



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU**

**DATED THIS THE 23<sup>RD</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2026**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA**

**REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO.244 OF 2025**

**BETWEEN:**

SMT. SUJATHA @ VANAJAKSHI,  
W/O HAREESH K.,  
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,  
R/AT INDASAKATTE VILLAGE,  
NALKUNDA POST, MAYAKONDA HOBALI,  
DAVANAGERE TALUK AND DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ADINARAYANAPPA, ADVOCATE)

**AND:**

SRI HAREESH K.,  
S/O KRISHNAMURTHY,  
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS,  
R/AT NO. 121,  
KOTE GANGURU,  
SHIVAMOGGA TALUK AND DISTRICT,  
SHIVAMOGGA-577534.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. MAHENDRAPAL, ADVOCATE FOR

SRI.UMESH B. N., ADVOCATE)

THIS RPFC FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY  
COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 11.09.2023  
PASSED IN C.MISC NO.32/2021 ON THE FILE OF JUDGE,

Digitally signed by  
AASEEFA  
PARVEEN  
Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA



FAMILY COURT, DAVANGERE, PARTLY ALLOWING PETITION  
FILED UNDER ORDER 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.Adinarayanappa, learned counsel for the  
petitioner as well as Sri.Mahendrapal, who represents Sri  
Umesh B.N., learned counsel on record for the respondent.

2. Challenge in this revision petition is the order that  
is passed by the Family Court, Davanagere, in  
Crl.Misc.No.32/2021 dated 11.09.2023.

3. The petitioner herein filed a petition under Section  
125 Cr.PC seeking the Court to direct her husband i.e.  
respondent herein to pay her a sum of ₹30,000/- per month  
towards maintenance. Family Court, Davangere passed orders  
directing respondent/husband to pay petitioner/wife a sum of  
₹5,000/- per month towards maintenance. Projecting that the  
sum granted towards maintenance is grossly low, this revision  
petition is filed.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that respondent is doing real estate business and thereby he is earning a lot. On the other hand petitioner has got no source of earnings. The father of the respondent, considering the plight of the petitioner, as a responsible father-in-law, deposited a sum of ₹38,00,000/- by way of Fixed Deposit in the joint names of the petitioner and respondent. Respondent is withdrawing the interest accrued and he is not paying any amount to the petitioner. Petitioner requires ₹30,000/- per month for her maintenance and therefore allowing the revision petition, the sum claimed may be awarded.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent states that respondent has no source of income. Respondent cultivates only 13 guntas of land and he earns nothing out of it, as agriculture is not profitable. Learned counsel thereby seeks to dismiss the revision petition.

6. Petitioner in her pleadings contended that respondent has raised arecanut in his land and thereby he earns ₹5,00,000/- per annum, he owns several sites at Rajanna Layout and thus he is capable of maintaining her. Petitioner



however failed to produce substantive proof with regard to the occupation of the respondent that he raised aracanut in his land, that he owns several sites at Rajanna Layout and earns a sum of ₹5,00,000/- per annum.

7. Family Court subjecting the evidence of PW1, RW1 and Exs.P1 to P4 to scrutiny, directed respondent/husband to pay petitioner/wife a sum of ₹5,000/- per month towards maintenance. That apart, as rightly contended by learned counsel for the respondent, when the impugned order was rendered in the month of September 2023, the revision petition came to be filed by the petitioner in the year 2025, with delay of 597 days. In case there are any change of circumstances in respect of earnings of respondent/husband, petitioner can file an application seeking enhancement of maintenance. However, so far as merits in this revision petition are concerned, taking into account all the facts and circumstances, the Family Court, Davanagere arrived at a just figure and thereby directed respondent to pay petitioner a sum of ₹5,000/- per month towards maintenance. This Court therefore does not find any



grounds to interfere with the findings given. Hence, the following

**ORDER**

The revision petition is dismissed.

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

AP  
CT:TSM  
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 48