



TR CMP No.1071 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JOTHIRAMAN

**TR CMP No.1071 of 2025
and CMP No.24107 of 2025**

V.Anitha
W/o.P.Murugesan, D/o.Venkatachalam
No.391, Kalippattiyar Kadu, Veppanatham, Varagur Post
Attur Taluk, Salem District - 636112

Petitioner(s)

Vs

P.Murugesan
S/o.Pazhanivel,
No.206, Rajini Gounder Illam, Kalli Main Road,
Manakadu, Melapattu, Sankarapuram Taluk,
Kallakurichi District.

Respondent(s)

Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 24 of C.P.C.
to withdraw G.W.O.P.No.9 of 2025 from the file of the Principal District and
Sessions Court, Kallakurichi and transfer the same to the file of the
Additional District Court, Attur.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.T.Mohanraju

For Respondent(s): Mr.Vargees Amal Raja



TR CMP No.1071 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

This petition has been filed to withdraw G.W.O.P.No.9 of 2025 from the file of the Principal District and Sessions Court, Kallakurichi and transfer the same to the file of the Additional District Court, Attur.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnized on 08.06.2016 and through the wedlock, a male child was born on 28.03.2018. Thereafter, the respondent filed a petition for restitution of conjugal rights before the Principal Subordinate Court, Kallakurichi and the same is pending in H.M.O.P.No.181 of 2024. The respondent also filed a petition for custody of the minor child before the Principal District and Sessions Court, Kallakurichi and the same is pending in G.W.O.P.No.9 of 2025. The petitioner is living with her parents along with her child in Attur and it is very difficult for her to travel along with her child from Attur to Kallakurichi for attending each and every hearing of the case. Therefore, the case in G.W.O.P.No.9 of 2025 may be withdrawn from the file of the Principal District and Sessions Court, Kallakurichi and transferred to the file



TR CMP No.1071 of 2025

of the Additional District Court, Attur.

WEB COPY

3. *Per contra*, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent would submit that if this petition is allowed, serious prejudice will be caused to the respondent and hence, prayed for dismissal of this petition.

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”.

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 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



TR CMP No.1071 of 2025

WEB COPY

Accordingly, this transfer civil miscellaneous petition is allowed. The case in G.W.O.P.No.9 of 2025 is hereby withdrawn from the file of the Principal District and Sessions Court, Kallakurichi and transferred to the file of the Additional District Court, Attur. No costs. Connected C.M.Ps. are closed.

10-10-2025

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

To

1. The Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Kallakurichi.

2. The Additional District Judge,
Attur.

M.JOTHIRAMAN J.



WEB COPY



TR CMP No.1071 of 2025

nsd

TR CMP No.1071 of 2025

10.10.2025