



WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.76 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.02.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Tr.C.M.P.No.76 of 2023

and

C.M.P.No.1770 of 2023

Mr.V.Senthil Murugan

... Petitioner

Vs.

Mrs.Kamatchi

... Respondent

Prayer: Transfer CMP is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw the H.M.O.P.No.358 of 2022 on the file of the Subordinate Court, Kancheepuram and transfer the H.M.O.P to the Subordinate Court, Kallakurichi.

For Petitioner

: Mr.A.Jinasenan

ORDER

The Transfer Petition is filed to transfer the H.M.O.P.No.358 of 2022, pending on the file of the Sub Court, Kancheepuram to the Sub Court, Kallakurichi.



2. The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 20.08.2012 at Kallakurichi as per Hindu Rites and Customs.

The Petitioner / husband states that a girl child was born from and out of the wedlock between the petitioner and the respondent on March 2016. The petitioner was working as a Sales Representative in Bajaj Two Wheelers and now suffering from certain ailments

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the respondent / wife is now working at Sriperumbudur, Kancheepuram District and more so, she is working as Record Clerk in the Sub Court. Since the petitioner is suffering from serious ailments, he is unable to travel and contest the case filed by the respondent / wife before the Sub Court, Kancheepuram.

4. The respondent / wife instituted Divorce proceedings in H.M.O.P.No.358 of 2022 in Kancheepuram and therefore, this Court cannot consider transferring the petition to Kallakurichi.

5. In respect of the ailments or otherwise, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the Court concerned for appropriate relief. However, the



respondent / wife instituted the Divorce proceedings before the Sub Court, Kancheepuram and thus, it cannot be transferred to the place in which the petitioner / husband resides.

6. The principles regarding transfer petitions, more specifically in the matters of matrimonial cases, are well settled through the three decisions of the High Court of Madras, in the following cases:-

(i) The Hon'ble Division Bench of the High Court of Madras in ***W.A.No.1181 of 2009, dated 09.07.2010***, wherein in paragraphs-21 and 22, it has been observed as under:-

“21. The domicile or citizenship of the opposite party is immaterial in a case like this. In case the marriage was solemnized under Hindu Law marital relationship is governed by the provisions of the Hindu Marriage Act. Therefore, Section 19 has to be given a purposeful interpretation. It is the residence of the wife, which determines the question of jurisdiction, in case the proceeding was initiated at the instance of the wife.



22. *While considering a provision like Section 19 (iii-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, the objects and reasons which prompted the parliament to incorporate such a provision has also to be taken note of. Sub Clause (iii-a) was inserted in Section 19 with a specific purpose. Experience is the best teacher. The Government found the difficulties faced by women in the matter of initiation of matrimonial proceedings. The report submitted by the Law Commission as well as National Commission for Women, underlying the need for such amendment so as to enable the women to approach the nearest jurisdictional court to redress their matrimonial grievances, were also taken note of by the Government. Therefore such a beneficial provision meant for the women of our Country should be given a meaningful interpretation by Courts.”*

(ii) In yet another case in ***Tr.CMP.Nos.138 and 139 of 2006, dated 30.08.2006***, the High Court of Madras has considered the following judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India:-

“(1) In the case of Mona Aresh Goel vs. Aresh



Satya Goel [(2000) 9 SCC 255], when the wife pleaded that she was unable to bear the traveling expenses and even to travel alone and stay at Bombay, the Supreme Court ordered transfer of proceedings.

*(2) In the case of **Geeta Heera vs. Harish Chander Heera [(2000) 10 SCC 304]**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that where the petitioner's wife has pleaded lack of money, the same has to be considered.*

*(3) In the case of **Lalita A.Ranga vs. Ajay Champalal Ranga [(2000) 9 SCC 355]**, the wife has filed a petition to transfer the proceedings initiated by the husband for divorce, at Bombay. The place of residence of the wife was at Jaipur, Rajasthan. In that case, the petitioner is having a small child and that she pleaded difficulty in going all the way from Jaipur to Bombay to contest the proceedings from time to time. Considering the distance and the difficulties faced by the wife, the Supreme Court has allowed the transfer petition.*

*(4) In a decision in **Archana Singh vs. Surendra Bahadur Singh [(2005) 12 SCC 395]**, the wife has sought for transfer of matrimonial proceedings and a divorce petition has been filed by the respondent's husband at Baikunthpur to be transferred to Allahabad,*



where the petitioner's wife was residing, on the ground that it would be difficult for her to undertake such long distance journey, particularly in circumstances, in which she finds that the proceedings under Section 125 Cr.P.C. was already pending before the Family Court, Allahabad. Considering the difficulties faced by the wife and also the long distance journey, the Honourable Supreme Court was pleased to order transfer of the proceedings to Allahabad.”

(iii) In a decision made in **TR.CMP(MD)No.108 of 2010, dated 03.03.2011**, the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, wherein in paragraph-18, it has been observed as below:-

“18. It is true that section 19 of the Hindu Marriage Act, has been amended by insertion of proviso of (iii)(a) to section 19. Of Course, this amended section 19(iii)(a) gives special preference to the wife to file a petition or defending the case of the husband before the Court within whose jurisdiction she resides. The intention of the Legislator is to safe-guard the interest and rights of the women, who are being subjected to harassment and cruelty. But this special preference conferred under section 19(iii)(a) of the Hindu Marriage Act shall not be used to wreck



WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.76 of 2



vengeance on the husband. There must be a justifiable cause to select the jurisdiction of the Court where she resides.”

7. In view of the fact that the respondent / wife instituted a Divorce Petition before the Sub Court, Kancheepuram, this Court is not inclined to consider the present Transfer Petition.

8. Accordingly, the Transfer Petition in Tr.C.M.P.No.76 of 2023 is devoid of merits and stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

01.02.2023

skr

Index : Yes

Speaking order

Neutral Citation : Yes

To

1.The Judge,
Subordinate Court,
Kallakurichi.

2.The Judge,

Page 7 of 9



Subordinate Court,
Kancheepuram.

WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.76 of 2





WEB COPY

Tr.C.M.P.No.76 of 2



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

skr

Tr.C.M.P.No.76 of 2023

01.02.2023