

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION
WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO.296 OF 2016**

IN THE MATTER OF:

Angel Trust

...Petitioner

versus

Union of India

...Respondent

PAPER BOOK
(FOR INDEX KINDLY SEE INSIDE)

PRASHANT BHUSHAN: COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER

INDEX

S.No.	Particulars	Page No.
1.	LISTING PERFORMA	
2.	WRIT PETITION	
3.	ANNEXURE P1: True copy of the Law Commission report No. 261 - “Need to Regulate Pet Shops and Dog and Aquarium Fish Breeding” (submitted to the Union Minister of Law and Justice), dated 28th August 2015	
4.	ANNEXURE P-2: True copy of the announcement from the official FBI website regarding re-categorization of the animal abuse cases with serious crimes, dated 02 January 2016.	
5.	ANNEXURE P-3: True copy of the op-ed in the New York Times by Gregory Berns, Professor of Neuroeconomics at Emory University, USA and the author of “How Dogs Love Us: A Neuroscientist and His Adopted Dog Decode the Canine Brain dated 05 October 2013.	
6.	ANNEXURE P-4: True copy of “The Admissibility of Evidence of Animal Abuse in Criminal Trials for Child and Domestic Abuse” by A Campbell, cited as (2002) 43(2) Boston College Law Review 463) dated NIL.	
7.	ANNEXURE P-5: True copy of “Making The Dogman Heel: Recommendations For Improving The Effectiveness Of Dogfighting Laws” by F Ortiz cited as (2010) 3 Stanford Journal of Animal Law and Policy 1 dated NIL.	
8.	ANNEXURE P-6: True copy of “Is Animal Cruelty a “Red Flag” for Family Violence?: Investigating Co-Occurring Violence Toward Children, Partners, and Pets” by Sarah DeGue and David DiLillo, cited as Journal of Interpersonal Violence 24:6 (June 2009), pp. 1036–1056, dated NIL.	
9.	ANNEXURE P-7: True copy “Animal Abuse and Youth Violence” by of FR	

	Ascione, cited as (2001) Juvenile Justice Bulletin at 1, dated NIL.	
11.	ANNEXURE P-8: True copy of “The Relationship of Animal Abuse to Violence and Other Forms of Antisocial Behaviour” by A Arluke, J Levin, and F Ascione, cited as (1999) 14 Journal of Interpersonal Violence 963, dated NIL.	
12.	ANNEXURE P-9: True copy of “The Relationship between Animal Cruelty, Delinquency, and Attitudes toward the Treatment of Animals” by Bill C. Henry, cited as Society & Animals 12:3, Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2004, dated NIL.	
13.	ANNEXURE P-10: True copy of “Conceptualising Animal Abuse with an Antisocial Behaviour Framework” by Eleonora Gullone, cited as Animals (Basel). 2011 Mar; 1(1): 144–160, dated NIL.	
14.	ANNEXURE P-11: True copy of a Hindustan Times report showing a man in Delhi torturing and beating a street dog and then posting it on Facebook dated July 12, 2015	
15.	ANNEXURE P-12: True copy of an India Today piece reporting about a stray dog being tied up to a tree and beaten mercilessly with Lathis by residents of a Cooperative Group Housing Society in Sector 48 Chandigarh, dated 28 January 2016	
16.	ANNEXURE P-13: True copy of a Hindu newspaper piece, reporting on a man stabbing to death three stray dogs and a puppy outside Green Park Metro Station in South Delhi dated 20 March 2016	
17.	ANNEXURE P-14: True copy of a Times of India piece, reporting on a Bengaluru woman thrashing 8 puppies to death to teach dog a lesson dated 21 March 2016.	
18.	ANNEXURE P-15: True copy of a Hindustan Times piece, reporting on a man pouring acid on 5 new-born puppies for barking at him dated 26 March 2016	

19.	ANNEXURE P-16: True copy of a Times of India piece, reporting on a police man in Andheri, Mumbai, beats a stray dog till it's eye pops out dated 07 April 2016	
20.	ANNEXURE P-17: True copy of a an Indian Express piece, reporting on the Dehradun incident of police horse Shaktimaan getting her leg crushed allegedly due to being beaten up by a stick and then later on having her leg amputated and then finally dying of the same injury dated 21 April 2016	

SYNOPSIS AND LIST OF DATES

That the present writ petition is being filed in public interest under Article 32 of the Constitution of India, read with Article 21 read with Article 51A(g). The petitioner is seeking, *inter alia*, the immediate intervention of this Hon'ble Court to address the rising instances of barbaric animal cruelty and inhumane exploitation in the pet shop industry. In the last few years there has been a sudden rise in the cases of instances of barbaric animal cruelty such as:

- A Delhi man torturing and beating a street dog and then posting it Facebook (Jul 12, 2015)
- A stray dog tied up to a tree and beaten mercilessly with Lathis by residents of a Cooperative Group Housing Society in Sector 48 Chandigarh (28 January 2016)
- A man stabbing to death three stray dogs and a puppy outside Green Park Metro Station in South Delhi (20 March 2016)
- A Bengaluru woman thrashing 8 puppies to death to teach dog a lesson (21 March 2016)
- A man in Agra, pouring acid on 5 new-born puppies for barking at him (26 March 2016)
- A police man in Andheri, Mumbai, beats a stray dog till it's eye pops out (07 April 2016)
- The Dehradun incident of police horse Shaktimaan getting her leg crushed allegedly due to being beaten up by a stick and then later on having her leg amputated and then finally dying of the same injury (21 April 2016)

