

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

217

TA-346-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.09.2022

Sweety**...Petitioner**

Versus

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

Present:- Mr. Akshit Grover, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Girhotra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parmod Parmar, Advocate
for the respondent.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

While issuing notice of motion on 01.07.2020, the following
order was passed:

“Prayer in this petition is for transfer of the case preferred by the husband of the petitioner i.e. the respondent under Section 13 (i) (ia) (ib) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (Annexure P-1).

It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner with reference to para Nos. 4, 5,6 and 7 of the petition filed by the husband of the petitioner it has been stated that the petitioner is suffering from Arachnoid Cyst. The petitioner is unable to be treated despite she having been taken by him to various hospitals. Counsel contends that the petitioner resides in Rohtak whereas the said petition has been preferred by the husband of the petitioner at Jhajjar which is 40 Kms. away from Rohtak, therefore, it will be difficult for the petitioner to defend her case at Jhajjar. He, however, contends that two other

cases, which have been preferred by the petitioner against the respondent, are pending at Rohtak, one of which is a petition for maintenance under Section 125 Cr. P.C. He, therefore, contends that the present application be allowed and the petition (Annexure P-1) preferred by the respondent-husband for dissolution of marriage be transferred to Rohtak.

Notice of motion, for 16.07.2020.”

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 respondent-husband has opposed the prayer of the petitioner-wife.

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 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), *Rajani Kishor Pardeshi's* case (supra) and *N.C.V.*

Aishwarya's case (supra), this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition, with the following directions:-

- (i) *The petition filed under Section 13 (i) (ia) (ib) of the Hindu Marriage Act, pending before the Family Court, Jhajjar will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Rohtak.*
- (ii) *The District Judge, Rohtak will assign the said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction.*
- (iii) *The Family Court at Jhajjar is directed to transfer all the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Rohtak.*
- (iv) *The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court at Rohtak within a period of 01 month from today.*
- (v) *The Courts concerned, where the cases are pending between the parties, will accommodate them with one date in a calendar month.*

23.09.2022

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No