

(2017) 01 P&H CK 0194

High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No: Transfer Application No.158 of 2016 (O&M)

Gunveen

APPELLANT

Vs

Prabhjot Singh

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Jan. 27, 2017

Acts Referred:

- Civil Procedure Code, 1908 (CPC) - Section 24

Citation: (2017) 1 DMC 656

Hon'ble Judges: Mr. Rameshwar Singh Malik, J.

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Ms. Jatinder Jit Kaur Advocate, for the Applicant; Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Disposed Off

Judgement

Rameshwar Singh Malik, J.(Oral)—Applicant, by way of instant transfer application under Section 24 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, seeks transfer of the petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (for short "Act") titled as "**Prabhjot Singh v. Gunveen Malhotra**" filed by respondent husband from Jalandhar to S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali.

2. Notice of motion was issued.

3. The case was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court but the parties could not resolve the issue amicably. In the meantime, the applicant-wife was proceeded against ex parte by the learned Matrimonial Court at Jalandhar. Application on behalf of the applicant-wife was moved before learned Matrimonial Court for setting aside the ex parte proceedings.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that she has got clear instructions to say that the application moved by the applicant-wife seeking setting aside the ex parte proceedings has already been allowed by the learned Matrimonial Court.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

It has gone undisputed between the parties that there is no child out of this wedlock and the applicant-wife is staying with her parents at Mohali. Respondent-husband is not paying any amount of maintenance to the applicant. Applicant-wife is not having any regular source of income. She is dependent on her parents, who are bearing the expenses for the maintenance of applicant-wife. Distance between Jalandhar to Mohali is more than 150 km.

6. After giving anxious consideration to the rival contentions and careful perusal of the record of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that instant one has been found to be a fit case ordering the transfer of petition under Section 9 of the Act from Jalandhar to Mohali. It is so said because all the above said undisputed facts clearly go in favour of the applicant-wife and against the respondent-husband. In the circumstances of the case, it will not only be inconvenient but would be very difficult for the applicant-wife to go from Mohali to Jalandhar, to pursue the litigation imposed on her by the respondent-husband under Section 9 of the Act. Convenience of the wife in transfer applications, like the present one, arising out of a matrimonial dispute, is one of the relevant consideration. Further, distance between the two places, financial status of the wife, her source of income and her age are the relevant factors to be considered, while deciding the transfer applications like the present one.

7. The cardinal principle for exercise of power under Section 24 of the Civil Procedure Code is that the ends of justice demand the transfer of the suit, appeal or other proceeding. In matrimonial matters, wherever the Courts are called upon to consider the plea of transfer, the Courts have to take into consideration the economic soundness of either of the parties, the social strata of the spouses and behavioural pattern, their standard of life antecedent to marriage and subsequent thereto and circumstances of either of the parties in eking out their livelihood and under whose protective umbrella they are seeking their sustenance to life. Generally, it is the wife's convenience which must be looked at by the Courts, while deciding a transfer application.

8. The view taken by this Court also finds support from the following judgments of the Hon"ble Supreme Court, as well as different High Courts, including this Court: -

1. Mrs. Maneka Sanjay Gandhi and another v. Miss Rani Jethmalani, AIR 1979 (SC) 468.

2. Dr. Subramaniam Swamy v. Ramakrishna Hegde, 1990 (1) SCC 4.

3. Neelam Kanwar v. Devinder Singh Kanwar, 2000 (10) SCC 589.

4. Sumita Singh v. Kumar Sanjay and another, AIR 2002 (SC) 396.

5. Mangla Patil Kale v. Sanjeev Kumar Kale, 2003 (10) SCC 280.

6. **Fatema v. Jafri Syed Husain @ Syed Parvez Jafferri, AIR 2009 (SC) 1773.**
7. **Anjali Ashok Sadhwani v. Ashok Kishinchand Sadhwani, AIR 2009 (SC) 1374.**
8. **Kulwinder Kaur @ Kulwinder Gurcharan Singh v. Kandi Friends Education Trust and others, AIR 2008 SC 1333.**
9. **Nisha v. Dharmenda Pratap Singh Rathore, 2015 (3) All. LJ 168.**
10. **M.V. Rekha v. Sathya, 2011 (2) HLR 34.**
11. **Sneha v. Vinayak, 2013 ILR (Karnataka) 165.**
12. **Rimpal v. Balinder Kumar, 2010 (7) RCR (Civil) 286.**
13. **Anju v. Sanjay, 2011 (6) RCR (Civil) 112.**
14. **Komal Devi @ Komal Kumari @ Komal Rani v. Harbhajan Singh, 2012 (8) RCR (Civil) 84.**

