



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 9TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 34027 OF 2025 (GM-FC)

BETWEEN:

MR. SARATH CHANDRA REDDY
S/O C VENKATA REDDY
AGE ABOUT 47 YEARS
PRESENTLY R/A NO F 403 NO 26/27-F 403
GANGOTHRI 10TH CROSS, KODIHALLI
JIVANA BHIMANNAGAR
BANGALORE 560008. ...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. KIRAN KUMAR H., ADVOCATE)

AND:

CHANDRAKALA C
D/O N V PRASAD
AGE ABOUT 41 YEARS
R/A NO H NO 87/1187
NAGIREDDY REVENUE COLONY
KURNOOL-578002. ...RESPONDENT

(NOTICE TO RESPONDENT IS DISPENSED WITH
V/O DATED: 09.06.2026)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO DIRECT THE HON'BLE TRIAL
COURT TO DISPOSE THE MC NO. 7802/2022 (ANNEXURE-D)
PENDING ON THE FILE OF IV THE ADDL. PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY
COURT BANGALORE EXPEDITIOUSLY AND ETC.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

Digitally signed
by
DHANALAKSHMI
MURTHY
Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



ORAL ORDER

Heard Mr. Kiran Kumar H., learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. This writ petition is filed seeking a direction to the Trial Court to dispose of M.C. No.7802/2022 pending on its file, expeditiously. As this writ petition can be disposed of effectively at this stage itself, service of notice to the respondent is dispensed with.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the husband of the respondent. Petitioner filed a case for dissolution of marriage in the year 2012. Subsequently, he withdrew that case. In the year 2022, he filed another case seeking the decree of divorce and the same is M.C.No.7802/2022. That case is still pending. Therefore, this writ petition is filed seeking a direction to the Trial Court to dispose of the case expeditiously. Learned counsel thereby, seeks to allow the writ petition.

5. A perusal of the certified copy of proceeding sheets reveals that, after service of notice upon the respondent, at



the instance of both the learned counsel, the matter was referred to mediation. Mediation failed. Thereafter, respondent filed statement of objections along with the interlocutory application seeking leave of the court to file certain documents. The petitioner herein filed objections. Again, the matter was taken up for conciliation. But, it failed. Thereafter, both parties were directed to file their affidavits disclosing their assets and liabilities. Later, petitioner herein filed an affidavit stating that he is ready to take back the respondent to marital home. On that, the matter was again referred for mediation. All these factors reveals the best efforts put by the Court of IV Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bengaluru in dealing with the matter. This Court does not find any material which reveals that the Family Court is not taking up the case in the manner as required.

6. Only because a party has approached the High Court seeking a direction for expeditious disposal of his/her case, such a direction cannot be issued, that too, without looking at the statistics and other old matters



pending on the file of the particular court and the pressure of work. Therefore, this Court is of the view that relief sought cannot be granted. Hence, the following:

ORDER

Writ petition is dismissed.

As the writ petition is dealt with without service of notice upon the respondent, the Court of IV Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bengaluru is directed to serve copy of this order upon the respondent or the learned counsel who represents her before it.

Registry to forward copy of this order to the concerned Court forthwith.

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

CM
LIST NO.: 1 SL NO.: 22