IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 30TH DAY OF OCTOBER , 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

WRIT PETITION NO. 18267 OF 2026 (GM-FC)

BETWEEN:

SRI. RANGANATHA S.,
S/O SHIVARAMU,
AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS
R/AT FLOT 105, B BLOCK,
SINGAPURA MAIN ROAD,
NEAR AVEKSHA HOSPITAL,
VIDYARANYAPURAM,
BENGALURU-560097.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MANJUNATH M. R., ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT. SREEDEVI G. M.,
D/O MADEGOWDA
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
R/AT 1214, A BLOCK,
NEAR GANESHA TEMPLE,
SAHAKARANAGARA,
BYATARAYANAPURA,
BENGALURU-560092.

PRESENTLY:
R/AT 213, 11TH CROSS,
ARUNDATHINAGAR, CHANDRALAYOUT,
BENGALURU-560039.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SMT. JYOTHI C., ADVOCATE)

Digitally signed by AASEEFA PARVEEN
Location: HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED 26.03.2026 PASSED BY THE I ADDL. PRINCIPAL

JUDGE FAMILY COURT AT BENGALURU IN MC.NO.6687/2024, PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-A ON THE APPLICATION NO.4 FILED BY THE RESPONDENT FOR INTERIM MAINTENANCE PRODUCED AT ANNEXURE-C.

THIS PETITION, HAVING BEEN HEARD AND RESERVED FOR ORDERS ON ***08.10.2026***, COMING ON THIS DAY, PRONOUNCED THE FOLLOWING:

CORAM: HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA

CAV ORDER

This writ petition is filed seeking the Court to set aside the order that is passed by the Court of I Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Bengaluru on IA No.IV in MC No.6687/2024 dated 26.03.2026.

2. Heard Sri.Manjunath.M.R, learned counsel for the petitioner. Respondent failed to submit her contentions despite granting sufficient time.

3. Husband, as per the material available on record filed a petition under Section 11 of the Hindu Marriage Act seeking the Court to declare the marriage that was solemnized between him and the opposite party as null and void. In the said petition i.e. in MC

No.6687/2024, wife moved an interlocutory application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, which came to be numbered as IA No.IV seeking the Court to direct her husband to pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- per month towards maintenance. Family Court disposed of the said application through order dated 26.03.2026 directing husband to pay wife a sum of Rs.12,000/- per month towards interim maintenance. Aggrieved by the liability imposed, husband is before this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner/husband submits that wife suppressed her earlier marriage and married the petitioner. Indeed it was a second marriage to the petitioner/husband and third marriage to respondent/wife. Husband thought that it was a second marriage to both. Learned counsel also contended that petitioner/husband is a cardiac patient and he requires huge sum for his treatment. Further, for the loan he obtained he has to pay EMIs. Wife is a working woman. Therefore, she can maintain herself. Learned counsel also stated that though wife projected that she is suffering

from cancer, she is quite healthy as of now. Without considering these aspects, Family Court directed petitioner/husband to pay respondent/wife huge sum of Rs.12,000/- per month towards interim maintenance and therefore, this writ petition is filed. Learned counsel thereby seeks to set aside the impugned order.

5. No material is produced before this Court or before Family Court by the petitioner/husband to show that he suffers from such cardiac problem which disentitles him to do work or that he requires substantial sum for his treatment. Family Court discussed the financial status of petitioner/husband at paragraph No.13 of the impugned order. As rightly observed by the Family Court, whether respondent/wife suppressed her marital status and married the petitioner/husband is a fact to be decided at the time of final disposal of the case. Family Court taking into consideration the financial status of the parties, directed petitioner/husband to pay respondent/wife a sum of Rs.12,000/- per month towards interim maintenance. Though it is contended before this Court that

respondent/wife is also an employee, no proof is brought to the notice of this Court in support of the said submission. Therefore, this Court is of the view that there are no grounds to interfere with the well reasoned order of the Family Court.

6. Resultantly, the following:

ORDER

The writ petition is *dismissed*.

Sd/-
(DR.CHILLAKUR SUMALATHA)
JUDGE

NS
CT:TSM