VILLAGE,
KASABA HOBLI, MADDUR TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571 428.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. GOKUL H.R, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by
AASEEFA PARVEEN

Location: HIGH **AND:**
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

SMT. A.S. LATHA
W/O SRI. M.A. VENU
AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS,
R/AT C/O M. RUKMINI
NO.261, 7TH MAIN ROAD
SRINAGAR, BSK 1ST STAGE,
BENGALURU - 560 050.



...RESPONDENT

(RESPONDENT SERVED AND UNREPRESENTED)

THIS RPFC IS FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 10.06.2025 PASSED IN CRL. MISC NO.874/2018 ON THE FILE OF VI ADDITIONAL PRL. JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, BENGALURU., PARTLY ALLOWING THE PETITION FILED UNDER SEC.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.Gokul H.R learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Though notice was served upon the respondent, respondent has not chosen to contest the matter.

3. Being aggrieved by the order passed by the Court of VI Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bangalore, in Crl.Misc.Case No.874/2018 dated 10.06.2025, this revision petition is filed.

4. Respondent herein who is the wife of petitioner filed a petition seeking the Court to direct Petitioner/husband to pay her a sum of Rs.30,000/- per month towards maintenance. Family Court, subjecting the evidence of PW-1, Ex.P1 to P17 through scrutiny held that petitioner/husband is liable to pay respondent/wife a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month towards maintenance from the date of petition till her dis-entitlement.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has got no source of earnings. On the other hand respondent/wife is a B.Com graduate and is a working woman. Though petitioner appeared before the Family Court through his counsel, as he sustained injury to his backbone he could not move from the bed and thus he could not file his statement of objections and he could not adduce his evidence. Learned counsel also states that a direction was issued to the petitioner to pay respondent huge sum of Rs.15,000/- per month towards maintenance which he cannot pay. That apart, as respondent has got a job and she earns monthly, there is no requirement on part of the petitioner to pay anything to the respondent. But without considering these facts, Family Court directed petitioner to pay respondent a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month towards maintenance and hence the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

6. As per the material available on record, respondent filed the case claiming maintenance in the year



2018. The case was disposed of in the year 2025. Even if the said discharge summary produced by petitioner before this Court is taken to be genuine, he was admitted to hospital on 25.07.2023 and was discharged on 30.07.2023. So it is clear that the petitioner had got ample opportunity to file his counter/statement of objections and the affidavit disclosing his statement of assets and liabilities at any time between 2018 and 2023. But petitioner did not do so. Thus, the Family Court considering the evidence that was brought on record by respondent/wife directed the petitioner to pay respondent a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month towards maintenance. However, there is a clear mention that in her affidavit given disclosing the assets and liabilities, respondent made a mention that she pursued B. Com and is working on contract basis as Typist at Head Office, Prison Department, Bangalore and is earning Rs.15,500/- per month. That apart respondent failed to produce any substantive proof to establish her version that petitioner



earns Rs.80,000/- per month by doing real estate business.

7. Thus considering the financial status of respondent/wife and as respondent/wife failed to produce any material in support of her contention with regard to the earnings of the petitioner, this Court is of the view that the amount awarded towards maintenance is excessive.

8. Having considered the earnings of respondent, this Court is of the view that petitioner can only be directed to pay respondent a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards maintenance. Therefore, the revision petition is disposed of with the following:-

ORDER

- i. The revision petition is allowed in part.
- ii. The order that is rendered by the Court of
VI Additional Principal Judge, Family Court,



Bangalore in Crl.Misc.Case No.874/2018
dated 10.06.2025 is modified.

- iii. Petitioner is directed to pay respondent a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards maintenance from the date of petition i.e. 18.12.2018 till her dis-entitlement.
- iv. All other terms and conditions imposed holds good.
- v. All arrears to be cleared within a period of Eight weeks.
- vi. In the light of disposal of the revision petition, the proceedings on I.A No.2/2026 are closed.

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

VS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 9