



SOUNDARYA
COLLEGE OF LAW



Soundarya
Moot Court Society



Affiliated to Karnataka State
Law University Hubballi



Approved by Bar
Council of India



th

ALL INDIA

Soundarya College of Law

Moot Court Competition - 2026

Organised By :

- ✦ Moot Court Society
- ✦ Soundarya College of Law,
Bengaluru.

Date

23rd | 24th
October 2026

Venue

Soundarya College of Law,
Soundarya Layout, Sidedahalli,
Bengaluru, Karnataka 560073

Knowledge Partner :



— Table of Content —

About Us	3
Important Dates	6
General Rules & Regulations	7
Detailed Registration Procedure	8
Registration Details	10
Structure Of Rounds	11
Rules For Written Submission	13
Rules & Regulations Of The Moot Court	14
Competition Memorials	
Moot Proposition	19
Annexure i	27
Annexure ii	31
Annexure iii	35
Registration Form	44

About the Organisers

Established in 2018 under the prestigious Soundarya Educational Trust (SET), Soundarya College of Law (SCL), Bengaluru, is a premier institution affiliated with Karnataka State Law University (KSLU) and approved by the Bar Council of India (BCI). Offering 3-year LL.B., 5-year B.A. LL.B., and 5-year B.Com. LL.B. programmes, SCL is committed to academic excellence, experiential learning, and professional ethics. Guided by the philosophy "**Your Success, Our Commitment**," the college integrates innovative pedagogy, industry collaborations, mentorship, legal aid, research, and advocacy training to develop competent, socially responsible, and future-ready legal professionals equipped to excel in the evolving legal landscape.

About the Management

The remarkable growth and rising stature of Soundarya College of Law are shaped by the visionary stewardship of the Soundarya Educational Trust (SET), led by its esteemed Chairman, Sri Soundarya P. Manjappa, and its dynamic Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Keerthan Kumar M. Guided by the philosophy "Your Success, Our Commitment," the leadership has cultivated a culture of academic distinction, institutional innovation, and professional excellence. Through strategic industry partnerships, student-centric initiatives, structured mentorship, experiential learning, and a strong commitment to legal aid and research, the institution provides an intellectually vibrant environment that nurtures ethical, competent, and future-ready legal professionals.

About the Moot Court Society, SCL

The Moot Court Society (MCS) of Soundarya College of Law is the institution's flagship platform for advocacy training and experiential legal education. Through moot court simulations, legal research, memorial drafting, and courtroom advocacy, it equips students with the practical skills essential for legal practice. The Society nurtures analytical thinking, persuasive advocacy, and professional courtroom etiquette under the guidance of eminent legal experts. With a distinguished record of participation in and hosting of National Moot Court Competitions, MCS is committed to developing confident, competent, and practice-ready legal professionals.

About the AAACP

The Applied Animal Advocacy Certificate Program (AAACP) is a capacity-building initiative of the People for Animals Public Policy Foundation (PFAPPF), dedicated to nurturing a new generation of informed and effective animal advocates. The program equips participants with practical knowledge of animal welfare laws, public policy, ethical frameworks, and advocacy strategies to strengthen the implementation of animal protection laws in India. Through expert-led training, interactive learning, and policy-oriented engagement, AAACP empowers individuals to work collaboratively with government institutions, civil society, and communities to advance a more compassionate and humane society for all animals. Rooted in the values of compassion, integrity, and inclusivity, the program reflects PFAPPF's mission of creating lasting systemic change through policy reform, capacity building, and collaborative action.



ALL INDIA Moot Court Competition - 2026

The crown jewel of the Society's historical accomplishments was the resounding success of the 3rd All India Moot Court Competition 2025. This landmark national event witnessed fierce, high-caliber intellectual battles among top-tier law colleges and premier universities from every corner of the country, evaluated by an elite panel of sitting High Court judge, veteran jurists, and prominent legal practitioners. The brilliant organization, meticulous logistical execution, and exceptional academic standards of the 3rd Edition set a stellar benchmark across the national mooting circuit. Building on this triumphant legacy of competitive excellence, the Moot Court Society proudly steps forward to host the 4th All India Moot Court Competition, ready to offer the nation's brightest legal minds an unparalleled forum to showcase their advocacy skills.

AWARDS & CERTIFICATES

Winners
₹ 45,000/-
& Trophy

1st Runner Up
₹ 30,000/-
& Trophy

Best Mooter
₹ 5,000/-

Best Researcher
₹ 5,000/-

Best Amicus Curiae
₹ 5,000/-

Best Memorial
₹ 5,000/-

A certificate of participation shall be awarded to all the participants after the completion of the moot court competition which will stand testament to their efforts and participation in the competition.



Important Dates



SL No.	Event	Dates
1	Last date for temporary/ provisional registration	19 th September 2026
2	Last date for payment	26 th September 2026
3	Confirmation of registration	29 th September 2026
4	Last date for submission of memorial (soft copy) and travel plans	19 th October 2026
5	Last date for submission of memorials, registration forms and travel plans (hard copy)	21 st October 2026
6	Registration and inauguration	23 rd October 2026
7	Drawing of lots and exchange of memorials.	23 rd October 2026
8	Researcher test	23 rd October 2026
9	Preliminary rounds	23 rd October 2026
10	Octa finals	23 rd October 2026
11	Quarter finals	24 th October 2026
12	Semi finals	24 th October 2026
13	Finals	24 th October 2026
14	Valedictory ceremony	24 th October 2026

General Rules & Regulations

 **Date of the Competition:**
23rd & 24th October 2026

 **Official Language:**

1. The official language for the moot court competition shall be English only.

 **Dress Code:**

Male: Western formals, i.e., Black blazer, white shirt, black trousers and tie.

Females: Indian formals i.e., Salwar-kurta (black / white) or western formals i.e., Black Blazer, white shirt, black trousers and tie

 **Teams:**

1. Each participating team shall comprise a minimum of two (2) members and a maximum of three (3) wherein two (2) members, shall be designated as speakers and one (1) member as researcher.
2. The participants should currently be pursuing their Bachelor's Degree in law from recognised Universities i.e. Three years LLB or Five year law courses.
3. Only one team will be allowed to register per college in this competition.

 **Registration Timeline and Structure:**

To ensure a streamlined process and manage the high volume of applicants, registration for the Competition shall follow a strict Two-Stage Process.

Phase 1: Provisional Registration (Allotment of Temporary Team Code)

Phase 2: Final Registration & Fee Payment (Allotment of Permanent Team Code)



— Detailed Registration Procedure —

Phase I: Provisional Registration

- Interested teams must first fill out the Provisional Registration Form on or before 19th September 2026.
- Upon successful submission, the Organizing Committee will review the application and allot a Temporary Team Code via email.



Note: Receipt of a Temporary Team Code does not guarantee a slot in the competition; it merely permits the team to proceed to the payment stage.

Phase II: Final Registration and Payment

- Teams must complete the final registration and fee payment on or before 26th September 2026 i.e. after receiving their Temporary Team Code.
- The registration fee of [**Rs 7500/- or Rs 5500/- whichever is applicable**] must be paid via the designated payment gateway provided in the email having the temporary team code.
- Teams must upload their payment receipt/transaction details through the Final Confirmation Form which will be sent to the respective teams.

Phase III: Allocation of Permanent Team Code

- Once the payment is verified, the Organizing Committee will issue a Permanent Team Code.
- The Permanent Team Code will serve as the team's sole identity throughout the competition. Disclosure of institutional identity beyond this code will lead to immediate disqualification.





Strict Cap On Registrations

(First-Come, First-Served)

Important Notice on Capacity: Due to an overwhelming response in the previous edition and to maintain the highest standards of judging, the Organizing Committee has capped the total number of participating teams at 40.

- The registration portal will automatically close as soon as the maximum cap of Permanent Team Codes is reached, regardless of the official deadline.
- Securing a Temporary Team Code does not reserve a slot. Slots are secured strictly on a first-come, first-served basis depending on the completion of Phase II (Payment and Final Registration).
- No Late Entertainers: No requests for extensions, late registrations, or delayed payments will be entertained under any circumstances.



