



WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.1070 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.12.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Tr.C.M.P.No.1070 of 2022

and

C.M.P.No.18340 of 2022

A.Damodaran

.. Petitioner

vs

J.Nirmala

.. Respondent

Prayer: Transfer CMP is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw and transfer in H.M.O.P.No.18 of 2021 and H.M.O.P.No.222 of 2022 (both coming together) from the file of the Subordinate Court, Kancheepuram to Subordinate Court (Family Court) at Tambaram.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Kalyanasundaram
Senior Advocate
for Mr.R.Vasudevan

For Respondent : Mr.G.Dilipkumar



ORDER

The transfer petition is filed to withdraw and transfer H.M.O.P.No.18 of 2021 and H.M.O.P.No.222 of 2022 from the file of the learned Subordinate Court, Kancheepuram to learned Subordinate Court (Family Court) at Tambaram.

2. The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 12.09.2019 as per the Hindu Rites and Customs. One male child was born from and out of the wedlock between the petitioner and the respondent and is now living along with the respondent / mother.

3. The petitioner / husband filed H.M.O.P.No.18 of 2021 for judicial separation on the file of the learned Subordinate Court, Kancheepuram. The respondent / wife filed H.M.O.P.No.222 of 2022 for restitution of conjugal rights on the file of the same Court at Kancheepuram.

4. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner mainly contended that the distance between the place of residence of the petitioner and Kancheepuram is about 70 kms and if the case is transferred



to Tambaram, it would be convenient both for the petitioner as well as the respondent.

WEB COPY

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent / wife objected the same by stating that the petitioner is unemployed and more so, has to take care of her two year old male child.

6. 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



WEB COPY



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:-

WEB COPY

*“(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



WEB COPY



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.”

7. Considering the facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion tha the distance criteria, as claimed by the petitioner / husband, deserves no merit consideration. The respondent / wife is unemployed and has to maintain the two year old male child. Thus, this Court is not inclined to entertain this transfer petition and accordingly, the transfer petition stands dismissed. There will be no order as to costs.



Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

WEB COPY

19.12.2022

drm

Index : Yes / No

Speaking order / Non-speaking order

To

1. The Subordinate Court, Kancheepuram.
2. The Subordinate Court, Tambaram.



WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.1070 of 2



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

(drm)

Tr.C.M.P.No.1070 of 2022
and
C.M.P.No.18340 of 2022

19.12.2022