



\$~101

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 9350/2025**

**PEOPLE FOR THE ETHICAL**

**TREATMENT OF ANIMALS PETA INDIA**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajshekhar Rao, Sr. Adv. along  
with Ms. Pritha Srikumar, Mr. Sulabh  
Rewari, Ms. Arunima Kedia, Ms.  
Meghna Sharma, Ms. Meherunissa  
Jaitley and Ms. Saumya Sinha,  
Advocates.

versus

**THE COMMITTEE FOR**

**CONTROL AND SUPERVISION**

**OF EXPERIMENTS ON ANIMALS CCSEA, MINISTRY**

**OF FISHERIES, ANIMAL HUSBANDRY AND DAIRYING,  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA THROUGH ITS CHAIRMAN & ANR.**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajesh Gogna (CGSC) along  
with Ms. Priya Singh, Mr. Anubhav  
Tyagi, Advs. for R1

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA**

**ORDER**

% **08.07.2025**

**CM APPL. 39565/2025 (Seeking Permission to File Lengthy List of  
Dates and events)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

**W.P.(C) 9350/2025 & CM APPL. 39564/2025**

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner alleging failure on the part of the respondent no.1/ The Committee for Control and Supervision of Experiments in Animals (CCSEA), Ministry of Fisheries, Animal



Husbandry and Dairying, Government of India, a statutory committee constituted under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, to address the systematic failure and blatant violations of animal rights and also regulatory non-compliances at the hands of the respondent no.2.

4. It is submitted that the respondent no.2 which is a Preclinical Contract Research Organisation and Commercial Beagle Dog Breeder is engaged in conducting experimentation on animals and their breeding. It is submitted that the petitioner made a complaint to the respondent no.1 about the abusive, cruel treatment and neglect of animals at the facility of the respondent no.2.

5. Pursuant thereto, an inspection is stated to have been conducted by the multidisciplinary committee constituted by respondent no.1 at the facility, the copy of the concerned inspection report dated 17.06.2025 has been placed on record in these proceedings as Annexure (P-18). A perusal of the same substantiates that there has been abject disregard of the relevant statutory requirements by the respondent no.2. The concerned animals are subject to conditions which are quite disturbing. The relevant portions of the inspection report are as follows:-

#### **2. Non-compliances in Animal Use**

The headcount and placement of dogs housed at PBPL indicate that the facility is exceeding the number approved by CCSEA, in direct violation of regulatory limits which is 1000 dogs. This overpopulation appears to stem from breeding activities surpassing the number of animals required for ongoing experiments. As a result, two rooms—originally designated for experimentation and located in close proximity to active experimental areas—were repurposed as stock rooms to accommodate the surplus animals. Notably, this was done without screening the dogs for infectious diseases. Veterinarians at the facility stated that the rooms would be fumigated and sterilised before being returned to experimental use; however, even if this is outlined in the organisation's SOPs,



reliance on such reactive measures raises concerns regarding the robustness of biosafety protocols.

### **3. Number of Animals Currently Under Rehabilitation**

At the time of inspection, 73 dogs—comprising 62 males and 11 females—were reported to be under rehabilitation. This information was provided verbally, with no supporting written documentation shared by the facility. However, a headcount conducted by the inspectors confirmed the reported total.

## **XI. Conclusion**

The operational deficiencies observed at PBPL are not isolated incidents but indicative of entrenched structural, procedural, and ethical failures. The scale and severity of non-compliances documented during the inspection raise significant concerns regarding the facility's adherence to established standards of animal welfare and regulatory accountability.

The situation demands urgent attention—particularly with respect to the removal and rehabilitation of animals to prevent further pain, distress, or suffering. The findings also call for a critical review of the facility's registration and breeding licence in view of the serious and repeated deviations from prescribed norms. A detailed micro-audit of PBPL's Institutional Animal Ethics Committee (IAEC) is imperative, including a comprehensive reconciliation of records relating to breeding, procurement, experimentation, reuse, rehabilitation, transfer, euthanasia and disposal. Such scrutiny is essential to evaluate compliance with approved protocols and to verify the accuracy and integrity of reported data.

6. It is submitted that despite the categorical findings in the aforesaid inspection report, no action whatsoever has been taken and, in the meantime, the respondent no.2 continues to indulge in extremely objectionable practices such as euthanasia. It is submitted that none of the animals are being provided with suitable habitat and other veterinary services.

7. Issue notice.

8. Learned counsel, as aforesaid, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent no.1.



9. Issue notice to the respondent no.2 through all permissible modes, including electronically.
10. Let reply be filed within a period of three weeks from today. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within a period of two weeks thereafter.
11. Learned counsel for the respondent no.1 accedes that the inspection report dated 17.06.2025 substantiates the apprehensions/allegations of the petitioner. He, however, submits that subsequent show cause notices have been served on the respondent no.2 and further audits are being conducted before taking requisite action. for the purpose of taking action.
12. From the state of affairs as noticed above and as also apparent from the perusal of the inspection report and the photographs filed by the petitioner as Annexure-P8, it is apparent that urgent interim directions are necessitated to ameliorate the conditions of animals in the concerned facility.
13. Accordingly, the respondent no.1 is directed to take immediate steps to ensure that the necessary remedial steps are taken, and measures put in place for providing veterinary treatment, proper handling of animals and also to prevent proliferation of practices such as euthanasia, treatment without sedatives, etc. Adequate arrangement is also required to be placed for proper habitat of the animals.
14. For the aforesaid purpose, let an inspection be conducted by the respondent no.1 along with representatives of the petitioner to identify the areas of concern. Let the same be done within one week. Let requisite steps be taken within a period of two weeks thereafter. Let a Status Report be filed within four weeks from today.
15. Till the aforesaid exercise is conducted, the respondent no.2 is



restrained from procuring/ housing any new animals at its facility.

16. List on 04.08.2025.

**SACHIN DATTA, J**

**JULY 8, 2025/uk**