



C.M.A(MD)No.299 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 23.01.2026

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

C.M.A(MD)No.299 of 2025

Anandakumar

... Appellant/Petitioner

-VS-

Dhavamani

... Respondent/Respondent

PRAYER: Civil Miscellaneous Appeal filed under Section 19 of the Family Court Act, to modify the Judgment and Decree made in G.W.O.P.No.100 of 2024 dated 11.12.2024 on the file of the Family Court, Karur by allowing the Civil Miscellaneous Appeal.

For Appellant : Mr.I.Velpradeep

For Respondent : Mr.K.Suresh



C.M.A(MD)No.299 of 2025

WEB COPY

JUDGMENT

**(Judgment of the Court was delivered by
G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.)**

This Civil Miscellaneous Appeal has been preferred as against the Judgment and Decree passed in G.W.O.P.No.100 of 2024 dated 11.12.2024, on the file of the Family Court, Karur, whereby the petition filed by the appellant was partly allowed.

2.Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed on record.

3.The appellant filed a petition seeking visitation right once a week until the child attains majority and also sought permission to make video calls to speak with the child. The appellant married the respondent on 31.08.2020 and a male child was born on 12.07.2023. However, due to misunderstanding, they separated and the respondent is now living separately with the male child. The



C.M.A(MD)No.299 of 2025

WEB COPY

respondent also lodged a complaint as against the appellant, which was registered in Crime No.11 of 2023 on the file of the Inspector of Police, K.Paramathi All Women Police Station, Karur.

4.In order to prove the claim, the appellant examined himself as P.W.1 and marked Exs.P1 to P.5. On the side of the respondent, no witness was examined and Ex.D.1 was marked.

5.On perusal of the oral and documentary evidence, the Trial Court partly allowed the petition and permitted the appellant to visit his child on alternative Sundays in the month, but refused permission for the appellant to speak with the child through video calls. Aggrieved by the same, the present appeal has been preferred by the appellant.

6.The learned counsel appearing for the appellant submitted that though the Trial Court permitted the appellant to visit



C.M.A(MD)No.299 of 2025

his minor child, it failed to fix the time for such visitation. Further, the appellant seeks visitation rights once in a week and permission to make video calls to the minor child.

7.The learned counsel appearing for the respondent submitted that the respondent has no objection to the appellant visiting at any time on alternative Sundays. However, since the child is only aged about 2-1/2 years, it would be very difficult for the child to communicate through video calls.

8.In view of the above, the appellant is permitted to visit the minor child at the residence of the respondent on alternative Sundays in a month from 02.00 p.m., to 07.00 p.m. He is also permitted to bring toys and eatables for the minor child. Since the child is only aged about 2-1/2 years, it is not feasible for the child to communicate through video calls.



C.M.A(MD)No.299 of 2025

WEB COPY

9.With the above directions, this Civil Miscellaneous

Appeal is disposed of. No costs.

**[G.K.I.J.] & [R.P.J.,]
23.01.2026**

NCC :Yes/No
Index :Yes/No
Internet :Yes
ps

To

1.The Judge,
Family Court,
Karur.

2.The Record Keeper (Vernacular Records),
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



C.M.A(MD)No.299 of 2025

G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.
AND
R. POORNIMA, J.

ps

C.M.A(MD)No.299 of 2025

23.01.2026