



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 19.10.2016

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

TR.CMP(MD)No.386 of 2016

and

C.M.P(MD)No.7550 of 2016

Revathi

... Petitioner/Respondent

Vs.

M.Sundhar Raj

... Respondent /Petitioner

PRAYER : Petition filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw the case in H.M.O.P.No.76 of 2015 pending on the file of the Subordinate Court, Ambasamuthiram and transfer the same to the file of the Subordinate Court, Sivakasi and pass such further orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Alagumani

For Respondent : No appearance

ORDER

This Transfer Civil Miscellaneous petition has been filed to withdraw the case in H.M.O.P.No.76 of 2015 pending on the file of the Subordinate Court, Ambasamuthiram and transfer the same to the file of the Subordinate Court, Sivakasi.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner is heard.

3. The facts in nutshell for consideration is that the marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 12.06.2013 as per the Hindu Rights and customs at Subramaniyapuram Murugan Temple at Ambasamuthiram. Out of the wedlock, a male child was born and now aged about one year. The present petition is filed for transferring the H.M.O.P.No.76 of 2015 filed by the respondent seeking divorce, from the Subordinate Court, Ambasamuthiram to the Subordinate Court, Sivakasi. The main ground raised by the petitioner is that the petitioner is living with her parents and she is unemployed. Hence, she leads her life with the support of her parents and not having income on her own.

4. Notice was issued to the respondent and the same was returned as "unclaimed". The respondent has not appeared either in person or through counsel.



5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the decisions laid down by this Court which is extracted below, this case deserves consideration:-

(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:-

'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.



WEB COPY

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



WEB COPY

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.''

6. In view of the facts and circumstances and the decisions cited supra, the TR.C.M.P.(MD)No.386 of 2016 is allowed and the H.M.O.P.No.76 of 2015 pending before the Subordinate Court, Ambasamuthiram is ordered to be transferred to file of the Subordinate Court, Sivakasi. No costs. Consequently, C.M.P.(MD) No.7550 of 2016 is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(co)
/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Subordinate Judge, Ambasamuthiram.
2. The Subordinate Judge, Sivakasi.

+1cc to M/s.R.Alagumani, Advocate in SR.No.62179/16

pmu

sm:pv:08/11/2016:4P/4C

TR.CMP (MD) No.386 of 2016
and
C.M.P (MD) No.7550 of 2016
19.10.2016