



Meena

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
TRANSFER APPLICATION NO.7 OF 2024

ARUN KUMAR SHARMA AND ANR ... APPLICANTS
Versus
ANANDRAO V. CHATIM AND 3 ORS ... RESPONDENTS

Mr Arun Kumar Sharma, Applicant No. 1 in person.
Ms Sailee Kenny, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.
Mr Geetesh Shetye, Additional Government Advocate for
Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

CORAM:- VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

DATED :- 7th February, 2025

P.C.:

1. This is a second transfer application filed by the party in person who is otherwise an Advocate by profession.
2. The first transfer application was filed before the District Court and levelled several allegations against the then incumbent of the District Court-II at Mapusa; that application was rejected by the Principal District Judge on 20/10/2023 pursuant to which the Petitioner filed a revision Application No.30/2023 before this Court assailing the order of rejection of his transfer application. This Court, by its order dated 28/11/2023, rejected the revision application confirming that there were no grounds made out for transfer of the

proceedings before the District Court.

3. Subsequently, the earlier presiding officer was transferred and a new Presiding Officer took charge of that Court on 04/11/2024. This Court has from time to time extended the directions issued in the earlier proceedings, directing the District Court to dispose of the proceedings in a time bound manner; the last such direction was given on 24/12/2024, on the application to this Court of the present Judicial Officer in that Court.

4. This transfer application has been filed just prior to the order extending the directions given by this Court. The grounds for transfer stated in paragraph 21 of the application do not make out any fresh case for transfer of the proceedings in the District Court. The grounds stated in the application by no means justify the exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 24 of the CPC. The application is therefore rejected in limine.

5. Considering the fact that this is a second transfer application being moved within a short period of one year from the rejection of the first transfer application, with no worthy grounds being made out, it would have been an appropriate case to impose costs on the Applicant, more so since he is a practising Advocate. However, as a matter of last chance and considering that party appears in person such costs would not be imposed on this occasion. However, it is made clear that

in the event any subsequent applications are made on similar grounds,
it may be appropriate to impose such costs.

VALMIKI MENEZES, J.