

\$~10,11&12.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

TR.P.(C.) No.68/2017

GARIMA @ GAURI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Raghav Narayan, Adv.

Versus

RISHI KUMAR

..... Respondent

Through: Counsel for the respondent
(appearance not given).

AND

TR.P.(C.) No.69/2017

GARIMA @ GAURI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Raghav Narayan, Adv.

Versus

RISHI KUMAR

..... Respondent

Through: Counsel for the respondent
(appearance not given).

AND

+ TR.P.(C.) No.70/2017

GARIMA @ GAURI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Raghav Narayan, Adv.

Versus

RISHI KUMAR

..... Respondent

Through: Counsel for the respondent
(appearance not given).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

ORDER

%

06.09.2017

TR.P.(C.) No.68/2017, TR.P.No.(C.) 69/2017 & TR.P.No.(C.) 70/2017.

1. Transfer is sought of M. No.56006/2016, Civil Suit No.55951/2016 and HMA No.562916/2016, all pending in the Court of Shri M.C. Gupta, Principal Judge, Family Courts (North), Rohini Courts, Delhi to Family Court (South-East), Saket Courts Complex, New Delhi, on the ground of the

TR.P.(C.) No.68/2017, TR.P.No.(C.) 69/2017 & TR.P.No.(C.) 70/2017

page 1 of 3

Signature Not Verified

Signing Date:14.10.2024 7:07:22
Certify that the digital and physical file have
been compared and the digital data is as per
the physical file and no page is missing.

6

petitioner/wife residing closer of the Saket Courts Complex, New Delhi than to the Rohini Courts, Delhi.

2. Notice of the petitions was ordered to be issued and the counsel for the respondent / husband appears and seeks time to file reply.

3. Considering the nature of controversy, adjournment is refused.

4. The counsels have been heard.

5. It is contended by the counsel for the respondent/husband (i) that these petitions have been filed to harass the respondent/husband; and, (ii) that the petitioner/wife, after receiving substantial amount of money though had agreed to divorce by mutual consent and had also participated in the First Motion therefor but is now, with a *mala fide* intent refusing. It is yet further contended that the respondent / husband is residing closer to the Rohini Courts, Delhi.

6. The arguments urged on merits are of no relevance in these Transfer Petitions. It is deemed appropriate that the convenience to the petitioner/wife, than of the respondent/husband, be given preference.

7. The petitions are accordingly allowed.

8. M. No.56006/2016, Civil Suit No.55951/2016 and HMA No.562916/2016 all pending in the Court of Shri M.C. Gupta, Principal Judge, Family Courts (North), Rohini Courts, Delhi are ordered to be transferred to the Family Courts (South-East), Saket Courts Complex, New Delhi.

9. The Presiding Judge, Family Court (North), Rohini Courts, Delhi is requested to physically transfer the files forthwith.

7
10. The parties to appear before the Family Court (South-East), Saket Courts Complex, New Delhi on 30th October, 2017.

The petitions are disposed of.

SEPTEMBER 06, 2017
'pp'..

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J

TR.P.(C.) No.68/2017, TR.P.No.(C.) 69/2017 & TR.P.No.(C.) 70/2017

page 3 of 3