

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IA 1/2006 in WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO(s). 195 OF 2006

PEOPLE FOR ETHICAL TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

CENTRAL ZOO AUTHORITY & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for directions)

Date: 06/12/2007 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.V. RAVEENDRAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.M. PANCHAL

Mr. Raj Panjwani, Adv. (A.C.)

For Petitioner(s) Ms. Purnima Bhat, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Vikas Sharma, Adv.
Central Zoo Authority Ms. Rashmi Malhotra, Adv.
For Mr. D.S. Mehra, Ad.
Mrs Anil Katiyar ,Adv (N.P.)

Mr. Anis Suhrawardy ,Adv

Mr. B.B. Singh ,Adv

Ms. Kamini Jaiswal ,Adv

2

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

Mrs.B.Sunita Rao ,Adv
Mr. Bhavani Shankar Gadnis, Adv.

NCT at Delhi

Ms. Asha G. Nair, Adv.
Mr. S. Wasim A. Qadri, Ad.
For Mr. D.S. Mahra, Adv.

State of A.P.

M/s. Manoj Saxena, Rajnish Kr. Singh, Rahul
Shukla, T.V. George, Advs.

Mr. Ranjan Mukherjee ,Adv

Mr. Krishnanand Pandeya ,Adv

Mr. D.K. Goswami, Adv.

Mr. Fuzail Khan, Adv.

Mr. Anil Kumar Jha ,Adv

Mr. C.D. Singh ,Adv

State of HP

Mr. J.S. Attri, AAG

Mr. Vivek Singh Attri, Adv.

Ms. A.Subhashini, Adv.

State of Bihar

Mr. Gopal Singh, Adv.

Mr. Manish Kumar, Adv.

State of Tripura

Mr. Gopal Singh, Adv.

Mr. Rituraj Biswas, Adv.

State of Raj.

Mr. Aruneshwar Gupta, AAG

Mr. Naveen Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Shashwat Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Vikrant Deol, Ad.

State of Maharashtra Mr. S.S. Shinde, Adv.

Mrs.Asha G.Nair, Adv.

State of Arunachal

Mr. Anil Shrivastav, Adv.

3

Pradesh

Mr. Ritu Raj, Adv.

State of Pb.

Mrs. Jayshree Anand, AAG

Mr. K.K. Mahalik, Adv.

Mr. Kuldip Singh, Adv.

State of Haryana

Mr. Vikram Mawari, Adv.

Mr. T.V. George, Adv.

State of Mizoram

Mr. K.N. Madhussodhanan, Adv.

Mr. R. Sathish, Adv.

State of Manipur

Mr.N. Koteswar Singh, AG

Mr. KH. Nobin Singh, Adv.

State of Orissa

Mr. Jana Kalyan Das, Adv.

Mr. Swetaketu Mishra, Adv.

UT of

Pudhucherry

Mr. V.G. Pragasam, Adv.

Mr. S. Joseph Aristotle, Adv.

Mr. S. Prabu Ramasubramanian, Adv.

State of Nagaland

Mr. U Hazarika, Adv.

Mr. Satyamitra, Adv.

Ms. Sumita Hazarika, Adv.

State of
Chattisgarh

Ms. Suparna Srivastava, Adv.

Mr. Manish Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Rajesh Srivastava, Adv.

State of Sikkim

Mr. A. Mariarputham, Adv.

Mrs. Aruna Mathur, Adv.

For M/s. Arputham Aruna & Co., Advs.

State of M.P. Mr. B.S. Banthia, Adv.
Mr. Vikas Ujpadhyay, Adv.

State of Assam Mr. Riku Sarma, Adv.
For M/s. Corporate Law Group, Advs.

State of Karnataka Mr. Sanjay R. Hegde, Adv.
Mr. Amit Kr. Chawla, Adv.

4

Mrs. Hemantika Wahi, Adv.
Ms. Pinky, Adv.
Ms. Jesal, Adv.
Ms. Sangeeta Singh, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

Heard learned amicus curiae and counsel for the Central Zoo Authority.

Learned amicus curiae points out that the Central Zoo Authority has de-recognized 302 zoos all over India. It is submitted that when a zoo is de-recognized, it has to stop exhibition of animals and any violation thereof by continuing exhibition of animals would attract the penal provisions of the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972. We are told that those zoos were de-recognized, as they were not in conformity with the standards prescribed. After de-recognition, the Central Zoo Authority has not issued any direction in regard to the fate of the animals which are kept in de-recognized zoos.

We, therefore, direct the Central Zoo Authority to come up with comprehensive guidelines as to (i) how it will deal with application for revival of recognition; (ii) the manner in which the animals in de-recognized zoos should be dealt with. The amicus curiae pointed out that unless there is a direction to stop exhibiting the animals in de-recognized zoos, the zoos will not be motivated to rectify the shortcomings and provide the up-gradation required as per the guidelines

5

prescribed by the Central Zoo Authority and the provisions of the Wildlife Protection Act, for giving recognition again. The Central Zoo Authority is directed to come up with proper suggestion in this regard also. The suggestions/guidelines to be submitted within a period of eight weeks.

List after three months.

(R.K.DHAWAN)
COURT MASTER

(VEERA VERMA)
COURT MASTER