



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

117

**Transfer Application No.652 of 2026 (O & M)
Date of decision :-13.05.2026**

Reeta Goswami

.....Applicant

Versus

Anil Kamboj

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Saket Bhandari, Advocate
for the applicant.

NIDHI GUPTA J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition filed by applicant-wife is for transfer of the petition filed by respondent-husband under Section 13(1)(ia) of the Hindu Marriage Act,1955 (for short 'the Act') bearing HMA/117/2026, titled as "Anil Kamboj vs. Reeta Goswami" (Annexure P-1) pending in the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, SAS Nagar, Mohali to a Court of competent jurisdiction at Karnal.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits :-

- i) That the parties were married on 27.4.2013 according to Hindu rites and rituals.
- ii) That two male children were born out of this wedlock, on 17.3.2015 and 06.2.2018 respectively and are residing in her care and custody, at her matrimonial home at Karnal.



- iii) That the applicant is working as Date Entry Operator in the office of BDO, Karnal and is residing in her in-laws house and alongwith in-laws taking care of her minor children as well as her mother and sister who are residing in Sector 7, Karnal, Haryana. On the other hand, the respondent-husband is working in M/s Cholamandalam General Insurance Co. Ltd., Sector 22, Chandigarh and because of nature of his job, he has to travel to different places near Chandigarh.
- v) It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that the respondent-husband had suddenly stopped talking with the applicant and after some time, the applicant came to know that the respondent has filed the above said petition under Section 13(1)(ia) of the Act against her and no other proceedings except the said petition are pending between the parties. It is very fairly submitted by learned counsel for the applicant that the applicant is residing with her in-laws, however, most of the time, she used to reside at her matrimonial home at Karnal on the address as mentioned in the Memo of Parties.
- vi) That the distance between place of residence of the applicant-wife i.e. Karnal and the place of proceedings under Section 13(1)(ia) of the Act, filed by the respondent-husband, pending before the Principal Judge, Family Court, SAS Nagar, Mohali, is about 125 kilometers on one side.
- vii) That being female and as she has to look after her sister, mother as well as two minor children at Karnal, it is very difficult for her to visit SAS Nagar Mohali to attend the Court.
3. It is *inter alia* on these grounds that applicant prays for transfer of the case, as detailed in para 1 above.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant.



5. Besides the facts as noticed hereinabove, the legal position in such like cases as the present one, is well established. In this regard, judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in **N.C.V. Aishwarya vs A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha," 2022 Live Law (SC) 627**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held 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 socioeconomic paradigm in the Indian society, generally, it is the wife's convenience which must be looked at while considering transfer.

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. Further reliance can be placed upon the judgments in **“Sumita Singh vs Kumar Sanjay”, 2002 SC 396** and **“Rajani Kishor Pardeshivs Kishor Babulal Pardeshi”, 2005(12) SCC 237**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that “while deciding the transfer application, the Courts are required to give more weightage and consideration to the convenience of the female litigants and transfer of legal proceedings from one Court to another should ordinarily be allowed, taking into consideration their



convenience and the Courts should desist from putting female litigants under undue hardships.”

7. Even this Court in number of cases has followed the aforesaid principle of law. Accordingly, it is well settled that while considering the transfer of a matrimonial dispute/case, at the instance of the wife, the Court is to consider the family condition of the wife, the custody of the minor child, economic condition of the wife, her physical health and earning capacity of the husband and most important the convenience of the wife i.e. she cannot travel alone without assistance of a male member of her family, connectivity of the place to and fro from her place of residence as well as bearing of the litigation charges and travelling expenses.

8. After going through the entire paper-book, considering the fact that issuance of notice to the respondent has the consequences of staying further proceedings before the trial Court, otherwise the applicant-wife will have to bear the litigation expenses and transportation expenses and in case, notice of motion is issued, even the respondent-husband has to bear the litigation expenses and in view of the judgments i.e. **Sumita Singh's** case (supra), **Rajani Kishor Pardeshi's** case (supra) and **N.C.V. Aishwarya's** case (supra) passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present petition, subject to the following conditions:-

- a) The petition filed by respondent husband under Section 13(1)(ia) of Act, bearing No. HMA/117/2026 titled as “Anil Kamboj vs. Reeta



Goswami”, pending in the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, SAS Nagar (Mohali) is transferred to a Court of competent jurisdiction at Karnal.

- b) The Id. District Judge, SAS Nagar (Mohali) is directed to transfer complete record pertaining to the aforesaid case to District Judge, Karnal.
- c) The parties are directed to appear before the District & Sessions Judge, Karnal on 15.6.2026.
- d) The District Judge, Karnal will assign the said petition to the Court of competent jurisdiction.

9. The concerned Court at Karnal will make all endeavour to refer the case before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre for exploring the possibility of some amicable settlement between the parties.

10. The Court concerned, where the litigation is pending between the parties, will accommodate them with one date in one calendar month.

11. However, liberty is granted to the respondent to revive this petition, if he intends to contest the same, provided that:-

- (a) The respondent will clear all arrears of maintenance amount, **if any**, in terms of any petition filed by the applicant either under Section 125 Cr.P.C. or Section 12 of the Domestic Violence Act or Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act.
- (b) The respondent will file an affidavit giving undertaking to pay Rs.1,000/- per day, to the applicant for attending the Court proceedings at District Courts, SAS Nagar (Mohali) on each and every date of hearing.



(c) The respondent will bring a demand draft of Rs.25,000/-, drawn in favour of applicant, towards the litigation expenses to pursue the case at District SAS Nagar (Mohali) in case the respondent opts to contest this petition.

12. I am supported by the decisions rendered by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in **TA No. 1315/2022, Rohini Arora v Nitin Talwar; TA No. 1322 of 2022, Jaswinder Kaur v Gurvinderjeet Singh; and TA No. 1323 of 2022, Usha Rani v Karmajit Singh.**

13. As already noticed above, since the petition is being disposed of without issuing notice to the respondent, accordingly, in these peculiar circumstances, in order to ensure appearance of the parties before the District Judge, Karnal on 15.6.2026, it is directed that a copy of this order be sent to the respondent through registered post, besides sending a copy of this order to the District Judges concerned through e-mail. Applicant through her counsel, present in the Court, is directed to ensure her appearance accordingly.

Disposed of.

Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

May 13, 2026

Vijay Asija

(**NIDHI GUPTA**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No