

The new law on Delhi's street dogs leaves many questions unanswered. It highlights both citizen safety and animal welfare, but without clarity on execution, it risks being more symbolic than effective. For now, people are watching developments closely. The law's dual focus is its greatest strength and its greatest weakness. It's commendable that it doesn't prioritize one concern at the expense of the other. However, by trying to be everything to everyone, it has created a host of unanswered questions. For example, it advocates for designated feeding zones, but who gets the final say in deciding their location if the community disagrees? It calls for the removal of 'critically ill' dogs, but what is the standard for this diagnosis, and where are the facilities to house them? This lack of operational clarity makes the law vulnerable to being purely symbolic. It allows politicians to claim they've 'solved' the problem while the on-ground situation remains unchanged. Citizens are aware of this possibility, which is why they are in a 'wait and see' mode. They are looking past the headlines and waiting for the detailed rules and procedures that will determine whether this law has any real teeth.