One of the salient reasons for an alarming increase in animal cruelty has to do with the fact that as of right now there is vacuum of law w.r.t. to protection of animals. The reason for such a vacuum is that the main legislation for animal protection - The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 ("PCA Act") - has not been amended since 1960 to keep up with the times and even today the only punishment for such dastardly acts is a mere 50 Rupees fine and no jail term. The only other provisions of law that deal with such barbaric crimes are section 428 and section 429 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ("IPC"). These sections provide for punishment for the "mischief by killing or maiming animal", but then go to on to limit it's scope to only animals of value above 10 Rupees (for section 428) and of value more than 50 Rupees (for section 429). Furthermore, sections 428 and 429 come in "Chapter XVII: Of Offences Against Property". It is because of this limit of 10 and 50 Rupees and the fact that these sections come in the heading of offences against property, that they are not readily applicable in cases of abuse to stray animals. For a stray animal, is technically not of any monetary value (be it above or below 10 or 50 Rupees) and also such a stray animal is not a household pet of anyone, so possibly cannot be classified as property, and hence does not attract the provisions of chapter XVII of the IPC. For example, if

a person hacks a stray dog to death, then applying these provisions of the IPC would be very tough as the stray dog was not purchased from pet shop for a few thousand Rupees and hence it does not have any monetary value (let alone above or below 10 or 50 Rupees) nor can it be classified as anyone's property. It is because of such insufficient statutory provisions (compounded by lax enforcement), that there is a vacuum of law w.r.t to animal abuse and as a consequence there is no deterrence in society, as regards to animal cruelty. The perpetrators exploit this vacuum and commit heinous acts against animals with impunity.

It is further most humbly submitted that in **“Asiatic Wild Buffalo and Red Sanders case” - T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India**, [(2012) 3 SCC 277], this Hon'ble Court held that environmental justice can only be achieved if we shift our focus from anthropocentric to ecocentric. The Hon'ble Court went on to further say that as per the ecocentric approach we must protect all animals that are there in nature and not just those who have a certain monetary value. Thus keeping such a ecocentric approach in mind, it is humbly submitted that section 428 and section 429 of the IPC, (an Act enacted in 1860) should interpreted so to include all animals and not just the one's that cross a certain monetary value. This will help in achieving the goals envisaged in the *Asiatic Wild Buffalo case* (Supra) of shifting our jurisprudence from being anthropocentric to ecocentric.

Studies show that animals like dogs, have the same emotions as humans. They feel love, fear and pain. This was proven using sophisticated and latest scientific methods such as F-MRI (functional MRI) and it conclusively proves that dogs, and many other animals (especially our closest primate relatives), have emotions just like us, humans.

It is also pertinent to mention here that it is now scientifically proven that those who abuse animals escalate to women and children – With time, the high of abusing a defenseless animal dissipates and to impose their power, such abusers, then prey on women and children. Also there are ample studies which show an overlap animal abuse has with domestic violence and child abuse Further more, in criminology, the following truisms are widely accepted as regards animal cruelty:

- Cruelty to animals is a precursor to larger crime
- There is an inextricable connection between abuse and criminal violence
- If somebody is harming an animal, there is a good chance they also are hurting a human as well
- Animal abusers of today could be the serial killers of tomorrow.

These truisms can be best captured by the following Venn Diagram:



In fact, many notorious serial killers, who committed abominable and unspeakable crimes on women and children, started off by torturing animals. Such killers include:

- Richard Ramirez - 14 murders, > 24 rapes (Stabbed, gutted animals.)
- Ted Bundy: > 36 rape and murders of young women. (Tortured animals as a youth.)
- Jeffrey Dahmer: 17 murders, mutilations. (Killed animals and mounted their heads on stakes)
- Edward Cole: > 16 murders (Strangled puppies.)

Also now the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) in the US (United States of America), has re-categorized acts of animal cruelty and put it in the same table as other serious offences like arson, burglary, assault, and homicide. By doing so, the FBI sent out a message that abuse of animals is a crime against society. Also, under the new categorization they will begin tracking and collecting information about incidents of animal cruelty and putting them in the FBI's criminal database. This database then will help the FBI using statistical method be able to figure out abusers and killers, before they move to on women, children and larger society. Such an enforcement of animal laws benefits the larger society greatly and is a valuable tool in law enforcement.

It is pertinent to note that this Hon'ble Court in the "Jallikattu judgment" (***Animal Welfare Board of India Vs. A. Nagaraj*** [(2014) 7 SCC 547]) expanded the scope of Article 21 and said that Article doesn't only apply to humans but applies to animals also. The court laid down:

"Article 21 of the Constitution, while safeguarding the rights of humans, protects life and the word "life" has been given an expanded definition and any disturbance from the basic environment which includes all forms of life, including animal life, which are necessary for human life, fall within

the meaning of Article 21 of the Constitution... Right to dignity and fair treatment is, therefore, not confined to human beings alone, but to animals as well.”

The Hon'ble Court further goes on to opine how the penalty in the PCA Act is paltry and reduces the deterrence in society and then exhorts the Parliament to urgently amend the PCA Act and provide sufficiently deterrent punishments:

“Penalty for violation of those rights are insignificant, since laws are made by humans. Punishment prescribed in Section 11(1) is not commensurate with the gravity of the offence, hence being violated with impunity defeating the very object and purpose of the Act... Parliament is expected to make proper amendment of the PCA Act to provide an effective deterrent to achieve the object and purpose of the Act and for the violation of section 11, adequate penalties and punishments should be imposed.”

It also imperative to point out another facet of despicable animal abuse – that in the form of pet shops, dog breeding and fish shops. As of right now, there are no regulations in India, pertaining to this burgeoning 80,000 crore market, which is marked by rampant animal abuse and unabated exploitation. This matter is so grave, that on 28th August 2015, **the Law Commission of India, under the Chairmanship of Justice AP Shah, submitted its Report No. 261 on the “Need to Regulate Pet Shops and Dog and Aquarium Fish Breeding”** to the Union Minister of Law and Justice. The report observes that pet shops and breeders violate provisions of animal welfare laws with impunity, and recommends that it is necessary to regulate their practices. Some of horror that go on in this illicit and unregulated trade include: (citing from the Law Commission report)

- Selling unweaned pups – taking the pups away from the mothers much before they can open their eyes and need their mother's milk to survive
- Puppies drugged to prevent them from crying
- Large birds are stuffed into small cages
- De-beaking birds – cutting the beaks of birds with hot knives
- De-clawing kittens – taking out the claws of cats with plyers so that they don't scratch the pet shop surface
- Docking of dogs tails - cutting tails without anesthesia for cosmetic purposes)
- Lack of basic veterinary care in such pet shops
- Star tortoises and other protected animals are sold openly and wild animals (including parakeets, munias and mynas) are caught and sold in complete violation of the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972
- It is estimated that for every bird sold in the market, two die en route. Fledglings are stolen from their nests and

smuggled to market in cartons and tiny boxes, and some are even rolled up inside socks during transport to cities. Captive birds' wings are crudely clipped with scissors to prevent them from flying.

