

TA-1026-2023 (O&M)

- 1 -

230
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
TA-1026-2023 (O&M)
Decided on: 05.12.2023

Hardeep Kaur

...Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

Arwinder Singh and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Pranav Chamoli, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel)
for the Applicant/petitioner.

None for respondent No.1.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present transfer application, under Section 24 CPC, has been filed by the petitioner - wife, for seeking transfer of the petition, bearing No. DMC/1049/2022, filed by the respondent – husband, under Section 12 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, titled as “Arwinder Singh v. Hardeep Kaur and another”, presently pending in the Court of Ld. Addl. Principal Judge, Family Court-I, Jalandhar, to any Court of competent jurisdiction at Ludhiana.

2. In the present case, for securing the presence of the respondents, notice of motion was issued on 18.08.2023. However, as per office report, service of notice has been affected through affixation *qua* respondent No.1 – husband, who himself has mentioned same address in the divorce petition filed by him, whereas, respondent No.2 is unserved, who otherwise is proforma respondent. Thus, service is deemed to have been affected.

3. The present transfer petition has been filed, *inter alia*, on the following grounds:-

- i) Petitioner-wife and respondent-husband got married on 06.03.2022, at Ludhiana, according to the Sikh rites and ceremonies, and no child has borne out of the said wedlock.
- ii) Petitioner-wife is 12th standard pass and is unemployed, while the respondent-husband is a song writer, and his father is also serving in Punjab Police, and he is earning approximately Rs.1.00 lakhs p.m. from his work.
- iii) Distance from Jalandhar to Ludhiana, is about 65 Kms. (one side), which takes around 1-1:30 hours, thus, causing extreme hardships to the petitioner-wife.
- iv) Petitioner-wife is financially dependent on her parents, and lacks convenient transportation options, thus, is compelled to rely on public transit, resulting in significant hardships.
- v) Financial condition of the parental home of the petitioner-wife is also not sound, and her parental family lives in a hand to mouth condition.
- vi) Besides above, two litigations i.e. (i) Petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955; and (ii) Petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. for grant of maintenance, are pending consideration before the District Courts at Ludhiana.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and gone through the material available on record.

5. In the facts and circumstances similar to the present case, in paragraph Nos. 9 & 10 of the judgment rendered in the case of **N.C.V. Aishwarya v. A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha**, AIR 2022 SC 4318, Hon'ble the Apex 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.”

6. Further, Hon’ble the Apex Court in **Rajani Kishor Pradeshi v. Kishor Babulal Pardeshi**, (2005) 12 SCC 237, 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.”

7. However, to avoid any misuse of the lenient view by the female litigants, Hon’ble the Apex Court in **Anindita Das v. Srijit Das**, (2006) 9 SCC 197, has also cautioned that the Courts should ensure that such leniency given to the female litigants should not be misused. Relevant Paragraph 3 of the aforesaid judgment says as under:

“3. Even otherwise, it must be seen that at one stage this Court was showing leniency to ladies. But since then it has

been found that a large number of transfer petitions are filed by women taking advantage of the leniency taken by this Court. On an average at least 10 to 15 transfer petitions are on Board of each Court on each admission day. It is, therefore, clear that leniency of this Court is being misused by the women.”

8. Thus, this Court is of the view that while adjudicating a transfer petition initiated by the wife in the context of a matrimonial dispute, the Court must take into account a comprehensive array of the following factors:-

- (a) Economic condition and earning capacity of the parties, i.e. husband and wife;
- (b) Social standing of the wife and her dependency on her parents;
- (c) Custody of any minor children involved;
- (d) Education of the children, if any;
- (e) Physical well-being of both, i.e. wife and husband;
- (f) Pending litigation(s) between the parties including criminal cases, if any;
- (h) Accessibility of the location from where the wife resides to the court where the case is pending;
- (i) Availability of convenient commuting options

Undoubtedly, only a harmonious consideration of all these vital aspects would ensure a just and equitable decision in such cases.

9. As already notice above, despite service and opportunity, the respondent-husband has chosen not to appear in the present proceedings and he has already been ordered to be proceeded against *ex-parte*.

10. Thus, applying the principles of law, laid down by Hon’ble the Apex Court in *N.C.V Aishwarya’s case (supra)*, *Rajani Kishor’s case*

(supra) and Anindita Das's case (supra), this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition, by issuing following directions:

- (i) Petition filed by respondent - husband under Section 12 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, bearing No. DMC/1049/2022, titled as “Arwinder Singh v. Hardeep Kaur and another”, pending in the Court of Ld. Addl. Principal Judge, Family Court-I, Jalandhar, is transferred to a Court of competent jurisdiction within Sessions Division Ludhiana.
- (ii) Learned District Judge, Jalandhar, is directed to transfer complete record pertaining to the aforesaid case to learned District Judge, Ludhiana, by directing both the sides to appear before the Court of learned District Judge, Ludhiana, on a particular date to be fixed by him, for further proceedings.
- (iii) On receipt of record of the case, learned District Judge, Ludhiana, will either keep the said case in his own Court or to assign the same to a Court having competent jurisdiction within Sessions Division Ludhiana, to try the same.
- (iv) The concerned Court at Ludhiana, shall diligently strive to amicably resolve the marital discord between the parties by referring the matter to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre.
- (v) After transfer at Ludhiana, the concerned Court will accommodate the parties to the *lis* with at least one date in a calendar month.

TA-1026-2023 (O&M)

- 6 -

directed to transmit copies of this order forthwith to learned District Judge, Jalandhar and learned District Judge, Ludhiana, through email(s) as well.

Petition stands **disposed of** in above terms.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

05.12.2023
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/ No
Whether reportable?	Yes/ No