



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF JUNE, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO. 318 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SRI. RAMRAJA M ASRANI
SO. LATE MANOHAR LAL ASRANI,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
R/AT PLOT NO.218. FLAT NO.205.,
KRISHNA PLAZA APARTMENT.
NEAR JAWAHAR PARK, LADAKGUNJ,
NAGPUR-440 008.
MAHARASHTRA.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ANIL RAMACHANDRA, ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed **AND:**

by AASEEFA
PARVATHI

Location:
HIGH COURT
OF
KARNATAKA

1. SMT. SAKSHI R ASRANI @ SANTOSH
W/O.RAMRAJA M ASRANI
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
2. MISS.KRIPA
D/O. RAMRAJA M. ASRANI
AGED ABOUT 14 YEARS,
3. MASTER.DEVASHISH
S/O. RAMRAJA M ASRANI
AGED ABOUT 12 YEARS



BOTH R2 AND R3 ARE REPRESENTED BY
NATURAL GUARDIAN
SAKSHI R. ASRANI,
ALL ARE R/AT NO.22/3/9,
THE OBALD ROAD,
K LINGAIAH COLONY,
NAZARBAD,
MYSURU-570010.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. M.R.SURAYA KUMAR, ADVOCATE FOR R1 (ABSENT);
R2-AND R3 ARE MINORS REP. BY R1)

THIS RPFC FILED UNDER SEC.19(4) OF THE FAMILY
COURTS ACT., AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 14.08.2025
PASSED IN CrI.Misc NO.848/2023 ON THE FILE OF I
ADDITIONAL PRINCIPAL JUDGE, FAMILY COURT, MYSURU,
PARTLY ALLOWING THE PETITION FILED UNDER SEC.125 OF
Cr.P.C., FOR 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

Sri.Anil Ramachandra, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted his contentions on the merits of the matter on 04.06.2026. There was no representation on respondents' side on that day. To give fair opportunity to the respondents to make their submission, the case was adjourned. Even on 16.06.2026 there was no representation on respondents' side. Therefore, the matter was ordered to be listed on this day under the caption 'for dictating the orders' and accordingly, the matter is listed.

2. Challenge in this revision petition is the order that is rendered by the Court of I Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Mysuru in Crl.Misc.No.848/2023 dated 14.08.2025. First respondent being the wife, second respondent being the minor daughter and third respondent being the minor son of the petitioner herein filed a case seeking the Court to direct the petitioner to pay respondent No.1/wife a sum of Rs.48,550/- per month and respondent Nos.2 and 3, a sum of Rs.90,417/- per month



towards maintenance besides Rs.2,00,000/- towards litigation expenses. Family Court through the impugned order directed petitioner to pay respondent No.1 a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month and respondent Nos.2 and 3 a sum of Rs.5,000/- each per month towards their maintenance. Family Court also directed the petitioner to pay entire educational expenses of respondent Nos.2 and 3. Aggrieved by the order thus passed, the revision petitioner is before this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner worked as Finance Commission Agent for some time. Subsequently, he stopped working. Petitioner has got no source of earnings. Further he has to look after his aged mother. Learned counsel also submitted that petitioner filed G & WC No.14/2024 seeking custody of the children i.e., respondent Nos.2 and 3 herein. The Court of I Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Mysuru passed orders on 06.01.2026 directing respondent No.1/wife to hand over the custody of respondent Nos.2 and 3 to the



petitioner herein. However, till now such custody was not handed over. Learned counsel thereby seeks to allow this revision petition.

4. Though petitioner took a plea that he encashed the amount kept in deposit i.e. Rs.5,00,000/- and handed over the same to respondent No.1/wife, no proof was produced by him to establish that fact. It is not the version of petitioner that due to any ill-health or due to any sufficient cause he stopped working as Commission Agent. Also there is no material on record to show that respondent No.1 has got her own source of earnings. Therefore, liability vests upon the petitioner to maintain the respondents. However, respondents failed in their attempt to establish the earnings of the petitioner. Therefore, this Court is of the view that the sum granted towards maintenance in favour of the respondents is excessive and unjustifiable. This Court is of the view that petitioner can be directed to pay respondent No.1/wife a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month and respondent Nos.2 and 3



a sum of Rs.4,000/- each per month. Hence, this Court considers desirable to dispose of the revision petition accordingly.

5. Thus the following:

ORDER

- (i) The revision petition is *allowed in part*.
- (ii) The order that is rendered by the Court of I Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Mysuru in CrI.Misc.No.848/2023 dated 14.08.2025 is modified.
- (iii) Petitioner is directed to pay respondent No.1 a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards her maintenance. Such amount shall be paid till her lifetime or until this order is modified by the competent Court.
- (iv) Petitioner shall also pay respondent Nos.2 and 3 a sum of Rs.4,000/- each per month towards their maintenance.
- (v) So far as respondent No.2 is concerned, such amount shall be paid till the date of



her marriage or till she becomes financially independent.

- (vi) Maintenance ordered to be paid to respondent No.3 shall be paid till he attains the age of majority.
- (vii) Further petitioner shall bear and pay entire educational expenses of respondent Nos.2 and 3.
- (viii) The revision petition is accordingly disposed of.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE