

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

I.A.No.1 in WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO(s). 195 OF 2006

PEOPLE FOR ETHICAL TREATMENT OF ANIMALS Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

CENTRAL ZOO AUTHORITY & ORS. Respondent(s)

(For directions)

Date: 09/10/2006 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.K. THAKKER

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Raj Panjwani, Adv.
Ms. Purnima Bhat, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Rajiv Dutta, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Vikas Sharma, Adv.
Mr. R.C. Kathia, Adv.
Ms. M.P. Hunayunisa, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay R. Hegde, Adv.
Mr. Anil K. Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Vikrant Yadav, Adv.

Ms. Reena Singh, Adv.
Mr. Ranendra Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Manoj Saxena, Adv.
Mr. Rajnish Kr. Singh, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Shukla, Adv.
Mr. T.V. George, Adv.

Mr. KH. Nobin Singh, Adv.
Mr. B.V. Niren, Adv.
Mr. S. Biswajit Meitei, Adv.

Mr. V. Krishnamurthy, Adv.

Mr. V.G. Pragasam, Adv.
Mr. S. Vallinayagan, Adv.

Mr. J.S. Attri, AAG.
Mr. Vivek Singh Attri, Adv.

Ms. Suparna Srivastava, Adv.
Ms. Pooja Matlani, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Srivastava, Adv.

...2/-

-2-

Mr. B.S. Banthia, Adv.

Mr. Tara Chandra Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Neelan Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Gopal Singh, Adv.
Mr. Rituraj Biswas, Adv.

Mr. K.N. Madhusoodhanan, Adv.
Mr. R. Sathish, Adv.

Mr. Gopal Singh, Adv.
Mr. Nishakant Pandey, Adv.

Mr. A. Mariarputhan, Adv.
Mrs. Aruna Mathur, Adv.
for M/s. Arputhan, Aruna & Co., Adv.

Mr. Aruneshwar Gupta, AAG.
Mr. Naveen Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Mukul Sood, Adv.
Mr. Shashwat Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Shikha Tandon, Adv.

Mr. B. Dutta, A.S.G.
Ms. Asha G. Nair, Adv.
Mr. R.C. Kathia, Adv.

Mr. Bhavanishankar V. Gadnis, Adv.
Ms. Sunita B. Rao, Adv.

Mrs. Anil Katiyar, Adv.
Mr. Ranjan Mukherjee, Adv.
Mr. Jana Kalyan Das, Adv.
Mr. Krishnanand Pandeya, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Except the State Governments of Uttar Pradesh, Jharkhand and Orissa, other State Governments have not filed the reply affidavits.

Prayer (a) of the application, in fact, seeks implementation of the directive of the Central Zoo Authority dated 7th February, 1995. Further, as far back as on 20th November, 2000, this Court in Writ Petition (C) No.47 of 1998, while directing that all stipulations laid by the Central Zoo Authority while granting conditional recognition should be

...3/-

-3-

strictly adhered to within the time frame prescribed by it, had also directed that animals collection shall be planned within the carrying capacity to avoid inbreeding and overcrowding in the zoos. Our attention has been drawn by Mr. Raj Panjwani, learned counsel for the petitioner, to the information received from various zoo authorities which ostensibly shows that there is no planning.

Having regard to this state of affair, we direct that no zoo shall permit any further breeding of animals in their respective custody beyond the number specified by the Central Zoo Authority in its aforesaid directive dated 7th February, 1995.

The other prayers in the application relate to issue of direction to respondents to appoint experienced curator, veterinarian etc. and to provide full fledged veterinary unit with diagnostic facilities and to comply with the requisite Rules (Rule 10(31)).

The State Governments are directed to file their response within a period of eight weeks. List thereafter.

N. Annapurna
(N. Annapurna)
Court Master

V.P. Tyagi
(V.P. Tyagi)
Asstt. Registrar

9/10/06