

TA No. 224 of 2017

Amit Kumar
2017.05.24 16:47
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**TA No. 224 of 2017
Date of decision: 22.5.2017**

Gurparvesh Kaur and another

...Applicants

Versus

Raj Kumar

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Ms. Rajni Gupta, Advocate
for the applicants.

Mr. Piyush Kant Jain, Advocate
for the respondent.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Applicants, by way of instant transfer application under Section 24 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure (for short 'CPC'), seek transfer of civil suit No. 9481 of 2016 dated 27.10.2016 (Raj Kumar Vs. Smt Gurparvesh Kaur and another), filed by respondent from Ludhiana to Chandigarh.

Notice of motion was issued and learned trial court was directed to adjourn the case beyond the date fixed before this Court. Reply, filed in the court today, is taken on record and copy thereof has been supplied to the learned counsel for the applicants.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Learned counsel for the applicants submits that both the

TA No. 224 of 2017

applicants are above 70 years of age and are suffering from more than one age related ailments. In this view of the matter, it is very difficult for the applicants to pursue the litigation imposed on them by the respondent, while going from Chandigarh to Ludhiana.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent submits that respondent is also a senior citizen being more than 60 years of age. He prays for dismissal of the transfer application.

After giving anxious consideration to the rival contentions raised and careful perusal of the record of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that instant one has been found to be a fit case for ordering the transfer of the abovesaid civil suit from Ludhiana to Chandigarh. It is so said because all the abovesaid undisputed facts clearly go in favour of the applicants and against the respondent. In the circumstances of the case, it will not only be inconvenient but would be very difficult for the applicants to go from Chandigarh to Ludhiana, to pursue the litigation imposed on them by the respondent.

The view taken by this Court 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. Savitri Vs. Hari Chand, AIR 1999 SC 55***
- 4. Neelam Kanwar Vs. Devinder Singh Kanwar, 2000 (10) SCC 589.***
- 5. Sumita Singh Vs. Kumar Sanjay and another, AIR 2002***

(SC) 396.

6. Rachna Kanodia Vs. Anuk Kanodia, 2002 (1) MLJ 86

7. Archana Singh Vs. Alok Partap Singh, 2002 (2) MLJ 568

8. Mangla Patil Kale Vs. Sanjeev Kumar Kale, 2003 (10) SCC 280.

9. Fatema Vs. Jafri Syed Husain @ Syed Parvez Jafferri, AIR 2009 (SC) 1773.

10. Anjali Ashok Sadhwani Vs. Ashok Kishinchand Sadhwani, AIR 2009 (SC) 1374.

11. Kulwinder Kaur @ Kulwinder Gurcharan Singh Vs. Kandi Friends Education Trust and others, AIR 2008 SC 1333.

12. Nisha Vs. Dharmenda Pratap Singh Rathore, 2015 (3) All. LJ 168.

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

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

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

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

17. 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 **Dr. Subramaniam Swamy** (supra), which can be gainfully followed in the present case, read 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

TA No. 224 of 2017

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)”

Reverting to the facts of the case in hand and respectfully following the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as different High Courts, including this Court, it is unhesitatingly held that applicants are entitled for getting the abovesaid civil suit transferred from Ludhiana to Chandigarh, so as to enable them to pursue the litigation without facing any undue hardship or harassment at the hands of the respondent. It is the settled principle of law that justice is not only to be done but it should also appear to have been done. If the applicants are forced to go from Chandigarh to Ludhiana, it would amount to denial of justice to them. Thus, to strike a balance between the parties with a view to do complete and

TA No. 224 of 2017

substantial justice and proceeding on a holistic view of the matter, this Court is of the considered view that it would be just and expedient to transfer the civil suit from Ludhiana to Chandigarh.

No other argument 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 and the same is hereby allowed. Abovesaid civil suit filed by the respondent is ordered to be transferred from Ludhiana to Chandigarh.

Accordingly, the learned District Judge, Ludhiana, is directed to send complete record of the abovesaid civil suit to the learned District Judge, Chandigarh, at an early date but in any case within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

The learned District Judge, Chandigarh, is also directed to assign the civil suit to the learned court of competent jurisdiction, for an early decision, in accordance with law.

Parties through their counsel are directed to appear before the learned court at Chandigarh, on 6.7.2017.

With the above-said observations made and directions issued, present transfer application stands disposed of, however, with no order as to costs.

22.5.2017
AK Sharma

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No