2026 INSC 623

REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Civil Appeal No(s). 8212-8213 OF 2026
(Arising out of SLP (C) No.34898-34899 of 2014)

GOPALAKRISHNA SURAPANENI — **APPELLANT(s)**

VERSUS

ANURADHA SURPANENI MAIDEN — **RESPONDENT(s)**

O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Leave granted.

3. The appellant is also present in person. The respondent has joined the proceedings through virtual mode.

4. The appellant has moved the Court against the order impugned by which the High Court has upheld the dismissal of the petition filed by the appellant before the Family Court seeking divorce from the respondent-wife.

Learned Senior counsel for the appellant submitted that the

parties are living separately since the year 2003 and despite his efforts, they could not be reunited. It was submitted that the conduct of the respondent-wife right from the beginning has been one of harassment towards the appellant for the reason that when both of them were living abroad, she started making wild and scandalous allegations against him due to which, ultimately, the appellant lost his job and had to relocate to India to live with his parents at Hyderabad. It was submitted that due to the constant harassment faced, the family had moved to Andhra Pradesh, after selling the Hyderabad residence. Thereafter, the father of the appellant has died and he is living with his mother at the house of his sister after coming back to Hyderabad, as he has no permanent residence/house of his own, or in the name of his parents, as the house of the parents of the appellant was sold in Hyderabad and they shifted to Andhra Pradesh and the money which they got from the sale was used for the treatment of the father of the appellant who later on passed away.

6. It was contended that in such background, the appellant has now realized that he has no future with the respondent-wife and has gone on the path of self-realization and does not want his peace to be disturbed at this juncture in life. It was submitted that after the separation, he has given more than Rs.

40,00,000/- (Rupees Forty Lakhs) to the respondent-wife for her and their daughter's upkeep. Further, it was contended that in terms of the earlier order of this Court, Rs. 68,00,000/- (Rupees Sixty Eight Lakhs) has been deposited in the Registry of the Court, which now has increased due to accumulation of interest to approximately Rs. 75,00,000/- (Rupees Seventy Five Lakhs). On a query of the Court as to what would be the quantum he would be ready to further give to the respondent-wife by way of a one-time permanent settlement, upon instructions, learned counsel for the appellant submitted that initially the amount indicated to him was Rs. 40,00,000/- (Rupees Forty Lakhs), but now the appellant has agreed to a sum of Rs. 60,00,000/- (Rupees Sixty Lakhs).

7. On a query as to whether the appellant contends that he should be made free of any responsibility towards the daughter who is not before us, he fairly submits that the rights of the daughter *qua* the father, including that on his estate/ancestral properties would not be diminished and further that he would also pitch in with his contribution at the time of the marriage of his daughter.

8. The respondent appearing in person vehemently opposed the prayer seeking divorce. It was contended that the issues raised by the appellant are frivolous and in fact fictitious as no

such incident occurred. It was further contended that the respondent is totally opposed to grant of divorce, more so because of societal pressure. On a query of the Court as to what were her real differences, when clearly relationships cannot be restored between the parties by passing of orders and the Court was of the tentative opinion that the marriage has irretrievably broken down, the respondent-wife could not come up with any satisfactory explanation.

9. With regard to the quantum of the money being offered by the appellant to the respondent, the respondent was not ready to accept the fact that this would be by way of a permanent settlement in terms of a divorce granted to the parties.

10. The Court thus, was left in a peculiar situation where it had to take a call as to whether interference was required or not. The Court may indicate here that in such matters and at a juncture where the stance of the parties are absolutely hard and totally inflexible, the Court has to take a hard decision which may not be acceptable to both the parties. However, the Court has to look at the matter objectively, more so, for the reason that both the parties have a life ahead which it is for them to choose how they want to spend and forcing a relationship, that too of husband and wife, cannot be done by judicial proceedings. The Court thus has taken a very realistic

view in the matter and going by what has been stated above, has come to the conclusion that the marriage between the parties being dead for all practical purposes has to be nullified.

11. Accordingly, exercising our power/jurisdiction under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, we grant a decree of divorce to the parties on the ground of irretrievable breakdown of marriage. Registry to prepare the decree accordingly.

12. However, the said grant of divorce is subject to the appellant paying/transferring an amount of Rs. 60,00,000/- (Rupees Sixty Lakhs) in favour of the respondent-wife within two months from today, as has been undertaken before the Court and proof thereof be filed before this Court. The amount lying with the Registry of Rs. 68,00,000/- (Rupees Sixty Eight Lakhs) along with whatever interest may have accrued in the interregnum be paid to the respondent by the Registry upon completion of the required formalities within two weeks from today.

13. We also record that their daughter, who is not before us, shall not be denuded of her rights which are crystallized due to her being the biological daughter of the appellant. Further, we also record that the appellant has agreed that he would also contribute his share in the marriage of the daughter whenever the same takes place.

14. As we have been informed that there is one case filed by the appellant which is pending at Hyderabad being FCA No.93 of 2019, the same stands quashed.

15. The appeals stand allowed in the aforementioned terms.

16. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
(AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH)

.....J.
(R. MAHADEVAN)

NEW DELHI
May 27, 2026.

ITEM NO.80 COURT NO.13 SECTION III-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 34898-34899/2014

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 26-09-2014in FCA No. 16/2007 26-09-2014 in FCA No. 22/2007 passed by the HighCourt of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad]

GOPALAKRISHNA SURAPANENI Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

ANURADHA SURPANENI MAIDEN Respondent(s)

[FOR ORDERS]
IA No. 1/2014 - APP FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS
IA No. 5/2015 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.
IA No. 29297/2024 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES
IA No. 3/2014 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES

Date : 27-05-2026 These matters were called for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AoR
Ms. Kanishka Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Respondent-in-person

O R D E R

Leave granted.

2. Appeals stand allowed in terms of the reportable signed order.

3. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SACHIN KUMAR SRIVASTAVA)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(ANJALI PANWAR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed order is placed on the file)