



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 27TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TYAGARAJA N. INAVALLY

REV.PET FAMILY COURT NO.200100 OF 2025

BETWEEN:

VIKAS S/O IRANNA TEGGELI,
AGE: 38 YEARS, OCC:MANAGER,
AT FORD MOTOR COMPANY, CHENNAI,
R/O. SECTOR NO.62, PLOT NO.31,
NAVANAGAR, BAGALKOT,
DIST. BAGALKOT-587 101.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. HARSHAVARDHAN R. MALIPATIL, ADVOCATE)

AND:

SOUMYA W/O VIKAS TEGGELI,]
AGE:34 YEARS, OCC:NIL,
R/O. C/O. SHETAGAR,
NEAR AL-AMEEN MEDICAL COLLEGE,
ATHANI ROAD, TQ. AND
DIST. VIJAYAPURA-586 101.

...RESPONDENT

(BY SRI. S.S. HALALLI, ADVOCATE)

THIS REVISION PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION
19 (4) OF FAMILY COURT ACT, PRAYING TO ALLOW THIS
PETITION WITH COSTS AND SET SIDE THE ORDER OF
LEARNED 1ST ADDL. PRL. JUDGE FAMILY COURT AT



VIJAYAPUR DATED 19.07.2024 IN CRL.MISC.NO.496 OF 2022 AND CONSEQUENTLY DISMISSED THE SAID CRL. MISC. PETITION FILED BY THE RESPONDENT HEREIN, IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TYAGARAJA N. INAVALLY

ORAL ORDER

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and also the learned counsel for the respondent. Perused the relevant materials on record.

2. There is delay of 274 days in filing the petition. The petitioner has filed application IA No.1/2025 under Section 5 of Limitation Act praying for condoning the delay in filing the application.

3. The petitioner has filed his affidavit along with application and for the reasons stated therein, he has prayed for condoning the delay in filing the petition.



4. The learned counsel for the respondent has filed statement of objection in detail submitting that there is inordinate delay of 274 days in filing the application and there is no reason or explanation for the delay in filing the petition. Hence, for the reasons mentioned in the objection in detail, the learned counsel for the respondent has sought for dismissal of the application.

5. The respondent has filed petition before the Family Court, Vijayapura (the trial Court) under Section 125 of Cr.PC praying for an order to direct the petitioner to pay her maintenance of Rs.50,000/- per month.

6. The petitioner being respondent has appeared and filed objection to the petition. There is no dispute regarding relationship of the parties. Hence, the material on record show that the petition aware of the fact of disposal of the petition before the trial Court.



7. The contention of the petitioner in the affidavit filed along with application is that the respondent filed petition in RPFC No.200106/2024 for enhancement of the maintenance amount and such being the case the petitioner under the belief that he can agitate his challenge in the said petition and only to award technical defect in not challenging the maintenance awarded by the Family Court in the petition, he has filed the present petition. This would clearly show that actually the petitioner had no intention of challenging the impugned order of the Family Court. Therefore, there is no sufficient cause made out by the petitioner to condone the delay in filing the application. Hence, the application filed for condoning the delay in filing the petition is liable to be dismissed.

8. In the result, IA No.2/2025 filed by the petitioner is rejected.



NC: 2026:KHC-K:2785
RPFC No. 200100 of 2025

9. Consequently, this petition is dismissed as
barred by limitation.

Sd/-
(TYAGARAJA N. INAVALLY)
JUDGE

SMP
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 23
CT: SB