

107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33384-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.07.2024

Gagandeep Kaur

... Petitioner

Vs.

Sandeep Singh


... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sukhveer S. Killianwali, 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 case No.MNT125/41/2021 (Annexure P-1), case No.CRM/64/2023 (Annexure P-2) and CRM/65/2023 (Annexure P-3) filed by the petitioner, from the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib (Punjab) to the competent Court of jurisdiction at Mandi Dabwali, District Sirsa (Haryana).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner along with her minor children is living at Mandi Dabwali, District




Sirsa. It is further contended that the distance between Malout and Mandi Dabwali is 40 kms and as such, it is very difficult for her to travel to Malout to pursue the aforesaid cases pending before the Court at Malout.

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 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. Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate appears on behalf of the respondent and files Memorandum of Appearance, which is taken on record. He has opposed the prayer for transfer of the aforementioned petition from the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib to Mandi Dabwali, District Sirsa.

5. Heard.


6. 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.

7. 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.”

8. In the present case, the petitioner has to look after the minor children, who are residing with her at Mandi Dabwali. Furthermore, distance between Malout and Mandi Dabwali is about 40 kms 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.

11. 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.MNT125/41/2021 (Annexure P-1), case No.CRM/64/2023 (Annexure P-2) and CRM/65/2023 (Annexure P-3) filed by the petitioner, pending in the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib are ordered to be transferred to the jurisdiction of District and Sessions Judge, Sirsa. The District Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib is directed to transfer the record pertaining to the aforesaid case to the District Judge, Sirsa, who will assign the said petition/application(s) to the competent Court of jurisdiction at

2024:PHHC:087542



Mandi Dabwali. The parties are directed to appear before learned trial Court within a period of 30 days from today.

15.07.2024
vishnu

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

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