



WEB COPY



Tr.C.M.P.No.601 of 2025 and C.M.P. No.14736 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-09-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

Tr.C.M.P.No.601 of 2025 and C.M.P. No.14736 of 2025

N.M.Keerthiga

... Petitioner

VS

M.Prasanna

... Respondent

Prayer: Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 24 of C.P.C. to withdraw the case in H.M.O.P. No.67/2025 pending before the learned Principal Subordinate Court, Kallakurichi and transfer the same to the Learned Family Court, Erode.

For Petitioner: Ms.A.M.Amutha Ganesh

For Respondent: Mr.A.G.Rajan

ORDER

This petition has been filed to withdraw H.M.O.P. No.67 of 2025 from the file of the Principal Subordinate Court, Kallakurichi and to transfer the same to the file of the Family Court, Erode.



Tr.C.M.P.No.601 of 2025 and C.M.P. No.14736 of 2025

2.Heard the learned counsel on both sides.

WEB COPY

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner/wife is residing at her parental home at Erode along with her child. The respondent/husband had filed a petition for divorce before the Principal Subordinate Court, Kallakurichi. Since the petitioner/wife is residing at Erode, it is very difficult for her to travel along with her child. Therefore, the case in H.M.O.P. No.67 of 2025 may be withdrawn from the file of the Principal Subordinate Court, Kallakurichi and transferred to the file of the Family Court, Erode.

4.Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondent/husband would submit that if the case is transferred, serious prejudice would be caused to the respondent/husband. The reasons assigned in the affidavit is not acceptable one to transfer the case. The distance from Erode to Kallakurichi is only 163 k.m. and not 300 k.m. as stated in the transfer petition. Moreover, there is no necessity for the petitioner/wife to appear before the Principal Subordinate Court, Kallakurichi for each and every hearing as stated in the transfer petition. Therefore, the learned counsel for



the respondent has stated objection to allow this petition.

WEB COPY

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

6.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.



WEB COPY



Tr.C.M.P.No.601 of 2025 and C.M.P. No.14736 of 2025

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.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."

8.In the 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 the 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



Tr.C.M.P.No.601 of 2025 and C.M.P. No.14736 of 2025

from one Court to another, I am inclined to allow this petition.

WEB COPY

9.Accordingly, this transfer civil miscellaneous petition is allowed.

The case in H.M.O.P. No.67 of 2025 is hereby withdrawn from the file of the Principal Subordinate Court, Kallakurichi and transferred to the file of the Family Court, Erode. No costs. Consequently, connected C.M.P. is closed.

25-09-2025

vga

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

To

1.The Principal Subordinate Court,
Kallakurichi.

2.The Family Court , Erode.

M.JOTHIRAMAN J.

vga



WEB COPY



Tr.C.M.P.No.601 of 2025 and C.M.P. No.14736 of 2025

Tr.C.M.P.No.601 of 2025 and C.M.P. No.14736 of 2025

25.09.2025