



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

DHARWAD BENCH

DATED THIS THE 26TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

REVIEW PETITION NO.100050 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

SRI. NAZEER HUSSAIN
S/O HONNUR SAB,
AGE: 49 YEARS,
OCC: N.E.K.R.T.C. BUS DRIVER,
GANGAVATHI DEPOT,
R/O GANGAVATHI TALUQ,
KOPPAL DISTRICT-583 227.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. MAHANTESH R. PATIL, ADVOCATE FOR
SRI. H.N. GULARADDI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SMT. P NOORJAHAN ALIAS RAJAMMA
W/O FORMER H. NAZEER HUSSAIN,
AGE: 37 YEARS, OCC: HOUSEWIFE,
R/O KATEGUDDA, BALLARI-583 101.

...RESPONDENT

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 114
READ WITH ORDER XLVII RULE (1) OF CPC, PRAYING TO
REVIEW THE ORDER DATED 26.03.2025 PASSED IN RPFC
NO.100126/2022 AND PASS NECESSARY ORDERS FOR
RE-CONSIDERATION OF THE ABOVE MATTER ON GROUNDS
URGED IN THE RPFC NO.100126/2022.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR FINAL HEARING, THIS
DAY, THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:





CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE E.S.INDIRESH

ORAL ORDER

This review petition is preferred by the petitioner in RPFC No.100126/2022, seeking review of the order passed by this Court dated 26.03.2025.

2. It is argued by Sri Mahantesh R. Patil, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Sri H. N. Gularaddi, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that, a compromise has been entered into between the parties in O.S.No.06/2014 before the Family Court, Bellary and the same has not been brought to the notice of this Court while arguing the matter in RPFC No.100126/2022 and accordingly, sought for review of the order dated 26.03.2025 in RPFC No.100126/2022.

3. In the light of the submission made by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, I have perused the order dated 10.08.2022 in Criminal Misc. No.19/2021, wherein the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Ballari has granted the monthly maintenance of Rs.7,500/- to the



respondent-wife and also imposed the litigation cost of Rs.10,000/- towards the proceedings therein. This Court, after considering the material on record and also the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Ramesh Chander Kaushal Vs. Mrs. Veena Kaushal And Others*** reported in ***AIR 1978 SC 1807***, dismissed the petition filed by the petitioner-husband on the ground that, the award of maintenance is for the sustenance of the wife.

4. In that view of the matter, taking into consideration the scope and ambit of Section 125 of Cr.P.C. and also the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Shamima Farooqui v Shahid Khan*** reported in ***AIR 2015 SC 2025***, I am of the view that, no interference is called for in the judgment dated 100126/2022, as there is no error apparent on the face of the record. Accordingly, the review petition is ***dismissed***.

Sd/-
(E.S.INDIRESH)
JUDGE