

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY

TRANSFER C.M.P.No.57 of 2015

ORDER:

This petition is filed under Section 24 of C.P.C., to withdraw O.P.No.321 of 2014 from the file of the Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar and transfer the same to the file of the Family Court at Visakhapatnam.

2. A perusal of the record reveals that on 06.02.2015, this Court permitted the petitioner to take out personal notice to the respondent by registered post with acknowledgment due. In pursuance thereof, notice has been sent to the respondent and the same was returned with postal endorsement "no such person in this address. Returned to sender". For better clarification, the address furnished by the respondent in O.P.No.321 of 2014 filed by him on the file of the Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar and the address to which the petitioner sent notice are furnished in the following table:

Address mentioned by the respondent in his O.P.	Address to which the petitioner sent notice by post
Mr. Appala Venkata Ravi Kumar Giduthuri, S/o. G.Govinda Rao, aged 35 years, Occ: Private Employee, R/o. H.No.3394, First Floor, Road No.5, New MIG, Phase-II, BHEL, Lingampally, Hyderabad.	Gidhuthuri Appala Venkata Ravi Kumar, S/o. G.Govinda Rao, R/o. H.No.3394, First Floor, Road No.5, New MIG, Phase-II, BHEL, Lingampally, Hyderabad.

From the above table, it is clear that the notice was sent to the correct address of the respondent, as mentioned in O.P.No.321 of 2014 filed by him against the petitioner herein on the file of the Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar.

3. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner has drawn my attention to the decision in **AJEET SEEDS LTD. v. K.GOPALA KRISHNAIAH** at Paras-9 and 10, it is held as follows:

9. This Court has already held that when a notice is sent by registered post and is returned with a postal endorsement 'refused' or 'not available in the house' or 'house locked' or 'shop closed' or 'addressee not in station', due service has to be presumed.

(Vide *Jagdish Singh v. Natthu Singh, State of M.P. v. Hiralal* and *V. Raja Kumari v. P. Subbarama Naidu*.) It is, therefore, manifest that in view of the presumption available under Section 27 of the Act, it is not necessary to aver in the complaint under Section 138 of the Act that service of notice was evaded by the accused or that the accused had a role to play in the return of the notice unserved.”

10. It is thus clear that Section 114 of the Evidence Act enables the Court to presume that in the common course of natural events, the communication would have been delivered at the address of the addressee. Section 27 of the GC Act gives rise to a presumption that service of notice has been effected when it is sent to the correct address by registered post. It is not necessary to aver in the complaint that in spite of the return of the notice unserved, it is deemed to have been served or that the addressee is deemed to have knowledge of the notice. Unless and until the contrary is proved by the addressee, service of notice is deemed to have been effected at the time at which the letter would have been delivered in the ordinary course of business.”

4. As per the principle enunciated in the above decisions, when a notice has been sent to the correct address of the party and the same has been returned with an endorsement that “no such person in this address. Returned to sender”, it amounts to service of notice. The facts of the case on hand are almost identical to the facts of the cases cited supra.

5. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in the cases cited supra, I am of the considered view that the notice is deemed to have been served on the respondent. Since the respondent did not make appearance, after duly served with notice in this petition, the matter can be decided on merits in the absence of the respondent

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the material available on record.

7. The marriage of the petitioner was performed with the respondent on 28.11.2009 at Rajahmundry, as per Hindu Rites and Caste Custom. Immediately after the marriage, the petitioner joined the respondent to lead marital life. Out of lawful wedlock, they were blessed with a son on 12.08.2011. The respondent filed O.P.No.321 of 2014 on the file of the Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar for dissolution of marriage between him and the petitioner.

8. The petitioner has been residing in her parents' house at Visakhapatnam due to matrimonial disputes. As per the averments made in O.P.No.321 of 2014, the petitioner has been residing in Visakhapatnam. The distance between Visakhapatnam and Hyderabad is around 700 kilometers. The petitioner may face some difficulty to travel from Visakhapatnam to Hyderabad along with her son in order to prosecute O.P.No.321 of 2014. While deciding the petitions of this nature, the Court has to take into consideration the inconvenience likely to be caused to the parties to the proceedings, more particularly, to the wife and the children.

9. As per the principle enunciated in **Rachna Kanodia v. Anuk Kanodia**, and **Sumita Singh v. Kumar Sanjay**, the paramount consideration, in transfer of matrimonial cases, is the convenience of the wife.

10. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in the cases cited supra, I am of the considered view that the relief sought by the petitioner deserves to be allowed.

11. Accordingly, the Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is allowed. O.P.No.321 of 2014 is withdrawn from the file of the Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar and transferred to the file of the Family Court at Visakhapatnam for trial and disposal in accordance with law. There shall be no order as to costs.

12. Consequently, Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this transfer petition shall stand closed.

T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

Date: 01.10.2015.

lvd