

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

**TA No.203 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.12.2022**

Monika

...Petitioner

v

Parveen

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Radhey Shyam Sharma, Advocate for the respondent.

NIDHI GUPTA, J.(ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition filed by petitioner wife is for transfer of the petition bearing No.HMA-49 of 2019 filed by respondent-husband under Section 12 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, titled "Parveen vs. Monika" pending in the Court of Ld. District Judge, Fatehabad to a court of competent jurisdiction at Panipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, submits that:

i) that the marriage between the parties was solemnized on 21.09.2018 according to Hindu rites and rituals.

ii) that no child was born out of the wedlock.

iii) that the petitioner is living alone in a rented accommodation at Panipat.

iv) that the distance between her place of residence and place of proceedings is 180 kms. (one side)

v) that the petitioner is doing a diploma in computer application (Annexure P2) at Panipat.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent opposed the present petition and states that petitioner is divorcee and at the time of marriage, this fact was not disclosed by the petitioner and her family members. Ld. Counsel

makes reference to copy of medical prescription of the petitioner dated 27.09.2018 (Annexure P5), to submit that the petitioner is mentally disturbed.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. A perusal of Annexure P2 evidences that the petitioner is pursuing a diploma course in computer management at Panipat. Even though the petitioner is shown to be a resident of Gohana in the said certificate, the distance between Gohana and Panipat is hardly 50 kms, whereas the distance between Gohana and Fatehabad is almost 150 kms. Moreover, even assuming the allegation of the respondent regarding the mental status of the petitioner to be correct, the same constitutes a strong ground for allowing this petition, as it will clearly be very difficult for her to travel.

6. Further, the legal position in such like cases as the present one, is well established. In this regard, judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in **N.C.V. Aishwarya vs A.S. SaravanaKarthikSha," 2022 Live Law (SC) 627**, is most relevant wherein the 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.”

7. Further reliance can be placed upon the judgments in “**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.”

8. Even this Court in number of cases has followed the aforesaid principle of law. Accordingly, 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.

9. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties 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 deems it appropriate to allow the present petition, subject to the following conditions:-

a) The petition bearing No.HMA-49 of 2019 filed by respondent-husband under Section 12 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, titled “Parveen vs. Monika” pending in the Court of Ld. District Judge, Fatehabad is transferred to a court of competent jurisdiction at Panipat.

b) The ld. District Judge, Fatehabad is directed to transfer complete record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Panipat.

c) The parties, through their counsel, are directed to appear before the District & Sessions Judge, Panipat on 20.01.2023.

d)The District Judge, Panipat will assign the said petition to the Court of competent jurisdiction.

10. The concerned Court at Panipat will make all endeavour to refer the case before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre for exploring the possibility of some amicable settlement between the parties.

11. The Court concerned, where the litigation pending between the parties, will accommodate them with one date in one calendar month.

Disposed of.

14.12.2022

ashok

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No

(Nidhi Gupta)
Judge