Refund Policy :

- The registration fee is strictly non-refundable and non-transferable once the Permanent Team Code has been allotted.

Registration Details :

All the participating institutions have to confirm their participation by completing the following



1 Registration payment amount -

- With accommodation - Rs 7500/-
- Without Accommodation - Rs 5500/-

2 Once the registration is done the team shall mail a soft copy of the registration form along with the details of the payment to the corresponding email id- scl.mootcourt@soundaryainstitutions.in upon which the team participation and registration will be confirmed and the team shall be allotted with a Permanent Team Code and the same shall be used for memorials and other future communications.

3 Hard copy of the registration form along with travel plans must be sent on or before 21st October 2026.

4 The registration fee is non-refundable, and no claim for refund of fee shall be entertained.

5 Bank Account Details -

- a. Bank Name - AXIS BANK
- b. Account Holder Name - Soundarya College of Law
- c. Account Number - 917010052562868
- d. MICR Code - 560211062
- e. IFSC Code - UTIB0002926



Scan and pay via UPI

Researcher Test:

Only the researcher from each team will be allowed to take the Researcher test. In case of a two-member team, one member from the team will be allowed to take the Researcher test who shall be identified during the formal registration on 23rd October 2026. The test shall contain questions related to the moot problem and the relevant law. The researcher test shall be conducted in offline/physical mode only. In case of a tie, the researcher with the higher memorial score will be allotted higher rank. If the tie subsists, the researcher belonging to the team with the higher aggregate score will be allotted higher rank. If the tie still subsists, then the rank shall be determined by toss.

Draw of lots :

Draw of lots will be done soon after inauguration. It will determine the sequence of arguments i.e. Plaintiff/ Petitioner and Defendant/ Respondent. It shall also determine which team will be competing against whom.

Structure of Rounds :

1 2 Preliminary Rounds

2 Octa Final Rounds

3 Quarter Finals

4 Semi Finals

5 Finals

01. Preliminary Rounds

In each oral round, a team shall be represented by two speakers to present the arguments. The researcher shall not participate in the arguments but is required to be present during the Oral Rounds.

There will be 2 Preliminary Rounds. For each round, each team will be given a total of 30 minutes to present their case. The time includes questioning by judges. The division of time is left at the discretion of the team members, subject to a maximum of 18 minutes per speaker. Division of time should be informed to the Court Assistants/ Clerks at the beginning of the round. The oral arguments need to be confined to the issues presented in the memorials. Passing of notes to the speakers by the researcher during the rounds is allowed. A maximum of 5 minutes may be reserved for rebuttal and sur-rebuttal. Judges may, at their discretion, extend the time allotted for the oral arguments. In the Preliminary Rounds, each Team shall argue once as a Petitioner/ Plaintiff and once as a Respondent/ Defendant. All teams are expected to carry any case law and authorities with themselves which they intend to refer to. Only the top 16 teams based on their marks for each preliminary rounds will be selected to enter the Octa Finals. In case of a tie, marks from the researcher's test will be used to break the tie. If the tie is not broken, then the marks from the memorials will be used to break the tie to decide which team qualifies to go to Octa Final Rounds.

02. Octa Final Rounds

Each team shall argue only for one side, which shall be decided via a draw of lots. On the basis of knockout 8 teams will be selected to enter the quarter-final round. Each team will be allotted 30 minutes for the presentation of their arguments with a maximum of 18 minutes per speaker. A maximum of 5 minutes may be reserved for rebuttal and sur-rebuttal. Judges may, at their discretion, extend the time allotted for the oral arguments.

03. Quarter final round

Each team shall argue only for one side, which shall be decided via a draw of lots. On the basis of knockout 4 teams will be selected to enter the semi-final round. Each team will be allotted 40 minutes for the presentation of their arguments with a maximum of 20 minutes per speaker. A maximum of 5 minutes may be reserved for rebuttal and sur-rebuttal. Judges may, at their discretion, extend the time allotted for the oral arguments.

04. Semi final round

The rules governing quarter final rounds shall be applicable to Semi final rounds. Based on knockout, 2 teams will be selected to enter the Final round.

05. Final Round

Each team shall argue only for one side, which shall be decided via a draw of lots. Each team will be allotted 50 minutes for the presentation of their arguments with a maximum of 25 minutes per speaker. A maximum of 10 minutes may be reserved for rebuttal and sur-rebuttal. Judges may, at their discretion, extend the time allotted for the oral arguments.

Time Management & Judicial Discretion:

Strict adherence to the allotted time limits is mandatory. Teams may not independently exceed their designated speaking time. However, the Bench retains absolute discretion to ask questions and may grant time extensions for responses as they deem fit. Failure to comply with the time limits will result in a deduction of marks.



Rules for Written Submission:



- ✦ Cover page- The cover page must have the following :
 - a. Team Code on upper Left-hand side corner
 - b. The Case Titles
 - c. Colour- Blue for Petitioner and Red for Respondent
- ✦ Written memorials should be printed on one side with 1.5 inch margin on all sides.
- ✦ Main text font size- Times New Roman 12 and Footnotes- Times New Roman 10.
- ✦ Main text spacing- 1.5 and Footnotes- 1
- ✦ Citation format- Bluebook 21st Edition. Teams shall cite authorities in their Memorials by following a uniform style of citation for case laws.
- ✦ The memorials should be spiral bound.
- ✦ Page number must be written on the bottom right corner.
- ✦ The written submission should include the following :
 - a. The Table of Contents.
 - b. The Index of Authorities
 - c. The Statement of Jurisdiction
 - d. The Statement of Facts
 - e. The Statement of Issues
 - f. The Summary of Arguments
 - g. The Arguments Advanced/ Body of Arguments
- ✦ The Memorials shall not, in any way, disclose any fact pertaining to the identity of the Participating Team, its Members, or the Institution/College/University so represented.

Rules & Regulations of the Moot Court Competition Memorials



- ✦ The requirement for memorials as detailed under this section must be strictly followed and any non-compliance of the same will attract penalties in the form of deduction of marks.
- ✦ Each team must prepare memorials for both sides to the dispute.
- ✦ The last date for submitting the Memorials (for both sides) in soft copy is on or before 11:59 pm on 19th October 2026. No submission will be accepted after the prescribed time. And the Memorials submitted within the deadline shall be considered and judged for the “Best Memorial” Award.
- ✦ Once the Memorials have been submitted, no revisions, supplements or additions to the Memorials will be accepted.
- ✦ The soft copy of the Memorials shall be sent via e-mail to: scl.mootcourt@soundaryainstitutions.in with subject line “Memorial Submission – Team Code”. The Soft Copy should be sent in PDF format only. Attachments should be titled as for Petitioner side and as for Respondent side. e.g. SCLMCC002 PET and SCLMCC002 RES.
- ✦ Six (6) hard copies of each of the memorials for Petitioner & Respondent shall be sent to the organizers to ensure that it reaches prior to 21st October 2026 via speed post / courier.
- ✦ The participating teams should bring additional copies of memorials for Petitioner and Respondent for their use during the competition.
- ✦ If the Organizers observe any differences in the soft copy and hard copy of the Memorials, the same may lead to disqualification of such a team.
- ✦ It shall be the sole responsibility of the respective Participating Teams to ensure that the correct number of soft and hard copies of the Memorials are submitted to the Organizers within the prescribed deadlines.

Special Feature : The Amicus Curiae Round

For the very first time in this competition, we are proud to introduce a brand-new competitive element: The Amicus Curiae Round. Designed to test non-partisan legal scholarship, high-level policy reasoning, and live courtroom adaptability, this round gives eliminated teams a unique opportunity to return to the bench as an independent "Friend of the Court."

The Amicus Curiae does not represent either party to the dispute. Instead, their role is to offer a neutral, public-policy, or macro-legal perspective to assist the Bench in understanding the systemic real-world implications of their judgment.



1. Structure & Qualification

- a. Quarter-Finals Knockout: Eight (8) teams will compete in the Quarter-Finals on a knockout basis. The four (4) winning teams will advance directly to the Semi-Finals as Petitioners and Respondents.
- b. Amicus Curiae Selection: Out of the four (4) non-qualifying teams from the Quarter-Finals, the two (2) teams with the highest scores will qualify as Amicus Curiae Teams for the Semi-Finals.
- c. Courtroom Allocation: Each of the two (2) Semi-Final courtrooms will feature one (1) Amicus Curiae team alongside the Petitioner and Respondent.
- d. Courtroom Allocation: Each of the two (2) Semi-Final courtrooms will feature one (1) Amicus Curiae team alongside the Petitioner and Respondent.

2. Presentation Guidelines

- a. Single Speaker: The Amicus Curiae team must select only one (1) designated speaker (who may be Mooter 1, Mooter 2, or the Researcher) to represent the team during oral submissions.
- b. Time Limit: The designated Amicus Curiae speaker will be allotted a maximum of 15 minutes to deliver their oral arguments and answer judicial queries. Strict time adherence is enforced.
- c. Use of Electronic Devices: Amicus Curiae speakers are permitted to use an electronic device (e.g., laptop/tablet) inside the courtroom during their presentation for referencing legal authorities, statutes, or digital notes.

3. Evaluation & Marking Scheme (Total: 50 Marks)

The Amicus Curiae teams will be evaluated independently on a scale of 50 marks by the Semi-Final bench:

Sl NO.	Evaluation Criteria	Marks
1	Neutrality & Objectivity	10
2	Novelty of Argument & Legal Gaps	10
3	Knowledge of Law & Case Precedents	10
4	Handling Judicial Queries	10
5	Oratory Skills & Time Management	10
	Total Marks	50

4. Awards & Tie-Breaker Procedure

Best Amicus Curiae Award: Out of the two competing Amicus Curiae teams in the Semi-Finals, the team securing the highest score out of 50 will be adjudicated and awarded as the Best Amicus Curiae Team.

Tie-Breaker Hierarchy: In the event of a tie in scores between the two Amicus Curiae teams, the winner will be decided as follows:

- Primary Tie-Breaker:** The higher score achieved in the Researcher Test.
- Secondary Tie-Breaker:** If the tie persists, the higher score achieved in the Memorial Evaluation.

Use of Electronic Devices & Research Materials:

Teams representing the parties (Petitioner and Respondent) are strictly prohibited from using electronic devices of any kind (including laptops, tablets, or mobile phones) inside the courtroom during proceedings; their submissions must rely solely on physical materials such as moot memorials, books, bare acts, paper compilations, or printed notes. Conversely, the team representing the Amicus Curiae is permitted to use an electronic device inside the courtroom to reference legal authorities, statutes, or digital notes during their presentation. Failure to adhere to these device restrictions will result in immediate disqualification or mark deductions.

Scouting :

1. Scouting is strictly prohibited. Teams found scouting will be disqualified immediately.
2. If any team does not appear after 10 minutes after the commencement of any round as per the scheduled time, the team which did not appear shall be deemed to have given a walkover and the opponent team shall be declared as winners of the round.
3. The Committee reserves the right to take decisions on any matter not mentioned in the Competition Rules. Any such decision taken by the Committee shall be final and binding on all the team.
4. Any form of recording of the oral pleadings shall not be permitted.

Anonymity :

- The names of the team members, faculty co-ordinator, institution, state or city shall not be on any portion of the Memorial. The Team Number is a substitute for the team's institutional affiliation.
- Strict anonymity must be maintained across all team materials: no college name, crest, or institutional identifier shall appear anywhere on written memorials, compendiums, or cited judgment papers provided to the bench.

Note: All participants shall refrain from wearing, using or carrying any form of identifiable items, such as badges, blazers, pins, books/bag with a college/university/library logo or seal or any other identifiable material.

Announcement Of Results :

1. The results of the Preliminary rounds, Octa Final, Quarter-final and Semi-final Round shall be announced shortly after the completion of both the rounds.
2. The winners of the competition will be announced during the valedictory ceremony on 24th October 2026.

Miscellaneous :

1. Participants are required to maintain proper decorum in the court during the competition.
2. The organizers and administrators reserve the right to take appropriate action for any unethical, unprofessional or immoral conduct throughout the course of the competition.
3. The organizers and administrators reserve the right to vary, alter, modify or repeal any of the above rules if so required and as they deem appropriate.
4. All official communications will be made to the email submitted by them at the time of Registration.

Marking Of Memorials :

Every Memorial shall be marked on a total of 100 marks and the team memorial marks will be the average of the total of both sides. The following shall be the marking scheme:

SI NO.	Criteria	Marks
1	Knowledge of Facts and Law	30
2	Analysis, Organisation and Clarity	25
3	Extent and Use of Authority	20
4	Correct Format and Citation	15
5	Grammar and Style	10
	Total Marks	100

Marking Of Oral Rounds:

Maximum of 20 marks shall be deducted for any instances of plagiarism detected in the memorials depending on the level of similarities.

SI NO.	Criteria	Marks
1	Knowledge of Facts and Law	20
2	Logic and Reasoning to Apply the Legal Principles	20
3	Ability to Answer Questions	20
4	Time Management and Organization	20
5	Court Etiquettes/ Deference to the Court	10
6	Persuasiveness	10
	Total Marks	100

— Moot Proposition —

- ✦ The rapid urbanisation witnessed across India over the past decade has fundamentally transformed the relationship between human settlements and urban wildlife. Expanding metropolitan regions, increasing population density, changing land-use patterns, and the exponential growth of municipal solid waste have intensified interactions between human beings and free-ranging community animals, particularly dogs. While urban local bodies have increasingly relied upon scientific sterilisation and vaccination programmes to regulate community dog populations, public concerns over dog-bite incidents, rabies exposure, and civic safety have continued to generate intense legal and policy debates. The competing demands of protecting public health and ensuring humane treatment of animals have placed the constitutional and statutory framework governing community dogs under unprecedented scrutiny.
- ✦ The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 ("PCA Act") was enacted with the primary objective of preventing the infliction of unnecessary pain or suffering upon animals while promoting their welfare through humane treatment. According to Section 11 of the Act criminalises various acts of cruelty but simultaneously recognises limited statutory exceptions permitting destruction of animals where expressly authorised by law or rendered unavoidable by circumstances. Exercising its powers under the PCA Act, the Central Government notified the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 ("ABC Rules"), replacing the earlier regulatory framework governing street dog management. The Rules sought to institutionalise scientific sterilisation, anti-rabies vaccination, humane capture, treatment, and release of community dogs through coordinated implementation by local authorities. A defining feature of the Rules was the requirement that healthy sterilised and vaccinated community dogs should ordinarily be released back into the same locality from which they were captured, recognising that territorial stability among sterilised dogs was considered an essential component of long-term population control.
- ✦ The present dispute arises from the State of Pravarsha, a prosperous coastal State that had emerged as one of India's leading centres for information technology, biotechnology, advanced manufacturing, and logistics. According to the Pravarsha Economic Survey, 2025, the State recorded an average annual economic growth rate of 8.9% over the preceding five years and attracted investments exceeding ₹2 lakh crore. The capital city of Navapur, together with the industrial municipalities of Shantigram, Velanagar, and Rudrapur, witnessed rapid urban expansion fuelled by large-scale migration from neighbouring States. Between 2020 and 2025 alone, more than 1.9 million migrant workers settled in these urban centres, resulting in unprecedented pressure upon municipal infrastructure, waste management systems, and public health services.

