

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

TA-83-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 20.07.2022

Goldi**...Petitioner**

Versus

Rajesh**...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

Present:- Mr. Dharam Bir Bhargav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

None for the respondent.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for transfer of the petition filed by the respondent-husband under Section 12 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, titled as ***Rajesh vs. Goldi***, pending before the Family Court, Kaithal to the competent Court of jurisdiction at S.A.S. Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that on account of a matrimonial discord, the petitioner is residing with her parents at Lalru, District S.A.S. Nagar and has no source of income. It is further submitted that in order to harass the petitioner, the respondent-husband has filed the present petition under Section 12 of the Hindu Marriage Act at Kaithal. It is further submitted that the petitioner is facing great difficulty in prosecuting the said case, as there is a distance of about 100 kms between Kaithal and S.A.S. Nagar.

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.*”

Neither any reply is filed nor there is any representation on behalf of 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 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 12 of the Hindu Marriage Act, pending before the Family Court, Kaithal will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at S.A.S. Nagar.*
- (ii) *The District Judge, S.A.S. Nagar will assign the*

said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction.

- (iii) The Family Court, Kaithal is directed to transfer all the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, S.A.S. Nagar.*
- (iv) The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court at S.A.S. Nagar 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 Kaithal, 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 Kaithal, in case the respondent opts to contest this petition.*

20.07.2022

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No