

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

**T.A. No. 38 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: February 08, 2016**

Satnam Kaur

... Applicant

Versus

Khushwant Singh

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH
DHALIWAL**

Present: Mr. P.S. Salar, Advocate,
for the applicant.

Paramjeet Singh Dhaliwal, J. (Oral)

Instant application has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India read with Section 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure for transfer of petition No. 38 of 2015 titled “Khushwant Singh vs. Satnam Kaur” filed under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, pending in the Court of learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Samana to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Panchkula.

I have heard learned counsel for the applicant.

Learned counsel for the applicant contends that the petitioner has one minor female child and she has no source of income and it is difficult for her to attend the Courts at Samana. Learned counsel further contends that petitioner is staying with her sister at Pinjore, District Panchkula.

The contention raised by the learned counsel for the applicant is

not supported by any documentary evidence on record that she is residing with her sister. So far as other contention is concerned, identical contentions were raised before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Anindita Das vs. Srijit Das, (2006) 9 Supreme Court Cases,197. In the case of Anindita Das (supra), Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under:-

“3. Even otherwise, it must be seen that at one stage this Court was showing leniency to ladies. But since then it has been found that a large number of transfer petitions are filed by women taking advantage of the leniency shown by this Court. On an average at least 10 to 15 transfer petitions are on board of each court on each admission day. It is, therefore, clear that leniency of this Court is being misused by the women.

5. Except for stating that her health is not good, no particulars are given. On the ground that she is not able to come to Delhi to attend the court on a particular date, she can always apply for exemption and her application will undoubtedly be considered on its merit. Hence, no ground for transfer has been made out.

6. Accordingly, we dismiss the transfer petition. We, however, direct that the respondent shall pay all travel and stay expenses of the petitioner and her companion for each and every occasion when she is required to attend the court at Delhi.

7. The respondent shall send in advance to the petitioner, money for a 2nd class AC train ticket for herself and a companion. The respondent shall also pay stay expenses of the petitioner and her companion in a 3-star hotel. The trial Court shall ensure that the petitioner has been paid the travel expenses in advance and that the hotel expenses are paid to her on each and every occasion when she is required to attend the Court at Delhi.”

In view of above, no ground for transfer the case has been made out.

Dismissed. However, petitioner will be at liberty to move an appropriate application before the trial Court in view of judgment rendered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Anindita Das (supra)**.

February 08, 2016
vkd

[Paramjeet Singh Dhaliwal]
Judge