



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

114

TA-686-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: February 10, 2026

Dr.Anjali Ravi Ghangas

...Applicant

Versus

Dr.Ravi Ramphal Ghangas

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ARCHANA PURI

Present: Mr.M.S.Rana, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr.Raman Chawla, Advocate for the respondent.

ARCHANA PURI, J.

Applicant-wife has filed the present application for seeking transfer of the petition under Section 13(1) (ia) (ib) of the Hindu Marriage Act, filed by respondent-husband, bearing No.DMC-3-2024, titled '*Dr.Ravi Ramphal Ghangas vs. Dr.Anjali Ravi Ghangas*', pending in the Family Court, Siwani, District Bhiwani and she seeks transfer of the same to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Rohtak.

In pursuance of the notice issued, the respondent made appearance through counsel and filed the reply.

Counsel for the parties heard.

At the very outset, it is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that the marriage between the parties to the lis had taken place on 26.01.2015 and one son born from the said wedlock, who is aged 5 years at present, is in the care and custody of the applicant. However, on account of

**TA-686-2025****-2-**

matrimonial dispute, the parties are residing separate. Also, it is submitted that the applicant had got lodged FIR No.158 dated 18.04.2024 under Sections 498-A, 406, 323 and 506 IPC, Police Station Purani Sabzi Mandi, Rohtak, wherein, challan has been presented and the respondent is facing trial in the Courts at Rohtak. The applicant has also filed complaint under Section 12 read with Sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, which is also pending in the Courts at Rohtak and the respondent is making appearance in the same.

Further also, counsel for the applicant submits that the even though, the applicant as well as the respondent, are doctors, but however, the applicant is not doing any job and is not practising as a doctor anywhere. She has no source of earning. In the given circumstances, while having the custody of the minor child, it is difficult for her to commute a distance of 118 kms. to defend the divorce petition, which is pending before Family Court, Siwani.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent, while making reference to the reply submits that the application has been filed, only to cause harassment to the respondent. In fact, the respondent is serving in Army and because of the job constraints, it is difficult for him also, to pursue the matrimonial litigation. Further, counsel for respondent makes submission that the mother of the respondent is suffering from paralysis and therefore, he also has his family responsibilities, to take care of his mother and in these circumstances, it is difficult for him to pursue the entire litigation.

In fact, counsel for the respondent also submits that the applicant is a

**TA-686-2025****-3-**

qualified professional woman and she has concealed about having source of earning. While making reference to Annexure R-2, counsel submits that the applicant is a dentist and she had filed an application for seeking maintenance before the Army Authorities, wherein, she has admitted about herself to be employed with a company called IQVIA with a fixed salary of Rs.53,493/- per month. Even though, the maintenance was denied to her, but however, it is submitted that the maintenance was fixed by the Army Authorities for the son of the respondent to the extent of Rs.42,800/- per month, which is being paid by him regularly, which amount, as per the version of counsel for the respondent, stands enhanced to Rs.62,800/- per month, on account of enhancement of his salary.

Further also, counsel for the respondent submits that if the transfer application is to be accepted, in any case, he makes a prayer for transfer of the same to Bhiwani, instead of Rohtak.

Rejoinder was also filed and therein, the applicant has reiterated about herself to be not having any source of earning, though admits about filing of the application for seeking maintenance and submits that at the time of filing of the transfer application, the applicant was not having any source of earning.

In view of the submissions aforesaid, it is pertinent to mention that the Courts generally lean towards the convenience of the wife, while considering the transfer application, relating to the matrimonial dispute, but however, the same is not a thumb rule. Various other circumstances, spelt out from the material brought on record, ought to be taken into consideration. Undisputedly, there is minor child, aged about 5 years, born

**TA-686-2025****-4-**

from the estranged marriage and he is in the care and custody of the applicant. Counsel for the respondent has laid much emphasis upon the applicant, being professional woman as she is Dentist and in the given circumstances, it is submitted that it is falsely stated that she is not having any source of earning; In this regard, counsel for the respondent has made reference to Annexure R-2 clause 2(g), wherein, it is asserted that the qualification of the applicant is Bachelor in Dental Science and M.Sc. Clinical Research and also further employment with the company called IQVIA, with a fixed salary of Rs.53,493/- has been mentioned.

However, it is pertinent to mention that the same relates to 05.11.2024 i.e. much prior to the filing of the transfer application. Be that as it is, about the applicant to be an educated and professional lady, but however, this is one aspect, which ought to be taken into consideration. The weighing aspect is about the child, who is 5 years old and living with the applicant. There are many challenges faced, even by the mother, even though, she has inherent instinct for caring of the children, while doing single parenting.

Even though, counsel for the respondent has made a prayer for transfer of the case to Bhiwani, which is at a distance of about 45 kms. from his parental place Siwani, but however, the said prayer, as such, is also not acceptable, keeping in view two other cases already pending at Rohtak and more particularly, the criminal case, wherein, the respondent is required to make appearance, on each and every date of hearing as he is facing trial in the same. Being so, when all the cases, arising from this broken marriage, are pending at single station, definitely, it would be convenient for the



TA-686-2025

-5-

applicant as well as the respondent.

Keeping in view the same and also taking into consideration the job constraints of the respondent and also, of course the convenience of the applicant, who is taking care of the minor child, the transfer application, as such, is hereby allowed and the petition under Section 13(1) (ia) (ib) of the Hindu Marriage Act, filed by respondent-husband, bearing No.DMC-3-2024, titled '*Dr.Ravi Ramphal Ghangas vs. Dr.Anjali Ravi Ghangas*', stands transferred from the Family Court, Siwani, District Bhiwani, to the Court of competent jurisdiction at Rohtak. The requisite record of the aforesaid case be sent by the Family Court, Siwani, District Bhiwani to the District and Sessions Judge, Rohtak.

Learned District and Sessions Judge, Rohtak shall assign the said petition to the Family Court, Rohtak. Even, the parties are directed to appear before the Family Court, Rohtak, within a period of one month from today onwards.

However, the Courts concerned, shall make an endeavour to adjourn the cases, arising out of this matrimonial dispute, preferably for one and the same date. Moreover, the respondent also has an option to file an application to make appearance through virtual mode, as and when his presence is required and if any such application is filed, the Court concerned, shall consider the same and pass an appropriate order, in the fitness of the circumstances.

February 10, 2026
Vgulati

(ARCHANA PURI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
Yes/No