

**Sr. No.216
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**TA No.945 of 2019 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 25.02.2020**

Anjali

... Applicant

Versus

Dikshant Thakur

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present:- Mr. J.S.Bagga, Advocate,
for the applicant.

Mr. Ashok Bector, Advocate,
for the respondent.

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

1. Applicant-wife seeks transfer of petition filed by the respondent-husband under Section 13 (i) (i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 titled as “Dikshant Thakur Vs. Anjali” pending in the Court of learned Additional District Judge, Family Court, Chandigarh to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Kapurthala.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that no maintenance was being paid by the respondent and matter was settled in Lok Adalat in petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. vide order dated 09.04.2016. He further submits that respondent paid only one installment of maintenance and thereafter has not paid any maintenance. FIR under Sections 498-A, 406, IPC against the respondent-husband filed by the applicant-wife is already pending at Sultanpur Lodhi District Kapurthala, in which respondent-husband has been declared as proclaimed person

vide order dated 18.01.2019.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant further submits that applicant/petitioner is residing with her parents at Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala. She has no source of income. She is fully dependent upon her parents. The distance from her hometown to Chandigarh is about 200 kms. Therefore, it is difficult for her to come to Chandigarh on each date of hearing.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent husband opposes the transfer application and has filed reply in support of his arguments.

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 FIR under Sections 498-A, 406 IPC is already pending at Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, 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 Additional District Judge, Family Court, Chandigarh is ordered to be withdrawn from that Court and is transferred to the District Judge, Kapurthala for its disposal in accordance with law by the Court concerned.

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

25.02.2020
vandana

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No