

102 COCP-5244-2025 (O&M)

**SHAURYA MADAN
V/S
NISHANT KUMAR YADAV AND ANOTHER**

102-1 COCP-4465-2025 (O&M)

**SEHJEEVI FOUNDATION CHARITABLE TRUST
V/S
NISHANT KUMAR YADAV AND OTHERS**

Present: Mr. Anand Chhibbar, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Ateevraj Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner in COCP-4465-2025.

Mr. Anurag Chopra, Advocate and
Ms. Himani Jamwal, Advocate
for the petitioner in COCP-5244-2025.

Mr. Viraj Gandhi, Junior Panel Counsel
for respondent No.1 in both cases.

Ms. Armaan Saggar, Advocate
for respondent No.2 in COCP-5244-2025 and
for respondent No.3 in COCP-4465-2025.

Mr. Siddharth Arora, Advocate and
Mr. Navraj Narang, Advocate
for the applicant in CM-2012-CII-2026.

Ms. Shruti Sharma, Advocate (Local Commissioner).

The Local Commissioner appointed by this Court vide order dated 10.03.2026 has handed over a detailed report today. The same is taken on record. Registry to scan and tag the same at the appropriate place.

Yesterday when the matter was taken up, it was brought to the notice of the Court by the Local Commissioner that some of the employees of the SPCA have not been paid their salaries and it was one of the reasons that they were not working and neglecting the animals. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 was directed to apprise the Court as to whether the fact as

stated by the employees that they were not being paid their salaries was correct. Today, learned counsel for respondent No.1 has handed over copies of two orders, one dated 08.05.2025 whereby sanction was accorded for release of ₹50,00,000/- as financial assistance to the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA), Sector 38, Chandigarh; and the second order dated 13.11.2025 whereby an amount of ₹70,00,000/- was released. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 has stated that once the said amount was released it was for the SPCA to have disbursed the said amount.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2-SPCA has informed this Court that there were certain administrative issues qua releasing the salaries and that the salaries have now been released for the month of January 2026 and for the month of February 2026 the salaries would be positively released in a day or two.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners have pointed out that a form was circulated for registering as volunteers, which was a detailed form involving all sorts of declarations.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2-SPCA has stated that self-declaration form would not be required to be filled in by the volunteers and they would only have to give their name, two photographs and identity proof. They would have to give their options as to what kind of work they would be helping out with whether it is feeding/cleaning/medical assistance and the preferred timings. The volunteers would also have to give an undertaking to abide by the SOPs.

Learned counsel for the petitioners' state that they would have no objection in filling in the form as stated above alongwith an undertaking that they would abide by the SOPs.

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that at any point of time a maximum of five volunteers would be allowed to visit the SPCA. Learned counsel for the parties are further *ad idem* that photography and videography by the volunteers would be allowed between 02.00 pm to 03.00 pm. It has further been agreed that any volunteer who indulges in any unruly behaviour would be debarred from entering the SPCA premises. Learned counsel for respondent No.2-SPCA has assured the Court that CCTVs would be kept functional at all given times and the footage is being preserved for a period of one month as per Dr. Prateek Balana who is present in Court.

Since the petitioners have expressed their apprehension about the functioning of SPCA and the manner in which the animals are being kept, they have sought permission to have access to the CCTV footage, which is objected to by learned counsel for respondent No.2-SPCA on the ground that it would create a lot of issues at a later point of time.

In order to ensure that there is compliance of order dated 03.07.2025 passed by the Division Bench in CWP-PIL-152-2025, which reads as under :

“In the meantime, U.T. Administration is directed to ensure proper diet as well as treatment as and when necessary and availability of clean and fresh water to animals including well-ventilated accommodation.”

this Court deems it proper to order that Ms. Shruti Sharma, Advocate, who was appointed as a Local Commissioner vide order dated 10.03.2026, is given free access to the CCTV footage. She would submit a report to the Court in case she finds anything amiss in the functioning of the SPCA and/or in the upkeep of the animals and the shelter if noticed by her from the CCTV

footage. It is made clear that the CCTV footage which is obtained by the Local Commissioner shall not be shared with the petitioners and shall not be made public or shared on any social media.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2-SPCA has assured the Court that as directed by the Division Bench, all areas would be kept clean and proper hygiene would be maintained. Dr. Prateek Balana, who is present in Court, has stated that none of the non-aggressive and healthy dogs would be kept in cages and they would be allowed to roam freely during the morning hours and the evening hours.

Learned counsel for the petitioners have handed over a copy of the audited balance-sheet, which has been submitted by the SPCA, wherein a total expenditure of ₹1,22,11,642/- annually has been shown for the year ending 31.03.2024. Out of the said expenditure, ₹1,09,31,307/- has been shown as having been paid towards salaries. A meagre amount of ₹3,53,925/- has been shown to have been spent during the year on feed for the animals, ₹57,565/- on medical expenses; ₹1,80,339/- on diesel and ₹70,730/- on vehicle running and maintenance. It was brought to the notice of the Court by learned counsel for the petitioners and the Local Commissioner, who had visited the facility, that the food being fed to the animals was rice and eggs and *dalia*. The Local Commissioner has appended a photograph where two bowls can be seen out of which one contains a yellow liquid and the other contains a white liquid. Another photograph of injured dogs has also been appended.

Dr. Prateep Balana and Dr. Gaurav Lakhanpal, who are present in Court, have assured the Court that the hygiene would properly be maintained whether it's a healthy animal or an animal which is unwell/injured.

On a query by the Court as to the nutritional requirements of the dogs who are housed at the facility (there are no other animals in the shelter at this point of time), the doctors have informed the Court that requirement of an average dog weighing about 20 kgs is 150 gms. of protein, which would effectively mean 4 to 5 eggs a day. As informed, while preparing the food eggs are added to the rice while it is being boiled. It has further been informed that about 45 to 47 eggs are mixed with the entire morning feed and 45 to 47 eggs are mixed in the entire evening feed, which would effectively mean that the dogs are not even being fed two eggs each in the entire day as there are about 47 dogs as of today in the shelter. Hence, even as per the statement made by both the doctors present in Court, the nutritional requirement of the dogs is not being met.

Let an affidavit be filed by respondent No.2-SPCA stating the steps which would be taken by them to ensure that the nutritional requirement of the animals is duly met with.

List on **07.04.2026**.

Mr. Anand Chhibbar, Senior Advocate as well as Mr. Anurag Chopra, Advocate have volunteered that the Local Commissioner would be paid ₹10,000/- per month for her visit to the SPCA.

A copy of this order be placed on the connected file.

(**ALKA SARIN**)
JUDGE

11.03.2026
jk