

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

TA No.908 of 2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.08.2022

Kiranpal Kaur and another

....Petitioners

Versus

Sucha Singh

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Vijay Lath, Advocate
for the petitioners.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for transfer of the Civil Suit No.150 of 2022 titled as "*Sucha Singh vs Harmeet Singh and another*", pending before the Court of Additional Civil Judge (Sr. Division), Bholath, District Kapurthala to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Rupnagar.

Counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioner/wife has already filed a complaint under Sections 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act before the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rupnagar, in which the father-in-law namely Sucha Singh is arrayed as accused/respondent No.2. It is further submitted that now as a counter-blast to the same, the father-in-law has filed a suit for permanent injunction praying for grant of a decree regarding the possession over the property in dispute.

Further, it is argued on behalf of the petitioners that the litigations are already pending at Rupnagar and filing of the suit is an off-shoot of the on-going matrimonial litigation between the

petitioner/wife and her in-laws, just to harass and put undue pressure upon the petitioner/wife.

Counsel for the petitioners has also argued that on account of a petition filed by the respondent/father-in-law, the petitioner/wife is facing great difficulty in prosecuting the said case as there is a distance of about 125 Kms from Rupnagar to Kapurthala.

Counsel for the petitioner 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 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.*”

Counsel for the petitioner has also relied upon the judgment **“N.C.V. Aishwarya vs A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha,”** 2022 Live Law (SC) 627, wherein the Hon’ble Supreme Court has observed 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.”

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.

After hearing the counsel for the petitioner, considering the fact that issuance of notice to the respondent has the consequences of staying further proceedings before the trial Court, otherwise the petitioner/wife will have to bear the litigation expenses and transportation expenses and in case, notice of motion is issued, even the respondent/husband has to bear the litigation expenses 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 deem it appropriate to allow the present petition, subject to the following conditions:-

1. *The Civil Suit No.150 of 2022 titled as "Sucha Singh vs Harmeet Singh and another", pending in the Court of Additional Civil Judge (Sr. Division), Bholath, District Kapurthala will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Rupnagar.*
2. *The District Judge, Rupnagar, will assign the said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction.*
3. *The Additional Civil Judge (Sr. Division), Bholath, District Kapurthala is directed to transfer all the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Rupnagar.*
4. *The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court, Rupnagar, within a period of 01 month from today.*
5. *The Court concerned, where the litigation pending between the parties, will accommodate them with one date in one calendar month.*

Disposed of.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

18.08.2022

yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No