



CNR: KAHC010454712026

NC: 2026:KHC:55300
WP No. 20517 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 5TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

WRIT PETITION NO. 20517 OF 2026 (GM-FC)

BETWEEN:

DIPAK THAKUR
(AGED 57 YEARS)
S/O DR. DS THAKUR
152, 2ND FLOOR, DEFENCE ENCLAVE,
GEDLAHALLI, HENNUR ROAD,
BANGALORE -560 077

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. DIPAK THAKUR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SUNITA THAKUR
(AGED 54 YEARS)
D/O DAULAT RAM KHACHI
152, 1ST FLOOR, DEFENCE ENCLAVE,
GEDLAHALLI, HENNUR ROAD,
BANGALORE -560 077

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. RASHEED KHAN, ADVOCATE)

THIS W.P. IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO IMPUGNE ORDER OF 5 JUNE 2026 IN MC 5860/2021 PERUSED ON MEMO OF 6/4/2026 BY IV ADDT PRL JUDGE FAMILY COURT BANGALORE BE QUASHED ANNEXURE-C, SET ASIDE, AND THE CROSS EXAM NOTES ERRORS REPORTED BE AMENDED, TO MEET THE ENDS OF JUSTICE.



CNR: KAHC010454712026

NC: 2026:KHC:55300
WP No. 20517 of 2026

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

CORAM: HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

ORAL ORDER

Aggrieved by the orders passed in M.C.No.5860/2021 dated 05.06.2026 by the IV Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bangalore, the Party-in-person is before this Court.

2. The petitioner/party-in-person has filed an application under Order XVIII Rule 7 of the CPC to correct the error on page No.19, para 3, line 13 of the cross-examination of PW-1. It is his case that there was a typographical mistake in recording the cross-examination, at page No.19 para 3 line 13, where "in same premises" is typed as "in second floor," and it is the case of the party in person that this was brought to the notice of the Family Court immediately. Earlier, when a similar application was filed and no orders were passed by the Family Court, he approached this Court, and an order was passed by this Court to dispose of the said IA. The Family Court has considered and corrected the mistake. However, in this case, on the ground that repeated applications are filed and an affidavit is not filed, the Family Court had dismissed the



application. It is submitted by the party-in-person that the arguments are complete, and it is now coming up for the respondent's argument.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent submits that the petitioner is trying to take away admission during the cross-examination and is deviating from the same. The application was filed after one and a half months. The family Court has rightly dismissed the application and there are no grounds to interfere.

4. Having heard the party-in-person and the learned counsel for the respondent, perused the entire material on record. The petitioner is the party-in-person. According to him, there was a typographical mistake in the cross-examination earlier, such mistakes were corrected. In the considered opinion of this Court, instead of creating another litigation, the Family Court ought to have considered the same and ought to have passed an order on the memo, if there is any typographical mistake as stated by the party-in-person. But, instead of doing so, the Family Court passed an order stating that he is filing consecutive applications. In the cross-



**NC: 2026:KHC:55300
WP No. 20517 of 2026**

examination, if anything is not correctly recorded, and immediately when it is brought to the notice of the Court and the mistake is not rectified, the party is left with no option but to file the application. Notwithstanding the fact that whether the application is filed with a delay, the Family Court shall consider the memo and determine whether there is any typographical mistake. If there is a typographical mistake, the same shall be corrected. It is made very clear that the Court shall not entertain any further applications from either side and shall conclude the MC as expeditiously as possible.

5. Accordingly, this Court is passing the following:

ORDER

- i. The writ petition is ***disposed of.***
- ii. The Family Court shall dispose of the MC as expeditiously as possible.
- iii. Pending I.As., in the petition shall stand closed.

**SD/-
(LALITHA KANNEGANTI)
JUDGE**

TS, List No.: 1 Sl No.: 52
*MR