

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY
TR.CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO.593 OF 2018

ORDER:

This Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition, under Section 24 of Code of Civil Procedure 1908, is filed to withdraw F.C.O.P.No.1545 of 2018 pending on the file of Judge, Family Court, at L.B.Nagar, Ranga Reddy District and transfer the same to the file of Senior Civil Judge, Tenali, Guntur District.

The contention of the petitioner/wife is that she being lady unable to undertake journey from Tenali to Hyderabad covering distance of 270 kms and that she filed maintenance case and application under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act at Tenali. Therefore, requested to withdraw and transfer F.C.O.P.No.1545 of 2018 from the file of Judge, Family Court, at L.B.Nagar to the file of Senior Civil Judge, Tenali, Guntur District.

During hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner explained the inconvenience being caused to the petitioner to appear before the Judge, Family Court, at L.B.Nagar, undertaking journey of 270 kms being lady and finally requested to dispense with her appearance before the Court, in case the Court is not inclined to withdraw and transfer the case.

Though notice served on respondent, none appeared.

F.C.O.P. is pending before the Judge, Family Court, at L.B.Nagar and that the petitioner allegedly filed maintenance case and DVC at Tenali, making certain allegations. Therefore, on the ground of pendency of maintenance case and DVC, F.C.O.P. cannot be withdrawn and transferred. Even if F.C.O.P. is transferred to the Court at Tenali, that cannot be tried by the Senior Civil Judge.

The other ground that the petitioner pleaded is facing inconvenience to appear before the Court at Hyderabad. No doubt, it is difficult to undertake journey to appear before the Court on every date of adjournment. In case F.C.O.P. is withdrawn and transferred from L.B.Nagar at Hyderabad to Tenali, the respondent has to face same difficulty. The degree of difficulty may vary from men to women, but that itself is not a ground to decide the petition. According to Section 11 of the Family Court's Act, if there is any serious allegation touching the character of either of the parties, the Court may proceed with the trial in-camera.

The Apex Court in ***Krishna Veni Nagam v. Harish Nagam***¹ laid down certain guidelines for recording evidence in matrimonial cases. Those guidelines are modified by the Full Bench of the Apex Court in ***Santhini v. Vijaya Venketesh***². However, laid down three guidelines and the one of the guideline is that after completion of reconciliation proceedings, in the event of failure, the parties may chose to examine by video conference and if they gave consent for such video conference, the Court can proceed to record evidence of witnesses by video conference, but till that stage, the petitioner has to appear before the Court only for limited purpose of reconciliation. Therefore, the presence of the petitioner on the dates of adjournments except on the date of reconciliation and for record her cross examination, is dispensed with as long as she being represented by the counsel, this will not preclude the Judge, Family Court from passing any order in accordance with law. Whenever, the petitioner appears before the Court in connection with F.C.O.P, the respondent is directed to pay travelling allowance and other incidental expenses including stay and food etc. of the petitioner and the person who accompanying her.

With the above direction, the Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is disposed of. No costs.

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

M. SATYANARAYANA MURTHY, J

24.10.2018

kvrn

¹ (2017) 4 SCC 150

² (2018) 1 SCC 1