



CNR: KAHC010546732024

NC: 2026:KHC:53455
RPFC No. 200 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 25TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 200 OF 2024

BETWEEN:

SRI. ARUN PRASAD R.,
S/O. P. RAJAGOPAL,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS,
R/AT ARUN PRASAD COTTAGE,
BHEEMANNA GARDEN,
MUNESHWARA LAYOUT,
NEAR WHITEFIELD RAILWAY STATION
KADUGODI,
BENGALURU-560 066.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. VIJAYAN V., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI.HANUMANTHARAYA D., ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVEEN

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

AND:

SMT. KAVYA,
W/O. ARUN PRASAD R.,
D/O. P SUNDARRAJ,
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS,
R/O NO. 190, KAVYALAYA
3rd STAGE, 5th MAIN ROAD,
PILLANNA GARDEN,
BENGALURU - 560 045.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. SURAJ P.T., ADVOCATE)



NC: 2026:KHC:53455
RPFC No. 200 of 2024

CNR: KAHC010546732024

THIS RPFC FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 14.06.2024 PASSED IN CRL. MISC NO.288/2018 ON THE FILE OF PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, BENGALURU., PARTLY ALLOWING THE PETITION FILED UNDER SEC.125 OF Cr.P.C., FOR MAINTENANCE.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

ORAL ORDER

Heard Sri.Vijayan.V who represents Sri.Hanumantharaya.D, learned counsel on record for the petitioner as well as Sri.Suraj.P.T, learned counsel for the respondent.

2. Challenge in this revision petition is the order that is rendered by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Bengaluru in Crl.Misc.No.288/2018 dated 14.06.2024.

3. As the relationship between the parties to the proceedings is not in dispute, the revision petitioner will



hereinafter be referred to as the 'husband' and the respondent as 'wife'.

4. Wife filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C seeking maintenance of Rs.60,000/- to her to sustain herself and to maintain her daughter and Rs.25,000/- towards litigation expenses. The Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Bengaluru on appreciating the evidence brought on record dismissed the claim of respondent herein. However, a direction was issued to petitioner/husband to pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month for the maintenance of minor child Lisha.A.P from the date of filing of petition till its disposal and thereafter Rs.20,000/- per month during the period of minority of the child and till the child completes her education. Aggrieved by the liability imposed, the petitioner is before this Court.

5. The only point urged and highlighted by learned counsel for the petitioner/husband is that respondent/wife is also a earning person and therefore, she is under



CNR: KAHC010546732024

liability to share the responsibility equally in bringing up the child and therefore, directing the petitioner to pay Rs.20,000/- per month towards maintenance of the child is improper.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent states that the Family Court basing on the evidence produced passed appropriate orders.

7. There is no denial of the fact that the petitioner through his affidavit of assets and liabilities has shown his monthly income as Rs.1,36,335/-. Admittedly, respondent/wife has not produced any substantive proof with regard to her earnings. Her contention is that she earns Rs.25,000/- per month. Be that as it may, as earlier indicated the version of the petitioner as submitted by his counsel is that the respondent is also an earning person and therefore, she should share the responsibility of maintaining the child.



CNR: KAHC010546732024

NC: 2026:KHC:53455
RPFC No. 200 of 2024

8. At paragraph No.20 of the impugned order the Family Court made a mention that the petitioner who examined himself as Rw.1, during the course of cross examination clearly admitted that he does not know in which class his daughter is studying. That admission itself goes to show that respondent/wife is taking care of the child and she is looking after each and every requirement of the child. The petitioner who has not taken any responsibility to look after the child cannot now claim that his wife has to share the financial burden with him. That apart it is not the case of the petitioner that he has no financial capability to look after the welfare of his daughter. When both the parents are affluent and have got good financial status, they should contribute more amount for the welfare of their children. In the case on hand, admittedly petitioner is earning more than a lakh per month. As earlier indicated as per his own version, he receives a sum of Rs.1,36,335/- per month. Tribunal through the impugned order has directed the petitioner to



NC: 2026:KHC:53455
RPFC No. 200 of 2024

CNR: KAHC010546732024

pay his daughter less than one fifth of his income. Therefore, there are no grounds for the petitioner to agitate and contend that the maintenance granted for his child is excessive. Thus this Court holds that there are no merits in this revision petition.

Resultantly, the revision petition is *dismissed*.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

NS
CT:TSM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 4