



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S VISHWAJITH SHETTY

CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION NO. 1888 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

1. SRI PUTTASWAMIGOWDA,
S/O CHANNEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 70 YEARS,
2. SMT.CHIKKATHAYAMMA,
W/O PUTTASWAMIGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,
3. SMT. VENKATALAKSHMAMMA,
W/O PUTTASWAMIGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS,

ALL ARE RESIDING AT:
BRAHAMANIPURA VILLAGE,
LALAGHATTA POST, KASABA HOBLI,
CHANNAPATNA TALUK,
RAMANAGARA-562 160



...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. RAVISHA M G, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. SMT. VINUTHA B.S.,
D/O LATE SUBBEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS,



2. MASTER. SUMANGOWDA,
D/O P.RAJU,
AGED ABOUT 14 YEARS,
3. MASTER. LALITHGOWDA,
S/O SIDDIAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 11 YEARS,
(RESPONDENT NOS.2 AND 3 ARE MINORS
THEY ARE REPRESENTED BY THEIR NEXT
FRIEND/GUARDIAN MOTHER I.E., RESPONDENT
NO.1)

R/AT BELAKERE VILLAGE,
MALURU HOBLI, CHANNAPATNA TALUK,
RAMANAGARA-562 160.

4. SRI.P.RAJU,
S/O PUTTASWAMIGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
R/AT BRAHAMANIPURA VILLAGE,
LALAGHATTA POST, KASABA HOBLI,
CHANNAPATNA TALUK,
RAMANAGARA-562 160.

5. SMT.BHAGYA,
W/O SHIVAKUMAR.V.L,
AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,

6. SRI.SHIVAKUMAR.V.L,
S/O LINGEGOWDA,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,

RESPONDENT NOS.5 AND 6 ARE
R/AT NO.30242, SATHANURU ROAD,
BESIDE TO MAHADESHWARA TEMPLE,



SUNNAGHATTA, CHANNAPATNA TOWN AND TALUK,
RAMANAGARA-562 160.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. VIJAY KUMAR T, ADVOCATE FOR R1,
R2 AND 3 ARE MINORS REPRESENTED BY R1,
SRI. B ROOPESHA, ADVOCATE FOR R4,
SRI. LOKESH K.S., ADVOCATE FOR R5 AND 6)

THIS CRL.RP IS FILED U/S. 397 R/W 401 CR.P.C BY THE
ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER PRAYING THAT THIS HONBLE
COURT MAY BE PLEASED TO A. SET ASIDE THE ORDER DATED
22.11.2025 PASSED IN CRL.A NO.9/2024 BY THE
PRL.DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, RAMANAGARA TO THE
EXTENT OF RESIDENTIAL ORDER I.E., DOCUMENT NO.1 AND
ETC.,

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S VISHWAJITH SHETTY

ORAL ORDER

Petitioners are before this Court in this Criminal Revision
Petition filed under Section 397 read with Section 401 of
Cr.P.C. with a prayer to set aside the judgment and order dated
31.01.2024 passed in Crl.Misc.No.60/2021 by the Principal Civil
Judge (J.R.) and JMFC, Channapatna and the Judgment and
Order dated 22.11.2025 passed in Crl.A.9/2024 by the Principal
District and Sessions Judge and Ramanagara.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.



3. Respondent Nos.1 to 3 herein had initiated proceedings against respondent No.4 and the petitioners herein before the jurisdictional Magistrate under Section 12(1) of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act,2005 in Crl.Misc.No.60/2021. The learned magistrate, by judgment and order dated 30.01.2024, partly-allowed Crl.Misc.No.60/2021. The said judgment and order dated 30.01.2024 passed in Crl.Misc.No.60/2021 was assailed by the petitioners, who were arrayed as respondent Nos.2 to 4 therein, by filing Crl.A.No.9/2024 before the Principal District and Sessions Judge and Ramanagara, under Section 29 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. The said appeal was dismissed by the Appellate Court by judgment and order dated 22.11.2025. It is under these circumstances the petitioners are before this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are the in-laws of respondent No.1, who is the wife of respondent No.4 herein. Though there is no order passed by the learned Magistrate against the petitioners, attempt is being made to execute the orders even as against the petitioners. It



is under these circumstances, the petitioners are before this court.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 to 3 has argued in support of the impugned order and has prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. Perusal of the material on record will go to show that the learned magistrate has partly-allowed Crl.Misc.No.60/2024 and has directed respondent No.4 herein, who is the husband of respondent No.1 and father of respondent Nos.2 and 3, to pay monthly maintenance and also to provide residential accommodation to respondent Nos.1 to 3 herein, who are the petitioners in Crl.Misc.No.60/2024.

7. There is no order or direction passed against the present petitioners by the learned Magistrate in Crl.Misc.No.60/2021, which was partly-allowed on 30.01.2024. Under the circumstances, the petitioners cannot have any grievance against the order passed by the learned Magistrate in Crl.Misc.No.60/2021, wherein respondent No.4 has been directed to pay monthly maintenance to respondent Nos.1 to 3 and also to provide residential accommodation to them.



8. Under these circumstances, this Criminal revision petition does not merit consideration and accordingly, the same is ***dismissed***.

9. It is needless to state that respondent Nos.1 to 3 shall not take any coercive steps against the petitioners in the guise of executing the order passed by the learned Magistrate in Crl.Misc.No.60/2021 dated 30.01.2024.

10. This order will not come in the way of respondent Nos.1 to 3 herein, executing the aforesaid order passed by the learned Magistrate as against respondent No.4 herein.

Sd/-
(S VISHWAJITH SHETTY)
JUDGE

SMC
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 35