



Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.07.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN

Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

and

C.M.P.No.15432 of 2023

K.Vinodhini

.. Petitioner

Versus

S.Karthikeyan

.. Respondent

PRAYER: This Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw the petition in HMOP.No.193 of 2023 pending before the Sub Judge, Alandhur, Kancheepuram District and the same may be transferred to the Family Court, Mannargudi.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Mohammed Aseef

For Respondent : Ms. M.S.Rajeswari



Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition has been filed to withdraw the case in H.M.O.P.No.193 of 2023 on the file of the Sub Judge, Alandhur, Kancheepuram District and the same may be transferred to the Family Court, Mannargudi.

2. The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnised on 08.02.2007 as per the Hindu Rites and Customs. Two female children were born from and out of the wedlock between the petitioner and the respondent and now living with the petitioner. On account of matrimonial home broke down, the petitioner and the respondent are living separately. Now the petitioner is residing along with her parents who is unemployed. The respondent filed H.M.O.P No.193 of 2023 for restitution of conjugal rights before the learned Sub Judge, Alandhur, Kancheepuram District.



Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

3. In the averments of the complaint made by the respondent/husband, there are some allegations against the petitioner/wife and petitioner/wife has some complaints against the respondent/husband.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no possibility of re-union and since the petitioner is living with her two daughters in Mannargudi, she seeks for transferring the petition in H.M.O.P.No.193 of 2023 pending on the file of the learned Sub Judge, Alandhur, Kancheepuram District to the Family Court, Mannargudi.

5. The learned counsel for the respondent/husband submits that there is possibility of re-union and he is willing to live matrimonial life with the petitioner and therefore, he filed the H.M.O.P. No.193 of 2023 for restitution of conjugal rights, but the petitioner/wife is not willing to accept the claim made by the respondent/husband.

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:-



Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

(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



Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

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



Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

7. Considering the facts and circumstances, the H.M.O.P No.193 of 2023 pending on the file of the learned Sub Judge, Alandhur, Kancheepuram District stands transferred to the Family Court, Mannargudi forthwith. The Sub Court, Alandhur, Kancheepuram District is directed to transmit all the case papers to the Family Court, Mannargudi within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. It is made clear that if at all there is any possibility of re-union, the respondent/husband can very well approach the Mediation Centre at Mannargudi.

8. With the abovesaid directions, the Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition stands allowed. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

26.07.2023

kv

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

1. The Sub Judge, Alandhur, Kancheepuram District.
2. The Family Court, Mannargudi.



WEB COPY



Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN,J.

Kv

Tr.C.M.P.No.617 of 2023

26.07.2023