



WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.693 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.12.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Tr.C.M.P.No.693 of 2022

and

C.M.P.No.11855 of 2022

Kowsalya

... Petitioner

Vs.

Sudharsan

... Respondent

Prayer: Transfer CMP is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw the HMOP No.56 of 2022 from the file of the Sub Court, Omalur and transfer the same to the Sub Court, Uthangarai, Krishnagiri District.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Pradeep

For Respondent : Mr.Durai Genasekaran



ORDER

The petition for transfer is filed to withdraw the HMOP No.56 of 2022 from the file of the Sub Court, Omalur and transfer the same to the Sub Court, Uthangarai, Krishnagiri District.

2. The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnised on 25.02.2021. A girl baby was born from and out of wedlock between the petitioner and the respondent, now the child is aged about one year. That apart the petitioner is unemployed and residing along with her parents. Thus, she is depending on her parents for her livelihood. Therefore, the case of the petitioner is to be considered.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent raised an objection by stating that there is no safety for the respondent, if the case is transferred to the Court at Uthangarai. Already the family members of the petitioner attacked the respondent and therefore, the case is to be posted before any other Court. It makes no difference, if the case is transferred to Attur, which is also a nearby place to Uthangarai. That being the case, the said arguments advanced on behalf of the respondent does not have any force.





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 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



WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.693 of 2



jurisdiction of the Court where she resides.”



5. Considering the facts and circumstances, the HMOP No.56 of 2022 pending on the file of the Sub Court at Omalur stands transferred to the Sub Court at Uthangarai, Krishnagiri District. The Sub Court at Omalur is directed to transmit the case papers to the Sub Court at Uthangarai, Krishnagiri District to be tried along with HMOP No.69 of 2022 within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. 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.

06.12.2022

Jeni
Index : Yes
Speaking order

To

- 1.The Judge,
Sub Court,
Omalur.
- 2.The Judge,
Sub Court,
Uthangarai,
Krishnagiri District.



WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.693 of 2



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

Jeni

Tr.C.M.P.No.693 of 2022

06.12.2022