2026:PHHC:043537-D

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

212

CWP-PIL-111-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 19.03.2026

BHARATI RAMACHANDARAN

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Yashasvi A. Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Harish Mehla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipan Pal Yadav, Additional A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Naveen S. Bhardwaj, Additional A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Addl. Solicitor General of India with
Mr. Arun Gossain, Senior Panel Counsel for UOI.

* * * *

SHEEL NAGU, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

1. The present Public Interest Litigation has been filed raising the alleged public cause that certain persons are indulging in private dog fights involving ferocious breeds of dogs and yet no preventive or curative action has been taken by the functionaries of the State.

2. This petition had been filed praying for the following reliefs:-

I. To issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents to take appropriate legal action for curbing the illegal activity of private dog fighting.

II. To direct the respondent to appoint an independent body for investigating in the occurrences of illegal animal fights in the state of Punjab and file status report thereof before this

2026:PHHC:043537-D

Hon'ble Court

III. To issue a writ in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondent No.1 for effective implementation of Section 11(1)(m) (ii) and (n) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 by way of judicial process.

IV. *Pass any other direction or orders in the interest of justice.*

3. Insofar as the second prayer regarding appointment of an independent body for investigating occurrences of illegal animal fights is concerned, the States of Punjab and Haryana have filed their respective affidavits stating therein that Societies for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals have already been constituted in every District under the chairmanship of respective Deputy Commissioners, which is entrusted with the duties and functions as envisaged in Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960 (hereinafter referred to as 'Act of 1960') and Rules framed thereunder.

3.1. Thus, the second prayer made in the petition appears to be satisfied.

4. With regard to the first prayer seeking directions to curb illegal dog fights, it is evident that certain offences enumerated under Section 11(1) of the Act of 1960 are cognizable in terms of Section 31 thereof.

4.1 Thus, if a cognizable offence occurs, even a stranger can lodge an FIR, provided the information so furnished to the Police or the concerned competent authority alleges commission of cognizable offfence.

5. The petitioner is free to lodge an FIR as and when such instances take place or take recourse as enumerated in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in case the

2026:PHHC:043537-D

Police or the competent authority declines to register a cognizable offence.

6. We hope and expect that the Societies so constituted at District level shall take due cognizance of any grievance arising out of cruelty towards dog breeds alleged to be ferocious.

7. With aforesaid, the present PIL stands disposed of.

8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SHEEL NAGU)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

19.03.2026
S.Sharma

i) Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No
ii) Whether reportable? Yes/No