



Tr.C.M.P.No.1306 of 2022

THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.01.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

Tr.C.M.P.No.1306 of 2022

and

C.M.P.No.22043 of 2022

S.Jayashree

... Petitioner

vs

T.Srikanth

... Respondent

Prayer: Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is filed under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code, to withdraw H.M.O.P.No.91 of 2022 pending on the file of Sub Court, Aruppukottai and transfer the same to Sub Court, Sathyamangalam.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Parthasarathy

For Respondent : Mr.U.Kathiravan

ORDER

The Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is filed to withdraw H.M.O.P.No.91 of 2022 pending on the file of Sub Court, Aruppukottai and transfer the same to the file of the Sub Court, Sathyamangalam.



Tr.C.M.P.No.1306 of 2022

2.The marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 18.11.2018 as per the Hindu Rites and Customs. One male child was born from and out of the wedlock between the petitioner and the respondent and the child, who is now 3 years old is with the custody of the petitioner/wife. Due to misunderstanding, the petitioner and the respondent are living separately.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner/wife is unemployed and residing along with her parents and she has to take care of her minor child. Thus, the petitioner has filed a maintenance petition in M.C.No.6 of 2022, which is now pending on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Sathyamangalam. The respondent filed H.M.O.P.No.91 of 2022 for Divorce on the file of the Sub Court, Aruppukottai. Therefore, the petitioner is not in a position to spend, travel and contest the divorce case filed by the respondent/husband.

4.The learned counsel for the respondent raised objection stating that the petitioner is capable of travelling and contesting the divorce case before the Sub Court, Aruppukottai.



Tr.C.M.P.No.1306 of 2022

5. Parents are duty bound to maintain their minor children. The minor child has to be taken care of by the father, who is the natural guardian and an earning member. The petitioner/wife is unemployed and therefore, the respondent/father has to maintain the child.

6. Remedy of maintenance is the measure of social justice as envisaged under the Constitution to prevent the wife and the children from falling into destitution and vagrancy. Preamble and Article 39 and 15(3) of the Indian Constitution envisage social justice and positive State action for empowerment of women and children.

7. Court must act as a custodian of minor children, when such children are neglected by either of the parents. When the mother of the child is unemployed and living along with her parents mostly is the situation prevailing in our country. Grandparents are burdened with the minor children and the fathers are attempting to escape from the clutches of liability, which cannot be tolerated by the Courts. The father being the natural guardian under the Guardian and Wards Act, is bound to maintain his minor daughter or son by paying maintenance even in such



Tr.C.M.P.No.1306 of 2022

circumstances, where there is a matrimonial dispute or dispute for visitation right.

Such rights are to be established considering various other facts and circumstances.

Whether the father or mother is entitled for a visitation is to be considered based on the facts and circumstances of each case and not allowing the father or mother to have visitation right will not be a ground to deny Interim Maintenance to the minor child during the pendency of the matrimonial disputes.

8.In the present case, the transfer of the case is to be considered, since the petitioner is unemployed and taking care of minor male child and she is residing along with her parents at Sathyamangalam. That being the case, the divorce case filed by the respondent is to be transferred to the place, where the petitioner 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:-

WEB COPY

“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.”

WEB COPY

(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



Tr.C.M.P.No.1306 of 2022

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.”

10.As far as the maintenance petition filed by the petitioner in M.C.No.6 of 2022 is concerned, the Judicial Magistrate Court, Sathyamangalam is expected to consider for grant of interim maintenance in order to protect the livelihood of the minor child, which is the Fundamental Right to life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and take a decision without causing any undue delay. As far as the final maintenance is concerned, the same may be determined after the adjudication. Therefore, this Court directs the Judicial Magistrate Court, Sathyamangalam to dispose of the maintenance case in M.C.No.6 of 2022 as expeditiously as possible.

11.Accordingly, this Court is inclined to pass the following orders:



Tr.C.M.P.No.1306 of 2022

(i) H.M.O.P.No.91 of 2022 on the file of the Sub Court, Aruppukottai stands transferred to the file of the Sub Court, Sathyamangalam.

(ii) The Sub Court, Aruppukottai is directed to transmit the case papers within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

12. With these directions, this Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition stands allowed. There will be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

30.01.2023

Index : Yes
Speaking order
Neutral Citation Case: Yes
sp

To

1. The Sub Court, Aruppukottai.
2. The Sub Court, Sathyamangalam.



WEB COPY



Tr.C.M.P.No.1306 of 2022

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

sp

Tr.C.M.P.No.1306 of 2022
and
C.M.P.No.22043 of 2022

30.01.2023