

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

218

TA-499-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 31.10.2022

Kavita**...Petitioner****Versus****Sanjay****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Singal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surinder Gaur, Advocate
for the respondent.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for transfer of the petition filed by the respondent-husband under Sections 7 and 10 of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890, pending before the Family Court, Gohana to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the following litigation is already pending between the parties at Rohtak:

1. Divorce petition under Section 13(ia) and (ib) of the Hindu Marriage Act.
2. Peition filed under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005.
3. Petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance from the respondent-husband.
4. FIR No. 104 dated 23.03.2021, under Sections 323, 354, 406, 498-A, 506, 34 of the IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that both the

minor daughters are residing in the care and custody of the petitioner and they are studying in a school. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is working as a Peon in the office of District Town and Country Planning Officer, Rohtak, therefore, apart from attending her official duties, the petitioner has also to take care of her both minor daughters.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the respondent-husband is not paying any maintenance towards the minor daughters and has filed the aforesaid petition at Gohana, just to harass the petitioner.

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.”

Reply, by way of an affidavit, has been filed. In reply, it is stated that the petitioner is in fact residing with her parents in village Rukhi, Gohana. It is also stated that the minor daughters are also studying within the jurisdiction of Gohana and the distance is not very long and the petitioner can attend the proceedings at Gohana from her place of residence.

Be whatsoever, these facts are to be taken into consideration by the trial Court.

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 Sections 7 and 10 of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890 of the Hindu Marriage Act, pending before the Family Court, Gohana 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 Gohana 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.*

31.10.2022

Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No