



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 19557 OF 2023 (GM-FC)

BETWEEN:

VASANTHA VIKAS

S/O ARUMUGACHAMY,

AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS,

R/AT NO. 117, KALIAMMANKOVIL STREET,

VISWANATHAN ROAD, SIVAKASI,

STATE OF TAMIL NADU - 626 203.

...PETITIONER

Digitally signed by (BY SRI. MOHAMMED RAYEEF, ADVOCATE FOR
AASEEFA
PARVEEN
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

SRI. ZAMEER PASHA, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SUJITHA

W/O VASANTHA VIKAS,

D/O D. MUREGESH @ A.D MAHENDRAVERMA



AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS

2. MINOR SUJANTH VIKAS

S/O VASANTHA VIKAS

AGED ABOUT 14 YEARS

3. MINOR ATHINA VIKAS

D/O VASANTHA VIKAS

AGED ABOUT 10 YEARS

(2ND AND 3RD RESPONDENTS,

BEING MINORS REPRESENTED BY

THE 1ST RESPONDENT, THE MOTHER

AND NATURAL GUARDIAN)

ALL R/AT NO. 635, 10TH E MAIN ROAD,

6TH BLOCK, RAJAJI NAGAR,

BENGALURU - 560 010.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. DILRAJ JUDE ROHIT SEQUERIA, ADVOCATE;
R2 AND R3 ARE MINORS REP. BY R1)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO-SET ASIDE THE
IMPUGNED ORDER DTD 01.07.2023 PASSED IN I.A.NO.II U/S
125 OF CRPC IN CRL.MISC.NO.279/2022 BY THE IV ADDL
FAMILY COURT AT BANGALORE VIDE ANNEXURE-A AND ETC.,



THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING
IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS
UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL ORDER

Heard Sri.Mohammed Rayeef learned counsel who
represents Sri.Zameer Pasha learned counsel on record for the
petitioner as well as Sri.Dilraj J.R.S learned counsel for the
respondents.

2. With a prayer to issue a writ and to set aside the order
passed by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Bangalore
on I.A No.II in Criminal Miscellaneous Case No. 279/2022 dated
01.07.2023, this writ petition is filed by the husband of
respondent No.1 and father of respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

3.Respondents herein filed I.A No.II seeking interim
maintenance. Family Court through the impugned order
directed the petitioner to pay respondent Nos.1 to 3 a sum of
Rs.20,000/- each towards interim maintenance besides
Rs.50,000/- towards litigation expenses.



4. Arguing the matter, Sri.Mohammed Rayeef learned counsel who represents the petitioner states that respondent No.1 is a rich woman and leads luxurious life. She gave exaggerated figures of expenditure in her statement of assets and liabilities and claimed huge amount as maintenance. Respondent No.1/ wife works in the school which is maintained by her parents and she earns around Rs.70,000/- to Rs.80,000/- per month. That apart she resides along with the children at the house of her parents. Therefore, there is no requirement whatsoever to pay rent. That apart respondent No.1/wife maintains relationship with number of persons of opposite sex. Therefore, she is not entitled for any maintenance. The amount awarded towards interim maintenance of respondent Nos.2 and 3 is exorbitant considering the financial status of the petitioner. Petitioner draws not more than Rs.61,187/- per month. Out of the said amount he has to maintain himself and his mother. Thus the sum awarded towards interim maintenance is required to be reduced.



5. Vehemently opposing the said submission, Sri.Dilraj J.R.S learned counsel for respondents submits that petitioner runs as many as 27 fire crackers companies. That apart he is the Director and partner in some other companies. Thus, payment of Rs.20,000/- per month each to the respondents is not a big task to the petitioner. petitioner failed to produce the particulars of his earnings through the companies he maintains. Therefore, this writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. In the affidavit filed disclosing the assets and liabilities, the petitioner herein while disclosing his designation mentioned that he is 'Director, Partner, also a trustee in educational trust'. He has shown his monthly income as Rs.61,187/-. He stated that a car was provided by his company under employee incentive scheme and he is paying the EMI's. However, he mentioned that the same will be reimbursed by the company. Further he made a mention that he is involved in the business of manufacturing of Fireworks, Activated Carbon and Trading of LED lights. He further mentioned that he is one of the Directors in private limited companies and one of the Partners in partnership firms. He also made a mention that few companies



and partnership firms are in loss. However as rightly contented by learned counsel for respondents, petitioner failed to mention the details of those companies and the partnership firms. He also failed to state which of the companies and firms are in loss. His mention that 'few companies and partnership firms are in loss' can be taken as the other companies and partnership firms are in gain. However the exact earnings of the petitioner are not known. No conclusion can be arrived at regarding the exact earnings of the petitioner as the relevant particulars are not brought on record. However, considering the contents of the statement of assets and liabilities filed by the petitioner himself, it can safely be held that petitioner is in a position to maintain his wife and children i.e. the respondents herein. Petitioner failed to produce any proof in respect of the earnings of respondent No.1/wife.

7. When the affidavit given by respondent No.1 with regard to her assets and liabilities is gone through, as rightly contented by learned counsel for the petitioner, she failed to furnish the particulars in the manner required. However, she contended that she is unemployed. Admitted fact is that



respondent Nos.2 and 3 are under the custody of respondent No.1 and she is looking after them. Therefore taking into consideration the totality of facts and circumstances, this Court is of the view that the Family Court arrived at a just conclusion by directing the petitioner herein to pay respondents a sum of Rs.20,000/- per month each as interim maintenance.

8. Thus the ultimate conclusion of this Court is that there are no grounds to interfere with the findings given in the impugned order.

Resultantly following:-

ORDER

The writ petition is dismissed.

**Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE**

VS
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 10