



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 22ND DAY OF APRIL, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V SRISHANANDA

CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION NO. 175 OF 2026

BETWEEN:

HARI NATARAJAN,
AGED 46 YEARS
S/O M. NATARAJAN,
R/AT NO.A/503, JASMINE TOWER,
VASANT VIHAR,
THANE(W) - 400 601

...PETITIONER

(BY SMT. MEGHANA SHETTY, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. R. MURALIDHARAN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT. CHITHRUBINI HARI,
AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS
C/O SHRI. SUBRAMANIAN,
R/AT HOUSE NO.8/3,
PATALAMMA TEMPLE STREET,
NEXT TO A.V. HOSPITAL,
OPPOSITE STATE BANK OF INDIA,
NEAR ARUMUGAM CIRCLE,
BASAVANAGUDI, BENGALURU- 560 004
FOR HERSELF AND HER MINOR SON NITIN

...RESPONDENT

THIS CRL.RP IS FILED U/S 397 R/W 401 CR.PC (FILED
U/S 438 R/W 442 BNSS) BY THE ADVOCATE FOR THE
PETITIONER PRAYING THAT THIS HONOURABLE COURT MAY





BE PLEASED TO A) SET ASIDE THE JUDGMENT DATED 27.10.2025 PASSED BY THE COURT OF THE LEARNED SESSIONS JUDGE, BENGALURU IN CRL.A.NO.1784/2023.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V SRISHANANDA

ORAL ORDER

1. Heard Ms. Meghana Shetty for Sri. R. Muralidharan, learned counsel for the revision petitioner.

2. Respondent-husband in C.Misc. No.138/2017 is the revision petitioner, challenging the Order of the First Appellate Court insofar imposing cost of Rs.20,0000/- while allowing his appeal in CrI.A.No.1784/2023 and remitting the matter to the Magistrate for fresh consideration.

3. Having heard the counsel for petitioner, wherein it is tried to be emphasized and impressed upon this Court that delay has not occasioned on account of the revision



petitioner in disposing of the criminal appeal, imposition of the cost of Rs.20,000/- is incorrect.

4. This Court bestowed its attention to the relevant aspects of the matter including the order sheet that has been placed on record.

5. Admittedly, the request of the revision petitioner is allowed to permit him to lead evidence which he failed to do before the Trial Magistrate and matter was ordered to be decided afresh.

6. While considering the relevant aspects of the matter, learned Judge in the First Appellate Court has also taken note of the fact that delay has occasioned on account of the conduct of the revision petitioner.

7. In fact delay is not in disposing of the Criminal Appeal as is sought to be impressed upon this Court. But delay is attributable for conduct of the revision petitioner in not proceeding with the case before the Trial Magistrate diligently.



8. The same is found from the discussion of the learned Judge in the First Appellate Court in the impugned order.

9. Therefore, this Court does not find any good reasons to admit the revision petition for further consideration.

10. Accordingly, following order:

ORDER

Criminal Revision Petition is ***dismissed***.

**Sd/-
(V SRISHANANDA)
JUDGE**

SNC
List No.: 2 SI No.: 35