

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

**Transfer Application No.583 of 2016
Date of Decision: January 17, 2017**

Poonam Rani @ Rajni Bala

...Applicant

Versus

Harjit Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr.J.P.Singh, Advocate,
for the applicant.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J.(Oral)

Applicant-wife, by way of instant transfer application under Section 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure, seeks transfer of divorce petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, titled as ***“Harjit Singh vs. Poonam Rami @ Rajni Bala”*** filed by the respondent-husband, from Bathinda to Ferozepur.

Notice of motion was issued. As per the office report dated 21.10.2016, notice issued to the respondent has been received back with the report that he has refused to accept the notice which amounts due service. None came present on behalf of respondent despite service.

Heard learned counsel for the applicant.

It has gone undisputed before this Court that the applicant-wife along with her minor daughter is living with her parents at her parental house in District Ferozepur. Respondent-husband is not paying any amount of maintenance either to the wife or to the child. Distance

between Bathinda and Ferozepur is more than 100 km. Since the applicant is not having any source of income, she is dependent on her parents.

Keeping in view abovesaid undisputed facts, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that transfer application deserves to be accepted, so as to secure the ends of justice. Denial of transfer of divorce petition would amount to denial of justice to the applicant-wife.

The abovesaid view also finds support from the following judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, as well as different High Courts, including this Court: -

- 1. Mrs. Maneka Sanjay Gandhi and another Vs. Miss Rani Jethmalani, AIR 1979 (SC) 468.***
- 2. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy Vs. Ramakrishna Hegde, 1990 (1) SCC 4.***
- 3. Neelam Kanwar Vs. Devinder Singh Kanwar, 2000 (10) SCC 589.***
- 4. Sumita Singh Vs. Kumar Sanjay and another, AIR 2002 (SC) 396.***
- 5. Mangla Patil Kale Vs. Sanjeev Kumar Kale, 2003 (10) SCC 280.***
- 6. Fatema Vs. Jafri Syed Husain @ Syed Parvez Jaffer, AIR 2009 (SC) 1773.***
- 7. Anjali Ashok Sadhwani Vs. Ashok Kishinchand Sadhwani, AIR 2009 (SC) 1374.***
- 8. Kulwinder Kaur @ Kulwinder Gurcharan Singh Vs. Kandi Friends Education Trust and others, AIR 2008 SC 1333.***
- 9. Nisha Vs. Dharmenda Pratap Singh Rathore, 2015 (3) All. LJ 168.***

10. M.V. Rekha Vs. Sathya, 2011 (2) HLR 34.

11. Sneha Vs. Vinayak, 2013 ILR (Karnataka) 165.

12. Rimpal Vs. Balinder Kumar, 2010 (7) RCR (Civil) 286.

13. Anju Vs. Sanjay, 2011 (6) RCR (Civil) 112.

14. Komal Devi @ Komal Kumari @ Komal Rani Vs. Harbhajan Singh, 2012 (8) RCR (Civil) 84.

The relevant observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para 14 of its judgment in **Kulwinder Kaur @ Kulwinder Gurcharan Singh's** case (supra), which can be gainfully followed in the present case, read as under: -

“Although the discretionary power of transfer of cases cannot be imprisoned within a strait-jacket of any cast-iron formula unanimously applicable to all situations, it cannot be gainsaid that the power to transfer a case must be exercised with due care, caution and circumspection. Reading Sections 24 and 25 of the Code together and keeping in view various judicial pronouncements, certain broad propositions as to what may constitute a ground for transfer have been laid down by Courts. They are balance of convenience or inconvenience to plaintiff or defendant or witnesses; convenience or inconvenience of a particular place of trial having regard to the nature of evidence on the points involved in the suit; issues raised by the parties; reasonable apprehension in the mind of the litigant that he might not get justice in the court in which the suit is pending; important questions of law involved or a considerable section of public interested in the litigation; interest of

justice demanding for transfer of suit, appeal or other proceeding, etc. Above are some of the instances which are germane in considering the question of transfer of a suit, appeal or other proceeding. They are, however, illustrative in nature and by no means be treated as exhaustive. If on the above or other relevant considerations, the Court feels that the plaintiff or the defendant is not likely to have a fair trial in the Court from which he seeks to transfer a case, it is not only the power, but the duty of the Court to make such order.”

Again, deliberating on an identical issue, in the case of **Dr.**

Subramaniam Swamy (supra), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under: -

“The question of expediency would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case but the paramount consideration for the exercise of power must be to meet the ends of justice. It is true that if more than one court has jurisdiction under the Code to try the suit, the plaintiff as dominus litis has a right to choose the Court and the defendant cannot demand that the suit be tried in any particular court convenient to him. The mere convenience of the parties or any one of them may not be enough for the exercise of power but it must also be shown that trial in the chosen forum will result in denial of justice. Cases are not unknown where a party seeking justice chooses a forum most inconvenient to the adversary with a view to depriving that party of a fair trial. The Parliament has, therefore, invested this Court with the discretion to transfer the case from one Court to another if that is considered expedient to meet the ends of justice. Words of wide amplitude- for the ends of justice- have been advisedly used to leave the matter to the discretion of the

apex court as it is not possible to conceive of all situations requiring or justifying the exercise of power. But the paramount consideration must be to see that justice according to law is done; if for achieving that objective the transfer of the case is imperative, there should be no hesitation to transfer the case even if it is likely to cause some inconvenience to the plaintiff. The petitioner's plea for the transfer of the case must be tested on this touchstone.

(emphasis supplied)”

The abovesaid law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme has also been followed by this Court in order dated 16.03.2016 passed in TA No.945 of 2015 (Sushma and others Vs. Kapil @ Sahil Bansal), which, in turn, was based on the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, as well as different High Courts, including this Court.

No other arguments was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that instant transfer application deserves to be accepted.

Consequently, learned District Judge, Bathinda, is directed to send the complete record of the petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act titled as **“Harjit Singh vs. Poonam Rani @ Rajni Bala”** to the learned District Judge, Ferozepur, at an early date and in any case within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

Learned District Judge, Ferozepur, shall either decide the

case himself or assign it to another Court of competent jurisdiction at Ferozepur, for its early decision, in accordance with law.

With the abovesaid observations made and directions issued, instant transfer application stands allowed however, with no order as to costs.

January 17, 2017
seema

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No