

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

TRANSFER PETITION (CRIMINAL) NOS. 94-95 OF 2010

JYOTI MISHRA

.....APPELLANT

VERSUS

DHANANJAYA MISHRA

.....RESPONDENT

O R D E R

We have heard counsel for the petitioner.

2. No one appears for the respondent despite service of notice.
3. The petitioner is the estranged wife of the respondent. While still living with him at Hyderabad, she had filed a written report before the Station House Officer, P.S. Alwal, Secunderabad, that led to the institution of FIR No. 470/2009 dated September 09, 2009 under Section 498-A of the Penal Code citing her husband Dhananjaya Mishra (the sole respondent) and five others as accused. The Police, after investigation, submitted charge sheet and the proceedings against the accused are now pending before the VIth Metropolitan Magistrate, Cyberabad in CC No. 804/2009.
4. In the meanwhile, the petitioner left her husband at Hyderabad and came to live with her parents at

.....2/-

: 2 :

Indore. She has filed this petition for transferring the criminal case pending before the VIth Metropolitan Magistrate, Cyberabad to a court of competent jurisdiction at Indore, Madhya Pradesh.

5. The first thing that needs to be noticed is that in the Transfer Petitions only the husband Dhananjaya Mishra is impleaded as respondent. The other accused in the criminal case are not made parties to these

Transfer Petitions. The Transfer Petitions are, therefore, liable to be dismissed on that score alone.

6. Otherwise also, we are not inclined to transfer a criminal case from one State to another solely on the ground that it would be more convenient for the complainant (wife) to prosecute the matter there. It is true that in cases of dissolution of marriage, restitution of conjugal rights or maintenance, this Court shows much indulgence to the wife and ordinarily transfers the case to a place where it would be more convenient for the wife to prosecute the proceedings.

7. But a criminal case is on a somewhat different footing. The accused may not be able to attend the court proceedings at Indore for many reasons, one of

: 3 : .....3/-

which may be financial constraints, but the consequences of non-appearance of the accused before the Indore Court would be quite drastic. Having regard to the consequences of non-appearance of the accused in a criminal trial, we are loath to entertain the petitioner's prayer for transfer. In a criminal proceeding, the right of the accused to a fair trial and a proper opportunity to defend himself cannot be ignored for the convenience of the complainant simply because she happens to be the estranged wife.

8. For all these reasons, we are not inclined to accept the prayer for transfer in these cases.

9. The Transfer Petitions are dismissed.

.....J  
(AFTAB ALAM)

.....J  
(R.M. LODHA)

NEW DELHI,  
AUGUST 27, 2010  
ITEM NO.40

COURT NO.12

SECTION XVIA

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

TRANSFER PETITION (CRL.) NO(s). 94-95 OF 2010

JYOTI MISHRA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

DHANANJAYA MISHRA

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for stay)

Date: 27/08/2010 These Petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AFTAB ALAM  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.M. LODHA

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Anjani Kr. Mishra, Adv.  
Mr. Rajeev Kumar Bansal, Adv.  
Mr. Akshay K. Ghai, Adv.  
Mr. Sanjeev Bansal, Adv.

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

The Transfer Petitions are dismissed.

(N.S.K. Kamesh)  
Court Master

(S.S.R. Krishna)  
Court Master

(signed reportable order is placed on the file)