

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 04-01-2021

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Tr.C.M.P.No.783 of 2017

And

C.M.P.Nos.15914 of 2017 and 4805 of 2020

Mrs.P.Sudha

..Petitioner/Respondent

vs.

P.Manickam

..Respondent/Petitioner

PRAYER : Transfer CMP is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code to withdraw the Divorce Petition in HMOP No.83 of 2017 from the file of the Subordinate Judge, Hosur and transfer the same to the file of the Subordinate Judge, Sankari, Salem District.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Saikrishnan for
M/s.Sai and Bharath

For Respondent : No Appearance

O R D E R

The petition for transfer is to transfer the the HMOP No.83 of 2017 from the file of the Subordinate Judge, Hosur to the Subordinate Judge, Sankari, Salem District.

2. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner states that the marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 04.06.2003 as per Hindu Rites and Customs. Two children were born from and out of the wedlock between the petitioner and the respondent.

3. The petitioner states that difference of opinion arose on account of the demand of dowry by the respondent and the respondent compelled the petitioner to sell the house plot purchased in her name by her parents. Under those circumstances, a complaint was filed before the Jurisdictional Police Station and subsequently HMOP No.83 of 2017 was filed, seeking dissolution of marriage. The said petition was filed by the respondent.

4. The contention of the petitioner is that she is residing at Kuppanur Village, Pulampatti Post, Edappadi

Taluk, Salem District and the respondent filed petition for divorce in HMOP No.83 of 2017 before the Sub Court at Hosur. The petitioner is unemployed and she is not in a position to travel for every hearing to attend the case at Hosur. Thus, the present transfer petition is filed by the petitioner.

5. The principles regarding transfer petitions, more specifically in the matters of matrimonial cases are well settled through the decisions 3 of the High Court of Madras, 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.'

In view of the principles laid down and considering the facts and circumstances, the petitioner is entitled for the relief.

6. Accordingly, this Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition No.783 of 2017 stands allowed and H.M.O.P.No.83 of 2017 pending on the file of the Sub Court, Hosur is directed to be transferred to the Sub Court, Sankari, Salem District. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Subordinate Judge,
Hosur.
2. The Subordinate Judge,
Sankari,
Salem District.

+1cc to Mr.T.Saikrishnan, Advocate, S.R.No.362

Tr.CMP No.783 of 2017

mg(CO)
rv(22/01/2021)

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY