

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

**T.A. No.723 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : April 17, 2018**

Smt. Suniti

..... Petitioner

Versus

Vineet

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Lajpat Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Lalit Pardhan, 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 has been served through his counsel before the trial Court but none has appeared on his behalf. Therefore, he is proceeded against ex parte.

Petitioner seeks transfer of a petition bearing No.HMA/32/2007 filed under Section 13 (1)(ia) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1956, titled as “*Vineet vs Suniti*”, pending in the Court of learned District Judge, Jhajjar to a Court of competent jurisdiction at Bhiwani.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that three other cases between the parties are pending at Bhiwani Courts.

Keeping in view the difficulty expressed by the petitioner, all the cases pending between the parties should be tried and decided at one place. Therefore, the petition bearing No.HMA/32/2007 filed under Section 13 (1)(ia) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1956, titled as “*Vineet vs Suniti*”,

pending in the Court of learned District Judge, Jhajjar, is withdrawn from the said Court and transferred to the Court of learned District Judge, Bhiwani.

As such, the present petition is allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

April 17, 2018

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes

Whether Reportable: No