



110 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31791-2024
Date of decision: 08.07.2024

Ruby @ Ruby BiriwalPetitioner

Versus

Amit Kumar ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. D.P.S. Bajwa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 407 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.') seeking transfer of petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. bearing COM No.596 of 2022 titled as 'Ruby Vs. Amit Kumar' pending for 04.10.2024 in the Court of the learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Ludhiana to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhari.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner is living along with parents at Yamuna Nagar. It is further contended that the distance between Ludhiana and Yamuna Nagar is 185 kms approximately and as such, it is very difficult for her to travel to Ludhiana to pursue the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. at the District Court, Ludhiana.

3. Further, learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Sumita Singh Vs. Kumar Sanjay and another, AIR 2002 SC 396*** and ***Rajani Kishor Pardeshi Vs. Kishor Babulal Pardeshi, (2005) 12 SCC 237*** to contend that while



CRM-M-31791-2024

-2-

deciding the transfer applications, more weightage and consideration should be given to the convenience of the female litigants and transfer of legal proceedings from one Court to another Court should ordinarily be allowed in order to avoid undue hardship to the female litigants.

4. Heard.

5. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dealt with power of the Court to transfer proceedings under Sections 24 and 25 of the Civil Procedure Code in ***Kulwinder Kaur @ Kulwinder Gurcharan Singh Vs. Kandi Friends Education Trust, AIR 2008 SC 1333***, wherein it was held that the power to make such transfers is discretionary in nature and hence, it would be unwise to attempt to shackle it with a blanket formula uniformly applicable to all situations. However, it cannot be denied that the power must be used with abundance of care and caution. Further a three Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gana Saraswathi Vs. H. Raghu Prasad, (2000) 10 SCC 277*** had observed that in the interest of justice, the doctrine of forum non-conveniens can also be extended to matrimonial proceedings. It was stated that Courts usually allow transfer petitions in such cases to ensure that the wife does not suffer on account of not being able to participate in the proceedings.

6. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***N.C.V. Aishwarya Vs. A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1199*** 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 socio-economic 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.”

7. In the present case, the petitioner is living with her parents and her old aged father is suffering from heart disease for which his treatment is going on and the petitioner has nobody to accompany her to appear before the learned Court at Ludhiana. Furthermore, distance of Ludhiana from Yamuna Nagar is 185 kms approximately and therefore, it would cause immense hardship to the petitioner, much less, she will have to bear the transportation expenses to attend the Court proceedings on each and every date.

8. In view of the law settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sumita Singh's** case (supra), **Rajani Kishor Pardeshi's** case (supra) and **N.C.V. Aishwarya's** case (supra), present petition is allowed. Resultantly, petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. bearing case No.COM 596 of 2022 filed by the petitioner pending in the Court of learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Ludhiana is ordered to be transferred to the jurisdiction of District and

Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar. The District Judge, Ludhiana is directed to transfer the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to the District Court, Yamuna Nagar, who will assign the said petition to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Yamuna Nagar. The parties are directed to appear before the learned trial Court within a period of 30 days from today.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

08.07.2024
Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No