

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

TA-973-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.08.2019

Ramandeep Kaur

...Applicant

Versus

Ramandeep Singh Gill

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present: Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Advocate for the respondent.

H.S. MADAAN, J. (Oral)

Applicant Ramandeep Kaur, aged about 24 years, estranged wife of respondent Ramandeep Singh Gill, presently residing with her parents at Village Matdadu, Tehsil & District Sirsa, on account of matrimonial discord between the spouses, by way of filing the present application, seeks transfer of divorce petition, filed by her husband, the respondent against her having title 'Ramandeep Singh Gill Vs. Ramandeep Kaur' pending in the Court of District Judge, Family Court, Barnala to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Sirsa.

As per version of the applicant, the marriage solemnized between the parties on 03.12.2014 did not work. The applicant was harassed and maltreated, so as to force her to bring dowry articles from her parents but she could not get those demands fulfilled. The couple was not blessed with any child. On 07.02.2018, the respondent dropped the applicant at the house of her parents at Village Matdadu, Tehsil & District

Sirsa, where she is putting up ever since. She has filed a complaint under provisions of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 against the respondent in Court at Dabwali. The respondent has filed the petition in question against the applicant just to harass her. Under the circumstances, it is difficult for the applicant to travel from her parental place to Barnala to attend the dates of hearing in the Court there, covering a distance of about 150 kms on one side. Therefore, the present application be accepted.

Notice of the application was given to the respondent who put in appearance through counsel, filed written reply and is opposing the application vehemently, praying for its dismissal.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties besides going through the record.

The Apex Court in various judgments has observed that in matrimonial disputes between the spouses convenience of wife should be looked into. In that regard a reference can be made to authority **Sumita Singh** Versus **Kumar Sanjay and another**, 2002 AIR(SC) 396 by a Division Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court.

In **Bhartiben Ravibhai Ray** Versus **Ravibhai Govindbhai Ray**, 2017(3) RCR(Civil) 369, the Apex Court had allowed application for transfer of the divorce petition to a place where the wife was residing considering various factors including the distance between the place where the wife was residing and the place of sitting of the Court where divorce petition had been instituted and the fact that the wife had filed

two cases against her husband in the Court at the place of her residence wherein the respondent had already put in appearance.

In Apurva Versus Navtej Singh, 2017(2) Law Herald 966 by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, it was observed that wherever the Courts are called upon to consider the plea of transfer in matrimonial disputes, the Courts have to take into consideration various factors like economic soundness of either of the parties, the social strata of the spouses to which they belong and behavioural pattern, standard of life antecedents of marriage. Generally it is the wife's convenience, which must be looked at by the Courts while deciding the transfer application.

Keeping in view the contentions in the application and submissions made by learned counsel for the applicant, in which I find merit, in absence of any strong circumstance to the contrary, it would be proper and appropriate, if the application is accepted. The same is accordingly allowed. The petition in question is ordered to be withdrawn from the Court of District Judge, Family Court, Barnala and transferred to Family Court at Sirsa for disposal in accordance with law.

The parties through counsel are directed to appear in the transferee Court on 20.09.2019. Copies of orders be sent to both the Courts for information and necessary compliance.

19.08.2019

sumit.k

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No