

Delhi's street dog law has stirred both support and suspicion. Supporters see it as progressive, opponents fear harassment of animal feeders. The outcome depends largely on how authorities interpret and implement the provisions. The support comes from a belief that regulation is necessary to move forward. A formal law, supporters argue, brings clarity and accountability to a situation that was previously chaotic. It sets clear goals like vaccination and sterilization and provides a legal basis for action. The suspicion is rooted in the fear of arbitrary authority. Animal feeders, who are often at odds with their neighbors or RWAs, are worried that the law will be used against them. They fear that a biased official could use the rules about 'designated feeding spots' to effectively ban feeding in an area, or declare a friendly dog 'a nuisance' based on flimsy complaints. This makes the role of the implementing authorities absolutely critical. If they act as neutral, well-trained arbiters, the law could foster peace. If they are biased, corrupt, or simply indifferent, they could exacerbate conflicts. The law is a powerful instrument, but whether it is used for construction or destruction depends entirely on the hands that wield it.