



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.10.2016

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

WEB COPY

TR.C.M.P(MD)No.215 of 2015

and M.P(MD)No.1 of 2015

P.Sathyakala

... Petitioner

Vs.

K.Ganesh Kumar

... Respondent

Prayer: Petition filed under Section 24 of Civil Procedure Code to withdraw and transfer I.A.No.807 of 2015 in H.M.O.P(SR)No.4189 of 2015 pending on the file of the learned Family Court Judge, Chennai to try along with H.M.O.P.No.57 of 2015 on the file of the learned Subordinate Judge, Ramanathapuram.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.M.S.Johnny Basha

For Respondent : No appearance

ORDER

The present petition is filed seeking for transfer of I.A.No.807 of 2015 in H.M.O.P(SR)No.4189 of 2015 pending before the Family Court, Chennai to the Subordinate Court, Ramanathapuram, to be tried along with H.M.O.P.No.57 of 2015.

2.The marriage between the petitioner and respondent was solemnized on 30.10.2014 at Rameswaram Temple, Ramanathapuram District, as per Hindu Rites and Customs and due to the strained relationship between the parties, they lived separately. The petitioner filed a petition in H.M.O.P.No.57 of 2015 before the Sub Court, Ramanathapuram for restitution of conjugal rights and the respondent filed I.A.No.807 of 2015 in H.M.O.P(SR)No.4189 of 2015 before the Family Court, Chennai, for divorce along with waiver of one year period for presenting the petition under Section 13(1)(ia) of the Hindu Marriages Act, 1955.


3.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4.The main contention of the petitioner is that she is employed at Ramanathapuram in a private company and living along with her parents and further she had given a complaint before the Superintendent of Police, Ramanathapuram, against the respondent for demanding dowry. This apart, the petitioner is not in a position to travel from Ramanathapuram to Chennai, to defend the divorce petition filed by the respondent.

4.The principles regarding transfer petitions, more specifically in the matters of matrimonial cases are well settled through the decisions of the High Court of Madras, in the following cases:-

<https://hcservices.courtservice.in/Hcservices/>
(c) 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:-

'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:-

'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 judgments, the place of the wife is preferable and in the present case, the circumstances narrated by the petitioner deserve consideration.

6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the pendency of the case before the learned Sub Judge, Ramanathapuram, this Court is inclined to consider the case of the petitioner and accordingly, this transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is allowed and I.A.No.807 of 2015 in H.M.O.P(SR)No.4189 of 2015 pending before the Family Court, Chennai, is ordered to be transferred to the file of the Subordinate Court, Ramanathapuram forthwith for joint trial in H.M.O.P.No.57 of 2015. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petition is also closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar[CO]

/True copy/

ps

To Sub Assistant Registrar

1.The Judge, Family Court, Chennai.

2.The Subordinate Judge,Ramanathapuram.

1CC TO MR. S.M.S. JOHNNY BASHA, ADVOCATE SR: 63048

AM SS3 8 11 2016

3P 4C

TR.C.M.P. (MD)No.215 of 2015
21.10.2016