



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.12.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Tr.C.M.P.Nos.1089 & 1023 of 2022

and

C.M.P.Nos.17635 & 18684 of 2022

S.Prabhu	..	Petitioner in Tr.C.M.P.No.1089 of 2022
Roobini	..	Petitioner in Tr.C.M.P.No.1023 of 2022
	vs	
Roobini	..	Respondent in Tr.C.M.P.No.1089 of 2022
S.Prabhu	..	Respondent in Tr.C.M.P.No.1023 of 2022

Prayer in Tr.C.M.P.No.1089 of 2022: Transfer CMP is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw the case in M.C.no.63 of 2022 pending on the file of the Family Court, Tirupur and transfer the same to the Family Court, Chennai;

Prayer in Tr.C.M.P.No.1023 of 2022: Transfer CMP is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw the case in H.M.O.P.No.1279 of 2022 pending on the file of the I Additional Family Court, Chennai and transfer the same to the Family Court, Thiruppur.



WEB COPY



For Petitioner in
Tr.C.M.P.No.1089 of 2022 : Mr.S.I.Ilamvaludhi
for Dr.C.Ravichandran

For Petitioner in
Tr.C.M.P.No.1023 of 2022 : Ms.Meera Mogasundaram

For Respondent in
Tr.C.M.P.No.1089 of 2022 : Ms.Meera Moganasundaram

For Respondent in
Tr.C.M.P.No.1023 of 2022 : Mr.S.I.Ilamvaludhi
for Dr.C.Ravichandran

COMMON ORDER

The marriage between one S.Prabhu and Roobini was solemnized on 23.08.2018 as per the Hindu Rites and Customs. Due to misunderstandings, the said S.Prabhu and Roobini are living separately.

2. The petitioner / wife in Tr.C.M.P.No.1023 of 2022 filed M.C.No.63 of 2022 for maintenance, which is now pending on the file of the learned Family Court, Tirupur. The respondent / husband in Tr.C.M.P.No.1023 of 2022 filed H.M.O.P.No.1279 of 2022 for dissolution of marriage on the file



of the learned I Additional Family Court, Chennai.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner / wife states that the petitioner / wife is unemployed and is residing along with her parents at Tirupur. While so, she will not be in a position to spend, travel and contest the divorce case filed by the respondent / husband on the file of the learned I Additional Family Court, Chennai. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent / husband objected the said contention by stating that he is ready for mediation and therefore, the transfer petition is to be referred for mediation.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner / wife seriously objected the said contention by stating that there is no possibility of reunion and thus, the transfer case filed by the petitioner / wife is to be considered.

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:-

WEB COPY

“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.”

WEB COPY

(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 safeguard 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, H.M.O.P.No.1279 of 2022 pending on the file of the learned I Additional Family Court, Chennai stands transferred to the learned Family Court, Tirupur to be tried along



with the M.C.No.63 of 2022 as expeditiously as possible.

WEB COPY

7. Learned I Additional Family Court, Chennai is directed to transmit the case papers within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. In view of the fact that Tr.C.M.P.No.1023 of 2022 is allowed, the Tr.C.M.P.No.1089 of 2022, filed by the petitioner / husband stands dismissed. There will be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

19.12.2022

drm

Index : Yes / No

Speaking order / Non-speaking order

To

1. The I Additional Family Court, Chennai.
2. The Family Court, Tirupur.



WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.Nos.1089 & 1023 of 2



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

(drm)

Tr.C.M.P.Nos.1089 & 1023 of 2022
and
C.M.P.Nos.17635 & 18684 of 2022

19.12.2022