

2026:PHHC:068488



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

143

TA-597-2026

Date of decision :04.05.2026

KAVITA CHAUDHARY @ KAVITA CHOUDHARY

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

SANDEEP MALIK

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. Akshay Kumar Dahiya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking transfer of divorce proceedings pending before the Principal Judge, Family Court, Rohtak to learned Family Court, District Panipat.
2. Admittedly, a divorce petition under Section 13(i-a) under the Hindu Marriage Act was preferred by the respondent-husband, which is stated to be pending before the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Rohtak. It is the case of the petitioner that she is a working lady and has very limited leaves to her credit. She is also looking after two minor children, therefore, is unable to attend the proceedings at Rohtak from Samalkha, where she is residing. It is further submitted that another petition filed by the petitioner-wife is pending

before the courts at Panipat. It is contended that if the divorce petition filed by the respondent-husband is also transferred to Panipat, it would be convenient for her to effectively contest both matters at the same place.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the divorce petition pending before the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Court, Rohtak, be transferred to Panipat. However, upon consideration, I do not find any justification for ordering such transfer. The distance between Samalkha and Rohtak is approximately 84 kilometers, whereas Panipat is also situated at a distance of about 25 kilometers from Samalkha. Therefore, mere convenience of the petitioner alone cannot be a ground for transferring the matter to Panipat from Rohtak.

4. Both the petitioner and the respondent are working persons and are likely to face similar inconvenience in attending court proceedings. Moreover, the present matter is a civil dispute wherein the presence of the petitioner is not required on each and every date of hearing. Hence, no case for transfer is made out.

5. Accordingly, the transfer application is dismissed.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

04.05.2026
manoj

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No