

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE B.KEMAL PASHA

TUESDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/12TH KARTHIKA, 1937

Tr.P(CrI.).No. 73 of 2015 ()

MC 195/2015 of FAMILY COURT, KOLLAM

PETITIONER/RESPONDENT :

**SIBIKUMAR, AGED 35 YEARS,
S/O. SUKUMARAN, NO. 77, THODIYIL VEEDU,
KADAPPAKKADA, KOLLAM**

BY ADV. SRI.SASTHAMANGALAM S. AJITHKUMAR

RESPONDENT/PETITIONER :

**SHIMA M.S, AGED 28 YEARS,
D/O. MOHAN KUMAR, NARAYANA VILASOM, PATHAMKALLU
NEDUMANGAD VILLAGE, MANCH, NEDUMANGAD 695 541**

BY ADV. SRI.R.NIKHIL

**THIS TRANSFER PETITION (CRIMINAL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 03-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

bp

B. KEMAL PASHA, J.

.....
Tr.P.(Crl.) No.73 of 2015 B
.....

Dated this the 3rd day of November, 2015

ORDER

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

The respondent in M.C.195/2015 of the Family Court, Kollam is the petitioner herein. He seeks for the transfer of the case from the Family Court, Kollam to the Family Court, Nedumangad for trial and disposal. According to the petitioner, he is a resident of Kollam, whereas, the respondent is a resident of Nedumangad, where she is working.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondent.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent has pointed out that this is a pressure tactics being adopted by the petitioner to see that the respondent is leaving her claim for maintenance. It has been pointed out that the respondent is a resident of Nedumangad and her relatives

and neighbours are working at the courts at Nedumangad. The difference of opinion between the petitioner and the respondent is not known to the neighbours and relatives of the respondent and that is the reason why she has opted to file the said case before the Family Court, Kollam.

4. It has also been pointed out that the petitioner is working in Haryana. Especially when he is a resident of Kollam, who is working in Haryana, he is not in any way affected in the matter. It is convenient for him to have the matter agitated before the Family Court, Kollam. There is every possibility to believe that this is a pressure tactics adopted by the petitioner to see that the respondent is leaving her claim for maintenance. Matters being so, this Tr.P.(Crl.) is only to be dismissed and I do so.

In the result, this Tr.P.(Crl.) is dismissed.

Sd/-
(B.KEMAL PASHA, JUDGE)

aks/03/11

// True Copy //

PA to Judge