



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

**Sr. No.127**

**TA-354-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 06.08.2025**

**DR NAVJOT KAUR CHEEMA**

**....Applicant**

**Versus**

**DR VIKRAM SINGH BHANGU**

**.....Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ARCHANA PURI**

Present:- Mr. M.S.Sidhu, Advocate  
for the applicant.

Mr. Karanveer Singh and Mr. B.S.Chahal, Advocates  
for the respondent.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARCHANA PURI, J. (Oral)**

**CM-15286-CII-2025**

The present application has been filed at the behest of the applicant/respondent, for placing on record the copies of the zimini orders, passed by Family Court (Camp Court), Bholath, District Kapurthala.

In view of the averments made in the application, same is allowed and the requisite zimini orders are taken on record.

**Main case**

Applicant, Dr. Navjot Kaur Cheema, had filed the present application for transfer of the case i.e. HMA-43-2024, copy whereof is Annexure P-1, from the court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Camp Court, Bholath, District Kapurthala and she seeks transfer of the same to the



court of competent jurisdiction at Jalandhar, Hoshiarpur or Amritsar.

Upon notice, the respondent made appearance through counsel and filed the reply.

Counsel for the parties heard.

At the very outset, it is submitted that the case is sought to be transferred from the court of Ms. Rama Kanwardeep Kaur, solely on account of bad conduct of the Officer. Rather, while making reference to the contents of the application, it is submitted that the divorce petition was firstly pending for 01.02.2025 and then the case was adjourned to 19.02.2025. However, the file was abruptly taken up on 05.02.2025, which was not the date fixed before the court and thereupon, the Presiding Officer forced the counsel for the applicant to cross-examine the witness and when the counsel had apprised the court about the case to be already pending for 19.02.2025, the cost was imposed to the extent of Rs.5,000/- and order passed on 05.02.2025, copy whereof is Annexure P-4.

Also, it is submitted by the counsel for the applicant that the behaviour of the presiding officer, had abruptly changed, while taking up the file on 05.02.2025. In the given circumstances, various zimini orders, have been perused, which are taken on record today itself, vide CM-15286-CII-2025. Perusal of the said zimini orders reveals that firstly the case was fixed for 08.01.2025 and after conducting of the proceedings, the case was adjourned for 22.01.2025. On 22.01.2025, the cross-examination of DW-1 as well as remaining evidence of the respondent was not recorded and furthermore, the case was adjourned to 05.02.2025. On 05.02.2025, the further proceedings were conducted and there is mention made of the PW-1 to be present for cross-examination, but he was not cross-examined by the



counsel for the respondent.

From the aforesaid zimini orders, it is evident that there was no date fixed for 19.02.2025 in the case in hand. As such, the case was taken up on 05.02.2025 i.e. the date already fixed, as evident from the zimini orders. However, counsel for the applicant has drawn the attention of the court to Annexure P-3, which depicts about the updating of the case status on the District Court's Website and therein, the next date of hearing was mentioned as 19.02.2025. However, it is pertinent to mention that this updating itself is not done by the Presiding Officer and it was done by the official. Even though, some mistake may have occurred, but however, in the zimini orders, there is no such mistake coming up, about the file having taken up abruptly by the Presiding Officer on 05.02.2025, when the case was allegedly fixed for 19.02.2025. In the given circumstances, no malafide behaviour can be attributed to the Presiding Officer, as asserted.

Also, counsel for the applicant submits that general behaviour of the Presiding Officer, is also too bad. On query relating to the same, it is submitted that it has not been so mentioned in the application, though generally, it has been stated that the behaviour of the Presiding Officer had changed. In the absence of any detail, coming forth with regard to the behaviour of the Presiding Officer, it is difficult for this Court, to decipher about the conduct of the officer and manner of conducting the proceedings in the pending case.

Even though, the counsel for the respondent, as such, has stated in the application i.e. CM-11034-CII-2025, about himself to be not having any objection to the transfer of the case, but however, this in itself is not the ground to transfer the divorce petition, as sought by the applicant and as



TA-354-2025 (O&M)

consented by the counsel for the respondent.

Also, at this stage, it is pertinent to mention that if at all, there is any complaint with regard to the behaviour of the Presiding Officer, it is always the District Judge concerned, who is in a better position to appraise the same and take stock of the situation. On asking of the court, counsel for the applicant was not inclined to file any application, before the District Judge, thereby making complaint of the behaviour of the respondent or Presiding Officer (if any).

In view of the observations made aforesaid, no case is made out for allowing the transfer application. Hence, the same is hereby dismissed.

**06.08.2025**

Sonu

**(ARCHANA PURI)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : Yes/No