

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102 TA-1125-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.01.2024

Manpreet Kaur ...Petitioner

Versus

Khushkirat Singh ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI

Present: Mr. P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. N.K. Manchanda, Advocate for the respondent.

VIKAS SURI, J.

1. Prayer in this petition filed by petitioner-wife is for transfer of the petition filed by respondent-husband under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (for short ‘the Act’) titled ‘Khushkirat Singh vs. Manpreet Kaur’ pending in the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Nihal Singh Wala, Moga to a Court of competent jurisdiction at Barnala.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits:-
 - i) That the parties were married on 30.08.2020.
 - ii) That out of this wedlock, no child has been born to the parties.
 - iii) That the petitioner-wife is living separately from the respondent-husband and living with her parents at their mercy at Barnala.

- iv) That the petitioner is unemployed, having no source of income and totally dependent upon her parents and the respondent-husband, who is gainfully employed with the Indian Army and is currently serving at Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar, is not paying anything to her towards maintenance.
- v) That FIR No.50 dated 24.07.2021, under Sections 406, 506, 498-A and 120-B IPC was lodged against the respondent and is pending investigation at Barnala.
- vi) That the distance between place of residence of the petitioner-wife i.e. Village Wajidke Kalan, District Barnala and the place of proceedings under Section 13 of the Act, filed by the respondent-husband, pending before the Principal Judge, Family Court, Nihal Singh Wala, Moga, is about 75 kilometers on one side.

3. Upon notice, the respondent-husband has filed reply to the petition opposing the same. It is not disputed that the respondent-husband is serving in the Indian Army and is presently posted at K-Area, Zirakpur.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. Besides the facts as noticed hereinabove, the legal position in such like cases as the present one, is well established. In this regard, judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in ***N.C.V. Aishwarya vs. A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha***, 2022 SCC Online SC 1199, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme 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 reliance can be placed upon the judgments in ***Sumita Singh vs Kumar Sanjay***, AIR 2002 SC 396 and ***Rajani Kishor Pardeshi vs. Kishor Babulal Pardeshi***, (2005) 12 SCC 237, wherein the Hon’ble Supreme Court 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. Even this Court in number of cases has followed the aforesaid principle of law. Accordingly, it is well settled that while considering the transfer of a matrimonial dispute/case, at the instance of the wife, the Court is to consider the family condition of the wife, the custody of the minor child, economic condition of the wife, her physical health and earning capacity of the husband and most important the convenience of the wife i.e. she cannot travel alone without assistance of

a male member of her family, connectivity of the place to and fro from her place of residence as well as bearing of the litigation charges and travelling expenses.

8. After going through the record and in view of the judgments i.e. *Sumita Singh's case* (supra), *Rajani Kishor Pardeshi's case* (supra) and *N.C.V. Aishwarya's case* (supra) passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition, subject to the following conditions:-

- a) The petition filed by respondent husband under Section 13 of Act, bearing No.HMA/52/2022 titled as 'Khushkirat Singh vs. Manpreet Kaur, pending in the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Nihal Singh Wala, Moga is transferred to a Court of competent jurisdiction at Barnala.
- b) The learned District Judge, Moga is directed to transfer complete record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Barnala.
- c) The parties are directed to appear before the District & Sessions Judge, Barnala on 20.03.2024.
- d) The District Judge, Barnala will assign the said petition to the Court of competent jurisdiction.

9. The concerned Court at Barnala will make all endeavour to refer the case before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre for exploring the possibility of some amicable settlement between the parties.

10. The Court concerned, where the litigation is pending between the parties, will accommodate them with one date in one calendar month.

11. I am supported by the decisions rendered by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in TA No. 1315/2022, Rohini Arora v Nitin Talwar; TA No. 1322 of 2022, Jaswinder Kaur v Gurvinderjeet Singh; and TA No. 1323 of 2022, Usha Rani v Karmajit Singh.

12. Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of directing the parties to appear before the District Judge, Barnala on 20.03.2024. Copies of order be sent to both the Courts for information and necessary compliance.

13. Disposed of.

14. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

January 11, 2023
sumit.k

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes / No
Whether Reportable :	Yes / No