

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

203

TA-55-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 09.08.2022

Ashma Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

Gaurave Arora

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. G. S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

None for the respondent.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

While issuing notice of motion on 08.02.2022, the following order was passed:

“Applicant-wife has filed the transfer application for seeking transfer of the petition bearing number GW/62/2021, filed under Section 25 of Guardians and Wards Act, at the instance of respondent/husband/father, presently pending in the Family Court, Patiala to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Sardulgarh, Mansa.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that one female child, aged about 6 years born from the wedlock of the parties to the lis, is presently in the custody of respondent/husband/father. Applicant wife had filed present petition for custody of the minor child. The distance between Sardulgarh to Patiala is about 110 kms. The applicant is residing with her aged parents, who are not keeping good health. As such, it is difficult for her to pursue the litigation thrust upon her, at the instance of respondent/husband/father.

Notice of motion for 21.04.2022.

Notice re: stay, as well.

Lower Court shall adjourn the matter beyond the date fixed by this Court.”

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 for the petitioner has further relied upon ***2022 Live Law (SC) 627 N.C.V. Aishwarya vs. A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha***, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court has held 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.”

As per office report, the respondent is served, however, there is no representation on his behalf.

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 petitioner, considering the fact that if the aforesaid petition is not transferred, the petitioner-wife will have to bear the litigation expenses and transportation expenses and also in view of the ratio of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sumita Singh***'s case (supra) and ***Rajani Kishor Pardeshi***'s case (supra), this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition, with the following directions:-

- (i) *The petition filed under Section 25 of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890, pending before the Family Court, Patiala will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Sardulgarh, Mansa.*

- (ii) *The District Judge, Mansa will assign the said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction.*
- (iii) *The Family Court at Patiala is directed to transfer all the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Mansa.*
- (iv) *The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court at Sardulgarh, Mansa within a period of 01 month from today.*

However, liberty is granted to the respondent-husband to revive this petition, if he intends to contest the same, provided that:-

- (i) *The respondent will clear all the arrears of maintenance amount, if any, in terms of the petition filed by the petitioner either under Section 125 Cr.P.C. or Section 12 of the Domestic Violence Act or Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act.*
- (ii) *The respondent will file an affidavit giving undertaking to pay Rs.1,000/- per day, to the petitioner for attending the Court proceedings at Patiala, on each and every date of hearing.*
- (iii) *The respondent will bring a demand draft of Rs.25,000/- towards the litigation expenses of the petitioner to pursue the case at Patiala, in case the respondent opts to contest this petition.*

09.08.2022

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No