



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**

S.B. Civil Transfer Application No. 183/2025
CNR: RJHC020462902025 | URN: CTA / 322U / 2025

Hunny Verma S/o Shri Narendra Pal, R/o Village Bapawar Kalan,
Tehsil Sangod, District Kota at present R/o 3-Pa-55, Vigyan
Nagar Kota Rajasthan

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Pankaj Mehar S/o Ramnarayan Mehar, R/o Modak Village,
Tehsil Ramganjmandi District Kota
2. Gordhan Lal S/o Sewa,
3. Radhakishan S/o Sewa,
R/o Khari Mohalla, Kherabad, Tehsil Ramganjmandi,
District Kota
4. Nagarpalika Ramganjmandi, Through Executive Officer,
Ramganjmandi District Kota
5. Sub Registrar, Office of Sub Registrar, Ramganjmandi,
Tehsil Ramganjmandi, District Kota

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Pradeep Singh
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Gourav Sharma

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANEESH SHARMA

Order

17/08/2026

1. The present transfer application has been filed under Section 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, seeking quashing of the order dated 14.05.2025 passed by the learned District Judge, Kota in Civil Misc. Case No. 30/2025 and transfer of Civil Suit No.15/2023, titled as '*Hunny Verma Vs. Pankaj Mehar*', presently pending adjudication before the learned Additional District Judge, Ramganjmandi, District Kota, to the Court of learned Additional District Judge, Kota.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Presiding Officer of the learned Court below is not impartial and is adopting a biased approach against the petitioner and is favouring the respondent. He further submits that, on several occasions, the Presiding Officer has pressurized him to accept the compromise and take the refund, otherwise, the matter would be disposed of shortly, which has created an apprehension in the mind of the petitioner that he may not receive a fair and impartial adjudication. He therefore prays that the case may be transferred from Ramganjmandi to Kota.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents vehemently opposes the prayer for transfer and submits that the apprehension raised by the petitioner is wholly unfounded and illusory. He further submits that the respondent had earlier filed an application under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC, which came to be rejected by the learned Court below. Another application filed by the respondent was also considered and rejected by the learned Court. He also submits that no order-sheet or other material has been brought on record to demonstrate any action or behaviour of the Presiding Officer giving rise to a reasonable apprehension of denial of fair and impartial justice.

4. Heard the submissions made at bar and perused the material available on record.

5. From a perusal of the record, no circumstance is reflected which may indicate that the learned Presiding Officer has acted with any bias or prejudice against the petitioner or in favour of the



respondent. Mere apprehension of a party, unsupported by any cogent or reasonable material, cannot be made the basis for transferring a case under Section 24 CPC.

6. It is also pertinent to note that the respondent had preferred an application under Order 7 Rule 11 CPC, which was rejected by the learned Court below, and another application filed by the respondent was also rejected. Further, the order-sheets placed on record do not reflect any wrongful action or impartial behavior on the part of the Presiding Officer which may reasonably lead to an apprehension that the petitioner would not get a fair and impartial hearing. Thus, the apprehension raised by the petitioner is not founded on any cogent material and remains merely subjective and illusory.

7. Apart from above, on examination of the impugned order as well as the reasons so recorded therein, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned order does not suffer from any illegality or perversity so as to warrant interference by this Court.

8. Therefore, this Court does not find any valid or proper ground for transferring the case from one Court to another merely upon the apprehension or wish of the applicant. If such baseless transfer applications are entertained on the mere asking of a litigant without any substantiating evidence, it would open a Pandora's box, thereby creating further unnecessary delays in the judicial process and undermining administrative discipline.



9. Considering the aforesaid aspect, this Court does not deem it appropriate to transfer the case from learned Additional District Judge, Ramganjmandi, District Kota, to the learned Additional District Judge, Kota.

10. Accordingly, the present civil transfer application, being devoid of merit, is hereby dismissed.

11 All pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(MANEESH SHARMA),J

SOURAV/27