- Fish become stressed and sometimes die because of confinement, crowding, contaminated water and unnatural temperatures

The report also cites how such practices pose a human health hazard – “PFA Fatehabad unit, besides several others, drew attention to the practice of disposal of waste from pet shops. Waste from pet shops is allowed to mix with household waste that pollutes the neighbourhood as well as the ground water. Dead animals are dumped with household waste or buried in the neighbourhood, which leads to more contamination, and no post mortem is conducted to rule out infectious diseases that could spread to humans. They suggest that the spread of avian/bird flu may have a close relation with the manner in which animals are indiscriminately bred and sold in the country.” It is submitted here by the Petitioners, that this is gross a violation of **Article 21** – *Right to clean and disease free environment* - without which no society can ever sustain let alone develop. Furthermore, the virulence and large scale loss of life that bird flu brings with itself is known by everyone. And if tomorrow there is an outbreak of the same, let's say in Delhi (which is as it is very densely populated and hence the disease will travel like lightening) then such filthy pet shops will act like a mass transmission station for the disease. These pet shops will be like mobile signal towers, just that instead of radio waves, they would do large scale broadcast of the disease to all the neighbouring areas. In such a case, the Petitioner begs to ask, that who would be responsible? The unregulated pet shops (who will claim innocence as they had no regulation to follow) or the State (who have currently abdicated their responsibility to promulgate and enforce such regulations). It is most humbly submitted, that this situation, is nothing short of a ticking time bomb.

Considering the serious nature of the problem, the Law Commission in its recommendations notes that “Commission is of the opinion that firstly, based on an analysis of the legal position, the representations received by the Commission, and the large number of reports on the issue, it appears that the provisions of the law are violated with impunity by pet shops and breeders.”

The Law Commission then goes on to recommend that the three sets of rules as drafted by the AWBI (Animal Welfare Board of India) be notified immediately by the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (“MoEF”). The three sets of rules regarding pet shops are:

1. Pet Shop Rules, 2010
2. Dog Breeding, Marketing and Sale Rules, 2010 and

3. Aquarium Fish Breeding and Marketing Rules

These rules have been lying with the Animal Welfare Division of the MoEF since 2010.

It is appalling to mention that, despite about 1 year being passed since the submission of the report by the Law Commission to the Law Ministry, no such rules have been notified, and the egregious violation of animal laws and inhumane exploitation in the pet industry, runs rampant.

It is because of severe cruelty meted out to animals every day and also the appalling exploitation that occurs in these breeding mills and pet shops, that Article 21 (which as per the Jallikattu judgment, applies to animals also) is violated and also since the penalty in the PCA Act is paltry and virtually non-existent, that Article 14 is also violated since, such low penalties in antithetical to the principle of “Anti-Arbitrariness” in the constitutional jurisprudence of India.

Furthermore, the Respondent is obliged under **Article 21 read with Article 51A(g) and section 3 of the PCA Act**, to ensure that all animals are treated with compassion and dignity and are not meted out with unspeakable cruelty. Section 3 of the PCA Act says that –

“3. Duties of persons having charge of animals. – It shall be the duty of every person having the care of charge of any animal to take all reasonable measures to ensure the wellbeing of such animal and to prevent the infliction upon such animal of unnecessary pain or suffering.”.

This section is applicable in the present Petition because the State is the person (as envisaged in the section) who has the charge of all the animals in the country and this responsibility is not only for the animals in the reserved forests and sanctuaries etc but also every other animal in its jurisdiction – be it the stray dog on the streets of Ernakulum or sparrows (a fast dying breed) on the buildings on Delhi. And since the State is under such a duty as put by section 3, it is failing the same by not bringing out legislations to cure the vacuum of law, despite the exhortation by this Hon’ble Court in *Animal Welfare Board of India Vs. A. Nagaraj* (Supra) and also by the Law Commission in its Report No. 261.

It is also equally important to note here that the Directive Principle of State Policy under **Article 48A** enjoins the State to take steps to protect the wildlife of the country and that wildlife doesn’t only mean the animals in the forests but animals all over the country. Furthermore, such protection doesn’t only mean from poaching but also the severe cruelty, they are meted out every day. The Directive Principle of State Policy under Article 48A reads as –

“48A. The State shall endeavor to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forests and wild life of the country.”

It is also humbly submitted that it does not behoove a civilized society and the worlds largest democracy, that the under the current laws, the only order for hacking a puppy to death is a paltry 50 Rupees fine and no jail term. It flies in the face of our constitutional duty under Article 51A(g), which enjoins us to have compassion for all living beings and not just humans – “to protect and improve the natural environment including forests, lakes, rivers and wild life, and to have compassion for living creatures”. In fact Mahatma Gandhi, once famously said that “The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated.”

This Hon’ble Court has been the foremost protector of rights and liberties of the voiceless and has in a catena of judgments such as ***Vineet Narain Vs Union of India*** [(1998) 1 SCC 226] and in ***Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan*** [(1997) 6 SCC 241], has held that when there is a legislative vacuum, the Supreme Court of India can step in, and issue guidelines, to cure the vacuum. In Vineet Narain case (Supra) this Court has observed as under in Paragraph 51 of the reported decision:-

“There are ample powers conferred by Article 32 read with Article 142 to make orders which have the effect of law by virtue of article 141 and there is mandate to all authorities to act in aid of the orders of this Court as provided in Article 144 of the Constitution. In a catena of decisions of this Court, this power has been recognised and exercised, if need be, by issuing necessary directions to fill the vacuum till such time the legislature steps in to cover the gap or the executive discharges its role.”

