

SWARTLAND WEST COAST SPCA
INSPECTOR REPORT

I4802

Complaint Reference No.

Building:
Street: 22 AMARYLLIS
Suburb: ST HELENA BAY
Postal Code:
Inspector: JAMESON OCTOBER
Date of Inspection: 2025-08-25
Time of Inspection: 09:00

RESPONDENT'S DETAILS

Name:
Company:
Identification:
Email:
Tel 1:
Tel 2:

REPORT

Access Granted By: NEVILLE LOVE
Comment:
Were Animals Seen on the Property: Yes
Relationship to Property Owner: Owner
Captured By: LOUISE VAN ZYL 2025-08-25 10:51

CHECKLISTS

CONFINEMENT OF ANIMALS	Static Chain - adequate length	Property not fenced properly and no gate.
ADEQUATE SPACE AVAILABLE	Yes	
CLEAN LIVING ENVIRONMENT	Yes	
WATER AVAILABLE	Yes	
ADEQUATE SHELTER AVAILABLE	Yes	
ANIMALS IN GOOD CONDITION	Yes	
VETERINARY PROBLEMS / HEALTH CO	No	

General Report Comments: On Friday 22 August 2025, our office received a complaint from a member of the public, Sarah. At the time of the initial call, no physical address was provided to our administrative staff. The complainant alleged that her neighbour had struck a pitbull-cross dog in the face with his fist. The address was only obtained on the morning of 25 August 2025, which allowed the inspection to be carried out.

Upon arrival at the property, I was granted access by the owner, Mr Love, to conduct an inspection of the dog and the premises.

Mr Love confirmed that on Thursday, his dog Sniper (pitbull-cross) had broken loose and ran into the street, attempting to attack a smaller dog that was passing by. He explained that because the property is not fully fenced and has no gate, the dog was able to escape.

According to Mr Love, his son-in-law intervened during the incident. He admitted to striking Sniper with his hand, but stated it was on the dog's back in order to force him to release the smaller dog. He denied that the dog had been punched in the face. Mr Love stated that had his son-in-law not acted, the smaller dog could have been killed.

I conducted a physical inspection of Sniper. Findings were as follows:

Dog was walking normally and alert, though displaying aggressive behaviour.

Body condition was acceptable.

Dog had access to food, water, and shelter.

No visible wounds, swelling, or injuries to the head or body.

Dog is kept on a chain approximately 10m in length with a collar. The reason provided is that the property is not properly fenced and the dog is aggressive. I educated about a running chain.

Following the inspection, I contacted the complainant, Sarah, telephonically to update her. She questioned why I had not stopped at her house. I explained that visiting her property would have made it apparent to Mr Love that she was the complainant, which could have compromised her confidentiality.

I further explained that because she is the only person who directly witnessed the alleged assault, she would need to provide a sworn affidavit to the South African Police Service (SAPS) in order for the case to proceed. I advised her that she could call me from SAPS should she require assistance in explaining the situation to the officers.

Sarah stated that another person had also witnessed the incident. I informed her that it would be beneficial if both witnesses made affidavits. I also reiterated that photographic or video evidence strengthens any case, which is why our office initially advised her to obtain such evidence if possible.

At the time of inspection, Sniper appeared in acceptable condition with no evidence of injuries consistent with the complaint of being struck in the face. Based on the owner's statement and physical findings, no immediate welfare concerns requiring removal of the animal were identified. However, the complainant has been advised to submit a sworn statement to SAPS, along with any corroborating witnesses, should she wish to pursue the matter further. I also advised her that they can contact me from SAPS when she is there and I can explain to them if need be.

ACTIONS

NO ACTION REQUIRED

REPORT OUTCOMES

Case finalised - NFA

NO CONTRAVENTIONS OF THE APA -

INSPECTION ANIMALS

Description:

NIL