

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY
TRANSFER CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO.377 OF 2017

ORDER:

This Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition, under Section 24 of Code of Civil Procedure 1908, is filed to withdraw O.P.No.664 of 2017 on the file of Judge, Family Court, L.B.Nagar, Ranga Reddy District and to transfer the same to the Senior Civil Judge's Court, Visakhapatnam, on the ground that the petitioner, being a woman, is unable to undertake journey covering the distance of 650 kilometres to attend the Family Court at L.B.Nagar, Ranga Reddy District.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner at the stage of admission.

3. The first and foremost ground for withdrawal and transfer of O.P. is that the petitioner is unable to undertake journey covering the distance of 650 kilometres. She is aged 35 years. She is not too old. No doubt, it is difficult for a woman to undertake journey on every date of adjournment. But that by itself is not a ground to withdraw and transfer the case, since the *forum non conveniens* based on the principle laid down in **Modi Entertainment Network and another v. W.S.G. Cricket Pte.Ltd**¹ is not a ground in view of latest Judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Krishna Veni Nagam v. Harish Nagam**², where the Hon'ble Apex Court issued certain guidelines to the Judges, which reads thus:

“Spirit behind the orders of this Court in allowing the transfer petitions filed by wives being almost mechanically allowing is that they are not denied justice on account of their inability to

¹ (2003) 4 SCC 341

² AIR 2017 SC 1345

participate in proceedings instituted at a different place on account of difficulty either on account of financial or physical hardship. Our Constitutional scheme provides for guaranteeing equal access to justice, power of the State to make special provisions for women and children and duty to uphold the dignity of women. Various steps have been taken in this direction. However, the Apex Court also issued certain directions in para 18 of its judgment, which read thus:

- i) Availability of video conferencing facility.
- ii) Availability of legal aid service.
- iii) Deposit of cost for travel, lodging and boarding in terms of Order XXV Code of Civil Procedure.
- iv) E-Mail address/phone number, if any, at which litigant from out station may communicate.”

In view of the above guidelines, the inconvenience for the petitioner to undertake journey may not be a ground to withdraw and transfer O.P.No.664 of 2017 from one Court to another and at best, the witness can be examined by video conference. However, in view of difficulty expressed by the petitioner to undertake journey of 650 kilometres, the Judge, Family Court, L.B. Nagar, Ranga Reddy District, is directed not to insist the petitioner to appear on every date of adjournment, except on the dates when her presence is required, more particularly when the petitioner is required to be cross-examined by the counsel for the respondent. This direction would meet the ends of justice and serve the purpose.

4. In view of the law declared by the Apex Court in **Krishna Veni Nagam's** case (referred supra), the Judge, Family Court, L.B. Nagar, Ranga Reddy District is directed to follow the

guidelines issued in the said case and permit the counsel for the respondent to cross-examine the petitioner and witness on her behalf by video conference and in case, video conference is not available, the Judge, Family Court, L.B. Nagar, Ranga Reddy District shall direct the respondent to deposit costs of travelling, boarding, lodging and other incidental expenses to the credit of O.P. and on such deposit, the petitioner shall appear before the Court on the date when her presence is required for cross-examination or any other purpose.

5. With the above direction, the Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this petition shall stand closed.

JUNE 13, 2017
ssp

M. SATYANARAYANA MURTHY, J

