

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

201

**TA-1122-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.10.2022**

Balwinder Kaur @ Binder

...Petitioner

Versus

Rajinder Kumar @ Raju

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

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

None for the respondent.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for transfer of the petition filed by the respondent-husband under Section 13(1) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, pending before the Family Court, Ludhiana to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Jalandhar.

While issuing notice of motion on 15.11.2021, the following order was passed:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner has to travel a distance of 150 kilometres (to and fro) in order to attend the proceedings before the concerned Court at Ludhiana. He would further contend that a petition under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of maintenance is also pending in the Court concerned at Jalandhar.

Notice of motion returnable 09.12.2021.

Process dasti as well.

The petitioner is at liberty to serve the respondent through the counsel representing him in the Court below.

Meanwhile, the Court below shall adjourn the proceedings beyond the date given by this Court.”

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.”

Since while issuing notice of motion on 15.11.2021, the proceedings before the trial Court were stayed, the same is deemed notice upon the respondent, however, there is no representation on his behalf.

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 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), **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(1) of the Hindu Marriage Act, pending before the Family Court, Ludhiana will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Jalandhar.*

- (ii) *The District Judge, Jalandhar will assign the said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction.*
- (iii) *The Family Court at Ludhiana is directed to transfer all the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Jalandhar.*
- (iv) *The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court at Jalandhar 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.*

12.10.2022*Waseem Ansari***(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE***Whether speaking/reasoned**Yes/No**Whether reportable**Yes/No*