



WEB COPY

TR CMP No. 179 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

TR CMP No. 179 of 2026

And

CMP.No. 338 of 2025

Sneha
W/o.Gokul Arjun,
D/o.Dinesh Kumar,
No.30/28,
Pandian Street,
RMK Nagat, New Perungalahur, Chennai 600 048,
Chengalpattu District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

R.V.Gokul Arjun
S/o.Ravi Chandran,
5/450, GoKul bhavan, 3rd Cross, hanumantha Nagar,
Chinna Elasagiri, Housur Tow and Taluk,
Krishnagiri District 635126

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure praying to withdraw the HMOP.No.269 of 2025 from the file of the Prl.Sub Court, Hosur and transfer the same to the file of the Sub Court, Tambaram to be tried along with HMOP.No.338 of 2025.

For Petitioner(s): MR.M.Marudhachalam

For Respondent(s): SOLE RESPONDENT - LEFT




ORDER

WEB COPY

This petition has been filed seeking to withdraw the case in HMOP.No. 269 of 2025 pending on the file of Sub Court, Hosur, and the same may be transferred to the Sub Court, Tambaram.

2. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and perused the materials available on record.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/wife would submit that the petitioner/wife got married to the respondent/husband on 28.08.2023 at SDB Grand Palace, East Tambaram, as per Hindu Religious, Rites and Customs. Thereafter, there was some misunderstanding between the petitioner and the respondent. The respondent/husband filed an HMOP.No. 269 of 2025 on the file of Principal Subordinate Judge, Hosur, to dissolve the marriage between the petitioner and the respondent that took place on 28.08.2023. Subsequently, the petitioner/wife also filed an HMOP.No. 338 of 2025 u/s.9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 seeking for restitution of conjugal rights. The petitioner/wife herein is residing in the Chengalpattu District along with her aged parents without any sources of income. Therefore, the petitioner/wife herein would not be able to travel to Family Court, The Nilgiris District, for attending each and every hearing of the case. Therefore, the case in HMOP.No.



269 of 2025 may be withdrawn from the file of the Principal Sub Court, Hosur, and transferred to the file of Sub-Court, Tambaram.


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".



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 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 from one Court to another, there can be no impediment for allowing this petition as prayed for.

8. Accordingly, this Transfer Civil Miscellaneous Petition is allowed. The case in HMOP.No. 269 of 2025 is hereby withdrawn from the file of the Principal Sub Court, Hosur, and transferred to the file of the Sub Court, Tambaram to be tried along with HMOP.No.338 of 2025. The respondent/husband shall appear before the Court below for trial and also



through Video Conferencing Mode as and when required. No costs.

Consequently, connected Civil Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

WEB COPY

23.06.2026

MSM

To

- 1.The Principal Sub Court, Hosur.
- 2.The Sub Court, Tambaram.



WEB COPY

TR CMP No. 179 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

MSM

TR CMP No. 179 of 2026

And

CMP.No. 338 of 2025

23-06-2026