

# News

---

**Investigation into 21 missing canines at the DRDO site is permitted by the Karnataka High Court.**



Additionally, the Court ordered that no coercive action be taken against the two DRDO estate officers involved in the case, providing them with temporary reprieve. Additionally, they were told to assist the probe.

**High Court of Karnataka with DRDO**

The probe into the disappearance of twenty-one stray canines from the **Defence Research and Development Organization (DRDO)** township in Bengaluru has been allowed to continue by the Karnataka High Court [Rakesh Kumar Sahu & Another Vs State of Karnataka].

By a March 25 ruling, the Court had previously halted the investigation in relation to two accused DRDO personnel. This came after the Court questioned the **Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike's (BBMP) involvement in the case.**

The investigation into the canines' disappearance is to continue, according to **JM. Nagaprasanna's most recent ruling, which was issued on June 23.** Justice

However, the Court added that the investigation should only focus on offenses that the investigation ultimately proves, not on offenses that are only vaguely mentioned in the FIR.

"Therefore, I believe it is reasonable to permit investigation in light of the submissions, contra submissions, and SPP submissions. The Court stated, "Not for all the loosely laid offenses, but for offenses that would actually occur and that would actually occur upon examination.

### **M. Nagaprasanna, Justice**

**In response to a plea submitted by two DRDO estate officers who were charged in a criminal case that was brought in March of this year, the court issued an interim order.**

They were granted interim relief by the Court's June 23 decision, which prohibited the two DRDO estate officers from being subjected to coercion at this time. The Court ruled that they would not be subjected to any form of harassment or coercion. **In order to assist the prosecution** in covering the truth, the Court further ordered them to assist with the investigation. n dis

Additionally, it mandated that the investigative report be submitted to the High Court prior to being presented to the jurisdictional court. The workout must be finished in six weeks.

The case is scheduled to be heard again on August 11.

The Court stated that the case started because of a peculiar situation involving a large DRDO campus in Bengaluru where a number of stray dogs resided. The order states that around twenty-one dogs that roamed the campus's internal roadways went missing on March 9 of this year and have not been found as of yet.

**The Bench noted, "The case is of 21 missing dogs which are not found even today."**

A report alleging that the animals had been removed in an unethical manner led to the booking of two estate officers and another individual, identified as an unknown accused.

A request to vacate the interim injunction was made after the High Court in March halted the case's investigation.

Additional Solicitor General Aravind Kamath, who represented the petitioners, contended that the charges brought against the estate officers **under Section 240 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (false evidence), Section 325 (mischief by killing or maiming animals), Section 270 (public nuisance), Section 61(1) (criminal conspiracy), and Section 11 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act** were "preposterous" and had nothing to do with the petitioners.

### **Kamath Arvind**

According to Kamath, a BBMP representative visited the campus on March 7 and three stray canines from the second phase of the DRDO housing complex were moved on March 6, 2026, according to a statement in a BBMP WhatsApp group. He argued that the complaint was based solely on WhatsApp conversations and hearsay.

**"An investigation is necessary. Cruel treatment of animals is unacceptable.** They must survive and have equal rights. Kamath countered that the officers could not be held vicariously guilty just because they were employed on campus. "But that does not mean you prosecute an officer who is not involved in it."

In opposition to the plea, BBMP attorney Vaishali Hegde argued that no one could enter the DRDO property without authorization and questioned who had entered the campus, taken the dogs away, and where the animals were at the time.

She said that several dogs were discovered put in plastic bags with bleeding wounds and that illegal dog catchers operated in residential layouts. **"All we want is let the investigation go on, no coercive action against the petitioners,"** she submitted.

State Public Prosecutor BN Jagadeesh also backed the investigation's continuation, saying that even if some of the offenses mentioned might have been applied incorrectly, **a probe was required to find out what happened to the 21 canines that were last seen on the DRDO site.**

**He claimed that DRDO had received notices and that CCTV footage allegedly showing how canines were handled was accessible for review.** He claims that DRDO officials can end up being witnesses rather than defendants.

"An investigation is definitely necessary. **Before ultimately directing the investigation to proceed, Justice Nagaprasanna responded,** "We will see what is your role as an accused or witness, but investigation is must."