

**Sr. No.205
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**TA No.408 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 04.03.2020**

Manju

... Applicant

Versus

Dinesh Jindal

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present:- Mr. Naveen Gupta, Advocate
for the applicant.

Mr. Darshan Singh, Advocate,
for the respondent.

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

1. Applicant-wife seeks transfer of petition filed by the respondent-husband under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 bearing No. DMC/1019/2018 titled as “Dinesh Jindal Vs. Manju” pending in the Court of learned District Judge, (Additional Family Court), Hisar to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Narwana, District Jind.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that complaint under Section 12 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 against the respondent-husband filed by the applicant-wife is already pending at Narwana, District Jind. He further submits that one FIR against the respondent husband under Sections 323, 34, 406, 498-A, 506 IPC is also registered at Police Station Uchana, District Jind.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant is residing at Uchana Mandi, District Jind with her parents. She has

no source of income. Her father is a handicapped person having 100% disability in the eyes and is unable to walk properly without any help. The distance from her residence to Hisar Court is about 70 kms. Therefore, it is difficult for her to go to Hisar on each date of hearing. On the other hand, respondent-husband is a resident of Tehsil Uklana, District Hisar. The distance between Uklana and Narwana is 28 Kms. It is also convenient for the respondent to attend the Court hearings at Narwana.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent appears and opposes the said application.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case.

6. Both the cases pending between the parties are aftermath of matrimonial discord. Keeping in view the contentions in the application and the conceded position that petition under Section 12 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 is already pending at Narwana it would be proper, appropriate and in the interest of justice if both the cases are tried and decided at one place.

7. Reference may also be had to the observations made by Hon'ble the Supreme Court of India in cases titled as "***Sumita Singh Vs. Kumar Sanjay and another***", ***AIR 2002 SC 396*** and ***Rajni Kishor Pardeshi v. Kishor Babulal Pardeshi***" ***2005 (12) SCC 237***, wherein in matrimonial matters, convenience of wife is to be preferred over the convenience of husband.

8. Even otherwise, the ethos as manifested under Article

51-A of Constitution of India also envisage that it shall be fundamental duty of every citizen of India to uphold the dignity of woman. In addition, per Article 15 (3), power has also been conferred on the State to make special provisions for women and children.

9. It was perhaps in this spirit that an amendment was inserted by Act 50 of 2003 with effect from 23.12.2003 in Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, whereby, in case of a wife being the petitioner, jurisdiction was conferred to the Court within local limits of whose ordinary original civil jurisdiction, the wife is residing on the date of presentation of the petition. In fact the very statement of objects and reasons of the Bill whereby Clause (iiia) was inserted in Section 19 (i) of HMA, by way of marriage laws (Amendment Act 2003) states as below :

“The Special Marriage Act, 1954 and the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 provide that a petition for relief under the provisions of these Acts shall be presented to the District Court within the limits of whose original civil jurisdiction the marriage was solemnized or the respondent, at the time of the presentation of the petition, resided or the parties to the marriage last resided together or the petitioner was residing at the time of the presentation of the petition, in a case where the respondent was at the time residing outside the territories to which these Acts extended or had not been heard of as being alive for a period of seven years by those who would naturally have heard of him if he were alive. However, these provisions are not considered adequate or fair as far the women are concerned. Under the existing provisions, a petition cannot be filed by the

aggrieved wife to the District Court within the local limits of whose ordinary jurisdiction she may be residing. In view thereof, the Government has decided to amend the provisions of these Acts so that the wife can also file petition in the District Court within local limits of whose jurisdiction she may be residing.”

10. After the aforesaid amendment, husband can only institute proceedings, either where marriage was solemnized or where the wife is residing or where the parties last resided together. Only in a case where wife is residing outside India, the husband can institute proceedings where he is residing. Whereas, wife can file a petition on the additional ground of her being resident within the local limits of the competent Court. The said right has been exclusively conferred on a wife so as to keep her convenience in mind in the matrimonial matters.

11. In the premise, present application is allowed. The petition in question pending before the Court of learned District Judge, (Additional Family Court), Hisar is ordered to be withdrawn from that Court and is transferred to the District Judge, Jind for its disposal in accordance with law by the Court concerned.

04.03.2020

vandana

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No