



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED: 25.10.2016
CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

WEB COPY

TR.C.M.P (MD) No.452 of 2016
and
C.M.P. (MD) .No.9070 of 2016

M.Muthu Ganesh

... Petitioner

Vs.

K.Veeraputhiran @ Manikandan

... Respondent

Prayer: The Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is filed under Section 24 of Civil Procedure Code to withdraw the H.M.O.P.No.28 of 2016 on the file of learned II Additional Sub Court, Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District and transfer the same to Sub Court, Kovilpatti and taken on file along with H.M.O.P.No.155 of 2016 on the file of the Sub Court, Kovilpatti, Tuticorin District.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Senthil Kumar


For Respondent : Mr.T.Lajapathi Roy

O R D E R

The Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is filed seeking to withdraw the H.M.O.P.No.28 of 2016 on the file of II Additional Sub Court, Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District and transfer the same to the Sub Court, Kovilpatti and taken on file along with H.M.O.P.No.155 of 2016 on the file of the Sub Court, Kovilpatti, Tuticorin District.

2. The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 28.10.2012, as per Hindu Rites and Customs at Therisanankoppu, Kanyakumari District and the petitioner left the matrimonial home due to the harassment of the respondent. Due to the counter allegations between the respective parties, the petitioner filed H.M.O.P.No.155 of 2016 before the Sub Court, Kovilpatti for divorce and the respondent filed H.M.O.P.No.28 of 2016 for the same prayer of divorce which is now pending before the II Additional Sub Court, Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District.

3. The contention of the petitioner is that she is living with her parents at Kovilpatti and not having any source of income of her own. Further, her father is a labour working in a sweet stall and earning meagre amount of salary which is not sufficient to meet out his own expenses. Therefore, she is not in a position to spend and incur expenses to defend the case of divorce filed by the respondent at Nagercoil.



4. The learned counsel for the respondent opposed the petition by stating that the petitioner left the matrimonial home on her own volition and not at the instance of the respondent and she deserves no consideration and accordingly, the petition is to be dismissed.

WEB COPY

5. 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:-

(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.

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 ~~at Bombay~~ 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.'

6. 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.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to consider the case of the petitioner and accordingly, this Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is allowed and the H.M.O.P.No.28 of 2016 pending on the file of the II Additional Sub Court, Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District is ordered to be transferred to the file of the Sub Court, Kovilpatti forthwith. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(AE)

/True copy/



To

1. The II Additional Subordinate Judge, Nagercoil,
Kanyakumari District.

2. The Subordinate Judge,
Kovilpatti.

+1cc to Mr.B.Senthilkumar, Advocate SR.No.63617

+1cc to Mr.T.LajapathiRoy, Advocate Sr.No.63771

akv

sm:GSV-PM:29/11/2016:4P/5C

TR.C.M.P. (MD) No.452 of 2016
25.10.2016