



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 25.10.2016

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

TR.CMP(MD)No.161 of 2016

and

C.M.P(MD)No.2871 of 2016

Marikannu @ Vadivukkarasi

...Petitioner/Petitioner

vs.

Suresh Raj

...Respondent/Respondent

Petition filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to transfer the HMOP.No.46 of 2016 on the file of Subordinate Judge, Ponneri, to the file of the Subordinate Judge, Pudukottai.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.D.Prakash

ORDER

The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 02.11.2011 as per the Hindu rites and customs. The contention of the petitioner is that before the Marriage, the respondent represented himself as owner of a Hotel business near Chennai. But, subsequently after the marriage, the petitioner realised that he is only working as an employee in a hotel and married the petitioner by misrepresentation. Out of the wedlock, a female child was born and the behaviour of the respondent was abnormal, due to his addiction to liquor and the petitioner was physically tortured. Not stopping with that, the respondent used to beat the petitioner with abusive language. The petitioner filed HMOP.No.45 of 2016, for divorce, before the Sub Court, Pudukottai. Even before entering appearance in HMOP.No.45 of 2016, the respondent filed a similar petition for divorce before the Sub Court, Ponneri, in HMOP.No.46 of 2016.

2.The petitioner is now living with her parents along with the three year old girl child and not having any independent sources of income and living with her father's meagre income. Hence, she is not in a position to meet out the expenditure to defend the case before the Sub Court at Ponneri.

3.The notice sent to the respondent returned with an endorsement ''refused'' and therefore, this Court is inclined to pass orders on merits.



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 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.

5.Considering the facts and circumstances of this case 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.46 of 2016 on the file of the Sub Court, Ponneri, is ordered to be transferred to the Sub Court, Pudukottai, forthwith. No costs. Consequently, C.M.P(MD)No.2871 of 2016 is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1)The Subordinate Judge, Ponneri.

2)The Subordinate Judge, Pudukottai.

TR.CMP(MD)No.161 of 2016 and
C.M.P(MD)No.2871 of 2016
25.10.2016

nbi

SH/GSV-PM:29.11.2016:3P/3C