



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 3RD DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 133 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SRI.RAVI K.R.
S/O RAMACHANDRAIAH,
AGED 42 YEARS,
R/AT KOLALA VILLAGE,
KOLALA HOBLI,
KORATAGERE TQ.
TUMAKURU DIST-572140

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. M.B. CHANDRA CHOODA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT.NANDITHA
D/O RAVI.K.R,
AGED 12 YEARS,
MINOR,
REP. BY HER NATURAL GUARDIAN
HER MOTHER SMT. DHANALAKSHMI.K
R/AT 10TH CROSS,
SARASWATHIPURAM,
DR. RADHAKRISHNA ROAD,
MARALURU, TUMKURU CITY,
TUMAKURU DIST-572106.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. MURALI S., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. V. RAJIAH, ADVOCATE)

Digitally
signed by
AASEFFA
PARVEEN
Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA



THIS RPFC FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 1.04.2025 PASSED IN CRL. MISC NO.36/2023 ON THE FILE OF I ADDITIONAL PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, AT TUMAKURU., PARTLY ALLOWING THE PETITION FILED UNDER SEC.125 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.M.B.Chandra Chooda learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Sri.Murali.S who represents Sri.V.Rajaiah learned counsel on record for the respondent.

2. Challenge in this revision petition is the order that is rendered by the court of I Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Tumakuru in Crl.Misc.No.36/2023 dated 01.04.2025.



3. Respondent, who is the minor daughter of the petitioner, filed the petition invoking Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking a direction to the petitioner/father to pay her a sum of Rs.20,000/- per month towards maintenance. Family Court, through the impugned order, directed petitioner/father to pay respondent/daughter a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month towards maintenance till her marriage or till she is capable of maintaining herself, whichever is earlier. With a contention that the amount awarded is exorbitant, this revision petition is filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that disputes arose between the petitioner and his wife and petitioner filed a case seeking decree of divorce. Decree as sought for was passed. Wife challenged the decree before this Court, but she could not get any relief and the decree of divorce was confirmed. While dismissing the appeal filed by his wife, challenging the decree of divorce, this Court directed the petitioner to pay his wife a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month towards maintenance. Petitioner is



paying such sum regularly and there are no dues. To harass the petitioner, wife got filed a suit for partition and the said suit is still pending. After the decree of divorce was passed, petitioner married again and begot two daughters. Petitioner is under obligation to look after the welfare of those children. The net salary of the petitioner is around Rs.47,000/-. Out of the said sum, he has to pay Rs.10,000/- towards maintenance of his wife i.e., the mother of respondent. He has to maintain his wife whom he married again and also two children. Therefore, he is unable to pay huge sum of Rs.15,000/- towards maintenance of respondent. Learned counsel states that sum granted towards maintenance is exorbitant and the Family Court without taking into consideration the financial status of the petitioner awarded such amount and therefore, this revision petition is filed.

5. Per contra, learned counsel who represents the respondent states that petitioner has got permanent employment. His second wife purchased a house by paying



huge sum of Rs.9,32,000/- as sale consideration passed from the petitioner herein. Also petitioner has got no other responsibilities except to maintain the respondent. Thus, the amount awarded as maintenance in favour of the respondent is justified.

6. There is no denial of the fact that the gross salary of the petitioner is Rs.81,948/- as per the documents produced. Further, respondent produced evidence to show that petitioner herein owns a Royal Enfield bike and a TVS scooty. Also evidence is produced to show that a car stands in the name of the mother of the petitioner and that a residential house also stands in her name. Thus, as rightly contented, petitioner has no obligation to maintain his parents. However, out of the salary he receives, petitioner has to pay a sum of Rs.10,000/- towards maintenance of the mother of the respondent, he has to maintain his wife whom he married again and also the two children whom he begot. Therefore, this Court is of the view that it would be highly difficult for



the petitioner to pay sum of Rs.15,000/- per month towards the maintenance of the respondent. At the same time, this Court is of the view that obligation vests upon the petitioner to look after the welfare of the respondent who is none other than his child. Taking into consideration the interest of both parties and the evidence produced, this Court is of the view that petitioner can be directed to pay respondent a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month towards her maintenance. The sum fixed by the Family Court therefore is excessive.

7. Hence, 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 I Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Tumakuru in Crl.Misc.No.36/2023 dated 01.04.2025 is modified.



- (iii) Petitioner/father is directed to pay respondent/ daughter a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month towards maintenance from the date of filing of Crl.Misc.No.36/2023 till her marriage or till she is capable of maintaining herself, whichever is earlier.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

DS
CT:TSM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 38