



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT PETITION NO.9858 OF 2026 (GM-FC)

BETWEEN:

SMT. SRISHTI RAI
W/O SRI MANISH PARETA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
FLAT NO. 1702, D BLOCK,
17TH FLOOR,
VAISHNAVI ARS GARDENIA,
BBMP NO 2208, SM RD, T. DASARAHALLI,
BENGALURU-560057.

...PETITIONER

(BY SMT. NEERAJA KARANTH, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. DINESH S., ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI. MANISH PARETA
S/O SRI SHIVLAL PARETA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS
RESIDING AT SHIVKUTI,
GAINTA ROAD,
ITAWA, KOTA,
RAJASTHAN - 325004

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. ABHINAY J., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. RAJESH PANDIAN, ADVOCATE FOR

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



C/R IN CP NO. 4127/2026)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH OF THE ORDER PASSED ON I A NO. IV IN MC NO. 791/2024 PASSED BY THE 1ST ADDL PRL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, BENGALURU, FILED HERewith AT ANNEXURE- A, DTD 19.11.2025 AND MODIFY THE TERMS OF THE ORDER TO SUIT THE CONVENIENCE OF THE CHILD.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL ORDER

Heard Smt.Neeraja Karanth who represents Sri.Dinesh.S, learned counsel on record for the petitioner as well as Sri.Abhinay.J who appears through video conference and represents Sri.Rajesh Pandian, learned counsel on record for the respondent.

2. Seeking a writ of certiorari and to quash the order that is rendered by the Court of I Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bengaluru on IA No.IV in MC



No.791/2024 dated 19.11.2025, this writ petition is filed by the mother of the child by name Master Vihaan Pareta.

3. Respondent/father filed IA No.IV seeking visitation rights of the minor child Vihaan Pareta (hereinafter be referred to as the 'child' for brevity) on every weekend, during school vacations and also to contact the child through video call every day in the evening.

4. Petitioner/mother objected the relief sought for contending that the respondent/father harassed her by sending number of emails, threatened the child's life and the well being. The respondent/father constantly speaks ill about the child and thus it is not safe for the child to spend time with respondent/father.

5. Family Court considering the facts and circumstances of the case, granted visitation rights to the respondent/father on second and fourth weekend of a month from 10.00 a.m. of Saturday to 6.00 p.m. of



Sunday. Further permission was accorded to respondent/father to call the child through video call everyday evening between 7.00 p.m. and 8.00 p.m. for a maximum of half an hour. Also visitation rights for 50% of the vacation was granted to the respondent/father. Aggrieved by the order thus passed, mother is before this Court.

6. Smt.Neeraja Karanth who represents the petitioner/mother submits that the child refuses to go with his father. Child is not comfortable with father. Respondent/father who takes the custody of the child on Saturday, as per the impugned order is required to look after him till 6.00 p.m. of the next day i.e. on Sunday. But by the evening of Saturday he drops the child at the place of petitioner/mother and on Sunday again he picks up the child in the morning. Thus respondent/father is unable to look after the welfare of the child. So far as communicating the child through video call is concerned, the child is required to play with his friends. After coming



from school, the child insists to go to park to play with his friends. Also petitioner/mother is required to make the child sit to do his homework and thereafter she has to provide food to the child. Therefore, making the child again sit before a gadget between 7.00 p.m. and 8.00 p.m. has become a difficult task. Hence, the condition imposed with regard to calling the child by the respondent/father through video call every day requires modification.

7. The submission that is made by Sri.Abhinay.J who represents the respondent on the other hand is that petitioner/mother never obliged the impugned order. She is creating trouble on each and every occasion and therefore, respondent/father was constrained to file an execution petition for execution of the impugned order. So far as visitation rights are concerned, on each and every occasion petitioner/mother accompanies the child and stays with him which prevents the father from spending material time with the child. By the evening,



petitioner/mother insists respondent/father to send the child along with her and therefore, he is constrained to send the child. Learned counsel further submits that due to frustration and as the petitioner/mother foisted number of false cases against the respondent/father and his parents, he sent several emails to the petitioner/mother and the intention of respondent/father is not to harass either the petitioner/mother or the child. Learned counsel thereby seeks to dismiss this writ petition.

8. In the impugned order there is a clear mention that the presiding officer i.e., the I Additional Principal Judge interacted with the child on 15.11.2025, wherein the child expressed that he frequently met his father in public places and he does not have any hesitation in spending time with his father and that he also expressed that he is expecting a gift from his father on his birthday.

9. A perusal of entire record reveals presence of abundant love and affection towards the child by the



parties to the proceedings i.e., petitioner and respondent. However, the litigation at various Courts, the prevailing disputes and the egos is making the parties drive for making the things more worse. Both the petitioner and respondent as per the material available on record are of the view that they are the affected parties in the hands of others. But the silent sufferer is the child.

10. So far as the interim custody of the child is concerned, the Family Court taking into consideration each and every aspect of the case gave reasoned findings. There is no denial of the fact that the child is aged around 8 years as of now. The children of that age normally returns home from school by 5.00 p.m. Child can as well play with his friends between 5.00 p.m. and 07.00 p.m. The interaction through video call is only for half an hour between 7.00 p.m. and 8.00 p.m. Therefore, even after such interaction, time will be left for the child to study, do homework if any, take food and sleep. Therefore, this Court is of the view that there are no grounds to interfere



with the directions given regarding the interim visitation through the impugned order.

11. Resultantly, the following:

ORDER

The writ petition is *dismissed*.

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