



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 176 OF 2024

BETWEEN:

MR. INDERJIT YADAV,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
S/O DHIR SINGH YADAV
PRESENTLY RESIDING AT
B-1501, ELLORA TOWER SECTOR 11,
CBD BELAPUR,
NAVI MUMBAI - 400 614

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ZAMEER PASHA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

1. MRS PRAKRUTHI M
AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS
W/O INDERJIT SINGH
D/O RETD. IGP MR. DN MUNIKRISHNA
RESIDING AT NO. 4, 'PRAKRUTHI',
15TH CROSS 100 FT. RING ROAD,
JP NAGAR, 6TH PHASE,
BANGALORE - 570 078.
2. MS. ANANYA INDERJIT
AGED ABOUT 18 YEARS
9 MONTHS D/O MR. INDERJIT YADAV
BOTH ARE RESIDING AT NO. 4,
'PRAKRUTHI', 15TH CROSS 100 FT.



RING ROAD, JP NAGAR, 6TH PHASE,
BANGALORE - 570 078.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. LAKSHMY IYENGAR, SR. COUNSEL APPEARING FOR
SRI. N. GOWTHAM RAGHUNATH, ADVOCATE FOR R1 AND R2)

THIS RPFC IS FILED UNDER SECTION 19(4) OF FAMILY COURT ACT, AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 20.10.2023 PASSED IN CRL.MISC.NO.175/2010 ON THE FILE OF THE I ADDITIONAL PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, BENGALURU, PARTLY ALLOWING THE PETITION FILED UNDER SECTION 125 OF THE CR. P.C., FOR MAINTENANCE.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL ORDER

Challenge in this revision petition is the order that is rendered by the Court of I Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bangalore, in Crl.Misc. Case No.175/2010 dated 20.10.2023.

2. Heard Sri.Zameer Pasha, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Smt.Lakshmi Iyengar, learned Senior Counsel who represents the respondents.

3. The relationship between the parties is not in dispute. Therefore, the revision petitioner will hereinafter be



referred to as the husband, respondent No.1 as wife and respondent No.2 as the child.

4. Wife and child filed a petition invoking Section 125 CrPC seeking the Court to direct the husband to pay them a sum of ₹1,50,000/- towards maintenance. Family Court through the impugned order directed husband to pay his wife and child a sum of ₹50,000/- each per month towards maintenance apart from incurring all the educational expenses of the child. Aggrieved by the liability thus imposed, husband filed this revision petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner/husband submitted that the marriage between the petitioner/husband and respondent No.1/wife was solemnized in the year 2003. They stayed for sometime at Bangalore, went to Shimla for sometime, stayed at Mumbai for sometime, visited Jaipur, later husband and wife went to UK, they stayed there for around one year. They returned to India thereafter. They lived happily for considerable period. But, due to disputes that arose between them, they started residing separately. Petitioner/husband met with an accident and thereby he became permanently and



completely disabled. Petitioner/husband pursued a course in 'Merchant Navy' and he got licence as "Ship's Chief Officer". He subsequently got a licence for 'Ship's Captain'. He was earning around ₹3,50,000/- per month as 'Chief Officer' and as Captain of ship, he was earning much more. However, due to the injuries sustained in an accident, he lost all his earning power. Petitioner/husband is left with no much income or property. Even going by the documents produced by respondent No.1/wife, his earnings does not cross ₹25,000/- per month. Without looking at the financial position of the petitioner/husband, the Family Court directed petitioner/husband to pay respondents a sum of ₹50,000/- each towards their maintenance. As the petitioner cannot pay such huge amount, he is before this Court. Learned counsel also stated that due to the adamant attitude of respondent No.1/wife, disputes arose between the couple which resulted in their separation. Learned counsel thereby sought to allow the revision petition.

6. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submitted that spending huge amount, the parents of respondent No.1 performed her marriage. Petitioner never took care of respondent No.1. Due to the bad habits of the



petitioner, respondent No.1 could not tolerate him and thereby they started residing separately. Petitioner has not produced any material to show that he suffers with permanent physical disability. That apart petitioner maintains number of Companies and his earning exceeds ₹10,00,000/- per month. On the other hand, respondent No.2 is daughter of the petitioner and respondent No.1 has no source of earnings to maintain herself as well as their daughter. It is the liability of the petitioner to maintain the respondents. Though respondents are entitled to a higher sum as maintenance than that which was awarded by the Family Court through the impugned order, yet if the amount ordered is paid, they can lead a peaceful life and therefore the revision petition is liable to be dismissed.

7. The Family Court subjecting the evidence of PW.1, RW.1 Exs.P.1 to P.29 and Exs.R.1 to R.49 came to a conclusion that liability vests upon the petitioner/husband to maintain the respondents.

8. Petitioner mainly disputes the quantum fixed by the Family Court towards maintenance. The version of the respondents is that the petitioner worked as Second Officer in



Chettinad Shipping Co. Ltd. and was earning ₹1,00,000/- per month. Thereafter, he worked at ASP Ship Management India Private Limited as Captain and started earning ₹6,00,000/- per month. The version of the petitioner is that he studied upto Second PUC and thereafter entered into Cadet recruitment and subsequently he did a marine course at United Kingdom. The version of the petitioner is that he met with an accident and the injuries sustained resulted in permanent and physical disability and thereby he is unable to do any work. The petitioner who examined himself as RW.1 during the course of cross-examination clearly stated that after accident he worked at EMAS shipping company for a period of one month. However, he volunteered that as he could not balance himself, he was removed from service. However, he also stated that he was taken as 'Chief Officer'. He further stated that medical test is required and it was taken before the employment. Thus, it is clear that in case petitioner was found medically unfit he would not have been taken into employment at all. That apart, petitioner has not produced any proof to show that he was removed on the ground that he was found physically unfit. RW.1 during the course of cross-examination also stated that



after filing of his statement of objections, he joined EMAS Company as a Duty Officer. He stated that he was holding NRE account in HSBC Bank, MG Road Branch, Mumbai and he was also holding NRO account in the same bank. He also deposed that he was holding some accounts in ICIC Bank, Canara Bank, Bank of India and Central Bank of India. He deposed that somewhere in the year 2009 - 2010 he closed all those accounts except his account at ICICI Bank. Petitioner has not filed any proof to show that he closed those accounts. RW.1 during the course of cross-examination also stated that he travelled to Dubai on work for getting placement job and he travelled to Dubai after the accident. Though petitioner denied his relationship initially with YAK Marine Private Limited, during the course of cross-examination, he volunteered that he was running YAK Marine Private Limited as Placement Agency and under that agency he was the Director. He stated that he still holds the same position in the same Agency. Family Court discussing at length with regard to the financial status of the parties, came to a conclusion that the petitioner/husband is liable to pay respondents a sum of ₹50,000/- each per month towards their maintenance. As rightly observed by the trial



Court at paragraph No.23 of the impugned order, the petitioner suppressed certain crucial documents which reveals his financial position.

9. Having considered the entire evidence that is brought on record, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is in a position to maintain the respondents and has got capacity to pay ₹50,000/- to each respondent per month towards their maintenance and also the expenses which respondent No.2 require for her education. Therefore, this Court is of the view that this revision petition lacks merits.

10. Resultantly, the revision petition stands *dismissed*.

11. Petitioner to clear all arrears within a period of three months.

12. As the revision petition itself is disposed of, the proceedings in IA No.1/2026 and IA No.2/2026 are closed.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE