



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 17TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET. FAMILY COURT NO.304 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SMT.NAGAMMA B. V.,
W/O SRI, ANANDAKUMAR,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
R/AT BOMMANAHALLI VILLAGE
CHIDAVARAHALLI POST, SOSALE HOBLI,
T.NARASIPURA TALUK,
MYSORE DISTRICT - 571 120.

PRESENTLY:

R/AT, NO 2130, 2ND CROSS, GROUND,
NEAR ASHWATH CHILDREN PARK,
SRIRAMU LAYOUT,
KENGARI SATELLITE TOWN,
BANGALORE 560060

...PETITIONER

Digitally signed
by AASEEFA
PARVENI

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA

(BY SMT. MOHANA KUMARI S., ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. MAHADEVASWAMY M., ADVOCATE)

AND:

SRI. ANANDA KUMAR,
S/O, LATE SIDDAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 42 YEARS,
P.C NO 10779 HEAD CONSTABLE,
PRESENTLY WORKING AT:
CUBBON PARK, POLICE STATION,



KASTURIBHA ROAD,
BANGALORE - 560001.

PERMANENT ADDRESS:
R/AT KALKUNI VILLAGE
KIRUGAVALU HOBLI,
MALAVALLI TALUK,
MANDYA DISTRICT-574 124.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SMT. NAGANANDINI, ADVOCATE)

THIS RPFC FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 20.08.2025 PASSED IN CrI. MISC NO.584/2019 ON THE FILE OF II ADDITIONAL PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, BENGALURU, PARTLY ALLOWING THE PETITION FILED UNDER SEC.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 Ms.Mohana Kumari S., who represents Sri.Mahadeva Swamy M., learned counsel on record for the petitioner as well as Ms.S.Naganandini, learned counsel for respondent.

2. Being aggrieved by the sum that is awarded as maintenance in her favour to be payable by the respondent through orders in CrI.Misc.Case No.584/2019 dated 20.08.2025



by the Court of II Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bengaluru, this revision petition is filed.

3. Learned counsel who represents the petitioner submits that petitioner is the wife of the respondent. Their marriage was performed in the year 2014. They lived together for considerable period. But, due to the disputes that arose between them, they started residing separately. The petitioner has got no source of earnings. As the mother of the petitioner is suffering from ill-health, petitioner is taking care of her mother and therefore she is unable to attend any work. On the other hand, respondent works as Police Head Constable and he earns around ₹60,000/- per month. Respondent filed a case seeking decree of divorce. In the said case i.e. in M.C.No.2700/2016, the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Bengaluru, passed interim order directing respondent-husband to pay petitioner-wife a sum of ₹8,000/- per month towards interim maintenance. On the ground that interim maintenance was granted to the petitioner and that she is receiving ₹8,000/- per month, the impugned order came to be passed granting maintenance of ₹7,000/- per month. However, M.C.



No.2700/2016 was disposed of on 13.09.2023. Interim maintenance was paid till the disposal of the said case and as there was no order for subsequent payment, petitioner is not receiving any amount thereafter. Learned counsel states that petitioner requires at-least ₹25,000/- per month for her maintenance as she resides in Bengaluru City where the cost of living is more. Learned counsel ultimately seeks to pass order to that effect.

4. Learned counsel for respondent submits that the Family Court taking into consideration that the respondent is paying ₹8,000/- towards interim maintenance, directed him to pay a sum of ₹7,000/- in addition to the said amount towards maintenance. However, after disposal of M.C.No.2700/2016, there was no obligation on part of respondent to pay said ₹8,000/- per month. Learned counsel contends that respondent is under obligation to look after his mother who suffers with old age ailments and indeed his take home salary is around ₹40,000/- per month.



5. The operative portion of the impugned order is as under:

"The present petition filed by the petitioner under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1873 is hereby allowed in part with costs.

Consequently, the respondent shall pay monthly maintenance of Rs.7,000/- to the petitioner from the date of petition during her life time or until the petitioner remarries in addition to the maintenance of Rs.8,000/- awarded to her in M.C.No.2700/2016"

6. In the light of the submission that is made by both learned counsel it is clear that, on disposal of M.C.No.2700/2016 on 13.09.2023, respondent stopped paying ₹8,000/-, as no order to that effect was passed through the final order. Taking into consideration the financial status of both parties, Family Court came to a conclusion that total sum which petitioner is entitled to receive towards maintenance from the respondent is ₹15,000/- per month. As the petitioner was already receiving ₹8,000/- towards interim maintenance, Family Court directed respondent to pay the balance amount



i.e. ₹7,000/- per month. Thus, this Court is of the view that the revision petition can be disposed of directing respondent to pay petitioner a total sum of ₹15,000/- per month towards maintenance. Therefore, revision petition is disposed of with the following:

ORDER

- (i) The revision petition is allowed in part.
- (ii) Respondent is directed to pay petitioner a sum of ₹15,000/- per month towards her maintenance and such amount shall be paid from the date of disposal of M.C.No.2700/2016 i.e. from 13.09.2023 till the petitioner remarries or till the amount ordered to be paid is modified by the Competent Court.

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

AP
CT:TSM
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 19