

ITEM NO.21 Court 4 (Video Conferencing) SECTION PIL-W

**S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S**

Writ Petition(s)(Criminal) No(s).166/2020

RED LYNX CONFEDERATION

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(WITH IA No.57624/2020-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and IA No.57623/2020-PERMISSION TO APPEAR AND ARGUE IN PERSON)

Date : 10-08-2020 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

**HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE D.Y. CHANDRACHUD
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.M. JOSEPH**

For Petitioner(s) Ms. Sangeeta Dogra, Petitioner-in-person

**For Respondent(s) Mr. Vikas Mehta, AOR
 Mr. Rajat Sehgal, Adv.**

**UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R**

1 The reliefs which have been sought in these proceedings under Article 32 of the Constitution, in a petition which has been filed in person, are as follows:

“1. Issue a writ of mandamus, or any appropriate writ, order or direction to formulate Investigation for reported matter u/s 55(c) Wildlife Protection Act 1972 by forming a committee under Honorable Retired Justice of NGT, or any High Court of India or Sitting/Retired Justice of Supreme Court who are specialized in Forest and Wildlife, AND /OR;

2. Issue a writ of mandamus, or any appropriate writ, order or direction to Centralize all the weapon license holders data and activities through an intelligence software for strict monitoring of crop protection and sports category to avoid illegal use weapon and ammunition(explosives) AND/OR;

3. Guidelines may be framed to have Veterinarian as wildlife wardens and in wildlife sections of the Ministry; Veterinarian Council of India is defunct since 2017 and to be made

operational honoring Indian Veterinarian Council Act 1984 Section 30, 54 & 56 AND/OR;

4. The section 55(c) [60 days' notice] and Section 11 of Wildlife Protection Act 1972 are unconstitutional and inhumane and hence it to be declared ultra vires AND/OR;

5. Court may pass any other order which may deem fit for managing population control effective solution to reduce Human Animal Conflict.”

2 The interim prayer is in the following terms:

“1. Directions to be issued to Secretary Government of India to destroy all the trophies that are lying in the house of Nawab Sh. Shafath Ali Khan and others offenders possession with compliance report to be presented before this Honorable Court in a video graphic form.”

3 During the course of the hearing, we had specifically drawn the attention of Ms Sangeeta Dogra, who appears in person, to the interim relief which is sought against a specific individual. The Court queried as to whether this is a petition which has been filed in the public interest or to seek relief in respect of a particular individual.

4 Besides what is noted above, the relief sought in prayer clause 1 cannot be granted. Moreover the reliefs which have been sought in prayer clauses 2 and 3 trench upon an area of policy. No valid basis has been indicated in the petition in respect of the prayer for challenging the constitutional validity of Section 55(c) and Section 11 of the Wildlife Protection Act 1972. In the absence of any cogent foundation in the pleadings both on facts and law, we are not inclined to entertain the petition under Article 32. A petitioner who moves the court purportedly in public interest is not exempt from observing the essential principles of pleading.

5 However, we clarify that we have not adjudicated upon any issue which may arise in an appropriate case. We leave it open to the petitioner to pursue

appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

6 The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

7 Pending applications stand disposed of.

(SANJAY KUMAR-I)
AR-CUM-PS

(SAROJ KUMARI GAUR)
COURT MASTER