



CNR: KAHC010249502025

NC: 2026:KHC:39671
RPFC No. 108 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 29TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO.108 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. M. K. GEETHA
W/O. K. L. MAHADEVA
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS

2. KUMARI DHANALAKSHMI
D/O. K. L. MAHADEVA
AGED ABOUT 20 YEARS

BOTH ARE R/AT #579
LINGAYANAKERE ROAD
KUMBARAKOPPAL, METAGALLI
MYSURU-570 016

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI MOHAN B. K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. K. L. MAHADEVA
S/O. LATE LAKSHMANA
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS
R/AT #1165, I WARD
2ND CROSS, VINAYAKA BADAVANE
K. R. NAGAR TALUK
MYSURU DISTRICT-571 602

OFFICE ADDRESS
WORKING AS TROLLEY MAN
PF NO.04370016

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



CNR: KAHC010249502025

NC: 2026:KHC:39671
RPFC No. 108 of 2025

SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY
K. R. NAGAR
MYSURU DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI PURUSHOTHAMA M. S., ADVOCATE FOR,
SRI BUBBERJUNG TRISULI VENKATESH, ADVOCATE)

THIS RPFC IS FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 16.01.2025 PASSED IN CRL. MISC NO.632/2023 ON THE FILE OF III ADDITIONAL PRL. FAMILY COURT, MYSURU., PARTLY ALLOWING THE PETITION FILED UNDER SEC.127 OF CR.P.C., FOR MAINTENANCE.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL ORDER

Heard Sri.Mohan.B.K, learned counsel for the petitioners who appears through video conference. Also heard Sri.Purushothama who appears physically before this Court and represents Sri.B.T.Venkatesh, learned counsel on record for the respondent.

2. Challenge in this revision petition is the order that is rendered by the Court of III Additional Principal



CNR: KAHC010249502025

Judge, Family Court, Mysore in Crl.Misc.No.632/2023 dated 16.01.2025.

3. Material available on record makes it clear that first petitioner who is the wife, second petitioner who is the daughter and another daughter initially filed Crl.Misc.No.426/2009 under Section 125 Cr.P.C against the respondent claiming maintenance. Orders were rendered in the said case on 31.07.2012 directing respondent to pay petitioner No.1 a sum of Rs.3,000/- per month and a sum of Rs.1,000/- per month each to petitioner No.2 and another daughter. Petitioners later filed Crl.Misc.No.55/2017 seeking enhancement. By order dated 30.05.2019, maintenance granted through order dated 31.07.2012 was enhanced. Respondent was directed to pay petitioner No.1 a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month and Rs.2,500/- per month each to petitioner No.2 and the other daughter. Petitioners filed Crl.Misc.No.632/2023 invoking Section 127 Cr.P.C seeking further enhancement. Family Court through the impugned order enhanced the



CNR: KAHC010249502025

NC: 2026:KHC:39671
RPFC No. 108 of 2025

sum and ordered respondent to pay petitioner No.1 a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month and petitioner No.2 a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards their maintenance. With a contention that the enhancement is too meager and that they are entitled to a higher sum, this revision petition came to be filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the salary of the respondent increased from Rs.45,000/- per month to Rs.63,835/- per month. Therefore, petitioners sought a direction to the respondent to pay them a sum of Rs.45,000/- per month towards their maintenance. However, Family Court has not ordered the sum required. Learned counsel thereby sought to pass necessary orders.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel who represents the respondent contended that respondent works in Indian Railways as a trackman and therefore, respondent and his family members are entitled for free



CNR: KAHC010249502025

NC: 2026:KHC:39671
RPFC No. 108 of 2025

treatment at railway hospitals. Learned counsel stated that in case petitioners suffer with any ill-health, they are entitled to get free treatment both at railway hospitals and in case there is any requirement, at any other private hospitals. Learned counsel also stated that concession is given for travel of the petitioners in the trains across the Country. The take home salary of respondent after all deductions is only Rs.29,307/- per month. Now through the impugned order, respondent is under obligation to pay a sum of Rs.15,000/- in total to the petitioners. Hence, only Rs.14,000/- will be left for the respondent to maintain himself. Thus there cannot be any further enhancement and therefore, the revision petition is not maintainable.

6. Ground No.10 of the revision petition reads as under:

"10. The family court erred in marginally increasing the earlier maintenance amount of the petitioners without properly appreciating the fact that admittedly the salary of the respondent has increased from Rs.45,000/- which he was getting at the time of filing of the previous petition to Rs.63,835/- as on date of filing the current petition."



CNR: KAHC010249502025

NC: 2026:KHC:39671
RPFC No. 108 of 2025

7. Thus it is clear that when respondent was earning Rs.45,000/- per month, he was directed to pay petitioner No.1 a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month and petitioner No.2 a sum of Rs.2,500/- per month apart from payment of Rs.2,500/- per month to another daughter. Even as per the version of the petitioners the salary increased from Rs.45,000/- to Rs.63,835/- and thus it has to be held that the salary is not doubled. However, through the impugned order the maintenance granted is doubled i.e., Rs.5,000/- granted in favour of petitioner No.1 is enhanced to Rs.10,000/- and Rs.2,500/- granted in favour of petitioner No.2 is enhanced to Rs.5,000/-. Of course, respondent is relieved from obligation to maintain another daughter in the light of her marriage. Having considered the financial status of the respondent, Family Court has passed orders enhancing the maintenance amount from Rs.5,000/- to Rs.10,000/- in favour of petitioner No.1 and from Rs.2,500/- to



CNR: KAHC010249502025

NC: 2026:KHC:39671
RPFC No. 108 of 2025

Rs.5,000/- in favour of petitioner No.2. This Court does not find any justifiable grounds thus whatsoever for further enhancement or for modification of the impugned order. Taking into consideration the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, Family Court, Mysore has passed a reasoned order. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the revision petition lacks merits. Hence, the following:

ORDER

The revision petition is *dismissed*.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

NS
CT:VC
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 34