



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23-01-2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

And

CMP No.17926 of 2022

R.Aravindaswamy

.. Petitioner

vs.

S.Vidhya

.. Respondent

PRAYER : This Transfer CMP is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw the case in HMOP No.158 of 2022 from the file of the Sub Court at Thirupattur and transfer the same to the file of the II Additional Family Court at Chennai to be tried along with HMOP No.3305 of 2022.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.V.S.Ilamvazhuthi

For Respondent : Mr.A.Nafies for Mr.I.Periaswamy

1/12



WEB COPY



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

ORDER

The present Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is filed to withdraw the case in HMOP No.158 of 2022 from the file of the Sub Court at Thirupattur and transfer the same to the file of the II Additional Family Court at Chennai to be tried along with HMOP No.3305 of 2022.

2. The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnised on 10.12.2021 as per Hindu Rites and Customs. Due to misunderstanding, both the petitioner and the respondent are living separately.

3. The petitioner-husband filed HMOP No.3305 of 2022 for dissolution of marriage on the file of the II Additional Family Court at Chennai.



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

4. The respondent-wife filed another HMOP No.158 of 2022 on the file of the Sub Court at Thirupattur for dissolution of marriage.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner made a submission that instead of contesting the case filed by him in the II Additional Family Court at Chennai, the respondent has filed separate divorce case before the Sub Court at Thirupattur and therefore, the said case is to be transferred to the II Additional Family Court at Chennai.

6. The learned counsel for the respondent raised an objection by stating that the respondent-wife is unemployed as of now and she is residing along with her parents at Thirupattur.

7. The learned counsel for the respondent states that the respondent-wife is residing at 2/3/3, Chinnapillai Vattam, Melachanganam Muthganur (Postal/Pudupet via), Melachamangalam, Thirupattur, Vellore. She is depending on her parents and therefore, she is not in a position to



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

travel all along from Thirupattur to Chennai to contest the case filed by the petitioner before the II Additional Family Court at Chennai.

8. In the present case, the transfer of the case cannot be considered, since the respondent-wife is residing along with her parents at Thirupattur. That being the case, the case filed by the petitioner in HMOP No.3305 of 2022 pending on the file of the II Additional Family Court at Chennai is to be transferred to the place, where the respondent now resides.

9. 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



WEB COPY



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

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



WEB COPY



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

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.



WEB COPY



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

(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.**



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

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:-



WEB COPY



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

"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 safeguard 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.CMP No.1041 of 2022

10. In view of the facts and circumstances, this Court is inclined to transfer HMOP No.3305 of 2022 pending on the file of the II Additional Family Court at Chennai to the file of the Sub Court at Thirupattur forthwith. The II Additional Family Court at Chennai is directed to transmit the case papers to the Sub Court at Thirupattur, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

11. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the respondent-wife was set ex parte in HMOP No.3305 of 2022. If so, the respondent is at liberty to file an appropriate petition to set aside the exparte order, enabling the Sub Court at Thirupattur to consider the issues and dispose of the cases filed by the petitioner and the respondent.

12. With the abovesaid directions and liberty, the Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition stands disposed of. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

23-01-2023

Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order.

Neutral Citation : Yes/No.

Internet : Yes/No.

Index: Yes/No.

Svn

To

1.The II Additional Judge,
II Additional Family Court,
Chennai.

2.The Sub Judge,
Sub Court,
Thirupattur.

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

Svn

11/12



WEB COPY



Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

Tr.CMP No.1041 of 2022

23-01-2023