- ✦ The Department of Urban Development reported that municipal solid waste generation across Pravara had increased by approximately forty-three per cent between 2019 and 2025. Although the State invested substantially in decentralised waste-processing facilities, several municipal corporations struggled to implement efficient segregation and disposal mechanisms. Illegal dumping of food waste near residential complexes, educational institutions, commercial establishments, and public markets became increasingly common. Veterinary experts repeatedly cautioned that the abundance of accessible food significantly contributed to the growth and territorial concentration of community dog populations.
- ✦ In January 2024, the Directorate of Animal Husbandry estimated the State's community dog population at approximately 10.82 lakh. However, an independent survey conducted by the Pravara Institute of Veterinary Sciences in September 2025 estimated the figure at only 9.31 lakh, attributing the discrepancy to methodological differences and repeated counting of territorial packs. Municipal authorities consistently relied upon the higher estimates while seeking additional budgetary allocations under the State Urban Animal Welfare Mission, whereas recognised animal welfare organisations questioned the reliability of the Government's methodology and relied upon the independent survey. The divergence in official data soon became a recurring point of contention in legislative debates and public discourse.
- ✦ Simultaneously, the Department of Public Health recorded a gradual increase in dog-bite cases across the State. Between January 2024 and February 2026, Government hospitals registered 2,41,768 dog-bite incidents requiring anti-rabies prophylaxis. Nearly forty per cent of the reported victims were children below sixteen years of age, while approximately nineteen per cent were senior citizens. The State Institute of Communicable Diseases confirmed fifty-eight human deaths attributable to rabies during the same period. Public health researchers, however, observed that hospital records did not distinguish between bites caused by sterilised community dogs, unsterilised dogs, abandoned pets, or owned domestic animals. Epidemiologists further noted that more than ninety per cent of community dogs examined during municipal vaccination drives exhibited no symptoms of rabies, thereby cautioning against drawing simplistic conclusions solely from aggregate dog-bite statistics.
- ✦ Against this backdrop, the Navapur Municipal Corporation (NMC) initiated one of the State's most ambitious Animal Birth Control programmes. On 7 April 2025, the Corporation entered into a three-year Memorandum of Understanding with the VetLife Urban Animal Care Foundation, a registered not-for-profit veterinary organisation headed by renowned veterinary surgeon Dr. Ananya Rao. The project envisaged sterilisation and anti-rabies vaccination of nearly 85,000 community dogs through six dedicated Animal Birth Control Centres established across the city. Financial assistance was jointly provided by the State Government and the Animal Welfare Board, while implementation was monitored through quarterly audits conducted by an independent technical committee.
- ✦ By order dated 3 July 2026, the Hon'ble Supreme Court granted Special Leave, tagged all connected petitions raising substantially similar questions, and constituted a Constitution Bench to authoritatively determine the constitutional validity and scope of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 and the legality of Government Order No. 214/PSA/2026.

- ✦ Within the first eight months, municipal records indicated that approximately 27,000 community dogs had been sterilised and more than 39,000 vaccinated. Independent evaluators reported a measurable decline in breeding activity in several municipal wards and recommended expansion of the programme. Animal welfare organisations hailed Navapur's initiative as a model for scientific implementation of the ABC Rules and urged other municipalities to replicate its framework.
- ✦ Despite these developments, isolated incidents involving aggressive community dogs continued to occur. On 18 December 2025, eleven-year-old Aarav Mehta, a student of Navapur Public School, sustained grievous injuries after being attacked by a pack of six community dogs while returning home from school. The incident occurred barely two hundred metres from a municipal garbage collection point that, according to local residents, had remained unattended for several days. CCTV footage capturing the incident spread rapidly across television channels and social media platforms, generating nationwide outrage. Aarav survived following multiple reconstructive surgeries, but the incident reignited public debate concerning the adequacy of existing legal safeguards.
- ✦ The Public anxiety intensified within weeks, further on 7 January 2026, Kamala Devi, a seventy-two-year-old retired school teacher residing in Shantigram, succumbed to complications allegedly arising from injuries sustained during an attack by free-ranging dogs near a municipal park. Less than two weeks later, on 19 January 2026, six construction workers employed by SkyRise Infrastructure Limited were injured after entering an abandoned industrial site where several community dogs had established territorial occupation. The residents alleged that repeated complaints submitted to municipal authorities regarding aggressive canine behaviour had been ignored for months, while municipal officials maintained that no scientifically verified evidence established that the same dogs were responsible for the attacks.
- ✦ These incidents generated extensive media coverage and triggered demonstrations across the State. The Federation of Resident Welfare Associations of Pravarsa (FRWAP), led by its President Mr. Raghav Malhotra, organised peaceful protests in eight major cities demanding immediate removal of community dogs from residential colonies, schools, hospitals, public parks, and commercial districts. The Federation contended that municipal authorities had become constrained by the mandatory release provisions contained in the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 and were unable to respond effectively to repeated complaints involving aggressive animals. It further argued that while humane treatment of animals remained an important constitutional objective, it could not supersede the State's primary obligation to safeguard human life and public safety.
- ✦ The debate acquired constitutional overtones on 2 February 2026, when Justice (Retd.) Devendra S. Kaul, Chairperson of the State Commission on Urban Public Health, observed during a televised policy consultation that the existing legal framework appeared to reveal "an unresolved tension between the constitutional obligation to preserve public health and the statutory commitment to humane treatment of community animals." Although the remarks formed no part of any official report, they received widespread public attention and were interpreted by various stakeholders as questioning the efficacy of the Animal Birth Control Rules.

✦ The recognised animal welfare organisations vehemently disputed these allegations. The Pravasha Society for Humane Coexistence, represented by environmental lawyer Adv. Nandini Bhargava, asserted that the incidents reflected decades of inconsistent implementation of sterilisation programmes rather than any defect in the statutory framework itself. According to the organisation, indiscriminate relocation of community dogs disrupted established territorial hierarchies, resulting in migration of larger numbers of unsterilised dogs into vacant territories and ultimately increasing conflict. Veterinary experts associated with the organisation relied upon published scientific studies indicating that sustained sterilisation and vaccination programmes, coupled with effective waste management, substantially reduced long-term population growth and disease transmission.

✦ Further, responding to the mounting public concern, the Government of Pravasha issued a notification dated 15 February 2026, constituting the High-Level Committee on Community Animal Management under the chairmanship of Justice (Retd.) Devendra S. Kaul. The Committee comprised constitutional law scholars, epidemiologists, veterinary surgeons, environmental scientists, municipal commissioners, representatives of recognised animal welfare organisations, and senior public health officials. It was entrusted with examining the implementation of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023, analysing the scope of Section 11 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, evaluating the increasing incidence of dog-bite cases, and recommending measures capable of balancing animal welfare with the constitutional obligation of the State to protect public health and human life.

✦ The Committee commenced statewide consultations on 21 February 2026, inviting representations from municipal corporations, resident welfare associations, public health institutions, veterinary colleges, environmental organisations, educational institutions, and members of the public. Within six weeks, it received more than 14,700 written representations, conducted hearings across twelve districts, and commissioned independent field studies to assess the implementation of sterilisation and vaccination programmes. While municipal authorities and resident associations consistently advocated greater executive discretion in dealing with habitually aggressive community dogs, veterinary experts and animal welfare organisations maintained that isolated incidents could not justify dilution of the statutory protections envisaged under the Animal Birth Control Rules. The sharp divergence of expert opinion laid the foundation for what would soon evolve into one of the most significant constitutional controversies concerning the validity and scope of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023, under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960.

✦ Upon hearing the parties, the High Court observed that the controversy raised issues of exceptional constitutional importance affecting municipal administration throughout the country and involving the interplay between Articles 14, 21, 48A and 51A(g) of the Constitution of India, the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 and the scope of executive powers exercisable by State Governments in matters concerning public health and animal welfare. Accordingly, by order dated 24 June 2026, the High Court directed that the matter be placed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

