

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.03.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Tr.C.M.P.No.204 of 2021
and C.M.P.No.5886 of 2021

R.Shanmugam

S/o.Raman

No.3/1545, Periya Perumal Gounder Street,
Vennampatty Railway Gate,
New Colony, Dharmapuri Town,
Dharmapuri District.

... Petitioner

Vs.

V.Archana

D/o.Venkatesan,

Panamarthu Patti Village,
Kallavi, Uthangarai Taluk,
Krishnagiri District.

... Respondent

Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 24 CPC, to transfer H.M.O.P.No.97 of 2019 from the file of the Subordinate Court, Uthangarai, to the file of the Family Court, Dharmapuri, to be tried along with H.M.O.P.No.158 of 2018.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Sathish Kumar

ORDER

Seeking transfer of H.M.O.P.No.97 of 2019 from the file of the Subordinate Court, Uthangarai, to the file of the Family Court, Dharmapuri, to be tried along with H.M.O.P.No.158 of 2018, this transfer civil miscellaneous petition has been filed.

2. The marriage between the petitioner/husband and respondent/wife was solemnized on 05.09.2016 as per hindu rites and custom. The petitioner/husband states that he has completed his B.E., degree and now, running business of producing milk, curd and other products. The respondent/wife left the matrimonial home and the petitioner/husband raised many allegations against the respondent/wife and this Court cannot adjudicate those allegations in the present transfer petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/husband admits that the respondent/wife is unemployed. However, he contended that the petitioner/husband is doing a business in his place at Dharmapuri Town and therefore, he is not in a position to travel and contest the case filed by the respondent/wife in H.M.O.P.No.97 of 2019 for restitution of conjugal rights.

4. This Court is of an opinion that the respondent/wife is interested for reunion and filed a petition in H.M.O.P.No.97 of 2019 for restitution of conjugal rights. The petitioner/husband already filed H.M.O.P.No.158 of 2018 before the Family Court, Dharmapuri. The respondent/wife is unemployed and therefore, the place of the wife is preferable for matrimonial disputes and the same is well settled as per the principles laid down by this Court, in the following cases:

(i) The Hon'ble Division Bench of the High Court of Madras in W.A.No.1181 of 2009, dated 09.07.2010 has held as follows:-

'21. The domicile or citizenship of the opposite party is immaterial in a case like this. In case the marriage was solemnized under Hindu Law marital relationship is governed by the provisions of the Hindu Marriage Act. Therefore, Section 19 has to be given a purposeful interpretation. It is the residence of the wife, which determines the question of jurisdiction, in case the proceeding was initiated at the instance of the wife.

22. While considering a provision like Section 19 (iii-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, the objects and reasons which prompted the parliament to incorporate such a provision has also to be taken note of. Sub Clause (iii-a) was inserted in Section 19 with a specific purpose. Experience is the best teacher. The Government found the difficulties faced by women in the matter of initiation of matrimonial proceedings. The report submitted by the Law Commission as well as National Commission for Women, underlying the need for such amendment so as to enable the women to approach the nearest jurisdictional court to redress their matrimonial grievances, were also taken note of by the Government. Therefore such a beneficial provision meant for the women of

our Country should be given a meaningful interpretation by Courts."

(ii) In yet another case in TR.CMP.Nos.138 and 139 of 2006, dated 30.08.2006, the High Court of Madras has considered the following judgments:-

"16.In AIR 2000 SC 3512 (1) (Mona Aresh Goel vs. Aresh Satya Goel), when the wife pleaded that she was unable to bear the traveling expenses and even to travel alone and stay at Bombay, the Supreme Court ordered transfer of proceedings.

In 2000 (10) SCC 304, the Honourable Supreme Court has held that where the petitioner's wife has pleaded lack of money, the same has to be considered.

In 2000 (9) SCC 355, the wife has filed a petition to transfer the proceedings initiated by the husband for divorce, at Bombay. The place of residence of the wife was at Jaipur, Rajasthan. In that case, the petitioner is having a small child and that she pleaded difficulty in going all the way from Jaipur to Bombay to contest the proceedings from time to time. Considering the distance and the difficulties faced by the wife, the Supreme Court has allowed the transfer petition.

In a decision reported in 2005 (12) SCC 395, the wife has sought for transfer of matrimonial proceedings and a divorce petition has been filed by the respondent's husband at Baikunthpur to be transferred to Allahabad, where the petitioner's wife was residing, on the ground that it would be difficult for her to undertake such long distance journey, particularly in circumstances, in which she finds that the proceedings under Section 125 Cr.P.C. was already pending before the Family Court, Allahabad. Considering the difficulties faced by the wife and also the long distance journey, the Honourable Supreme Court was pleased to order transfer of the proceedings to Allahabad."

(iii) In a decision made in TR.CMP(MD)No.108 of 2010, dated 03.03.2011, the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, has observed as below:-

"18.It is true that section 19 of the Hindu Marriage Act, has been amended by insertion of proviso of (iii)(a) to section 19. Of Course,

this amended section 19(iii)(a) gives special preference to the wife to file a petition or defending the case of the husband before the Court within whose jurisdiction she resides. The intention of the legislator is to safe-guard the interest and rights of the women, who are being subjected to harassment and cruelty. But this special preference conferred under section 19 (iii)(a) of the Hindu Marriage Act shall not be used to wreck vengeance on the husband. There must be a justifiable cause to select the jurisdiction of the Court where she resides.'

5. In view of the facts and circumstances, this Court is of an opinion that the present petition for transfer deserves no merit consideration. However, the H.M.O.P.No.158 of 2018 filed by the petitioner/husband for divorce is to be transferred for common trial. Accordingly, H.M.O.P.No.158 of 2018 pending on the file of the Family Court, Dharmapuri, stands transferred to the file of the Subordinate Court, Uthangarai, to be tried along with H.M.O.P.No.97 of 2019.

With the above directions, this transfer civil miscellaneous petition is disposed of. No costs. Connected C.M.P. is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

NSD

To

1. The Judge, Family Court,
Dharmapuri.

2. The Subordinate Judge,
Uthangarai.

+ 2cc to Mr.M.Sathiskumar, Advocate SR.No.20130

Tr.C.M.P.No.204 of 2021
and C.M.P.No.5886 of 2021

SR-II (CO)
TE (22/042021)