Since the executive and legislature have not performed their part, the animal rights activists have no hope that this grim situation of abuse of exploitation of the voiceless, will abate. And therefore, they seek this Hon’ble Court’s intervention in putting an end to this tyranny against the voiceless, which eventually harms us, the humans as well.

LIST OF DATES:

- 1860 ***The Indian Penal Code, 1860*** is enacted to cover all substantive aspects of criminal law, on the recommendations of first Law Commission of India established in 1834, under the Chairmanship of Thomas Babington Macaulay, under the Government of India Act 1833.
- 1960 The ***Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960*** is enacted to prevent the infliction of unnecessary pain or suffering on animals.

- 05.10.2013 Gregory Berns, Professor of Neuroeconomics at Emory University, USA and the author of “How Dogs Love Us: A Neuroscientist and His Adopted Dog Decode the Canine Brain, writes in New York Times about his studies on animals using F-MRI, to show how animals have the same emotions as humans and feel pain, love and anger as the rest of us.
- 07.05.2014 The Supreme Court of India passes a milestone judgment in the matter titled “**Animal Welfare Board of India vs. A. Nagaraja & Ors.** (Supra) banning the bulls and bullocks in exhibitions, for example, Jallikattu, bullock cart racing, and emphasized the need to urgently amend the PCA Act and expanding the scope of Article 21 to include animals as well.
- 28.08.2015 **The Law Commission in its Report No. 261** on the “Need to Regulate Pet Shops and Dog and Aquarium Fish Breeding” to the Union Minister of Law and Justice, notes the inhumane abuse and despicable exploitation in the pet shops industry and recommends that the AWBI (Animal Welfare Board of India) three sets of rules regarding pet shops (“Pet Shop Rules, 2010”), dog breeding (“Dog Breeding, Marketing and Sale Rules, 2010”), and aquarium fish breeding (“Aquarium Fish Breeding and Marketing Rules”), lying pending since 2010, with the Animal Welfare Division of the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (“MoEF”) for scrutiny be “be notified and implemented at the earliest.”
- 01.0.2016 The FBI re-categorizes acts of animal cruelty and puts it in the same table as other serious offences like arson, burglary, assault, and homicide. It also tracks such animal abuses cases, so that it locate such abusers before they escalate and commit crimes on women and children.
- 12.07.2015 A man tortures and beats a stray dog in Delhi and then posts the video on Facebook.
- 29.01.2016 A stray dog is tied up to a tree and beaten mercilessly with Lathis by residents of a Cooperative Group Housing Society in Sector 48 Chandigarh.
- 20.03.2016 A man stabs three stray dogs and a puppy to death outside Green Park Metro Station in South Delhi.
- 21.03.2016 A Bengaluru woman thrashes 8 puppies to death to teach dog a lesson
- 26.03.2016 A man pours acid on 5 new-born puppies for barking at him

- 07.04.2016 A police man beats a stray dog till it's eye pops out in Andheri, Mumbai
- 21.04.2016 Police horse Shaktimaan dies after getting her leg crushed allegedly due to being beaten up by a stick and then later on having her leg amputated
- __.04.2016 Hence, the present writ petition.

BEFORE THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION
WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. _____ OF 2016

IN THE MATTER OF:

ANGEL TRUST

Through its Director

Mr. Siddhartha K Garg

Siddhartha@angeltrust.org

...Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA

Through the Secretary,

Ministry of Environment,

Forests & Climate Change,

Shashtri Bhawan

New Delhi – 110001

...Respondent

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 32 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

To,

The Hon'ble Chief Justice of India

And his companion judges of the Hon'ble Supreme Court

Most respectfully showeth:

1. That the present writ petition is being filed in public interest under Article 32 of the Constitution. The petitioner is seeking, inter alia, the immediate intervention of this Hon'ble Court to address the rising instances of barbaric animal cruelty and inhumane exploitation in the pet shop industry.

THE PARTIES

2. That the Petitioner Angel Trust, is a registered trust (Reg. No. 1,221 in Book No. 4, Vol. no. 4,249, dated 18.09.2014). It is a non-profit body. The petitioner NGO works for animal rights and activities include feeding about 25 dogs daily, providing emergency medical

assistance for stray animals, conducting neutering drives, rescuing animals, arranging adoption homes, counselling of children who abuse animals and taking up pro-bono cruelty animal abuse cases. Till now the Petitioner has got about 50 dogs neutered, 25 kittens rescued and provided emergency medical assistance to several animal (mostly stray dogs) hit and run cases and given legal advice to many on animal cruelty cases. For achieving such goals, the petitioner works with larger NGO's in the NCR region such as the Friendicoes-SECA (Society for Eradication of Cruelty to Animals) and Noida SPCA (Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals). The petitioner has no personal interest, or private/oblique motive in filing the instant petition. There is no civil, criminal, revenue or any litigation involving the petitioner which has or could have a legal nexus with the issues involved in the PIL.

3. The Respondent herein is 'State' for the purposes of Article 12 of the Constitution. The Respondent is the Central Government through the nodal Union Ministry of Environment and Forests which is tasked with the initiation and implementation of all steps for the protection of the Environment and animal welfare under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1960. Under its auspices are the measures to ensure there is no animal abuse.

THE CAUSE OF ACTION

4. The facts that lead to the cause of action for the present Petition is the alarming rate of the rise of instances of barbaric animal cruelty and inhumane exploitation in the pet shop industry, which occur due to the vacuum in law w.r.t to animal abuse and exploitation. Many of such instances are mentioned in the Petition.
5. The present Petition is based on authentic information and public documents sourced from authentic news reports, opinions and writings of eminent experts and scholars on criminology and other publicly available information.

BACKGROUND

6. One of the salient reasons for an alarming increase in animal cruelty has to do with the fact that as of right now there is vacuum of law w.r.t. to protection of animals. The reason for such a vacuum is that the main legislation for animal protection - The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 ("PCA") - has not been amended since 1960 to keep up with the times and even today the only punishment for such dastardly acts is a mere 50 Rupees fine and no jail term.

