



WEB COPY



Tr.C.M.P.No.355 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

**TR CMP No.355 of 2025
and CMP No.7907 of 2025**

Sulochana
W/o.Nethaji Mohan,
No.77, Ambedkar Nagar, Chengalpattu, Palur,
Kancheepuram-603 101

Petitioner(s)

Vs

Nethaji Mohan
S/o.Mohan Kuppusamy,
No.14, Korimedu, Gummidipoondi,
Tiruvallur-601 201

Respondent(s)

Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 24 of C.P.C.
to withdraw H.M.O.P.No.208 of 2024 from the file of the Subordinate Court,
Ponneri and transfer the same to the file of the Family Court, Chengalpattu.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.M.Jaikumar

For Respondent(s): No appearance



Tr.C.M.P.No.355 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

This petition has been filed to withdraw H.M.O.P.No.208 of 2024 from the file of the Subordinate Court, Ponneri and transfer the same to the file of the Family Court, Chengalpattu.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the respondent/husband filed a petition for divorce before the Subordinate Court, Ponneri and the same is pending in H.M.O.P.No.208 of 2024. The petitioner/wife is living in her parental home at Chengalpattu and she is facing severe financial hardship, as the respondent has abandoned her. In such circumstances, it is very difficult for her to travel 100 kms from Chengalpattu to Ponneri for attending each and every hearing of the case without any assistance. Therefore, the case in H.M.O.P.No.208 of 2024 may be withdrawn from the file of the Subordinate Court, Ponneri and transferred to the file of the Family Court, Chengalpattu.

3. Though the respondent entered appearance through a counsel and his name being duly printed in the cause list, there is no representation on behalf of the respondent/husband today.



WEB COPY

4. I have gone through the affidavit filed in support this petition and I find merit in the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. At this juncture, it may be apposite to cite the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **N.C.V.Aishwarya vs. A.S.Saravana Karthik** (**MANU/SC/1211/2022 : 2022 Live Law (SC) 627**) held at paras 9 and 10, which reads 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. (emphasis supplied)

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”.

WEB COPY

6. It is also relevant to refer the decision made by the Madurai Bench of Madras High Court in TR.CMP(MD)No.108 of 2010 dated 03.03.2011, wherein, it has observed as below:-

"18.It is true that section 19 of the Hindu Marriage Act, has been amended by insertion of proviso of (iii)(a) to section 19. Of Course, this amended section 19(iii)(a) gives special preference to the wife to file a petition or defending the case of the husband before the Court within whose jurisdiction she resides. The intention of the legislator is to safe-guard the interest and rights of the women, who are being subjected to harassment and cruelty. But this special preference conferred under section 19 (iii)(a) of the Hindu Marriage Act shall not be used to wreck vengeance on the husband. There must be a justifiable cause to select the jurisdiction of the Court where she resides."

7. In light of the proposition laid down in the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***N.C.V.Aishwarya*** case cited *supra* and also in light of the observation made by this Court, wherein, it has been held that convenience of the wife has to be considered, while transferring the case from one Court to another, there can be no impediment for allowing this petition as prayed for.



Tr.C.M.P.No.355 of 2025

WEB COPY

Accordingly, this transfer civil miscellaneous petition is allowed. The case in H.M.O.P.No.208 of 2024 is hereby withdrawn from the file of the Subordinate Court, Ponneri and transferred to the file of the Family Court, Chengalpattu. No costs. Connected C.M.P. is closed.

06.10.2025

nsd
Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes;
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

1.The Subordinate Judge,
Ponneri

2.The Judge, Family Court,
Chengalpattu.



WEB COPY



Tr.C.M.P.No.355 of 2025

M.JOTHIRAMAN J.

nsd

TR CMP No. 355 of 2025

06.10.2025