



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 28TH DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO.208 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

N. P. RAVISH
S/O L. PUTTANANJIAH,
AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS,
SURVEYOR IN DEPT. OF SURVEY,
RESIDENT OF NANDIHALLIPALYA,
NITTUR HOBLI, GUBBI TALUK,
TUMAKURU DISTRICT-572 223.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. TEJAS, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. LAKSHMIKANTH K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. K. B. PREETHI
W/O N. P. RAVISH,
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS,
2. KUSHALKUMAR
S/O N. P. RAVISH,
AGED ABOUT 18 YEARS,

BOTH ARE R/AT KAGGERE VILLAGE,
BELLAVI HOBLI, TUMAKURU TALUK,
NOW RESIDING AT WARD NO.24,
8TH MAIN, 2ND CROSS ROAD,
S.S.PURAM, TUMAKURU.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MAHESH C. M., ADVOCATE)



THIS RPFC IS FILED UNDER SECRTION 19(4) OF FAMILY COURTS ACT, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 14.07.2025 PASSED IN CRL.MIS.NO.61/2024 BY THE HON'BLE PRL.JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, TUMAKURU, AND PASS ANY SUCH ORDER/S AS THIS HON'BLE COURT DEEMS FIT IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL ORDER

Being aggrieved by the additional liability imposed through the enhanced sum awarded as maintenance, this revision petition is filed. Revision petitioner challenges the order that is rendered by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Tumakur in Criminal Misc. No.61/2024 dated 14.07.2025.

2. Heard Sri.Tejas, who represented Sri.Lakshmikanth K., learned counsel on record for the revision petitioner. Respondents failed to avail the opportunities granted for making their submission.

3. Material available on record reveals that respondent No.1 who is the wife and respondent No.2 who



is the son of the revision petitioner filed a petition in Criminal Misc. No.508/2009 seeking maintenance from the revision petitioner herein. The Court through the order dated 28.03.2016, directed the revision petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- each to the respondents. Thereafter, respondents filed Criminal Misc. No.61/2024 under Section 127 of Cr.P.C. seeking enhancement. The Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Tumskuru, through order dated 14.07.2025, allowed the said petition in part and thereby directed revision petitioner to pay respondent No.1 a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month and respondent No.2 a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month towards maintenance. Amount granted was ordered to be paid in favour of respondent No.1 from the date of petition during her lifetime or till she gets remarried and to respondent No.2 till he attains the age of majority. There is no denial of the fact that by the date of filing of this revision petition itself, respondent No.2 attained the age of majority.



4. Arguing the matter, learned counsel for the revision petitioner submitted that respondent No.1 harassed and tortured revision petitioner in many ways and on several occasions. Respondents filed a petition claiming maintenance and the Court directed revision petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- per month each to respondent Nos.1 and 2 and the petitioner was paying said amount. However, respondent No.1 without any basis filed a petition for enhancement. Without considering the earnings of the revision petitioner, his liabilities and responsibilities and the financial status of respondent No.1, Family Court directed revision petitioner to pay huge sum as maintenance and aggrieved by the same, this revision petition is filed. Learned counsel contended that revision petitioner has to maintain his aged mother and also his daughter, who is residing with him. On the other hand, respondent No.1 received huge assets from her father. She maintains good bank balance. Therefore, there is no necessity for her to claim any maintenance from the



revision petitioner. Learned counsel thereby sought to allow the revision petition.

5. Revision petitioner succeeded in establishing that parents of respondent No.1 owns and possess landed as well as house property. It is also brought on record that respondent No.1 filed a suit for partition against her father. Also, it is brought on record that the mother of respondent No.1 filed a suit against her brother for partition. However, as rightly observed by the Family Court, parents possessing property alone cannot be taken into consideration to hold that respondent No.1 will have no claim against her husband or that she can maintain herself and the child. Likewise, though it is brought on record that respondent No.2 filed a suit against his father i.e., the revision petitioner herein for partition and though the said suit was decreed, no evidence is on record to show that respondent No.2 derives any income from the said property. Also, it is brought on record that revision petitioner had obtained an order of stay from this Court in



respect of passing of final decree. Therefore, under no circumstances, it can be held that respondent No.2 will derive any fruits through the property fell to his share in pursuance of the preliminary decree passed.

6. There is no denial of the fact that the revision petitioner is a licenced surveyor. Revision petitioner who got examined himself as RW.1 during the course of cross-examination admitted that he is a licenced surveyor and every month he will carry out 12 to 13 survey works. He further admitted that his family owns 14 acres of coconut, arecanut and mango garden. Taking into consideration the financial status of the revision petitioner, his liability to maintain the respondents and the absence of any convincing evidence with regard to the stand taken by the revision petitioner that respondent No.1 can maintain herself as well as the child, Family Court passed an order directing revision petitioner to pay respondent No.1 a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month and respondent No.2 a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month towards maintenance. Only till



respondent No.2 attains the age of majority, maintenance was ordered to be paid. As respondent No.2 attained the age of majority, as of now there is no requirement for the revision petitioner to pay anything to respondent No.2. He should only pay maintenance as ordered by the Court in favour of respondent No.1. Having considered the financial status of the revision petitioner, this Court is of the view that sum granted towards maintenance is neither excessive nor exorbitant. This Court does not find any grounds whatsoever to interfere with the reasoned order of the Family Court. Hence, this Court ultimately holds that there are no merits in this revision petition. Resultantly, following:

ORDER

Revision petition stands *dismissed*.

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

LG
List No.: 19 SI No.: 3
CT:SI