



WEB COPY

CRP No. 892 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

**CRP No. 892 of 2026 and
CMP No.4806 of 2026**

S. Gayathri Devi, D/o.Sankaravadivel,
No.59, Murugesanar Street,
Chengalpattu, Kancheepuram,
Tamil Nadu 603002

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

Rajkumar S, S/o.Selvaraj,
No.A/2, Arakkonam Road,
Thirukoil Staff Quarters,
Tiruttani, Tamil Nadu 631 209

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to set aside the Impugned Fair and Decretal order dated 04.12.2025 passed in FCIA No.2 of 2025 in FCOP No.459/2024 on the file of Family Court at Chengalpet.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. M.Vijaya Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr. R.Sathish Kumar
for Ms.V. Revathy

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the order passed by the Family Court, giving visitation right to the respondent/father to have interaction with the child.



2. The respondent herein filed FCOP No.459 of 2024 seeking divorce and pending OP, he also filed FCIA No.2 of 2025 under Section 26 of Hindu Marriage Act seeking visitation rights. The said application was allowed by the Family Court, permitting the respondent to take the children for a full day outing, once in a month between 9.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. for temple visit, shopping, nursery gardens, play stations etc. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner/mother has come before this court.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has no serious objection for interaction of the respondent with the children. However, in guise of interaction, the respondent is taking the children to Tiruttani, which is nearly 85 kilometres away from Chengalpattu, wherein, the petitioner's parents are residing with him. He further submitted that taking the children to such a long distance in a single day, would cause physical inconvenience to the children. Therefore, the impugned order shall be suitably modified.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondent would submit that after passing of the impugned order, the respondent had interaction with the children twice.



WEB COPY

5. If the petitioner feels there is some inconvenience in implementation of the impugned order, it is always open to the petitioner to file an appropriate application before the concerned court seeking modification of the said order. Therefore, this court is not inclined to interfere with the order passed by the Family Court.

6. Accordingly, this civil revision petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to move the concerned court seeking modification of the order, if she so advised. There shall be no order as to costs. Connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

24-02-2026

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

MST

To

The Family Court Judge,
Chengalpattu.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 892 of 2



S.SOUNTHAR, J.

MST

CRP No. 892 of 2026

24-02-2026