

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Writ Petition(Civil) No.440/2000

GEETA SESHAMANI

Petitioner (s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA &amp; ANR.

Respondent (s)

(with appln.(s) for impleading party and directions) (for final disposal)

Date : 23/09/2002 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.G. BALAKRISHNAN  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARIJIT PASAYAT

For Petitioner (s)	Mr. Mahendra Vyas, Adv. Mr. P K Manohar, Adv.
For Respondent (s) Union of India	Mr. R.N. Trivedi, ASG Ms. Halida Khatun, Adv. Mr. Shreekant N. Terdal, Adv.
Animal Welfare Bd.	Mr. Raj Panjwani, Adv. Mr. Iqbal Shamsi, Adv. Mr. Vijay Panjwani, Adv.
State of Assam	Ms. Krishna Sarma, Adv. Ms. Asha G Nair, Adv. Mr. V K Sidatharan, Adv. for M/s. Corporate Law Group, Advs.
State of Arunachal Pradesh	Mr. Anil Shrivastav, Adv. Ms. Jyoti Dutt, Adv.
State of A.P.	Mr. T.V. Ratnam, Adv. Mr. K Subba Rao, Adv.
State of Bihar	Mr. B B Singh, Adv.
U.T. of Chandigarh	Ms. Kamini Jaiswal, Adv. Ms. Aishwarya Rao, Adv. Ms. Shomila Bakshi, Adv.
State of Chhatisgarh	Mr. Prakash Shrivastava, Adv.

....2/-

State of Goa	Ms. A.Subhashini, Adv.
State of Gujarat	Ms. Hemantika Wahi, Adv. Ms. Sadhna Sandhu, Adv.
State of Haryana	Mr. Jai Prakash Dhanda, Adv. Ms. Raj Rani Dhanda, Adv. Mr. Sunder Khatri, Adv. Mr. Bhagat Singh, Adv.
State of H.P.	Mr. Naresh K. Sharma, Adv.
State of Jharkhand	Mr. Ashok Mathur, Adv. Mr. Rajesh Pathak, Adv.
State of J & K	Mr. Anis Suhrawardy, Adv.
State of Kerala	Mr. K R Sasiprabhu, Adv.
State of Karnataka	Mr. Satya Mitra, Adv. Mr. Sanjay R. Hegde, Adv.
State of Mizoram	Ms. Hemantika Wahi, Adv. Ms. Sadhna Sandhu, Adv.
State of Maharashtra	Mr. S S Shinde, Adv. Mr. V N Raghupathy, Adv. Mr. S V Deshpande, Adv. (NP)
State of Meghalaya	Mr. Ranjan Mukherjee, Adv.
State of Manipur	Mr. Khwairakpam Nobin Singh, Adv.
State of M.P.	Mr. Satish K. Agnihotri, Adv.
State of Nagaland	Mr. Kailash Vasdev, Sr. Adv. Mr. Sanjay K. Shandilya, Adv. Ms. V.D. Khanna, Adv.
State of Orissa	Mr. Radha Shyam Jena, Adv.
Govt. of Pondicherry	Mr. V.G. Pragasam, Adv.
State of Punjab	Mr. Ajay Bansal, Dy. Adv. Genl., Pb. Mr. R S Suri, Adv. Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Adv. (NP)
State of Rajasthan	Mr. Ranji Thomas, Adv. Ms. Bharathi Upadhyaya, Adv. Mr. Sushil Tekriwal, Adv. Mr. J M Rao, Adv.
State of Sikkim	Mr. A Mariarputham, Adv. Ms. Aruna Mathur and Mr. Anurag D Mathur, Adv. for M/s. Arputham, Aruna & Co., Adv.
State of Tripura	Ms. Vimla Sinha, Adv. Mr. Rahul Singh, Adv. Mr. Gopal Singh, Adv. Mr. Rajiv Mahapatra, Adv.
State of Tamilnadu	Mr. P N Ramalingam, Adv.
State of U.P.	

...3/-

.PA

:3:

Mr. A.S. Pundir, Adv.(NP)

State of Uttaranchal Mr. A S Rawat, Adv.  
Mr. Ajay K. Agrawal, Adv.  
Mr. Mahesh Chandra, Adv.

State of West Bengal Mr. Tara Chandra Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Neelam Sharma, Adv.

for NCT of Delhi, Mr. T.A. Khan, Adv.  
Andaman & Nicobar Mr. D S Mahra, Adv.  
Admn., Lakshadeep, Mr. S Wasim A Qadri, Adv.  
Dadar & Nagar Haveli,  
Daman & Diu.

For applicant (s) Mr. Rakesh K Khanna, Adv.  
in impleadment appln. Mr. Rajeev Singh, Adv.  
Mr. R P Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Surya Kant, Adv.

Mr. Anil Nag, Adv.  
  
Mr. Sushil Kumar Jain, Adv.  
  
Mr. Ambhoj Kumar Sinha, Adv.

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

.....L.....I.....T.....T.....T.....T.....T.....J

.SP2

Despite this Court's orders dated 9th August, 2002 and 26th August, 2002, the Union of India has, as far as this Court is concerned, taken no effective steps for containing the menace of monkeys which are outside zoo and menace of stray dogs and cattle which roam on the roads. The excuse which is given by the learned Additional Solicitor General is that it is for the MCD and the NDMC to do the needful and/or they are the organisations which have the necessary manpower. As far as this Court is concerned, the territory of Delhi has a unique position being Capital of this country and which is also regarded as a Union

...4/-

.PA

:4:

Territory under the Constitution. It is, therefore, the primary responsibility of the Union of India to carry out the directions given by this Court. Other authorities, constitutional or statutory, are also duty-bound to render assistance in complying with the terms of this Court's order. We direct the Union of India and the Cabinet Secretary in particular to see that effective steps are taken for compliance of this Court's order dated 26th August, 2002. Compliance be reported to this Court on 30th September, 2002 as to steps which are being taken. It will be open, as is obvious, for the Union of India to requisition or engage the services of such authorities, bodies or persons which can effectively deal with this menace. We are conscious of the fact that it may not be possible in this shortwhile to complete the exercise but atleast effective beginning has to take place.

.SP1

