



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 25.10.2016

CORAM :

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

TR.CMP(MD)No.147 of 2016

and

C.M.P(MD)No.2593 of 2016

S.Suganya

... Petitioner

vs.

S.Siva Ponnaiah

... Respondent

Petition filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw the case in HMOP.No.43 of 2016 on the file of the Family Court, Tirunelveli, and transfer the same to the file of the Sub Court, Tuticorin.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Lajapathi Roy

For Respondent : Ms.Dhanalakshmi for Mr.S.Selvakumar

ORDER

The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 18.10.2012 as per the Hindu rites and customs. The petitioner states that the respondent was employed at Dubai as IT programmer and soon after the marriage, he left her and went to Dubai for his employment. The petitioner was subjected to cruelty and mistreatment at the hands of her in-laws. Subsequently, at the instance of the elders, the respondent took her to Dubai and out of the wedlock, a girl child was born. There was frequent quarrels between the petitioner and the respondent. She was forced to leave the matrimonial home. Subsequently, the respondent filed HMOP.No.43 of 2016 before the Family Court, Tirunelveli, for divorce. The petitioner is very much willing for re-union and all her attempts to join the matrimonial home went in vain. The respondent filed the divorce petition only to harass the petitioner knowing the fact that she will not be in a position to travel to Tirunelveli along with her two year old female child.

3.The contention of the respondent is that the petitioner alone is responsible for all her acts and she used to pick up quarrels with in-laws unnecessarily and created trouble in the matrimonial home. Therefore, the present petition deserves no consideration and liable to be dismissed.

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

3.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 interpreting Section 19(iii)(a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, 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:-

"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.

4.Considering the contentions and the rival contentions of the respective parties and in view of the above pronouncements, this Court is of the view that the case of the petitioner deserves to be considered. Accordingly, this Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is allowed and HMOP.No.43 of 2016 on the file of the Family Court, Tirunelveli, is ordered to be transferred to the Sub Court, Tuticorin, forthwith. No costs. Consequently, C.M.P(MD) No.2593 of 2016 is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

nbi

To

1)The Judge,
Family Court, Tirunelveli

2)The Judge,
Sub Court, Tuticorin.

+1CC to Mr.T.Lajapathi Roy, Advocate Sr.No.63772

+1CC to Mr.S.Selvakumar, Advocate Sr.No.63512

GJM/DB/8.11.16-3p-5C

TR.CMP (MD) No.147 of 2016
25.10.2016