



CNR: KAHC010429932025

NC: 2026:KHC:45490
RPFC No. 182 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 182 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. SMT. CHAITHRASHREE M.,
W/O SHIVAKUMAR H.M
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,
R/AT RESIDING AT 10TH CROSS,
SIDDAGANGA MUTT MAIN ROAD,
DEVARAYAPATTA POST
TUMAKURU - 572 104.
2. OMKAR H.S.,
S/O SHIVAKUMAR H.M
AGED ABOUT 9 YEARS,
R/AT RESIDING AT 10TH CROSS,
SIDDAGANGA MUTT MAIN ROAD,
DEVARAYAPATTA POST,
TUMAKURU - 572 104.
REPRESENTED BY HER NATURAL
GUARDIAN/MOTHER
SMT. CHITHRASHREE

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. MANOHAR B.K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI. SHIVAKUMAR H. M.,
S/O. MANJUNATH H.R.
AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS,
R/AT YESHAVANTHAPURA INDIAN POST,
SUB- DIVISION GROUND FLOOR,
AMPC OLD ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING,



NC: 2026:KHC:45490
RPFC No. 182 of 2025

NEAR RMC YARD POLICE STATION,
YESHAVANTHAPURA,
BANGALORE - 560 022.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. SRIDHAR R., ADVOCATE)

THIS RPFC FILED UNDER SECTION 19(4) OF THE FAMILY COURTS ACT, 1984, AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 06.06.2025 PASSED IN CRL.MISC.NO.159/2022 ON THE FILE OF THE PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, 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.Manohar B.K., learned counsel for the petitioners as well as Sri.Sridhar R., learned counsel for respondent.

2. The order that is rendered by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Tumakuru, in Crl.Misc.No.159/2022 dated 06.06.2025 resulted in filing of this revision petition.



3. Petitioner No.1 being the wife and petitioner No.2 being the minor son of respondent, filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance. Family Court through the impugned order directed respondent to pay petitioner No.1/wife a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month towards her maintenance. Family Court also directed respondent to pay petitioner No.2/son a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards his maintenance. Family Court further ordered respondent to pay all the educational and consequential expenses of petitioner No.2.

4. Making his submission on the merits of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioners are only aggrieved by the amount fixed towards maintenance of petitioner No.2. Learned counsel states that net salary of respondent is Rs.52,350/- per month as per the contents of Ex.R7. Further, father of respondent is a retired person. He gets pension. Therefore, is no liability vests upon respondent to maintain



his father. Thus, his sole dependants are petitioners herein. Therefore, Family Court ought to have directed respondent to pay petitioner No.2/ son a sum of Rs.20,000/- per month as claimed. Learned counsel thereby seeks to pass necessary orders.

5. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent submits that Family Court directed respondent to pay petitioner No.1 a sum of Rs.10,000/- and petitioner No.2/ son a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards their maintenance. Family Court also directed respondent to pay all the educational and consequential expenses pertaining to petitioner No.2. Respondent is complying the orders. Thus, there are no grounds for further enhancement.

6. As per the material brought on record and the discussion of the Family Court at para 28 of the impugned order, respondent is a postman and his gross salary for the month of March 2025 is Rs.57,480/- and net salary is Rs.52,350/-. Earning Rs.52,350/- per month, respondent



CNR: KAHC010429932025

NC: 2026:KHC:45490
RPFC No. 182 of 2025

will be under obligation to pay petitioner No.1 a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month, petitioner No.2 a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month and that he is required to bear all the educational and consequential expenses in respect of petitioner No. 2/son. Thus, as rightly contended by learned counsel for respondent, substantial amount will go towards payment of maintenance to petitioners and for educational expenses of petitioner No.2. This Court is of the view that by enhancing the amount awarded towards maintenance of petitioner No.2, much more amount cannot be ordered to be deducted from the net salary of the respondent. Family Court taking into consideration all factual aspects, directed respondent to pay petitioner No.1/wife a sum of Rs.10,000/- and petitioner No.2/son a sum of Rs.5,000/- towards their monthly maintenance. As a direction was also issued to the respondent to bear all the educational and consequential expenses of petitioner No.2, this Court is of the view that with the amount they receive towards maintenance, petitioners No.1 and 2 can maintain



NC: 2026:KHC:45490
RPFC No. 182 of 2025

CNR: KAHC010429932025

themselves. Thus, this Court does not find any grounds for interference.

7. Therefore, the following

ORDER

The revision petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

AP
CT:TSM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 39