

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**TA No.22 of 2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.08.2022**

Vanita Garg

....Petitioner

Versus

Bal Krishan Bansal

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Tribhawan Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocate
for the respondent.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

At the very outset, counsel for the petitioner submits that in the prayer clause of the petition, it is stated that the petition filed by the respondent/husband under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act is pending before the Principal Judge, Family Court Bathinda, whereas the same is pending before Camp Court Phul, District Bathinda and has prayed for transfer of the said petition to Barnala.

Vide order dated 01.02.2022, the following order was passed:-

“The present transfer application has been filed by the wife for seeking transfer of petition under Section 9 of Hindu Marriage Act, filed at the instance of the respondent/husband, which is now pending in the Family Court at Bathinda, to any competent Court at Barnala.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that wife is residing at her parental house in Barnala. She has already filed petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C., which is pending in Family Court, Barnala. Even though maintenance has been fixed by the Court, but the husband is not making payment of maintenance to the wife. It is

difficult for her to pursue the litigation imposed upon her, as she is residing with her aged parents at Barnala.

Notice of motion for 23.03.2022.”

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that on account of a matrimonial discord, the petitioner has filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. and also got registered an FIR No.349 dated 02.09.2019 at Barnala.

Counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the respondent/husband has filed the petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, as a counter-blast, before the Principal Judge, Family Court, Camp Court Phul, District Bathinda.

Counsel for the petitioner has also argued that on account of a petition filed by the respondent/husband, the petitioner is facing great difficulty in prosecuting the said case as there is a distance of about 65 Kms from Barnala to Camp Court Phul, District Bathinda.

Counsel for the petitioner 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 has 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.”*

Counsel for the petitioner has also relied upon the judgment **“N.C.V. Aishwarya vs A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha,” 2022**

Live Law (SC) 627, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed as under:-

9. 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.

10. 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.”

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 the family condition of the wife, the custody of the minor child, economic condition of the wife, her physical health and earning capacity of the husband and most important the 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.

Counsel for the respondent has, however, not disputed the factual position but opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner.

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 i.e. ***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 filed under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, pending before the Family Court, Camp Court Phul, District Bathinda will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Barnala.*
- 2. The District Judge, Barnala, will assign the said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction.*
- 3. The Family Court, Camp Court Phul, District Bathinda is directed to transfer all the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Barnala.*
- 4. The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court, Barnala, within a period of 01 month from today.*
- 5. The Court concerned, where the litigation pending between the parties, will accommodate them with one date in one calendar month.*

Disposed of.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

24.08.2022

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No