- ✦ The High-Level Committee continued its deliberations amidst growing public scrutiny. During the course of its proceedings, it sought detailed implementation reports from all thirty-eight municipal corporations functioning within the State of Pravarsha. On 14 March 2026, the Navapur Municipal Corporation submitted its Annual Compliance Report under the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023. The report disclosed that, against an estimated community dog population of 92,430 within municipal limits, 38,714 dogs had been sterilised and vaccinated as of 28 February 2026. The report further revealed that nearly 19% of the budget allocated for the financial year remained unutilised owing to delays in procurement of veterinary equipment, shortage of trained veterinary surgeons, interruptions in the supply of anti-rabies vaccines and administrative delays in establishing additional Animal Birth Control Centres. Simultaneously, the Corporation admitted that despite repeated notices issued under the Municipal Solid Waste Management Bye-laws, indiscriminate dumping of organic waste continued in several municipal wards, thereby facilitating the congregation of community animals.
- ✦ In order to independently verify the factual position, the Committee conducted an on-site inspection of Ward No. 17 of Navapur on 29 March 2026, where the attack upon Aarav Mehta had occurred. The inspection revealed that the municipal waste collection point situated near Navapur Public School had remained unattended on several occasions, resulting in substantial accumulation of biodegradable waste. CCTV footage examined by the Committee appeared to depict community dogs, stray cattle and pigs regularly feeding at the site. While the Municipal Commissioner attributed the irregular waste collection to a prolonged sanitation workers' strike during November and December 2025, representatives of the sanitation department disputed the explanation and produced internal correspondence indicating that repeated requests for additional collection vehicles had remained pending before the Urban Development Department. Local residents, however, maintained that complaints concerning aggressive canine behaviour had been repeatedly submitted to municipal authorities months before the incident involving Aarav Mehta, whereas municipal records reflected only two formal complaints received in the prescribed format. The factual controversy remained unresolved.
- ✦ Before the Committee could finalise its recommendations, another widely reported incident further intensified the debate. On 6 April 2026, Meera Khanna, a twelve-year-old student residing in Velanagar, sustained multiple bite injuries after being attacked by three community dogs while entering a municipal playground. Although she recovered following timely medical treatment, the incident received extensive media attention after local residents alleged that repeated complaints regarding aggressive dogs had been ignored by the Velanagar Municipal Corporation. Municipal authorities denied negligence, asserting that no prior complaints had been received concerning the specific animals involved and that subsequent veterinary examination failed to conclusively identify the dogs responsible. Animal welfare organisations further alleged that social media platforms had circulated unverified videos unrelated to the incident, thereby inflaming public sentiment and undermining objective assessment of the facts.

- Concerned by the increasing public anxiety, the Government of Pravarsha convened an emergency meeting on 12 April 2026 involving municipal commissioners, senior police officials, epidemiologists, veterinary experts, representatives of the Animal Welfare Board and public health authorities. During the meeting, the Director of Public Health presented data indicating that registered dog-bite cases had increased by nearly 18% between 2024 and 2025, particularly in rapidly urbanising districts. Conversely, the Director of Animal Husbandry informed the meeting that over 87% of community dogs examined during municipal sterilisation programmes exhibited no symptoms of rabies or abnormal aggression. He further cautioned that scientific literature did not establish a direct causal relationship between community dog density and dog-bite incidents, emphasising that factors such as inadequate waste management, abandonment of pet dogs, territorial disturbances, human provocation and disruption of sterilisation cycles significantly influenced aggressive behaviour.
- On 28 April 2026, the High-Level Committee submitted its Interim Report to the State Government. The Committee concluded that the principal deficiencies lay in inconsistent implementation rather than in the statutory framework itself. It observed that only six of the thirty-eight municipal corporations had achieved sterilisation coverage exceeding 70%, notwithstanding substantial financial assistance extended under the State Urban Animal Welfare Mission. The Committee recommended strengthening veterinary infrastructure, improving waste management practices, increasing anti-rabies vaccination coverage, establishing dedicated rehabilitation facilities for diseased and injured animals, and ensuring uniform implementation of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023. While acknowledging legitimate public concerns regarding repeated dog attacks, the Committee expressly observed that indiscriminate relocation or destruction of healthy community dogs lacked scientific justification and was inconsistent with the objectives underlying the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960.
- Barely two weeks later, however, a separate study published by the National Institute of Public Health Analytics (NIPHA) fundamentally altered the course of public discourse. The study, titled *Urban Canine Population and Public Health Risk Assessment: A Multi-City Epidemiological Study*, analysed data collected from government hospitals, municipal authorities and district surveillance units across six States, including Pravarsha. While acknowledging that sterilisation and vaccination constituted indispensable components of urban canine management, the study concluded that existing legal restrictions significantly constrained the ability of municipal authorities to respond promptly to repeated incidents involving aggressive community dogs. It recommended that local authorities be statutorily empowered to permanently isolate, rehabilitate or, where certified by an independent veterinary board as posing an imminent and continuing threat to human life, humanely euthanise such animals. The report simultaneously cautioned that these powers should be exercised only in exceptional circumstances and subject to rigorous procedural safeguards.

Further on the publication of the NIPHA Report triggered intense public debate throughout the State. Resident Welfare Associations characterised the report as scientific confirmation that the existing legal framework had become impractical for densely populated urban centres. Several public health experts endorsed the recommendations, emphasising that constitutional governance required balancing compassion towards animals with the State's obligation to protect human life under Article 21 of the Constitution. Conversely, recognised animal welfare organisations criticised the report for relying upon incomplete datasets and for failing to distinguish between sterilised community dogs, abandoned pets, owned domestic animals and unvaccinated stray dogs. Veterinary scientists questioned the statistical methodology adopted by NIPHA and asserted that the study merely established correlation rather than causation. They further contended that weakening the territorial stability contemplated under the Animal Birth Control Rules could ultimately aggravate the very problem the report sought to address.

In accordance with the growing public pressure, the Government of Pravarsha invoked its powers under the Pravarsha Municipal Public Safety Act, 1998 and issued Government Order No. 214/PSA/2026 dated 18 May 2026. The Government Order authorised municipal corporations, in exceptional circumstances, to identify "habitually aggressive community dogs" through a District Veterinary Assessment Board and to remove such animals from public spaces pending further evaluation. It further authorised humane euthanasia where a three-member veterinary panel certified that rehabilitation was impossible and that continued release of the animal posed an imminent and continuing threat to human life, subject to approval by the Municipal Commissioner.

Within hours of the notification, the Pravarsha Society for Humane Coexistence, the Federation for Urban Animal Welfare, and People for Ethical Animal Protection jointly condemned the Government Order, contending that it was contrary to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 and the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023. They argued that Section 11 of the PCA Act prohibited unnecessary pain or suffering and that the State Government lacked legislative competence to create fresh categories permitting euthanasia in the absence of express statutory authorisation. According to them, the Government Order effectively nullified the mandatory release provisions contained in the Animal Birth Control Rules and undermined the legislative intent underlying the parent enactment.

The Federation of Resident Welfare Associations of Pravarsha adopted an entirely different position. While welcoming the Government Order, it contended that the measures introduced were insufficient to address the recurring threat posed by aggressive community dogs. According to the Federation, the mandatory obligation contained in the Animal Birth Control Rules requiring sterilised dogs to be released back into the same locality effectively deprived municipal authorities of meaningful discretion even in areas witnessing repeated attacks upon children, elderly persons and other vulnerable groups. It was asserted that the Rules, though enacted with laudable objectives, had exceeded the scope of delegated legislation by substantially restricting executive powers not contemplated under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, thereby jeopardising the constitutional guarantee of life and personal safety under Article 21.

Consequently, on 27 May 2026, Adv. Nandini Bhargava, acting on behalf of the Pravarsha Society for Humane Coexistence, instituted Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1643 of 2026 before the High Court of Pravarsha challenging the constitutional validity of Government Order No. 214/PSA/2026. The petition sought a declaration that the Government Order was ultra vires the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 and the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023, together with consequential directions restraining municipal authorities from implementing its provisions.

Within two weeks, the Federation of Resident Welfare Associations of Pravarsha instituted Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1718 of 2026 before the same High Court. While supporting the Government Order, the Federation simultaneously challenged the constitutional validity of specific provisions of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023. It was contended that the mandatory release of sterilised community dogs into the same locality, irrespective of repeated public safety concerns, travelled beyond the rule-making powers conferred under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, particularly Section 11, and disproportionately restricted the authority of the State to discharge its constitutional obligation of protecting human life and public health.

Considering the importance of the issues involved, a Division Bench of the High Court ordered that both petitions be heard together. During the proceedings, the Union of Indiana, the Animal Welfare Board of Indiana, the Veterinary Council of Indiana, the National Institute of Public Health Analytics, the Indianan Association of Municipal Commissioners, the Indianan Veterinary Association, and several recognised public interest organisations sought intervention. The proceedings witnessed extensive submissions concerning the doctrine of delegated legislation, constitutional limitations upon executive action, municipal governance, public health policy, environmental jurisprudence, comparative international practices governing community animal management and the interpretation of Section 11 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960. Divergent judicial pronouncements rendered by different High Courts on similar questions were also placed before the Bench.

