



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 156 OF 2022

BETWEEN:

DR B ANAND
AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS
S/O LATE. GULLAPPA
PRESENTLY R/AT SETTYHALLI
MARASURE POST
ANEKAL TALUK - 562106
BENGALURU URBAN DISTRICT.
EARLIER WORKING AT
ANIMAL AND HUSBANDRY CENTER
VETERINARY DEPARTMENT
DANAGUR, MALAVALLI TALUK
MANDYA DISTRICT - 571145.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI.NIKIL, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. BHADRINATH R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT KRUTHI
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS
D/O DR G ANAND.
2. SMT. RADHA
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS
W/O. DR. G. ANAND
BOTH ARE R/AT NO. 732
6TH CROSS, YARAGANAHALLI
MYSORE , MYSORE DISTRICT-570011.

...RESPONDENTS

Digitally signed by
DHANALAKSHMI
MURTHY
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



(BY SRI. MAHESHA M., ADVOCATE FOR R1:
NOTICE TO R2 IS DISPENSED WITH
V/O DATED: 19.07.2022)

THIS RPFC IS FILED UNDER SECTION 19(4) OF FAMILY COURTS ACT PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE IMPUNGED JUDGMENT/ORDER DATED: 03.10.2016 IN MISC NO.606 OF 2013 PASSED BY THE PRINCIPAL JUDGE FAMILY COURT AT MYSORE IN SO FAR AS PAYMENT OF MONTHLY MAINTENANCE TO THE RESPONDENT NO.1 OF RS.20,000/- FROM THE DATE OF PETITION TILL SHE GETS MARRIED AND ETC.

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. Nikil who represents Sri. Bhadrinath R., learned counsel on record for the petitioner.

2. Challenge in this revision petition is the order that is rendered by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Mysuru in Criminal Miscellaneous Case No.606/2013 dated 03.10.2016.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is the father of respondent No.1 and husband of respondent No.2. Respondents filed a petition under Section 125 of Criminal Procedure Code, seeking



maintenance of Rs.10,000/- per month in respect of maintenance of respondent No.2 – wife and Rs.20,000/- per month for the maintenance of respondent No.1 – daughter. Family Court rejected the claim of respondent No.2. However, the Family Court directed petitioner to pay respondent No.1 – daughter a sum of Rs.20,000/- per month towards maintenance from the date of petition till she gets married.

4. Learned counsel states that respondent No.1 – daughter got married and she also secured employment. Therefore, no liability vests upon the petitioner to pay any amount for the maintenance of respondent No.1 – daughter. Learned counsel, thereby, seeks to dispose of the revision petition accordingly.

5. As per the contents of the impugned order, petitioner was directed to pay a sum of Rs.20,000/- per month towards maintenance of respondent No.1 – daughter from the date of petition only till she gets married. The version of the petitioner is that respondent



No.1 got married and she also secured employment. Therefore, petitioner will not be under obligation to pay any amount as maintenance to respondent No.1 - daughter from the date she got married, as per the impugned order.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner has not stated anything with regard to the liability on the part of the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.20,000/- per month till the date of marriage of respondent No.1. 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**

CM
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 31