



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 20.10.2016

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

TR.CMP(MD)No.146 of 2015

and

M.P(MD)No.1 of 2015

Ramesh

... Petitioner

vs.

Yuvarani

... Respondent

Prayer:- Petition filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to order to withdraw and transfer the case in H.M.O.P.No.159 of 2014 on the file of the Principal Subordinate Judge at Kumbakonam, Thanjavur District, to the Subordinate Judge at Pudukottai District.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Prasanna Rajadurai

For Respondent : No appearance

ORDER

The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 29.01.2012 as per the Hindu rites and customs and due to the strained relationship between the parties, they are living separately. The respondent/wife filed HMOP.No.159 of 2014 for restitution of conjugal rights, which is pending before the Principal Sub Court at Kumbakonam, Thanjavur District. The petitioner/husband also filed HMOP.No.54 of 2014 for divorce, which is pending before the Sub Court, Pudukkottai.

2.The learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is having some personal inconvenience to attend the Court at Thanjavur and he is receiving frequent threats from the respondent and her relatives. Therefore, he is not in a position to attend the Court at Thanjavur freely.


3.Except the above reason, no meaningful reason has been stated by the petitioner to transfer the case from Thanjavur to Pudukkottai.

4.The principles with regard to transfer petitions, more specifically, in the matters of matrimonial cases, are in favour of women, and the decisions of the High Court of Madras, in the following cases also confirm that position:-

(i)The Hon'ble Division Bench of the High Court of Madras in W.A.No.1181 of 2009, dated 09.07.2010 has held as follows:-

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

21. The domicile or citizenship of the opposite party is immaterial in a case like this. In case the marriage was



solemnized under Hindu Law marital relationship is governed by the provisions of the Hindu Marriage Act. Therefore, Section 19 has to be given a purposeful interpretation. It is the residence of the wife, which determines the question of jurisdiction, in case the proceeding was initiated at the instance of the wife.

22. While considering a provision like Section 19 (iii-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, the objects and reasons which prompted the parliament to incorporate such a provision has also to be taken note of. Sub Clause (iii-a) was inserted in Section 19 with a specific purpose. Experience is the best teacher. The Government found the difficulties faced by women in the matter of initiation of matrimonial proceedings. The report submitted by the Law Commission as well as National Commission for Women, underlying the need for such amendment so as to enable the women to approach the nearest jurisdictional court to redress their matrimonial grievances, were also taken note of by the Government. Therefore such a beneficial provision meant for the women of our Country should be given a meaningful interpretation by Courts.'

(ii) In yet another case in TR.CMP.Nos.138 and 139 of 2006, dated 30.08.2006, the High Court of Madras has considered the following judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court:-

'16. In AIR 2000 SC 3512 (1) (Mona Aresh Goel vs. Aresh Satya Goel), when the wife pleaded that she was unable to bear the traveling expenses and even to travel alone and stay at Bombay, the Supreme Court ordered transfer of proceedings.

In 2000 (10) SCC 304, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that where the petitioner's wife has pleaded lack of money, the same has to be considered.

In 2000 (9) SCC 355, the wife has filed a petition to transfer the proceedings initiated by the husband for divorce, at Bombay. The place of residence of the wife was at Jaipur, Rajasthan. In that case, the petitioner is having a small child and that she pleaded difficulty in going all the way from Jaipur to Bombay to contest the proceedings from time to time. Considering the distance and the difficulties faced by the wife, the Supreme Court has allowed the transfer petition.

In a decision reported in 2005 (12) SCC 395, the wife has sought for transfer of matrimonial proceedings and a divorce petition has been filed by the respondent's husband at Baikunthpur to be transferred to Allahabad, where the petitioner's wife was residing, on the ground that it would be difficult for her to undertake such long distance journey, particularly in circumstances, in which she finds that the proceedings under Section 125 Cr.P.C. was already pending before the Family Court, Allahabad. Considering the



difficulties faced by the wife and also the long distance journey, the Honourable Supreme Court was pleased to order transfer of the proceedings to Allahabad.

(iii) In a decision made in TR.CMP(MD)No.108 of 2010, dated 03.03.2011, the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, has observed as below:-

''18.It is true that section 19 of the Hindu Marriage Act, has been amended by insertion of proviso of (iii)(a) to section 19. Of Course, this amended section 19(iii)(a) gives special preference to the wife to file a petition or defending the case of the husband before the Court within whose jurisdiction she resides. The intention of the legislator is to safe-guard the interest and rights of the women, who are being subjected to harassment and cruelty. But this special preference conferred under section 19(iii)(a) of the Hindu Marriage Act shall not be used to wreck vengeance on the husband. There must be a justifiable cause to select the jurisdiction of the Court where she resides.''

5.In view of the above pronouncements, this Court is not inclined to consider the present petition filed by the husband, seeking transfer of the case. Further, the petitioner is not able to substantiate or give any convincing or reasonable grounds to consider the present petition.

6.Under such circumstances, the present petition is devoid of merits and accordingly, this Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, M.P(MD)No.1 of 2015 is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CO)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1)The Subordinate Judge,
Principal Subordinate Court,Kumbakonam, Thanjavur District.

2)The Subordinate Judge,
Subordinate Court, Pudukottai District.

+1 cc to M/s.NA.Palaniyandi, Advocate in SR.No.62358/2016

nbi

CSL/SS-2/04.11.2016: 3p/4c

TR.CMP(MD)No.146 of 2015
20.10.2016