

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

234

**TA No.1279 of 2021 (O&M)
Date of decision:05.09.2022**

Usha Rani

.....Petitioner

Versus

Manjeet Singh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Vipin Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Ravi Malhotra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

None for the respondent.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for transfer of the petition filed under Section 11 read with Section 5(i) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 pending in the Family Court, District Ferozepur to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Jalandhar.

Vide order dated 23.12.2021, the following order was passed:-

“Taken up in physical mode.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner-wife would have to travel a distance of about 120 kilometres (one way) from her place of residence in District Jalandhar in order to attend to the proceedings initiated by the

respondent-husband under Section 11 read with Section 5(i) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 for declaring the marriage between the parties null and void in the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, District Ferozepur bearing case No.DMC/684/2021 and, hence, she would not be able to properly defend her case on each and every date of hearing. It is further contended that one complaint filed by the petitioner before the Commissioner of Police is already pending at Jalandhar.

Notice of motion returnable 24.01.2022.

Dasti as well. Liberty to serve through the counsel representing the respondent in the Court below.”

Counsel for the petitioner has argued that on account of a matrimonial discord, the respondent/husband has filed the petition under Section 11 read with Section 5(i) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, as a counter-blast, before the Principal Judge, Family Court, Ferozepur.

Counsel for the petitioner has also argued that on account of a petition filed by the respondent/husband, the petitioner is facing great difficulty in prosecuting the said case as there is a distance of about 122 Kms. from Ferozepur to Jalandhar. Counsel for the petitioner has further argued that the petitioner gave birth to a male child on 23.10.2021 at her parental home and custody of the minor child is also with the petitioner.

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.

There is no representation on behalf of the respondent.

After hearing the counsel for the petitioner, considering the fact that the petitioner/wife will have to bear the litigation expenses and transportation 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 petition filed under Section 11 read with Section 5(i) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, pending before the Family Court, Ferozepur will be transferred to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Jalandhar.*
- 2. The District Judge, Jalandhar, will assign the said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction.*
- 3. The Family Court, Ferozepur is directed to transfer all the*

record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Jalandhar.

4. The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court, Jalandhar, within a period of 01 month from today.

5. The Family Court, Jalandhar will make all endeavour to refer the case before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre for exploring the possibility of some amicable settlement between the parties.

6. 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

05.09.2022

geeta

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No