



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 121 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

MR. MUDIPU MOHAMMED NAWAZ @
MOHAMMED NAWAZ
S/O SHEIK ALI,
AGED 39 YEARS
R/AT AL-DHANA APARTMENT
NEAR GOUSIYA JUMA MASJID,
MUDIPU,
DAKSHINA KANNADA-574 153.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. DHANUSH, ADVOCATE FOR

SRI.VENKATESH SOMAREDDI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. MRS AYISHA RISHANA
W/O MUDIPU MOHAMMED NAWAZ @
MOHAMMED NAWAZ
AGED 30 YEARS
2. MISS. NUHA FATHIMA
D/O MUDIPU MOHAMMED NAWAZ @
MOHAMMED NAWAZ
AGED 6 1/2 YEARS,

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



REPRESENTED BY HER
GUARDIAN /RESPONDENT NO.1

3. MOHAMMED AZAAN
S/O MUDIPU MOHAMMED NAWAZ @
MOHAMMED NAWAZ
AGED 3 1/2 YEARS
REPRESENTED BY HIS MOTHER
RESPONDENT NO.1

ALL ARE R/AT D.NO.2-376,
KUKKADA KATTE HU HAKUVA KALLU,
BALEPUNI,
DAKSHINA KANNADA-574 153
PRESENTLY R/AT D.NO.1-4585,
AZAZIA MANZIL, K. C. ROAD,
THALAPADY,
MANGALURU- 575 023.

...RESPONDENTS

THIS RPFC FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY
COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 29.04.2023
PASSED IN CRL. MISC NO.28/2022 ON THE FILE OF PRL.
JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, D.K. MANGALURU., PARTLY ALLOWING
THE PETITION FILED UNDER SEC.125(1) (a) (b) 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 ON I.A.No.2/2025

This is an application filed seeking the Court to condone the delay of 630 days in filing revision petition.

2. Heard Sri.Dhanush who represents Sri.Venkatesh Somareddy learned counsel on record for the petitioner. Gone through the contents of the memorandum of facts given by learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel who represents the petitioner states that due to certain difficulties petitioner could not approach his Senior i.e., learned counsel on record for the petitioner and give instructions. Thus, delay occurred. Therefore, said delay is required to be condoned.

4. Reasons for preferring the revision petition with delay of 630 days are given at paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Memorandum of facts. The contents of those paragraphs are as under:



"2. I say that there is a delay of 630 days in filing the above Petition. I say that the Petitioner approached another advocate for filing the above petition. However, due to certain issues, the Petitioner decided to take back the documents and later approached our office.

3. The delay is on account of not receiving the certified copy of the trial court records on time from the advocate approached earlier by the petitioner."

5. Even if the contents of those paragraphs are taken into consideration and are believed to be true, taking back the documents from the earlier counsel including the certified copies and approaching another counsel does not require 630 days so as to file the revision petition. The wife aged around 28 years, daughter aged around four and half years, son aged around one and half years, filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance. Family Court held that wife is not entitled for any maintenance. Petitioner/father was directed to pay the



minor children a sum of Rs.7,500/- each for their maintenance. Having kept quiet for a long period of 630 days, petitioner/father has filed a revision petition challenging the order by which maintenance was granted in favour of the minor children. Established principles of law require disposal of Family Court matters more particularly the cases filed for grant of maintenance in an expeditious manner.

6. In the case on hand, father upon whom liability was fastened to maintain the children, kept quiet for a period of 630 days and filed revision petition challenging the order through which he was directed to pay maintenance. The reasons are neither convincing nor could be construed to be sufficient cause so as to condone the delay. Therefore, this Court is of the view that there are no merits in this application.

Resultantly, the application stands dismissed.



NC: 2026:KHC:29613
RPFC No. 121 of 2025

Consequently, the proceedings in the revision petition are closed.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

DS
CT:TSM
List No.: 1 SI No.: 2