

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

TA-7-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.09.2022

Sunita @ Sofia

....Petitioner

Vs.

Neeraj Kumar

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Rishabh Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Akhilesh Vyas, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate
for the respondent.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for transfer of the petition filed by the respondent-husband bearing No.GW/97/2020 titled as Neeraj Kumar Vs. Sunita @ Sofia, pending before the Family Court, Ludhiana to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Amritsar.

While issuing notice of motion, following order was passed by this Court on 06.01.2021: -

“Learned counsel for the applicant-wife submits that the applicant-wife has already initiated proceedings against the respondent-husband by filing petition under Section 125 of the

Cr.P.C. and the action of the respondent-husband in filing the petition under the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 is only an act of retaliation, so as to harass the applicant-wife.

*Learned counsel for the applicant-wife argues that the applicant-wife is a single lady and it is very difficult for her to travel from Amritsar to Ludhiana to attend the said proceedings and keeping in view the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Neelam Kanwar Vs. Devinder Singh Kanwar, 2000 (10) SCC 589** as well as in **Sumita Singh Vs. Kumar Sanjay and another, 2001 (10) SCC 41**, the suit/proceedings between the parties ordinarily should be tried at the place where the woman is residing unless and until there are special reasons not to do so, hence, the petition filed by the respondent-husband under the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 be transferred to Amritsar.”*

Learned counsel has relied upon the judgments **Sumita Singh Vs. Kumar Sanjay, 2002 SC 396** and **Rajani Kishor Pardeshi Vs. Kishor Babulal Pardeshi, 2005(12) SCC 237**, wherein the Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that *while deciding the transfer application, the Courts are required to give more weightage and consideration to the convenience of the female litigants and transfer of legal proceedings from one Court to another should ordinarily be allowed, taking into consideration their convenience and the Courts should desist from putting female litigants*

under undue hardships.”

Learned counsel has further relied upon **N.C.V. Aishwarya Vs. A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha, 2022 Live Law (SC) 627**, wherein the Hon’ble Supreme Court held as under: -

“The cardinal principle for exercise of power under Section 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure is that the ends of justice should demand the transfer of the suit, appeal or other proceeding. In matrimonial matters, wherever Courts are called upon to consider the plea of transfer, the Courts have to take into consideration the economic soundness of both the parties, the social strata of the spouses and their behavioural pattern, their standard of life prior to the marriage and subsequent thereto and the circumstances of both the parties in eking out their livelihood and under whose protective umbrella they are seeking their sustenance to life. Given the prevailing socioeconomic paradigm in the Indian society, generally, it is the wife’s convenience which must be looked at while considering transfer.

Further, when two or more proceedings are pending in different Courts between the same parties which raise common question of fact and law, and when the decisions in the cases are interdependent, it is desirable that they should be tried together by the same Judge so as to avoid multiplicity in trial of the same issues and conflict of decisions.”

Learned counsel for the respondent has, however, opposed the prayer for transfer of petition filed by the respondent-husband.

It is well settled that while considering the transfer of a matrimonial dispute/case at the instance of the wife, the Court is to consider

family condition of the wife, custody of the minor child, economic condition of the wife, her physical health and earning capacity of the husband and most important, convenience of the wife i.e. she cannot travel alone without assistance of a male member of her family, connectivity of the place to and fro from her place of residence as well as bearing of the litigation charges and travelling expenses.

After hearing the counsel for the parties, considering the fact that the petitioner-wife will have to bear the litigation expenses and transportation expenses and in view of the judgments in **Sumita Singh's** case (supra), **Rajani Kishor Pardeshi's** case (supra) and **N.C.V. Aishwarya's** case (supra) passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court deem it appropriate to allow the present petition, subject to the following conditions:-

1. *The petition bearing No.GW/97/2020 titled as Neeraj Kumar Vs. Sunita @ Sofia filed by the respondent, pending before the Family Court, Ludhiana will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Amritsar.*
2. *The District Judge, Amritsar will assign the said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction.*
3. *The Family Court, Ludhiana is directed to transfer all the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Amritsar.*
4. *The parties are directed to appear before the Family Court, Amritsar within a period of 01 month from today.*
5. *The Family Court, Amritsar will make all the endeavour to refer the case before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre for*

exploring the possibility of amicable settlement between the parties.

6. *The Court concerned, where the litigations between the parties are pending, will accommodate them with one date in one calender month.*

Present petition is disposed of accordingly.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

15.09.2022

vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No