



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

**DATED THIS THE 19<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2026**

**BEFORE**

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

**REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO.319 OF 2025**

**BETWEEN:**

1. SMT. SUREKHA. H. G.  
W/O K R SREESHARSHA  
AGE ABOUT 35 YEARS  
HOUSE WIFE
2. MASTER GOURAV  
S/O K R SREEHARSHA  
AGE ABOUT 7 YEARS  
SINCE MINOR REPRESENTED  
BY HIS MOTHER AND NATURAL GUARDIAN  
SMT. SUREKHA H. G.,

Digitally signed  
by AASEEFA  
PARVEEN

Location: HIGH  
COURT OF  
KARNATAKA

BOTH ARE R/AT NO. 2106, 8TH MAIN,  
D BLOCK, RAJAJINAGARA  
BANGALORE NOW AT  
C/O. SURVANA H. G.  
R/O BASAVESHWARI NILAYA,  
4TH CROSS BEHIND,  
SAI BABA TEMPLE,  
HOUSING BOARD,  
JYOTHINAGARA POST,  
CHIKKAMAGALURU.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SMT. NIRMALA K., ADVOCATE)



**AND:**

SRI. K. R. SREEHARSHA,  
S/O LATE KAMBADA RANGAPPA,  
AGE ABOUT 39 YEARS,  
R/AT BASAVANTHANAHALLI ,  
VILLAGE KALLAMBALLA HOBLI  
SIRA TALUK, TUMKUR DISTRICT,  
AND ALSO,  
R/AT NO. 2106, 8TH MAIN,  
D BLOCK, RAJAJINAGARA,  
BANGALORE.

...RESPONDENT

(BY MRS. BHUSHANI KUMAR, ADVOCATE)

THIS RPFC FILED U/S. 19(4) OF FAMILY COURTS ACT.,  
AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 03.06.2025 PASSED IN CRL.  
MISC NO.54/2023 ON THE FILE OF PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY  
COURT, CHIKKAMGALURU., PARTLY ALLOWING THE PETITION  
FILED UNDER SEC.127 OF Cr.P.C., FOR ENHANCEMENT OF  
MAINTENANCE.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA



**ORAL ORDER**

Seeking the Court to set aside the order rendered by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Chikkamagaluru in Crl.Misc.No.54/2023 dated 03.06.2025, this revision petition is filed.

2. Heard Ms.Nirmala.K learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Ms.Bhushani Kumar learned counsel for the respondent.

3. It is not in dispute that petitioner No.1 is the wife and petitioner No.2 is the minor son of the respondent.

4. Petitioners filed Crl.Misc.No.54/2023 against respondent contending that they are residing separately since 2018. Respondent deserted them. Therefore, they filed Crl.Misc.No.35/2019 under Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance. The Court directed respondent to pay them a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards maintenance. However, as the amount awarded as



maintenance is not sufficient for them to maintain themselves, they filed a petition under Section 127 Cr.P.C. seeking enhancement of maintenance from Rs.5,000/- to Rs.40,000/- per month. Respondent filed his objections, contending that he is ready to lead marital life with petitioner No.1, but petitioner No.1 is refusing. Respondent also contended that petitioners filed a suit for partition and the same is pending. He stated that he earns Rs.15,000/- per month, due to heavy rains 50% of his live stock lost its life. He also stated that petitioner No.1 holds a bachelor degree and she works at E-Fashions Bengaluru which is owned by her elder sister and brother-in-law and thereby she earns more than Rs.75,000/- per month and hence, there are no grounds for enhancement.

5. Making her submission on the merits of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioners contended that petitioner No.1 has to impart proper education to petitioner No.2. Further, she is at liability to provide all basic necessities to petitioner No.2. Petitioner No.1 has no



source of earnings and she is not doing any job. Thus, for her maintenance and for maintaining the child, she requires at least a sum of Rs.40,000/- per month. But through the impugned order, the Court directed respondent to pay petitioners only a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month and as the said sum is too meager and as petitioners cannot eek out their livelihood with such amount, they filed this revision petition. Learned counsel also stated that respondent is doing poultry business and he earns Rs.1,50,000/- per month.

6. Vehemently opposing the submission thus made, learned counsel for the respondent contented that petitioner No.1 earns more than the respondent. Respondent has no source of earnings except doing business on live stock. Respondent earns not more than Rs.15,000/- per month. On the other hand, petitioner No.1 earns around Rs.70,000/- to Rs.75,000/- per month. Sufficient material is on record which shows the financial status of petitioner No.1. Therefore, enhancement of the



sum that was awarded as maintenance is unwarranted, but the Family Court enhanced the same from Rs.5,000/- to Rs.10,000/- and thus, this revision petition is not maintainable.

7. A perusal of the impugned order reveals discussion on each and every aspect of the case. The Family Court at para 15 of the impugned order made a clear mention that it has gone through the contents of Ex.P14 YouTube video, wherein it is found that respondent gave his interview to Krishi Belaku YouTube channel in connection with his poultry business. The Court also said that no material was placed on record to show that he earns more than Rs.1,50,000/- per month and thus, the contents of the said interview given by respondent to the YouTuber cannot be taken into consideration in respect of the earnings of respondent. Also discussing about the financial status of petitioner No.1, the Family Court at para 17 of the impugned order observed as under:



"17. I have carefully gone through the contents of affidavit of assets and liabilities submitted by the petitioner No.1 along with bank account statement, wherein the petitioner No.1 has given particulars about her avocation as tailor and her monthly income is Rs.5,000/-. The contents of Bank account statement of petitioner No.1 for the period from 1.1.2022 to 30.11.2024 clearly goes to show that a money was deposited to the account of petitioner No.1 to the tune of Rs.25 to 30 thousand per month on regular basis. The petitioner No.1 has not disclosed the source of said deposits, which is received by her on every month, which creates doubt in the mind of court with regard to her contention about inability to maintain herself. The petitioner No.1 has suppressed the material fact of her source of income. The bank account statement of the respondent no where discloses that he is earning more income than the petitioner No.1 from his poultry business. The record further discloses that the petitioner No.1 is incurring expenses towards education of petitioner No.2."

8. Thus, the contents of the bank account statement of petitioner No.1 falsify her version that she



has no source of earnings. Taking into consideration the totality of the facts and circumstances, Family Court held that the maintenance granted in favour of the petitioners through orders in Crl.Misc.No.35/2019 i.e., to a tune of Rs.5,000/- is required to be enhanced to Rs.10,000/-. Family Court discussed in detail all the aspects of the case and also the contentions raised by both parties. This Court therefore does not find any grounds for interference. Petitioners failed to make out a case which entitles them to receive more than the amount that was awarded by the Family Court through the impugned order. Hence, this Court ultimately holds that there are no merits in this revision petition.

Resultantly, the revision petition stands dismissed.

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

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