

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

T.A. No.214 of 2015

Date of Decision.24.03.2015

Jasbir Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

Satgur Singh

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Cheema, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The petition for transfer is sought by the wife in a matrimonial proceeding instituted at Fatehabad saying that the case must be transferred to Mansa where she is living with her parents. According to the counsel appearing for the petitioner, the distance between the two places is about 90 kms and she will be greatly inconvenienced by having to take her child from Mansa to Fatehabad at every time. She has herself filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. for claiming maintenance in the Court at Mansa and the case is said to be pending.

2. I do not think that in a situation where the distance is even less than 100 kms, there must be a transfer of proceedings. It will be better and appropriate that the petitioner is granted transportation expenses for herself and for the person who may accompany her along with child at every date of hearing when she shows up in court for

effective date of hearing. The trial Court will consider granting the transportation expenses which I provisionally fix at ₹ 750/- for herself, her child and for the escort. At every day when she is present in Court, the trial court will ensure that the petitioner's husband is not allowed to benefit of continuance of trial unless the transportation expenses are paid by him. These observations relating to the amount are done in the absence of the respondent without being apprised of the wife's own means and it will be open for the Court to make appropriate modification if there are circumstances brought out for such modification.

3. The transfer application is dismissed but with the above observations relating to the provision for transportation expenses at every date of hearing.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 24, 2015
Pankaj*