The matters are now listed for final hearing before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Indiana. The following questions has been placed for consideration before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of Indiana:

1. Whether the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 are within the rule-making powers conferred under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, particularly Section 11 thereof?
2. Whether the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 strike a constitutionally permissible balance between animal welfare and the right to life and public safety under Article 21 of the Constitution of Indiana?
3. Whether Government Order No. 214/PSA/2026 issued by the State of Pravarsha is consistent with the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 and the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023?
4. Whether municipal authorities are empowered to permanently relocate, isolate, or humanely euthanise community dogs in exceptional circumstances threatening public safety?

ANNEXURE I

Reference No : DAHVS/ABC/STAT/2026/114

Date : 10-March- 2026

GOVERNMENT OF PRAVARSHA

In consultation with the
Department of Public Health and the Directorate of Urban Development

**Consolidated Statistical Report on Community Dog Population, Animal Birth
Control Programme and Public Health Indicators
(January 2024 – February 2026)**

1. Background

Pursuant to the implementation of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 and the State Urban Animal Welfare Mission, the Government of Pravarssha has undertaken periodic assessments concerning the population of community dogs, implementation of sterilisation and anti-rabies vaccination programmes, incidence of dog-bite cases, and municipal compliance with the Animal Birth Control framework.

The present statistical compilation has been prepared on the basis of information received from the Directorate of Animal Husbandry, Municipal Corporations, the Department of Public Health, Government Medical Colleges, District Veterinary Hospitals and independent monitoring agencies.

The figures contained herein are intended solely for administrative and policy purposes.

Table 1: Estimated Community Dog Population in the State of Pravarssha

Year	Government Enumeration	Independent Veterinary Survey	Estimated Variance
January 2024	10,82,146	9,96,384	7.92%
September 2025	10,14,238	9,31,227	8.19%
February 2026	9,92,481	9,08,614	8.45%

Observation:

The Directorate of Animal Husbandry attributes the variance primarily to differences in enumeration methodology, seasonal migration of territorial packs and repeated movement of community dogs across municipal boundaries.

Independent veterinary agencies have expressed reservations regarding the possibility of duplicate enumeration in densely populated urban clusters.

Table 2 : Implementation Status of Animal Birth Control Programme

Particulars	2024	2025	Up to 28 February 2026
Community Dogs Captured	2,86,714	3,74,926	82,417
Dogs Sterilised	2,64,081	3,81,227	46,912
Dogs Vaccinated Against Rabies	3,42,891	5,08,316	62,744
Dogs Released into Original Territory	2,48,442	3,59,104	43,188
Dogs Retained for Medical Treatment	6,814	9,226	1,674
Dogs Certified as Medically Unfit for Surgery	5,963	7,411	1,674

Table 3 : Public Health Indicators

Particulars	2024	2025	Up to 28 February 2026
Registered Dog-Bite Cases	1,02,438	1,20,615	18,715
Persons Administered Anti-Rabies Vaccine	96,201	1,14,402	17,286
Laboratory Confirmed Human Rabies Cases	22	31	5
Human Deaths Attributed to Rabies	19	28	11

Table 4 : Demographic Distribution of Registered Dog-Bite Victims

Category	Percentage
Children below 16 years	39.8%
Adults (16 – 60 years)	41.3%
Senior Citizens (Above 60 years)	18.9%

Table 5 : Municipal Performance under the Animal Birth Control Programme

Municipal Corporation Category	Average Sterilisation Coverage
Above 75%	6 Municipal Corporations
Between 50%–75%	11 Municipal Corporations
Between 25%–50%	14 Municipal Corporations
Below 25%	7 Municipal Corporations

Table 6 : Financial Utilisation under the State Urban Animal Welfare Mission

Financial Year	Budget Allocated	Budget Utilised	Utilisation Rate
2024–2025	₹238.40 Crore	₹160.82 Crore	67.46%
2025–2026 (up to February 2026)	₹247.60 Crore	₹200.56 Crore	81.00%

Table 7 : Reported Causes for Delay in Implementation

Cause	Percentage of Municipal Corporations Reporting the Issue
Shortage of Veterinary Surgeons	68%
Delay in Procurement of Surgical Equipment	54%
Inadequate Animal Holding Facilities	49%
Interruptions in Vaccine Supply	37%
Litigation Relating to Proposed ABC Centres	18%
Public Resistance to Establishment of Sterilisation Facilities	26%

Table 8 : Reported Factors Associated with Community Dog Congregation

Factor	Percentage of Municipal Corporations Reporting the Factor
Open Municipal Waste Dumps	81%
Improper Food Waste Disposal by Commercial Establishments	67%
Illegal Slaughter Waste Disposal	42%
Abandonment of Domestic Pets	39%
Unregulated Feeding in Public Places	36%
Construction Debris and Vacant Sites	31%

General Observations

- 1 Significant disparities continue to exist between municipal corporations regarding sterilisation coverage and implementation capacity.
- 2 A majority of municipal corporations reported shortage of trained veterinary personnel and infrastructure necessary for achieving annual sterilisation targets.
- 3 The available data does not uniformly distinguish between incidents involving sterilised community dogs, unsterilised community dogs, abandoned domestic dogs or owned pet animals.
- 4 Variations in population estimates may arise from differing enumeration methodologies adopted by municipal authorities and independent agencies.
- 5 Certain districts reporting comparatively higher sterilisation coverage also recorded lower breeding rates during the assessment period. However, no conclusive inference regarding causation is drawn in this Report.
- 6 Municipal authorities have identified improper waste management and increasing abandonment of domestic pets as recurring factors requiring policy intervention.

ANNEXURE II

Notification No. UD/HLCCAM/2026/41

Date : 15 -Feb -2026

GOVERNMENT OF PRAVARSHA

High-Level Committee on Community Animal Management

Chairperson

Hon'ble Justice (Retd.) Devendra S. Kaul

EXTRACTS FROM THE INTERIM REPORT OF THE HIGH-LEVEL COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY ANIMAL MANAGEMENT

Submitted to the Government of Pravarssha on 28 April 2026

1. Introduction

The Government of Pravarssha constituted the High-Level Committee on Community Animal Management to examine the implementation of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023, evaluate the increasing incidence of community dog-related public safety concerns, analyse the functioning of municipal authorities under the existing statutory framework, and recommend appropriate measures consistent with the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 and the constitutional obligations of the State.

The Committee comprised experts in constitutional law, public health, epidemiology, veterinary sciences, environmental management, municipal administration and animal welfare.

Between 21 February 2026 and 20 April 2026, the Committee conducted consultations in twelve districts, received 14,728 written representations, interacted with 31 Municipal Corporations, 18 Resident Welfare Associations, 42 registered Animal Welfare Organisations, representatives of the Animal Welfare Board, veterinary institutions, public health authorities, police officials and members of the public.

2. Scope of Examination

The Committee examined, inter alia :

- a. Interpretation of Section 11 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 in the context of community dog management; and
- b. The implementation of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023;
- c. Sterilisation and anti-rabies vaccination programmes undertaken by municipal authorities;
- d. Reported incidents involving community dogs;
- e. Municipal solid waste management practices;
- f. Availability of veterinary infrastructure;
- g. Comparative practices adopted by selected jurisdictions for urban animal management.

3. Principal Findings

After examining documentary records, field inspections, stakeholder consultations and statistical material, the Committee recorded the following interim findings:

Finding No. 1

- Implementation of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 remains substantially uneven across municipal corporations.
- Only six municipal corporations have achieved sterilisation coverage exceeding 70% of the estimated community dog population.
- Several municipalities continue to function below the minimum operational benchmarks contemplated under the Rules.

Finding No. 2

- Municipal solid waste management has emerged as one of the most significant operational challenges associated with congregation of community dogs.
- Repeated accumulation of biodegradable waste near markets, educational institutions, slaughterhouses, residential colonies and public parks creates sustained food sources that influence territorial occupation by free-ranging animals.
- The Committee observed that improvement of waste management practices constitutes an essential component of any long-term urban animal management strategy.

