



CNR: KAHC010529352025

NC: 2026:KHC:48435
WP No. 35280 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 7TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

WRIT PETITION NO. 35280 OF 2025 (GM-FC)

BETWEEN:

SRI V.MANIKYAM
S/O LATE SRI KRISHNASWAMY
AGED ABOUT 75 YEARS
R/AT NO. 18/1, 4TH MAIN F CROSS
MUNESHWARA BLOCK, PG HALLI
BANGALORE -560 003

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. PRATEEK G., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT M.VIJAYAKUMARI
W/O LT M.YUAVARAJ
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
R/AT 3RD CROSS, P C EXTENSION
KOLAR TOWN
KARNATAKA -563 101

2. KUM. DIVYA DARSHINI
MINOR
D/O LT. M.YUAVARAJ
REP BY NATURAL GUARDIAN MOTHER
SMT M.VIJAYAKUMARI
R/AT 3RD CROSS, P C EXTENSION
KOLAR TOWN
KOLAR -563 101

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SMT. SHILPA RANI, ADVOCATE FOR R1



NC: 2026:KHC:48435
WP No. 35280 of 2025

CNR: KAHC010529352025

R2- MINOR, REPRESENTED BY NATURAL GUARDIAN
MOTHER)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ALLOW THIS REVIEW
PETITION AND QUASH THE IMPUGNED PROCEEDINGS AND
ORDERS DATED 08.01.2025 AND 22.03.2025 IN CRL. MISC.
(FC) NO. 88/2021 PENDING BEFORE THE FAMILY COURT,
KOLAR.

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 order dated 22.03.2025 passed in
Crl.Misc.No.88/2021 by the Principal Judge of the Family Court,
Kolar, the petitioner is before this Court.

2. The trial court, by order dated 22.03.2025, directed
the attachment of the house property of Sri Manikyam, i.e., the
petitioner herein, to secure his presence and to obtain the
documents sought by respondent No. 1 for the educational
purpose of the second respondent. Aggrieved thereby, the
petitioner is before this Court.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner is the father-in-
law. His son is no more. The trial Court, under Section 125 of



the Cr.P.C., held that, on the grounds that the petitioner had not produced the document as sought for by the daughter-in-law, the trial Court cannot attach the house properties. It is submitted that the trial Court, beyond the jurisdiction conferred on it, passed such an order.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that they will cooperate with the trial Court and will appear before it. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has no documents and, as such, could not produce any. The trial Court ought not to have passed such an order.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent submits that she is seeking only a document for her child's educational purposes. Although the petitioner has the documents, they have not produced them before the trial court, and the trial court has rightly passed an order.

6. Having heard the learned counsel on either side, perused the material on record. The respondent is seeking the petitioner's document/caste certificate for her daughter's educational purposes. According to the petitioner, he is not in



**NC: 2026:KHC:48435
WP No. 35280 of 2025**

CNR: KAHC010529352025

possession of the documents. If any documents are required, there is a procedure by which they can be sought, and the trial Court can pass appropriate orders. But the trial Court cannot, in this manner, attach the properties of the father-in-law. Considering all these aspects, this Court is passing the following:

ORDER

- i. The order dated 22.03.2025, passed in CrI.Misc.No.88/2021 by the Principal Judge of the Family Court, Kolar, is ***set aside***.
- ii. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***allowed***.
- iii. The petitioner shall cooperate with the trial court and shall appear before the trial court on the next date of hearing.
- iv. The respondent is at liberty to avail the procedure that is available under law to seek those documents.
- v. All pending I.As., in the writ petition shall stand closed.

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

PKN
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 61