



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 11319 OF 2025 (GM-FC)

BETWEEN:

SRI. RAVICHANDRAN G.,
SON OF GOVINDRAJU
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
R/AT NO.871/1 GROUND FLOOR
MANJUNATHA NILAYA
KRS ROAD MOGARAHALLI
METAGAHALLI
MYSORE - 570066.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VENKATESH PRASAD R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT. CHAITHRA B B
WIFE OF RAVICHANDRAN G,
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. 123/B,
RAILWAY QUARTERS
VONTIKOPPAL,
MYSURU- 570 002.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. MAHESHA M.,ADVOCATE (ABSENT))

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASHING THE
IMPUGNED ORDER VIDE ANNEX-A DTD 21.12.2024 PASSED BY

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



THE HONBLE PRINCIPAL FAMILY JUDGE AT MYSURU IN CRL MISCELLANEOUS NO.1030/2023 WHEREIN THE PETITION FILED BY THE RESPONDENT UNDER SECTION 125 OF THE CRL PROCEDURE CODE.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL ORDER

Seeking the Court to issue a writ of certiorari and to quash the order that is rendered by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Mysuru in Crl.Misc.No.1030/2023 dated 23.11.2024, this writ petition is filed.

2. Sri.Venkatesh Prasad.R, learned counsel for the petitioner was heard on 02.06.2026 regarding the merits of the matter. Though sufficient time and opportunities were granted to the respondent to submit her contentions respondent could not do so.



3. As the status of parties is not in dispute, the petitioner will hereinafter be referred to as the husband and respondent as wife.

4. Respondent/wife filed an interlocutory application in Crl.Misc.No.1030/2023 seeking interim maintenance. Family Court through the impugned order directed petitioner/husband to pay respondent/wife a sum of Rs.8,000/- per month towards interim maintenance and aggrieved by the same, husband is before this Court.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent/wife stayed with the petitioner/husband only for 2 days. The marriage was not consummated. The petitioner/husband came to know that respondent/wife is suffering from a skin disease. That fact was suppressed by respondent/wife and her family members. Learned counsel stated that respondent/wife is a B.Ed graduate and she is capable of maintaining herself. Petitioner/husband earns around Rs.18,000/- per month. Petitioner/husband is



required to take care of his parents also. Without considering these facts, Family Court directed petitioner/husband to pay respondent/wife a sum of Rs.8,000/- per month towards interim maintenance. Learned counsel stated that the respondent/wife never performed her marital obligations and therefore, she is not entitled for any maintenance.

6. The version of respondent/wife as borne by record is that petitioner/husband deserted her and neglected to maintain her. Petitioner/husband is a lecturer and he earns Rs.70,000/- to Rs.1,00,000/- per month and thus he is capable of maintaining her.

7. The fact that the marriage was solemnized is not in dispute. Whether they stayed together for 2 days or 2 decades, the same doesn't matter and that will not disturb the status of the parties to the marriage till the same is dissolved. Further no material was brought on record by petitioner/husband to show that respondent/wife



is working or has got her own source of earnings. Equally, respondent/wife failed to produce any material to show that petitioner/husband earns around Rs.70,000/- to Rs.1,00,000/- per month. As per the version of petitioner/husband as a freelance technician he earns around Rs.18,000/- to Rs.20,000/- per month.

8. Having considered the earnings of the petitioner/husband and considering his obligation to maintain his parents and in the absence of any proof in respect of the stand taken by respondent/wife regarding the financial status of petitioner/husband, this Court is of the view that petitioner/husband can be directed to pay respondent/wife a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards interim maintenance. Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of with the following:

ORDER

- (i) The order that is rendered by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Mysuru dated 23.11.2024 in CrI.Misc.No.1030/2023 on



the application filed by the respondent/wife for grant of interim maintenance is modified.

- (ii) Petitioner/husband is directed to pay respondent/wife a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month from the date of filing of application for interim maintenance until further orders by the Family Court.
- (iii) All arrears shall be cleared within a period of 8 weeks.
- (iv) Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE