



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1812 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRL RC No. 1812 of 2025

1. Roopini R

D/o.Radhakrishnan, 47/11, 3rd Floor,
Atchaya Apartments, Alwarpet Street,
Alwarpet, Teynampet, Chennai-600
018.

2. Minor Shreeyas R

S/o.R.Roopini and Prashanth Ramesh,
47/11, 3rd Floor, Atchaya Apartments,
Alwarpet Street, Alwarpet, Teynampet,
Chennai-600 018.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Prashanth Ramesh

S/o.Ramesh Thangaswami, No.301,
Spencer Apartments, 6AM-304, HRBR
Layout 2nd Block, Kalyan Nagar,
Bangalore-560 043. And at New No.11,
Old No.6, 11th Cross Street, Indira
Nagar, Adyar, Chennai-600 020.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 442 of BNSS, 2023, prays to allow this Criminal Revision Case, call for the records and enhance the interim -Maintenance awarded in the fair and decretal order passed in MP.No.1805 of 2024 in MC.No.204 of 2024 dated 11.06.2025 pending on the file of the Learned VII Additional Family Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1812 of 2025



For Petitioner(s): Mr.V.Chethana

For Respondent(s): Mr.V.Anuradha
for Mr.T.Surendran

ORDER

Challenging the order passed by the learned VII Additional Family Judge, in MP.No.1805 of 2024 in MC.No.204 of 2024 dated 11.06.2025, the petitioner has preferred this revision seeking enhancement of maintenance.

2. Before the Trial Court, the 1st petitioner filed an application claiming interim maintenance for herself and the minor son in M.C. No. 204 of 2024. The said application was objected to by the respondent/husband. On considering the submissions of both sides, the Trial Court dismissed the claim for the wife on the ground that she has a source of income. With regard to the minor son, the Trial Court granted a sum of Rs.7,500/- per month. Aggrieved by the quantum, the petitioner has filed the present revision seeking enhancement.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the parties were



residing at Bangalore and the respondent is earning a considerable income, having been employed as an Executive Officer. Without considering the cost of living in Bangalore, the Trial Court granted only Rs.7,500/-, which is meagre. Hence, he prayed for enhancement. He further submitted that she reserves her right to contest the claim of maintenance for the wife in the main petition. As per the direction of this Court, the first petitioner and the respondent appeared before this Court.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent submitted that the respondent is presently unemployed. However, he is willing to bear the educational expenses of the minor son, provided the necessary bills and particulars are produced.

5. Considering the submissions of both sides, and taking into account the admitted fact that the petitioners are residing at Bangalore, this Court is of the view that Rs.7,500/- is insufficient for the second petitioner. Therefore, this Court is inclined to enhance the maintenance for the second petitioner to Rs.15,000/- per month.

6. As on date, a divorce petition is also pending before the learned VII Family Judge along with M.C.No. 204 of 2024, in which the first petitioner has filed a counter claim seeking permanent alimony. Therefore, liberty is granted to



both parties to work out their remedies before the Family Court along with M.C. No. 204 of 2024.

WEB COPY

7. With regard to arrears, the respondent is directed to pay the enhanced maintenance arrears for the period from April 2024 to November 2025. The arrears shall be paid within twelve (12) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, into the account of the first petitioner.

8. During the submissions, due to ill health, the first petitioner appeared through video conference. The respondent, who is the father of the minor child, submitted before this Court that he was not permitted to meet the minor son and has been unable to see him. Therefore, visitation rights were considered.

9. The learned counsel for the respondent submitted that they have always been willing to produce the child in compliance with visitation orders and have no hesitation in allowing the father to see the child. However, the first petitioner raised an objection that, during visitation, the child should not be kept in the company of the respondent's female friends. This objection was considered by this Court. The respondent fairly submitted that he wishes to spend time only



with his child and not with any other person. This assurance is recorded.

WEB COPY

10. The respondent is entitled to visitation with his son on the first Saturday of every English calendar month, from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. During this time, he shall be with the child alone or in the presence of his parents, and not in the company of any other person. At 4:00 p.m., he shall hand over the child to the first petitioner at the Family Court, Bangalore.

11. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is disposed of.

27-11-2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
rri



To

- 1.Prashanth Ramesh
S/o.Ramesh Thangaswami, No.301,
Spencer Apartments, 6AM-304, HRBR
Layout 2nd Block, Kalyan Nagar,
Bangalore-560 043. And at New No.11,
Old No.6, 11th Cross Street, Indira
Nagar, Adyar, Chennai-600 020.
- 2.The VII Additional Family Court,
Chennai.
- 3.The Family Court, Bangalore.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1812 of 2025



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.
rri

**CRL RC No. 1812 of
2025**

27-11-2025