

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

TA-188-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.08.2022

Surbhi Mehta

....Petitioner

Vs.

Vipul Mehta

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Vikas Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahejdeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Sahil Goel, Advocate
for the respondent.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

CM-3464-CII-2021

For the reasons stated in the application, same is allowed and
amended petition is taken on record.

CM stands disposed of.

TA-188-2021

Prayer in this petition is for transfer of the petition filed by the
respondent-husband under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, pending
before the Family Court, Panchkula to the competent Court of jurisdiction at

Nakodar, District Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that on an earlier occasion, the petitioner-wife filed a complaint under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act at Sultanpur Lodhi and the respondent-husband filed CRM-M-26346-2016 and vide order dated 23.01.2018, the complaint was transferred from Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala to Nakodar, District Jalandhar. Similarly, when the petitioner filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. at Sultanpur Lodhi, the respondent again approached this Court and the said case was also transferred to Nakodar. It is further submitted that now the respondent-husband filed the petition under Section 13 of Hindu Marriage Act at Panchkula just to harass the petitioner. It is also submitted that the petitioner is facing great difficulty in prosecuting the petition filed by the respondent, as there is a distance of about 200 kms from Sultanpur Lodhi to Panchkula.

Learned counsel has further contended that the petitioner is having a minor child, who is living in her care and custody and she is facing difficulty to defend the case, as she has to travel from Sultanpur Lodhi to Panchkula.

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 on the ground that the petitioner need not to appear in the proceedings under Section 13 of Hindu Marriage Act at Panchkula and it is the petitioner-wife, who deserted 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 filed under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, pending before the Family Court, Panchkula will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Nakodar, District Jalandhar.*
2. *The District Judge, Jalandhar will assign the said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Nakodar.*
3. *The Family Court, Panchkula is directed to transfer all the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Jalandhar.*
4. *The parties are directed to appear before the Family Court, Nakodar within a period of 01 month from today.*
5. *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**

22.08.2022

vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No