7. The only other provisions of law that deal with such barbaric crimes are section 428 and section 429 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (“IPC”). They read as follows:

“428. Mischief by killing or maiming animal of the value of ten rupees.—Whoever commits mischief by killing, poisoning, maiming or rendering useless any animal or animals of the value of ten rupees or upwards, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to two years, or with fine, or with both.

429. Mischief by killing or maiming cattle, etc., of any value or any animal of the value of fifty rupees.—Whoever commits mischief by killing, poisoning, maiming or rendering useless, any elephant, camel, horse, mule, buffalo, bull, cow or ox, whatever may be the value thereof, or any other animal of the value of fifty rupees or upwards, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to five years, or with fine, or with both.”

8. These sections provide for punishment for the “mischief by killing or maiming animal”, but then go on to limit its scope to only animals of value above 10 Rupees (for section 428) and of value more than 50 Rupees (for section 429). Furthermore, sections 428 and 429 come in “Chapter XVII: Of Offences Against Property”. It is because of this limit of 10 and 50 Rupees and the fact that these sections come in the heading of offences against property, that they are not readily applicable in cases of abuse to stray animals. For a stray animal, is technically not of any monetary value (be it above or below 10 or 50 Rupees) and also such a stray animal is not a household pet of anyone, so possibly cannot be classified as property, and hence does not attract the provisions of chapter XVII of the IPC. For example, if a person hacks a stray dog to death, then applying these provisions of the IPC would be very tough as the stray dog was not purchased from pet shop for a few thousand Rupees and hence it does not have any monetary value (let alone above or below 10 or 50 Rupees) nor can it be classified as anyone’s property. It is because of such insufficient statutory provisions (compounded by lax enforcement), that there is a vacuum of law w.r.t to animal abuse and as a consequence there is no deterrence in society, as regards to animal cruelty. The perpetrators exploit this vacuum and commit heinous acts against animals with impunity.
9. It is most humbly submitted that in **“Asiatic Wild Buffalo and Red Sanders case” - T.N. Godavarma Thirumulpad v. Union of India**, (Supra) this Hon’ble

Court held that environmental justice can only be achieved if we shift our focus from anthropocentric to ecocentric. The Hon'ble Court went on to further say that as per the ecocentric approach we must protect all animals that are there in nature and not just those who have a certain monetary value. Thus keeping such a ecocentric approach in mind, it is humbly submitted that section 428 and section 429 of the IPC, (an Act enacted in 1860) should be interpreted so to include all animals and not just the one's that cross a certain monetary value. This will help in achieving the goals envisaged in the *Asiatic Wild Buffalo case* (Supra) of shifting our jurisprudence from being anthropocentric to ecocentric. The relevant paras of the judgment are reproduced below:

“14. Environmental justice could be achieved only if we drift away from the principle of anthropocentric to ecocentric...”

20. Anthropocentrism considers humans to be the most important factor and value in the universe and states that humans have greater intrinsic value than other species. Resultantly, any species that are of potential use to humans can be a reserve to be exploited which leads to the point of extinction of biological reserves. Further, that principle highlights human obligations towards environment arising out of instrumental, educational, scientific, cultural, recreational and aesthetic values that forests has to offer to humans. Under this approach, environment is only protected as a consequence of and to the extent needed to protect human well being. On the other hand ecocentric approach to environment stress the moral imperatives to respect intrinsic value, inter dependence and integrity of all forms of life. Ecocentrism supports the protection of all life forms, not just those which are of value to humans or their needs and underlines the fact that humans are just one among the various life forms on earth.”

10. The main welfare legislation in India for the protection of animals from abuse and cruelty is the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1960. But the problem is that this Act has not been amended till now and even today, the punishment for, let's say, hacking a puppy to death is 50 Rupees and no jail term. This means that there is a vacuum of law when it comes to animal cruelty. And such a vacuum has resulted in there being no deterrence. The perpetrators know that due to the toothless legislation and lackadaisical enforcement, they will go scot free and hence commit heinous crimes against animals with impunity.
11. The other main concern in the present Petition is the burgeoning and completely unregulated Pet shop industry.

This industry is rampant with horrific abuse and exploitation. The same has been highlighted by the Law Commission in its report **No. 261 - “Need to Regulate Pet Shops and Dog and Aquarium Fish Breeding”** (submitted on 28th August 2015 to the Union Minister of Law and Justice). The report observes that pet shops and breeders violate provisions of animal welfare laws with impunity, and recommends that it is necessary to regulate their practices. A true copy of this report is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-1 (from page nos. _____ to _____)**.

12. The report observes that pet shops and breeders violate provisions of animal welfare laws with impunity, and recommends that it is necessary to regulate their practices. Some of horror that go on in this illicit and unregulated trade include: (citing from the Law Commission report)
 - Selling unweaned pups – taking the pups away from the mothers much before they can open their eyes and need their mother’s milk to survive
 - Puppies drugged to prevent them from crying
 - Large birds are stuffed into small cages
 - De-beaking birds – cutting the beaks of birds with hot knives
 - De-clawing kittens – taking out the claws of cats with pliers so that they don’t scratch the pet shop surface
 - Docking of dogs tails - cutting tails without anesthesia for cosmetic purposes)
 - Lack of basic veterinary care in such pet shops
 - Star tortoises and other protected animals are sold openly and wild animals (including parakeets, munias and mynas) are caught and sold in complete violation of the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972
 - It is estimated that for every bird sold in the market, two die en route. Fledglings are stolen from their nests and smuggled to market in cartons and tiny boxes, and some are even rolled up inside socks during transport to cities. Captive birds’ wings are crudely clipped with scissors to prevent them from flying.
 - Fish become stressed and sometimes die because of confinement, crowding, contaminated water and unnatural temperatures

13. The report also cites how such practices pose a human health hazard – “PFA Fatehabad unit, besides several others, drew attention to the practice of disposal of waste from pet shops. Waste from pet shops is allowed to mix with household waste that pollutes the neighbourhood as well as the ground water. Dead animals are dumped with household waste or buried in the neighbourhood, which

leads to more contamination, and no post mortem is conducted to rule out infectious diseases that could spread to humans. They suggest that the spread of avian/bird flu may have a close relation with the manner in which animals are indiscriminately bred and sold in the country.” It is submitted here by the Petitioners, that this is gross a violation of **Article 21 – Right to clean and disease free environment** - without which no society can ever sustain let alone develop. Furthermore, the virulence and large scale loss of life that bird flu brings with itself is known by everyone. And if tomorrow there is an outbreak of the same, let’s say in Delhi (which is as it is very densely populated and hence the disease will travel like lightning) then such filthy pet shops will act like a mass transmission station for the disease. These pet shops will be like mobile signal towers, just that instead of radio waves, they would do large scale broadcast of the disease to all the neighbouring areas. In such a case, the Petitioner begs to ask, that who would be responsible? The unregulated pet shops (who will claim innocence as they had no regulation to follow) or the State (who have currently abdicated their responsibility to promulgate and enforce such regulations). It is most humbly submitted, that this situation, is nothing short of a ticking time bomb.

14. Considering the serious nature of the problem, the Law Commission in its recommendations notes that:

“Commission is of the opinion that firstly, based on an analysis of the legal position, the representations received by the Commission, and the large number of reports on the issue, it appears that the provisions of the law are violated with impunity by pet shops and breeders.”
15. The Law Commission then goes on to recommend that the three sets of rules as drafted by the AWBI (Animal Welfare Board of India) be notified immediately by the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (“MoEF”). The three sets of rules regarding pet shops are:
 1. Pet Shop Rules, 2010
 2. Dog Breeding, Marketing and Sale Rules, 2010 and
 3. Aquarium Fish Breeding and Marketing Rules
16. These rules have been lying with the Animal Welfare Division of the MoEF since 2010. And it is appalling to mention that, despite about 1 year being passed since the submission of the report by the Law Commission to the Law Ministry, no such rules have been notified, and the egregious violation of animal laws and inhumane exploitation in the pet industry, runs rampant.

17. It is pertinent to note that this Hon'ble Court in the **Animal Welfare Board of India Vs. A. Nagaraj** (Supra) expanded the scope of Article 21 and said that Article doesn't only apply to humans but applies to animals also. The court laid down:

“Article 21 of the Constitution, while safeguarding the rights of humans, protects life and the word “life” has been given an expanded definition and any disturbance from the basic environment which includes all forms of life, including animal life, which are necessary for human life, fall within the meaning of Article 21 of the Constitution... Right to dignity and fair treatment is, therefore, not confined to human beings alone, but to animals as well.”

18. The Hon'ble Court further goes on to opine how the penalty in the PCA Act is paltry and reduces the deterrence in society and then exhorts the Parliament to urgently amend the PCA Act and provide sufficiently deterrent punishments:

“Penalty for violation of those rights are insignificant, since laws are made by humans. Punishment prescribed in Section 11(1) is not commensurate with the gravity of the offence, hence being violated with impunity defeating the very object and purpose of the Act... Parliament is expected to make proper amendment of the PCA Act to provide an effective deterrent to achieve the object and purpose of the Act and for the violation of section 11, adequate penalties and punishments should be imposed.”

19. It is because of severe cruelty meted out to animals every day and also the appalling exploitation that occurs in these breeding mills and pet shops, that Article 21 (which as per the Jallikattu judgment, applies to animals also) is violated and also since the penalty in the PCA Act is paltry and virtually non-existent, that Article 14 is also violated since, such low penalties in antithetical to the principle of “Anti-Arbitrariness” in the constitutional jurisprudence of India.

20. It is also submitted that the vacuum of law as regards animal abuse flies in the face of our constitutional duty under **Article 51A(g)**, which enjoins us to have compassion for all living beings and not just humans – “to protect and improve the natural environment including forests, lakes, rivers and wild life, and to have compassion for living creatures”. In fact Mahatma Gandhi, once famously said that “The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated.”

21. Furthermore, the Respondent is obliged under **Article 21 read with Article 51A(g) and section 3 of the PCA Act**, to ensure that all animals are treated with compassion and dignity and are not meted out with unspeakable cruelty. Section 3 of the PCA Act says that:

“3. Duties of persons having charge of animals. – It shall be the duty of every person having the care of charge of any animal to take all reasonable measures to ensure the wellbeing of such animal and to prevent the infliction upon such animal of unnecessary pain or suffering.”.

This section is applicable in the present Petition because the State is the person (as envisaged in the section) who has the charge of all the animals in the country and this responsibility is not only for the animals in the reserved forests and sanctuaries etc but also every other animal in its jurisdiction – be it the stray dog on the streets of Ernakulum or sparrows (a fast dying breed) on the buildings on Delhi. And since the State is under such a duty as put by section 3, it is failing the same by not bringing out legislations to cure the vacuum of law, despite the exhortation by this Hon’ble Court in *Animal Welfare Board of India Vs. A. Nagaraj* (Supra) and also by the Law Commission in its Report No. 261.

22. It is also equally important to note here that the Directive Principle of State Policy under **Article 48A** enjoins the State to take steps to protect the wildlife of the country and that wildlife doesn’t only mean the animals in the forests but animals all over the country. Furthermore, such protection doesn’t only mean from poaching but also the severe cruelty, they are meted out every day. The Directive Principle of State Policy under Article 48A reads as –

“48A. The State shall endeavor to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forests and wild life of the country.”

23. This Hon’ble Court has been the foremost protector of rights and liberties of the voiceless and has in a catena of judgments such as **Vineet Narain Vs Union of India** (Supra) and in **Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan** (Supra), has held that when there is a legislative vacuum, the Supreme Court of India can issue guidelines. In Vineet Narain case (Supra) this Court has observed as under in Paragraph 51 of the reported decision:-

“There are ample powers conferred by Article 32 read with Article 142 to make orders which have the effect of law by virtue of article 141 and there is mandate to all authorities to act in aid of the orders of this Court as provided in Article 144 of the Constitution. In a

catena of decisions of this Court, this power has been recognised and exercised, if need be, by issuing necessary directions to fill the vacuum till such time the legislature steps in to cover the gap or the executive discharges its role.”

24. Furthermore, the FBI has recently in early of 2016, re-categorized acts of animal cruelty and put it in the same table as other serious offences like arson, burglary, assault, and homicide. By doing so, the FBI sent out a message that abuse of animals is a crime against society. Also, under the new categorization they will begin tracking and collecting information about incidents of animal cruelty and putting them in the FBI’s criminal database. This database then will help the FBI using statistical method be able to figure out abusers and killers, before they move to on women, children and larger society. Such an enforcement of animal laws benefits the larger society greatly and is a valuable tool in law enforcement. A true copy of this announcement from the official FBI website is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-2 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.

SUPPORTING MATERIAL

Studies on Animal Sentience and Connection to Crimes against Humans

25. Gregory Berns, Professor of Neuroeconomics at Emory University, USA and the author of “How Dogs Love Us: A Neuroscientist and His Adopted Dog Decode the Canine Brain, writes on op-ed in New York Times about his studies on animals using F-MRI, to show how animals have the same emotions as humans and feel pain, love and anger as the rest of us. A true copy of this piece is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-3 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
26. Animal abuse has become increasingly recognised as a serious crime, as well as an indicator of human-directed violence - A Campbell ‘The Admissibility of Evidence of Animal Abuse in Criminal Trials for Child and Domestic Abuse’ (2002) 43(2) Boston College Law Review 463). A true copy of this journal article is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-4 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
27. A strong connection exists between animal mistreatment and human violence - F Ortiz ‘Making The Dogman Heel: Recommendations For Improving The Effectiveness Of Dogfighting Laws’ (2010) 3 Stanford Journal of Animal Law and Policy 1. A true copy of this journal article is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-5 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.

28. Animal abuse may be a red flag indicative of domestic violence - Sarah DeGue and David DiLillo, "Is Animal Cruelty a "Red Flag" for Family Violence?: Investigating Co-Occurring Violence Toward Children, Partners, and Pets", *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 24:6 (June 2009), pp. 1036–1056. A true copy of this journal article is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-6 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
29. The presence of abusive behaviour towards animals is a characteristic of one in four violent adult offenders - FR Ascione 'Animal Abuse and Youth Violence' (2001) *Juvenile Justice Bulletin* at 1. A true copy of this journal article is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-7 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
30. People who commit an act of animal abuse are more likely to commit other criminal offences than non-abusers. Animal abusers are 3-5 times more likely to have a violent criminal record than non-abusers (A Arluke, J Levin, and F Ascione 'The Relationship of Animal Abuse to Violence and Other Forms of Antisocial Behaviour' (1999) 14 *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 963 – A true copy of this journal article is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-8 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
31. There is a relationship between acts of cruelty to animals and involvement in other forms of antisocial behavior - Bill C. Henry, *The Relationship between Animal Cruelty, Delinquency, and Attitudes toward the Treatment of Animals*, *Society & Animals* 12:3, Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2004 .A true copy of this journal article is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-9 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
32. If an adult is abusing animal, then there is a sufficient chance that he/she is engaging in other criminal behaviour as well, particularly human directed aggressive behaviour - Eleonora Gullone, *Conceptualising Animal Abuse with an Antisocial Behaviour Framework*, *Animals (Basel)*. 2011 Mar; 1(1): 144–160. A true copy of this journal article is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-10 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.

Newspaper Reports

33. A Hindustan Times report shows a man in Delhi torturing and beating a street dog and then posting it on Facebook (July 12, 2015) – A true copy of this report is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-11 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.

34. An India Today piece reports about a stray dog tied up to a tree and beaten mercilessly with Lathis by residents of a Cooperative Group Housing Society in Sector 48 Chandigarh (28 January 2016). A true copy of this report is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-12 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
35. A Hindu newspaper piece, reports on a man stabbing to death three stray dogs and a puppy outside Green Park Metro Station in South Delhi (20 March 2016) – A true copy of this report is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-13 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
36. A Times of India piece, reports on a Bengaluru woman thrashing 8 puppies to death to teach dog a lesson (21 March 2016) – A true copy of this report is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-14 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
37. A Hindustan Times piece, reports on a man pouring acid on 5 new-born puppies for barking at him (26 March 2016) – A true copy of this report is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-15 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
38. A Times of India piece, reports on a police man in Andheri, Mumbai, beats a stray dog till it's eye pops out (07 April 2016) – A true copy of this report is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-16 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
39. An Indian Express piece, reports on the Dehradun incident of police horse Shaktimaan getting her leg crushed allegedly due to being beaten up by a stick and then later on having her leg amputated and then finally dying of the same injury (21 April 2016) – A true copy of this report is annexed herewith and marked as **Annexure P-17 (from page nos. ____ to ____)**.
40. In light of the vacuum of law created by not amending the PCA Act, thus rendering it obsolete and also not notifying the 3 sets of rules as formulated by the AWBI to regulate the pet industry, the Petitioner is filing the instant Petition.
41. The present writ petition is being filed on the following grounds amongst others:

GROUNDS

- A. That a vacuum of law has been created, since the ***Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960*** has not been amended since its inception in 1960 and as a result, there is no deterrence in society with w.r.t. to animal cruelty. The current punishment for even hacking a pup to death is a mere 50 Rupees and no jail term, as a result perpetrators abuse animals with impunity. Furthermore, sections 428 and 429 of the ***Indian Penal Code, 1860***, apply to animals above a certain monetary value and animals that are property of a person, and as a result these sections are inapplicable to stray animals and do not protect them from abuse.
- B. That despite the ***Law Commission in Report No. 261*** on the “Need to Regulate Pet Shops and Dog and Aquarium Fish Breeding” to the Union Minister of Law and Justice, exhorting the MoEF to notify the rules prepared by the AWBI, that no action has been taken so far. This has created another vacuum of law, consequent to which there is gross and inhumane abuse and exploitation that occurs in this burgeoning 80,000 crore industry.
- C. That ***Article 21*** (which applies to animals as well, as per ***Animal Welfare Board of India Vs. A. Nagaraj*** (Supra)) is violated due to the paltry and virtually non-existent penal provisions as regards infliction of cruelty.
- D. That ***Article 14*** is being violated since a paltry punishment of 50 Rupees, even in the case of most heinous cruelty perpetrated on animals, is antithetical of the central tenet of “Anti-Arbitrariness” of the constitutional jurisprudence of India.
- E. That in “***Asiatic Wild Buffalo and Red Sanders case***” - ***T.N. Godavarman Thirumulpad v. Union of India***, (Supra), this Hon’ble Court held that environmental justice can only be achieved if we shift our focus from anthropocentric to ecocentric and that as per the ecocentric approach we must protect all animals that are there in nature and not just those who have a certain monetary value. And interpreting section 428 and 429 of the IPC to include all animals irrespective of monetary value and ownership, would go in aligning our current laws to this approach.
- F. That ***Article 21 – Right to a clean and disease free environment*** – is being violated because the waste disposal practices and unhygienic conditions in such unregulated pet shops pose a large civic and societal health risk since the waste from pet shops is allowed to mix with household

waste that pollutes the neighbourhood as well as the ground water. Furthermore, dead animals are dumped with household waste or buried in the neighbourhood, which leads to more contamination, and no post mortem is conducted to rule out infectious diseases that could spread to humans including avian/bird flu. A clean and disease free environment is a *sine qua non* of any society without which it can never sustain, let alone develop. Furthermore, these pet shops will be like mobile signal towers, just that instead of radio waves, they would do large scale broadcast of deadly diseases like Bird flu, to all the neighbouring areas. It is most humbly submitted, that this situation, is nothing short of a ticking time bomb as regards to public health and safety.

- G. That the Respondent is obliged under **Article 21 read with Article 51A(g) and section 3 of the PCA Act**, to ensure that all animals are treated with compassion and dignity and are not meted out with unspeakable cruelty. This section is applicable in the present Petition because the State is the person (as envisaged in the section) who has the charge of all the animals in the country and this responsibility is not only for the animals in the reserved forests and sanctuaries etc but also every other animal in its jurisdiction – be it the stray dog on the streets of Ernakulum or sparrows (a fast dying breed) on the buildings on Delhi. And since the State is under such a duty as put by section 3, it is failing the same by not bringing out legislations to cure the vacuum of law, despite the exhortation by this Hon’ble Court in *Animal Welfare Board of India Vs. A. Nagaraj* (Supra) and also by the Law Commission in its Report No. 261.
- H. That the Directive Principle of State Policy under **Article 48A** enjoins the State to take steps to protect the wildlife of the country and that wildlife doesn’t only mean the animals in the forests but animals all over the country. Furthermore, such protection doesn’t only mean from poaching but also the severe cruelty, they are meted out every day. The Directive Principle of State Policy under Article 48A reads as – “48A. The State shall endeavor to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard the forests and wild life of the country.”
- I. That there is no deterrence w.r.t. to animal cruelty due to the paltry punishment provided in the PCA Act and that there is an urgent need to amend the same was highlighted by this Hon’ble Court in the “Jallikattu judgment” of 2014, (***Animal Welfare Board of India Vs. A. Nagaraj*** (Supra) case where it stated: “*Penalty for violation of those rights are insignificant, since laws are made by humans. Punishment prescribed in Section 11(1) is not*

commensurate with the gravity of the offence, hence being violated with impunity defeating the very object and purpose of the Act... Parliament is expected to make proper amendment of the PCA Act to provide an effective deterrent to achieve the object and purpose of the Act and for the violation of section 11, adequate penalties and punishments should be imposed.”

- J. That it has been held in a catena of judgments that in case of a legislative vacuum, the Supreme Court of India can issue guidelines. Same was held in judgments such as **Vineet Narain Vs Union of India** (Supra) and in **Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan** (Supra). In Vineet Narain case (Supra) this Court has observed as under in Paragraph 51 of the reported decision:- *“There are ample powers conferred by Article 32 read with Article 142 to make orders which have the effect of law by virtue of article 141 and there is mandate to all authorities to act in aid of the orders of this Court as provided in Article 144 of the Constitution. In a catena of decisions of this Court, this power has been recognised and exercised, if need be, by issuing necessary directions to fill the vacuum till such time the legislature steps in to cover the gap or the executive discharges its role.”*
- K. That it has been determined in a plethora of scientific studies that animals (like humans) feel the same emotions like pain and hurt and that there is a strong link between animal abuse and violent behaviour towards humans. The criminology, the truisms are that cruelty to animals is a precursor to larger crime, that there is an inextricable connection between abuse and criminal violence and if somebody is harming an animal, there is a good chance they also are hurting a human as well and lastly that animal abusers of today could be the serial killers of tomorrow.
- L. That it does not behove a civilized society and the worlds largest democracy, that the under the current laws, the only order for hacking a puppy to death is a paltry 50 Rupees fine and no jail term. It flies in the face of our constitutional duty under **Article 51A(g)**, which enjoins us to have compassion for all living beings and not just humans – “to protect and improve the natural environment including forests, lakes, rivers and wild life, and to have compassion for living creatures”. In fact Mahatma Gandhi, once famously said that “The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated.”

PRAYER

In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to pass the following orders:

- (a) Issue an order under Article 142 to make sections 428 and 429 of the IPC applicable to all animals irrespective of monetary value or ownership.
- (b) Issue guidelines as regards punishment for animal abuse, till the amendment to the PCA Act is not passed by the Parliament.
- (c) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other writ or direction to form a task force to look into the severe health risk posed by these pet shops and take preventative steps in stopping the rise and the spread of various animal borne diseases.
- (d) Issue a writ of mandamus or any other writ or direction to notify the 3 sets of rules as prepared by the AWBI to regulate the pet shop industry.
- (e) Pass any other order as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper.

AND FOR THIS KINDNESS THE PETITIONER AS IN DUTY BOUND SHALL EVER PRAY

DRAWN BY:

SIDDHARTHA K GARG

Advocate

FILED BY:

PRASHANT BHUSHAN

Advocate for petitioner

New Delhi

Dated