9. The relevant observations made by the Hon"ble Supreme Court in para 14 of its judgment in *Kulwinder Kaur @ Kulwinder Gurcharan Singh*'s case (supra), which can be gainfully followed in the present case, read as under: -

"Although the discretionary power of transfer of cases cannot be imprisoned within a strait-jacket of any cast-iron formula unanimously applicable to all situations, it cannot be gainsaid that the power to transfer a case must be exercised with due care, caution and circumspection. Reading Sections 24 and 25 of the Code together and keeping in view various judicial pronouncements, certain broad propositions as to what may constitute a ground for transfer have been laid down by Courts. They are balance of convenience or inconvenience to plaintiff or defendant or witnesses; convenience or inconvenience of a particular place of trial having regard to the nature of evidence on the points involved in the suit; issues raised by the parties; reasonable apprehension in the mind of the litigant that he might not get justice in the court in which the suit is pending; important questions of law involved or a considerable section of public interested in the litigation; interest of justice demanding for transfer of suit, appeal or other proceeding, etc. Above are some of the instances which are germane in considering the question of transfer of a suit, appeal or other proceeding. They are, however, illustrative in nature and by no means be treated as exhaustive. If on the above or other relevant considerations, the Court feels that the plaintiff or the defendant is not likely to have a fair trial in the Court from which he seeks to transfer a case, it is not only the power, but the duty of the Court to make such order."

Again, deliberating on an identical issue, in the case of *Dr. Subramaniam Swamy* (supra), the Hon"ble Supreme Court held as under: -

"The question of expediency would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case but the paramount consideration for the exercise of power must be to meet

the ends of justice. It is true that if more than one court has jurisdiction under the Code to try the suit, the plaintiff as dominus litis has a right to choose the Court and the defendant cannot demand that the suit be tried in any particular court convenient to him. The mere convenience of the parties or any one of them may not be enough for the exercise of power but it must also be shown that trial in the chosen forum will result in denial of justice. Cases are not unknown where a party seeking justice chooses a forum most inconvenient to the adversary with a view to depriving that party of a fair trial. The Parliament has, therefore, invested this Court with the discretion to transfer the case from one Court to another if that is considered expedient to meet the ends of justice. Words of wide amplitude-for the ends of justice-have been advisedly used to leave the matter to the discretion of the apex court as it is not possible to conceive of all situations requiring or justifying the exercise of power. But the paramount consideration must be to see that justice according to law is done; if for achieving that objective the transfer of the case is imperative, there should be no hesitation to transfer the case even if it is likely to cause some inconvenience to the plaintiff. The petitioner's plea for the transfer of the case must be tested on this touchstone.

(emphasis supplied)"

10. The above said law laid down by the Hon"ble Supreme Court has also been followed by this Court in order **dated 16.03.2016 passed in TA No.945 of 2015 (Sushma and others v. Kapil @ Sahil Bansal)**, which, in turn, was based on the judgments of the Hon"ble Supreme Court, as well as different High Courts, including this Court.

11. Reverting to the facts of the case in hand and respectfully following the law laid down by the Hon"ble Supreme Court as well as different High Courts, including this Court, it is unhesitatingly held that applicant-wife is entitled for getting the petition under Section 9 of the Act transferred from Jalandhar, so as to enable her to pursue the litigation without facing any undue hardship or harassment at the hands of the respondent-husband. It is the settled principle of law that justice is not only to be done but it should also appear to have been done. If the applicant wife is forced to go from Mohali it would amount to denial of justice to her. Thus, to strike a balance between the parties with a view to do complete and substantial justice and proceeding on a holistic view of the matter, this Court is of the considered view that it would be just and expedient to transfer the petition under Section 9 of the Act from Jalandhar to S.A.S.Nagar, Mohali.

12. No other argument was raised.

13. Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that instant transfer application deserves to be accepted and the same is hereby allowed. Petition under Section 9 of the HM Act filed by the respondent husband is ordered

to be transferred from Jalandhar to S.A.S.Nagar, Mohali.

14. Accordingly, the learned District Judge, Jalandhar, is directed to send complete record of the above-said petition to the learned District Judge, S.A.S.Nagar, Mohali, at an early date but in any case within a period of one month from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

15. The learned District Judge, S.A.S.Nagar, Mohali, is also directed either to decide the case himself or assign it to the learned court of competent jurisdiction, for an early decision, in accordance with law.

16. With the above-said observations made and directions issued, present transfer application stands disposed of, however, with no order as to costs.