

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

226

TA-315-2020 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 09.08.2022

**Raj Rani @ Rajni****...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Maya Kaur and others****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

Present:- Mr. Rajbir Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Grewal, Advocate  
for respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

**ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)**

Prayer in this petition is for transfer of the petition filed by the respondents under the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890, titled as ***Maya Kaur and another vs. Raj Rani @ Rajni and another***, pending before the Family Court, Yamuna Nagar (Jagadhri) to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Ambala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the husband of the petitioner has died and she is residing at Ambala along with her minor child. It is further submitted that the respondents, who are the parents of the deceased husband of the petitioner, have filed the aforesaid petition under the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 seeking custody of the minor child at Yamuna Nagar.

It is further submitted that the petitioner is facing great difficulty in prosecuting the said case, as there is a distance of about 60 Kms between the aforesaid two places.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that as per Section 9 of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890, the jurisdiction will be at a place, where the minor child is residing and since the minor child is residing with the petitioner at Ambala, the said petition may be transferred to Ambala.

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.”

Learned counsel for the respondents has opposed the prayer of the petitioner.

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 the Guardians and Wards*

*Act, 1890, pending before the Family Court, Yamuna Nagar will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Ambala.*

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

**09.08.2022**  
*Waseem Ansari*

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)**  
**JUDGE**

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |