

# **Stray Dogs, Urban Safety, and the Supreme Court: The Legal Crossroads in Delhi NCR**

## **I. Introduction**

The Delhi National Capital Region (NCR) stands at a pivotal legal and policy juncture. With over 600,000 stray dogs roaming its streets, the region has witnessed an alarming rise in dog-bite incidents, hospitalisations, and tragic fatalities—particularly among children and the elderly.

On 11 August 2025, the Supreme Court issued landmark interim orders directing the mass removal and sheltering of stray dogs, citing an “extraordinary” public health crisis. The directions, passed in a suo motu proceeding, have ignited a sharp debate between two fundamental imperatives: the constitutional right to life and safety on one side, and animal welfare protections under statutory and constitutional mandates on the other.

The case, now reserved for final judgment, raises profound questions about how India balances public health emergencies, urban governance failures, and humane treatment of animals.

## **II. Procedural Timeline: From Suo Motu Cognizance to Reserved Judgment**

- **28 July 2025** – Supreme Court takes suo motu cognizance based on a Times of India report highlighting concerns over child safety from stray dog attacks.

**Action:** Notice issued; urgent concerns raised regarding safety of children in public spaces.

- **11 August 2025** – Interim order passed directing mass removal and sheltering of stray dogs.

### **Key directions:**

1. Construction of dog shelters for over 5,000 dogs within 6–8 weeks.
2. No release of impounded dogs back onto streets.

3. Daily records of shelter operations to be maintained.
4. Mandatory CCTV coverage in shelters.
5. Establishment of a 4-hour capture/response helpline.
- **13 August 2025** – NGO challenge filed seeking stay or recall of interim order.

**Grounds:** Allegation that order was passed ex parte; concerns about statutory violations and cruelty from overcrowded shelters.

- **14 August 2025** – Expanded three-judge bench convened; final order reserved after full hearing.

**Proceedings:** All parties heard; conflicting Supreme Court and High Court precedents cited on stray dog management.

### **III. Empirical Reality: Stray Dog Population & Public Harm**

- Population: 6–7 lakh strays in Delhi NCR (2023–24 MCD/NDMC data).
- Bite cases: ~2,000 reported daily in Delhi; 60,000+ annually. Nationally, over 20,000 per day.
- Rabies deaths: ~20,000 annually in India (WHO estimates).
- Recent fatalities: 3 child deaths in Delhi NCR in the past 18 months; multiple severe mauling's.

These numbers, repeatedly referenced by the Court, underscore a serious and ongoing urban public health emergency.

### **IV. Legislative & Regulatory Landscape**

1. Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 (PCA Act)
  - **Section 11:** Criminalises cruelty to animals while permitting “reasonable” animal control measures.
  - **Section 38:** Empowers the Central Government to make rules for animal birth control.
2. Animal Birth Control (Dog) Rules, 2023

- Require sterilisation, vaccination, and return of stray dogs to their original locations after treatment.
- Prohibit mass relocation or indefinite impounding of stray dogs, except in genuine emergencies.
- Any removal must be for the shortest feasible duration and must not cause unnecessary suffering.

### 3. Delhi Municipal Bylaws

- Authorise municipal authorities to control dangerous animals for public safety.
- Such powers are subject to compliance with central animal welfare laws, including the PCA Act and ABC Rules.

### 4. Core legal tension

- The Supreme Court’s interim directions for mass sheltering and no release appear to override the ABC Rules’ “capture-sterilise-release” protocol, raising questions of statutory compliance and judicial overreach.

## **V. Competing Legal Principles: A Doctrinal Analysis**

- Right to Life (Article 21 – Public Safety)

Judicial stance: Paramount in priority; the Court has repeatedly emphasised the State’s duty to protect citizens—especially children and elders—from avoidable harm.

- Animal Welfare

Source: Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960; Animal Birth Control (Dog) Rules, 2023; Article 51A(g) of the Constitution.

Judicial stance: Humane, science-based management required; cruelty is prohibited; sterilisation and immunisation are compulsory; mass detention or culling is disfavoured except in genuine emergencies.

- **Municipal Obligations**

Judicial stance: Municipal bodies must ensure public safety, sanitation, and compliance with animal welfare statutes; repeated judicial observations cite municipal inaction as a major cause of the crisis.

- **Legal Consistency**

Judicial stance: The judiciary has generally favoured the “capture-sterilise-release” protocol; any deviation must be justified and non-arbitrary to avoid conflict with established precedents.

## **VI. The Supreme Court’s Reasoning: Exceptional Circumstance or Legislative Override?**

- I. **Emergency justification:** The Court treated the escalating dog-bite incidents—especially involving children—as an extraordinary public health emergency warranting temporary departure from the ABC Rules.
- II. **Infrastructure mandate:** Directed rapid construction of shelters for 5,000+ dogs within 6–8 weeks.
- III. **Operational safeguards:** Ordered daily operational logs, CCTV monitoring in shelters, and a 4-hour rapid capture/response helpline.
- IV. **Non-lethal approach:** Specifically prohibited culling, emphasising sheltering over killing.

- V. **Enforcement warning:** Issued strict contempt warnings for obstruction or non-compliance with the order.
- VI. **Procedural gap:** Initially passed without hearing animal welfare organisations; later addressed by convening a larger bench to hear all parties.
- VII. **Legal challenge:** Petitioners argue that the order violates the statutory ABC Rules, risks cruelty from overcrowded shelters, and disregards prior judicial precedent.
- VIII. **Judicial balancing:** Bench acknowledged need for harmonisation between urgent public safety interventions and statutory animal welfare mandates; final judgment reserved.

## **VII. Comparative Judicial and International Perspectives**

**Supreme Court (past orders 2023–24):** Endorsed strict compliance with ABC Rules; prohibited mass culling or prolonged detention.

**Delhi High Court:** Upheld the legality of the capture-sterilise-release protocol.

**Other High Courts:** Bombay, Rajasthan, and Gujarat courts have followed similar minimal-harm approaches; Rajasthan HC allows removal only with “minimum harm” standard.

**International best practices:** WHO, UK, and EU models recommend catch-neuter-vaccinate-release (CNVR) as most humane and effective for controlling stray dog populations.

## **VIII. Critical Issues & Observations**

- a) **Shelter capacity gap:** Planned shelter space (5,000) is grossly inadequate for a stray population exceeding 600,000 in Delhi NCR.
- b) **Statutory conflict:** The blanket “no release” direction appears to override the ABC Rules and previous apex court guidance.
- c) **Municipal inaction:** Chronic failure in implementing sterilisation and vaccination programmes is a root cause of the crisis.
- d) **Procedural fairness:** Initial exclusion of animal welfare groups was a procedural lapse; later rectified with a full bench hearing.

## **IX. Legal and Policy Forecast: Implications for Urban Governance**

### If the order is upheld:

May create a precedent for emergency overrides of statutory animal welfare protections in public health crises.

### If the order is modified or recalled:

Will reaffirm statutory supremacy and the humane ABC approach.

### **Policy imperatives going forward:**

- Full compliance with PCA Act and ABC Rules; detention only as a last resort.
- Achieve over 80% sterilisation and immunisation coverage within two years.
- Conduct independent third-party audits with results published on public dashboards.
- Promote responsible community feeding and incentivise adoption of strays.
- Establish rapid response teams in high-risk zones such as schools, markets, and parks.

## **X. Conclusion**

The Supreme Court’s forthcoming judgment will likely define the balance between public safety and animal welfare for decades to come.

The optimal path lies in harmonisation, not polarisation—combining humane, science-based animal birth control with robust public safety measures, backed by municipal accountability and judicial oversight.

Whether the Court affirms an emergency exception or reasserts statutory mandates, this case will serve as a precedent for how India addresses complex urban governance challenges where human and animal interests inevitably intersect.