

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

Transfer Application No.1347 of 2022

Date of decision :-07.11.2022

Monica Rawat

.....Applicant

Versus

Gaurav Khurana

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present:- None.

NIDHI GUPTA J. (Oral)

1. The lawyers are abstaining from work today.
2. Prayer in this application filed under Section 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure is for transfer of case bearing No.HMA/661/2022, filed under Section 13 of Hindu Marriage Act, titled as 'Gaurav Khurana vs. Monica Rawat', filed in July 2022, pending before the Principal Judge, Family Court, Sirsa to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Chandigarh.
3. The brief facts as stated in the application are that the marriage between the parties was solemnized on 24.1.2015 and from this wedlock, one male child, namely, Ayushman Khurana, was born on 14.4.2019, who is living with the applicant. It is stated that the marriage between the parties was performed by the parents of the applicant with great pomp and show. However the incessant demand of the dowry by the respondent and his

family caused great harassment to the applicant. The applicant further states in the application that in the year 2019 during pregnancy she was forced to go to her mother's house and after that the husband refused to take her back to the matrimonial home. Though, she went to her husband's residence in Talwandi Sabo (Bathinda) in February 2021 but there also, within a week, she was forced by the respondent-husband to go back to her paternal house. It is stated in the application that the father of the applicant had passed away and her sole survivor parent is her aged mother. Even though due to the constant taunting and harassment meted out to the applicant by the respondent-husband, the male child born out of the wedlock developed certain abnormalities with regard to behaviour and communication and the same was diagnosed as Autism Spectrum Disorder.

4. It is stated that the respondent-husband has filed the aforementioned petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, purely to harass and further troubled the applicant.

5. The applicant is stated to be currently residing in Chandigarh and is working on contractual basis at Multi Tasking Staff in Panjab University, Chandigarh and she is single-handedly looking after her autistic child and supporting her aged mother as well. Accordingly, in these circumstances it is difficult for her to go to the District Courts at Sirsa, which is almost 250 kilometers from Chandigarh to pursue the case filed by the respondent. It is accordingly prayed that the case bearing No.HMA/661/2022, detailed above, pending before the Principal Judge, Family Court, Sirsa be transferred to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Chandigarh.

6. It is *inter alia* on these grounds that applicant prays for transfer of the case, as detailed above, from the Principal Judge, Family Court, Sirsa to the competent Court in Union Territory, Chandigarh.

7. The legal position in such like cases as the present one, is well established. In this regard, judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in **N.C.V. Aishwarya vs A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha," 2022 Live Law (SC) 627**, is most relevant wherein the 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.”

8. Further reliance can be placed upon the judgments in “**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.”

9. Even this Court in number of cases has followed the aforesaid principle of law. Accordingly, 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.

10. After going through the entire paper book, 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 deems it appropriate to allow the present application/petition, subject to the following conditions:-

- a) The petition filed by respondent husband under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, pending in the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Sirsa, which is pending for 24.02.2023, is transferred to a Court of competent jurisdiction at Chandigarh.

b) The Id. District Judge, Sirsa is directed to transfer complete record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Chandigarh.

c) The parties are directed to appear before the District & Sessions Judge, Chandigarh on 24.02.2023.

d) The District Judge, Chandigarh, will assign the said petition to the Court of competent jurisdiction.

11. The concerned Court at Chandigarh 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.

12. The Court concerned, where the litigation pending between the parties, will accommodate them with one date in one calendar month.

13. However, liberty is granted to the respondent to revive this petition, if he intends to contest the same, provided that :-

(a) The respondent will clear all arrears of maintenance amount, if any, in terms of any petition filed by the petitioner either under Section 125 Cr.P.C. or Section 12 of the Domestic Violence Act or Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act.

(b) The respondent will file an affidavit giving undertaking to pay Rs.1,000/- per day, to the petitioner for attending the Court proceedings at District Courts, Sirsa, on each and every date of hearing.

(c) The respondent will bring a demand draft of Rs.25,000/-, drawn in favour of petitioner, towards the litigation expenses to pursue the case at District Sirsa in case the respondent opts to contest this petition.

14. I am supported in the above by decisions rendered by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **TA No. 1315/2022, Rohini Arora v Nitin Talwar**; **TA No. 1322 of 2022, Jaswinder Kaur v Gurvinderjeet Singh**; and **TA No. 1323 of 2022, Usha Rani v Karmajit Singh**.

15. As already notice above, today neither the counsel for the petitioner nor the petitioner has come present. Accordingly, in these peculiar circumstances, in order to ensure appearance of the parties before the District Judge, Chandigarh on 24.02.2023, it is directed that a copy of this order be sent to the parties through registered post, besides sending a copy of this order to the District Judges concerned through e-mail.

Disposed of.

November 07, 2022
Vijay Asija

(**NIDHI GUPTA**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes / No
Whether Reportable Yes / No