Finding No. 3

The Committee did not find sufficient scientific material to conclude that sterilised community dogs exhibit greater aggression than non-sterilised dogs.

The evidence placed before the Committee indicates that aggression may result from multiple interacting factors, including:

- Disruption of territorial hierarchy,
- Human provocation,
- Food scarcity,
- Disease,
- Breeding behaviour,
- Abandonment of domesticated animals,
- Competition for resources.

The Committee observed that further longitudinal scientific studies may be required before any definitive conclusion can be drawn.

Finding No. 4

The Committee noted significant inconsistencies in maintenance of municipal records concerning:

- Identification of sterilised animals;
- Anti-rabies vaccination status;
- Post-operative monitoring;
- Complaint registration;
- Incident verification.

The absence of uniform data collection standards limits the reliability of comparative assessment between municipalities.

Finding No. 5

- The Committee observed that repeated relocation of healthy territorial community dogs, without scientific justification, may disturb existing territorial equilibrium and permit migration of unsterilised animals into vacated areas.
- However, the Committee does not express any final opinion regarding exceptional situations involving demonstrable threats to public safety, as such questions may require legislative clarification and judicial determination.

Finding No. 6

- The Committee identified shortages of trained veterinary surgeons, surgical facilities, animal transport vehicles and post-operative recovery infrastructure as major impediments to effective implementation of the Animal Birth Control Programme.
- Budgetary allocation alone has not resulted in corresponding implementation due to administrative and logistical deficiencies.

Finding No. 7

Public participation in responsible pet ownership remains inadequate.

The Committee received numerous representations alleging:

- Abandonment of domesticated pets;
- Uncontrolled breeding by private owners;
- Unregulated feeding practices;
- Failure to register companion animals.

These factors contribute to increasing pressure upon municipal animal management systems.

Finding No. 8

- The Committee observed that available scientific literature supports sterilisation and anti-rabies vaccination as internationally recognised methods of long-term population stabilisation.
- At the same time, evidence placed before the Committee also indicates continuing public concern regarding incidents involving aggressive community dogs.
- The Committee considers both concerns to be genuine and requiring balanced policy intervention.

4. Interim Recommendations

Pending submission of the Final Report, the Committee recommends that the Government consider the following measures:

- 1 Strengthening municipal veterinary infrastructure.
- 2 Increasing annual sterilisation and anti-rabies vaccination targets.
- 3 Establishing district-level monitoring mechanisms for implementation of the Animal Birth Control Rules.
- 4 Improving municipal solid waste management.
- 5 Developing uniform digital databases for identification and monitoring of sterilised community dogs.
- 6 Conducting periodic public awareness campaigns relating to responsible pet ownership and interaction with community animals.
- 7 Establishing dedicated rehabilitation facilities for injured, diseased and medically unfit animals.

5. Observations

- The Committee records that differing views exist regarding the extent of powers available to municipal authorities while dealing with community dogs exhibiting repeated aggressive behaviour.
- Certain stakeholders advocated broader executive discretion to permanently remove such animals from public places.
- Others contended that existing statutory safeguards under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 and the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 sufficiently regulate such situations.
- The Committee refrains from expressing any conclusive opinion on the legal correctness of either position, considering that such questions involve interpretation of statutory provisions and are ultimately within the domain of competent constitutional courts.
- The Committee refrains from expressing any conclusive opinion on the legal correctness of either position, considering that such questions involve interpretation of statutory provisions and are ultimately within the domain of competent constitutional courts.

6. Limitation of the Report

This Interim Report is confined to assessment of implementation and policy considerations.

The Committee has not examined nor expressed any opinion upon:

- The constitutional validity of the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023;
- The constitutional validity of any executive action adopted by the Union or any State Government;
- The legality of any pending litigation concerning community animal management.
- The observations contained herein shall not be construed as binding findings on any judicial or quasi-judicial authority. Issued under the authority of the High-Level Committee on Community Animal Management.

(Sd/-)
Government of Pravarsha

ANNEXURE III

GOVERNMENT OF PRAVARSHA

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION

GOVERNMENT ORDER

Government Order No : UDMA/PSA/214/2026

File No : UDMA/LA-III/2026/1187

Date : 18-May-2026

Subject: Issuance of Interim Guidelines for the Management of Habitually Aggressive Community Dogs in Urban Local Bodies in the Interest of Public Safety and Public Health.

PREAMBLE

Whereas the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 seeks to secure humane treatment of animals and to prevent the infliction of unnecessary pain or suffering;

And whereas the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023 have been notified by the Central Government to regulate the capture, sterilisation, vaccination, treatment and release of community dogs through Urban Local Bodies and recognised implementing agencies;

And whereas the Government of Pravarsha has, during the period January 2024 to April 2026, received reports from various Municipal Corporations indicating an increase in complaints concerning dog-bite incidents, alleged aggressive behaviour by certain community dogs, and recurring public safety concerns in densely populated urban areas;

And whereas the Department of Public Health has submitted statistical material indicating variations in the incidence of reported dog-bite cases across different districts of the State;

And whereas several Resident Welfare Associations, educational institutions, public health authorities and elected representatives have represented before the Government that municipal authorities require greater operational flexibility while responding to exceptional cases involving repeated attacks allegedly attributable to identified community dogs;

And whereas the Government has considered the Interim Report dated 28 April 2026 submitted by the High-Level Committee on Community Animal Management, the representations received from stakeholders, and the necessity of ensuring an appropriate balance between public safety and humane treatment of animals pending further policy consideration;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred under Sections 42, 68, 74 and 112 of the Pravarsha Municipal Public Safety Act, 1998, read with all other enabling provisions, the Government of Pravarsha hereby issues the following Interim Guidelines to be observed by all Urban Local Bodies within the State until further orders.

CHAPTER I : PRELIMINARY

1. Short Title

These Guidelines may be called the Interim Guidelines for Management of Habitually Aggressive Community Dogs, 2026.

2. Commencement

These Guidelines shall come into force immediately upon publication.

3. Application

These Guidelines shall apply to—

- a. All Municipal Corporations;
- b. Municipal Councils;
- c. Town Municipal Councils;
- d. Urban Development Authorities;
- e. All authorities exercising municipal functions within the State of Pravarsha

4. Object

The object of these Guidelines is—

- a. To ensure immediate administrative response in exceptional situations involving community dogs alleged to pose a threat to public safety;
- b. To prescribe a uniform mechanism for veterinary assessment;
- c. To ensure humane treatment of community dogs during any intervention undertaken by municipal authorities;
- d. To maintain appropriate records concerning actions taken by Urban Local Bodies.

CHAPTER II : CONSTITUTION OF DISTRICT VETERINARY ASSESSMENT BOARD

5. Constitution

Every District Collector shall constitute a District Veterinary Assessment Board consisting of—

- a. Chief Veterinary Officer of the District — Chairperson;
- b. Senior Veterinary Surgeon nominated by the Director of Animal Husbandry;
- c. One Behavioural Animal Specialist nominated by the Veterinary Council of Pravarsha;
- d. One representative of the District Animal Welfare Committee;
- e. Municipal Health Officer concerned (Member-Secretary).

6. Functions

The Board shall—

- a. Examine complaints involving alleged aggressive community dogs;
- b. Evaluate veterinary records and behavioural evidence;
- c. Determine whether the concerned animal requires medical treatment, rehabilitation or continued observation;
- d. Recommend appropriate measures in accordance with these Guidelines.

CHAPTER III : REGISTRATION AND EXAMINATION OF COMPLAINTS

7. Persons Entitled to Submit Complaints

Complaints may be submitted by—

- a. Municipal Authorities;
- b. Police Authorities;
- c. Government Medical Officers;
- d. Government Educational Institutions;
- e. Resident Welfare Associations;
- f. Registered Animal Welfare Organisations;
- g. Any resident affected by the alleged incident.

