

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.344 of 2017

=====

Ragini Kumari Jaiswal, wife of Kaushal Kumar Jaiswal, daughter of Radheshyam Prasad Jaiswal at present Resident of Village- Nuaon, P.S.- Nuaon, District- Kaimur (Bhabua).

.... Petitioner

Versus

Kaushal Kumar Jaiswal, son of Late Vijay Shankar Prasad Jaiswal, resident of Shobhaganj, Ward No. 37, P.S. Sasaram Nagar, District- Rohtas.

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sumeet Kumar Singh
Mr. Abhiprav Singh, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party : Mr. Gaurav Govind, Advocate.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 27-07-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the opposite party.

2. The present petition has been filed for transfer of Matrimonial Case No. 110 of 2015 pending before the court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Rohtas at Sasaram to the court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Kaimur at Bhabhua.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she is a lady residing with her aged father at Kaimur at Bhabhua and is hard pressed to attend the Court at Rohtas at Sasaram for contesting the subject divorce petition.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party-husband refers to Annexure-A of the counter affidavit to submit that the petitioner had



earlier approached this Court in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 16950 of 2016 for transfer of Sasaram (T) P.S. Case No. 1010 of 2014 instituted by her from Sasaram to Kaimur at Bhabhua. The said matter was disposed of by order dated 13.12.2016 declining the prayer. It is submitted that the grounds raised in the present petition are the same as in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 16950 of 2016 which have not found favour with this Court.

5. Having heard the parties and on consideration of the materials on record, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. The grounds raised by the petitioner are almost identical as those considered in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 16950 of 2016 and on consideration of which, this Court was not inclined to grant relief to the petitioner. This Court sees no reason to take a different view in the matter in the present case.

6. The petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	28.07.2017.
Transmission Date	N.A.

