



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 07.12.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Tr.C.M.P.No.655 of 2022

and

C.M.P.No.11206 of 2022

M.Krupa Devi

... Petitioner

Vs.

T.Prem Anand

... Respondent

Prayer: Transfer CMP is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw and transfer the GWOP No.363 of 2021 on the file of the Principal District Court at Tiruvallur to the file of the V Additional Family Court, Chennai to be heard along with O.P.No.1697 of 2021.

For Petitioner : Mr. J.Saravana Vel

For Respondent : Mr. R.Ravindran

ORDER

The petition for transfer is filed to transfer the GWOP No.363 of 2021 from the Principal District Court, Tiruvallur to the file of the V Additional Family Court, Chennai to be tried along with O.P.No.1697 of 2021 filed by the respondent for dissolution of marriage.



2. The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnised on 02.09.2009 as per the Hindu Rites and Rituals. Two male children were born from and out of wedlock between the petitioner and the respondent and the children are now living with the respondent. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the respondent himself filed O.P.No.1697 of 2021 for dissolution of marriage on the file of the V Additional Family Court, Chennai and on the account of the jurisdictional factor, the GWOP No.363 of 2021 was filed before the Principal District Court at Tiruvallur. It will be inconvenient for the petitioner to travel both the places at Thiruvallur and Chennai for contesting the GWOP No.363 of 2021 and O.P.No.1697 of 2021.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent raised an objection by stating that as per Section 9 of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890, the petition was instituted before the jurisdictional court at Tiruvallur and therefore the same need not be transferred to Family Court at Chennai.

4. Undoubtedly, the petitions are to be instituted before the court having the jurisdiction. When it is brought to the notice of the High Court



that yet another petition for divorce was instituted by the same person in another court in the interest of justice, both the petitions are to be heard together and also for the benefit and convenience of the parties. In the present case, both the petitions i.e., GWOP No.363 of 2021 and O.P. No. 1697 of 2021 are filed by the respondent and therefore it would not cause prejudice to the respondent if the GWOP No.363 of 2021 is transferred to the V Additional Family Court at Chennai.

5. The principles regarding transfer petitions, more specifically in the matters of matrimonial cases, are well settled through the three decisions 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***, wherein in paragraphs-21 and 22, it has been observed as under:-

“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 of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India:-

*“(1) In the case of **Mona Aresh Goel vs. Aresh Satya Goel [(2000) 9 SCC 255]**, 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.*

*(2) In the case of **Geeta Heera vs. Harish Chander Heera [(2000) 10 SCC 304]**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that where the petitioner's wife has pleaded lack of money, the same has to be considered.*

*(3) In the case of **Lalita A.Ranga vs. Ajay Champalal Ranga [(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.

*(4) In a decision in **Archana Singh vs. Surendra Bahadur Singh [(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 5 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, wherein in paragraph-18, it has been 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 Legislature 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.”

6. Considering the facts and circumstances, the GWOP No.363 of 2021 pending on the file of the Principal District Court at Tiruvallur stands transferred to the file of the V Additional Family Court, Chennai to be heard along with O.P.No.1697 of 2021 as expeditiously as possible.

5. With the abovesaid directions, the Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition stands allowed. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

07.12.2022

Skr/Jeni
Index : Yes
Speaking order



Tr.C.M.P.No.655 of 2



To

- 1.The Judge,
Principal District Court,
Tiruvallur.
- 2.The Judge,
V Additional Family Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.655 of 2



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

Skr

Tr.C.M.P.No.655 of 2022

07.12.2022