8. Contents of Complaint

Every complaint shall, to the extent practicable, contain—

- a. Precise location of occurrence;
- b. Date and time;
- c. Details of injuries allegedly sustained;
- d. Medical records, where available;
- e. Photographs, CCTV recordings or other electronic evidence, if available;
- f. Names of witnesses, where ascertainable;
- g. Particulars of any previous complaints relating to the same animal.

No complaint shall be rejected solely on account of non-availability of any particular document.

CHAPTER IV : TEMPORARY CAPTURE AND VETERINARY ASSESSMENT

9. Temporary Capture

Upon receipt of credible information, the Municipal Commissioner may authorise temporary capture of the concerned community dog.

Temporary capture shall not amount to a determination that the animal is habitually aggressive.

10. Housing

Every captured animal shall be kept only in—

- a. A recognised Animal Birth Control Centre;
- b. Government Veterinary Hospital;
- c. Municipal Animal Shelter;
- d. Any facility approved by the Director of Animal Husbandry.

Adequate food, water, veterinary treatment and post-operative care shall be provided throughout the period of observation.

11. Veterinary Assessment

The District Veterinary Assessment Board shall examine—

- a. Physical health;
- b. Vaccination status;
- c. Sterilisation status;
- d. Behavioural assessment;
- e. Evidence concerning the alleged incident;
- f. Prior verified complaints;
- g. Possibility of disease;
- h. Likelihood of rehabilitation.

The Board may consult independent veterinary specialists wherever necessary.

CHAPTER V : MEASURES AVAILABLE TO MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES

12. Permissible Recommendations

Upon completion of assessment, the Board may recommend —

- a. Immediate release of the animal;
- b. Medical treatment;
- c. Anti-rabies vaccination;
- d. Sterilisation where medically feasible;
- e. Behavioural rehabilitation;
- f. Temporary observation;
- g. Relocation to a recognised permanent shelter where continued release is considered inappropriate;
- h. Any other humane measure considered necessary.

13. Recommendation for Humane Euthanasia

Where the Board unanimously records that —

- a. The community dog has demonstrably caused repeated grievous injuries;
- b. Credible evidence establishes an imminent and continuing threat to human life;
- c. Behavioural rehabilitation is unlikely to succeed;
- d. No less restrictive alternative remains reasonably available;

The Board may recommend humane euthanasia.

No recommendation shall be made unless supported by a reasoned report signed by every member of the Board.

14. Approval

No recommendation for euthanasia shall take effect unless approved in writing by —

- a. The Municipal Commissioner; and
- b. The Director of Animal Husbandry.

15. Method

Where approval is granted, euthanasia shall be performed only —

- a. By a registered Veterinary Surgeon;
- b. In accordance with accepted veterinary standards;
- c. Using scientifically recognised humane methods;
- d. After preparation of complete veterinary records.

CHAPTER VI : PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS

16. Record of Proceedings

Every recommendation shall record—

- a. Facts relied upon;
- b. Evidence considered;
- c. Veterinary findings;
- d. Reasons supporting the recommendation;
- e. Dissenting opinions, if any.

17. Reporting Requirements

Every Municipal Commissioner shall submit a quarterly report to the Department of Urban Development containing—

- a. Complaints received;
- b. Complaints verified;
- c. Dogs captured;
- d. Dogs released;
- e. Dogs rehabilitated;
- f. Recommendations made under Clause 13;
- g. Action taken thereon.

18. Preservation of Records

All proceedings shall be preserved for a minimum period of five years and shall be made available to any competent authority or court whenever required.

CHAPTER VII : MISCELLANEOUS

19. Interpretation

Any doubt arising in implementation of these Guidelines shall be referred to the Department of Urban Development and Municipal Administration, whose clarification shall operate until modified by the Government or a competent court.

20. Saving

Nothing contained in these Guidelines shall exempt any authority from compliance with the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, the Animal Birth Control Rules, 2023, or any other law for the time being in force.

21. Nature of Guidelines

These Guidelines are intended to operate as an interim administrative measure pending consideration of the recommendations of the High-Level Committee on Community Animal Management and shall remain in force until modified, superseded or withdrawn by the Government.

By Order and in the Name of the Governor of Pravarsha

(Sd/-)

A.K. Deshmukh, IAS

Principal Secretary to Government

Department of Urban Development and Municipal Administration

Government of Pravarsha

Authenticated by

(Sd/-)

R. Venkataraman

Deputy Secretary (Municipal Administration)

Government of Pravarsha

Core Committee



Ms. Pranitha. P. Pai
Assistant Professor
pranithapai@soundaryainstitutions.in



Dr. Vishwas Puttaswamy
Principal
scl.principal@soundaryainstitutions.in



Mr. Jithin George Jackson
Assistant Professor
jithingeorge@soundaryainstitutions.in



Ms. Damini
Assistant Professor
daminim@soundaryainstitutions.in



Ms. Pooja Abinaya GB
Assistant Professor
poojaabinaya@soundaryainstitutions.in

Student Coordinators



Mr. VKT Krishnadas Unni
President MCS
+91 97393 88022



Mr. Keerthi Raj
+91 63637 72421



Mr. Aneesha Krishnan
+91 7975251330



Ms. Shruthi
+91 7204748157

GLIMPSE OF 3rd ALL INDIA MOOT COURT COMPETITION 2025



Soundarya College of Law, in collaboration with its Academic Partner, ALMT Legal, organised its flagship National Moot Court Competition on 10–11 October 2025. Conceived as a premier academic exercise, the competition provided law students with an opportunity to strengthen their advocacy, legal research, analytical reasoning, drafting, and courtroom skills through simulated judicial proceedings.

The competition attracted participation from 42 teams representing law institutions from across India, underscoring its national significance and academic stature. The event was graced by Hon'ble Mr. Justice E. S. Indires, Judge, High Court of Karnataka, Prof. (Dr.) Sathish Gowda N., Registrar (Evaluation), Tumkur University, and Mr. S. S. Mahendra, Former Principal Government Advocate, High Court of Karnataka, whose presence added considerable academic and professional value to the proceedings.

RV Institute of Legal Studies emerged as the Winners, receiving the Winner's Trophy and a cash prize of ₹30,000, while Sri Jagadguru Renukacharya College of Law secured the Runner-up position and was awarded a cash prize of ₹20,000.

REGISTRATION FORM

(To Be Filled in Block Letters)

Institution Details

Name of the Institution / University	
Address	
Contact No of the Institution	
Faculty Coordinator	
Designation	
Email – ID	

Seal And Signature Of The Head Of The Institution / University

--

PARTICIPANT DETAILS

MOOTER I

Name

Gender

Semester And Course

Contact No

Email id

Please attach a passport
size photo

MOOTER II

Name

Gender

Semester And Course

Contact No

Email id

Please attach a passport
size photo

RESEARCHER

Name

Gender

Semester And Course

Contact No

Email id

Please attach a passport
size photo

REGISTRATION FEE DETAILS

Transaction Id / Dd /neft / Upi Id	
Mode Of Payment	
Amount Paid	
Payment Attachment Link	
Date & Time	

DECLARATION :

We, hereby declare that the institution and its team members will abide by all the rules of the competition set by the organizers and as notified to us from time to time throughout the period of the competition.

We also declare and confirm that all the information provided to the organizers in the registration form is true and accurate to the best of our knowledge.

In case of non-compliance or violation of any rules or regulations on our part, the organizing body shall reserve the right to cancel our registration/candidature.

Mooter I

Mooter II

Researcher

Seal and Signature of the Head of The Institution/ Department

TRAVEL DETAILS

Name Of the Institution	
Name of the Participants	1. 2. 3.
Primary Contact number of the Faculty	
Student contact no- (any one number)	
Mode of transport	
Date and Time of Arrival	
Date and Time of Departure	

Mooter I

Mooter II

Researcher

Seal and Signature of the Head of The Institution/ Department



SOUNDARYA COLLEGE OF LAW

Official Communication :

All communications regarding competition shall be made to
scl.mootcourt@soundaryainstitutions.in

 Soundaryanagar, Sidedahalli,
Nagasandra Post, Bengaluru – 560073

 +91 62690 00092 / +91 62690 00093

 scl.principal@soundaryainstitutions.in



Website



LinkedIn



Instagram