

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

TA-1151-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 04.09.2019

Meenakshi

...Applicant

Versus

Gaurav Gulati

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Rahul Arora, Advocate for
Mr. V.K. Gupta, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr. Raman Goklaney, Advocate for the respondent.

H.S. MADAAN, J. (Oral)

This application for transfer of divorce petition titled 'Gaurav Gulati Vs. Meenakshi' pending in the Court of District Judge, Ferozepur to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Moga, has been filed by applicant Meenakshi, aged about 28 years, estranged wife of respondent Gaurav Gulati, presently residing with her parents at Dharamkot, District Moga, due to differences between the spouses.

As per version of the applicant, she was married with the respondent on 06.09.2013. Thereafter, they started residing together, however, the couple was not blessed with any child. The applicant was harassed and maltreated by the respondent and his family members, since she was unable to meet their demands for bringing more dowry from her parents. Ultimately, she was forced to leave the matrimonial home. She had no other place to go except parental place at Dharamkot, District

Moga, where she is putting up now. She does not have any source of income. She has filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. against the respondent in Court at Moga, where the respondent is appearing. The respondent has filed the petition in question against the applicant to cause harassment and inconvenience to her. The applicant being a young woman, having no source of income, it is difficult for her to travel from her parental place to Ferozepur, to attend the dates of hearing in the Court there, covering a distance of about 80 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 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, Ferozepur and transferred to Family Court at Moga for disposal in accordance with law.

The parties through counsel are directed to appear in the transferee Court on 15.10.2019. Copies of orders be sent to both the Courts for information and necessary compliance.

04.09.2019

sumit.k

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes

No

Whether Reportable :

Yes

No