

266.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Transfer Application No.836 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision:21.01.2016

Lalita

... Petitioner

versus

Sunil

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Sajjan Malik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

None for the respondent.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. The wife has filed a petition under Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act in a court at Rohtak after the husband has filed a petition for divorce at Rohtak. The petitioner was surely looking for a forum of her own convenience when she was filing a petition after the petition was filed by the husband. The inconvenience now pleaded is that she has a child aged 2 years and it will be inconvenient for her to go to the court at Sonapat.

2. The distance between the two places is even less than 60 kilometers and it will be only appropriate that the case which was filed earlier is allowed to be proceeded where the case is filed. The petitioner is at liberty to apply to the court for maintenance and travelling expenses for herself and escort for every hearing and the

court at Sonapat will pass an order providing for maintenance before calling upon the wife to file even a reply. The court shall also ensure that on every hearing when the wife appears the husband pays the amount determined as travelling expenses for herself and for an escort before the trial progresses to the next stage.

3. Petition for transfer is dismissed but with the above observations for compliance by the trial court at Sonapat.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

21.01.2016
sanjeev