

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

**T.A. No.1046 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : March 07, 2018**

Suman Petitioner

Versus

Parmod Kumar Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Gurbachan Singh Bhatia, Advocate for the petitioner.

None for the respondent.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Respondent is duly served but not present.

Petitioner seeks transfer of a petition filed under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, titled as ***“Parmod Kumar vs Suman”***, pending in the Court of learned District Judge, Family Court, Rohtak to a Court of competent jurisdiction at Chandigarh.

Heard. I have also considered the case of the respondent.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that one criminal case between the parties is already pending at Chandigarh Courts, in which respondent is facing trial. Thereafter, he has filed a petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, to harass the present petitioner, who is unable to pursue her case at Rohtak.

Considering the difficulty expressed by the learned counsel for the petitioner and in order to ensure that all the cases pending between the parties should be tried at one place, the petition filed under Section 9 of the

Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, titled as “*Parmod Kumar vs Suman*”, pending in the Court of learned District Judge, Family Court, Rohtak, is withdrawn from the said Court and transferred to the Court of learned District Judge, Chandigarh, who may retain the case himself or entrust it to a Court of competent jurisdiction.

As such, the present petition is allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

March 07, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No