AN ACT to amend the education law, in relation to mandating the reporting of suspected animal cruelty by veterinarians.

THIS LEGISLATION IS APPROVED

I. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation changes two words in Section 6714 of New York’s Education Law to require, rather than permit, veterinarians to report suspected animal abuse to the authorities. Specifically, when a veterinarian reasonably and in good faith suspects that a companion animal under his or her treatment has an injury, illness or condition resulting from animal cruelty in violation of state law, then the veterinarian must report the incident and disclose to a police officer or SPCA agent the records concerning the animal’s condition and treatment. Likewise, a veterinarian must disclose such records to authorities if the veterinarian reasonably believes that doing so is necessary to protect the health or welfare of a companion animal, a person or the public.

1 A copy of the bill is available at https://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?default_fld=&leg_video=&bn=A05823&term=2021&Summary=Y&Text=Y (Assembly bill); https://assembly.state.ny.us/leg/?default_fld=&leg_video=&bn=S05023&term=&Summary=Y&Text=Y (Senate bill). (All cites last visited on May 28, 2021).

2 A veterinarian acts in good faith “when he or she reasonably believes that his or her actions are necessary to protect the health and welfare of the companion animal or the public.” N.Y. Educ. Law § 6714(3).

3 “Companion animal” means any dog, cat, or any other domesticated animal normally maintained in or near the household of the owner or person who cares for such other domesticated animal. N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 350(5).

4 Specifically animal cruelty in violation of N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law §§ 351, 353 or 353(a).

5 “Records” means all information concerning or related to the examination or treatment of the animal kept by the veterinarian in the course of his or her practice. N.Y. Educ. Law § 6714(1).

6 This language nearly tracks the “good faith” definition in N.Y. Educ. Law § 6714(3). See note 2 above. The provision is not redundant, however, because it additionally requires disclosing records when doing so is necessary.
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The identity of any veterinarian disclosing records would be kept confidential; disclosure of records pursuant to this paragraph shall only be to law enforcement, including SPCA agents. The veterinarian may also request documentation of the report.

The proposed legislation would take effect sixty days after enactment.

II. JUSTIFICATION

The New York City Bar Association’s Animal Law Committee supports the proposed legislation because mandated reporting of suspected animal abuse protects both animals and humans alike. Numerous states and organizations have already recognized as much.

A. The Proposed Legislation Protects Animals.

Requiring veterinarians to report and share records about suspected animal abuse or neglect recognizes the critical role that veterinarians play in identifying and prosecuting maltreatment.7 In particular, veterinarians have professional knowledge that helps them identify potential animal abuse or neglect.8 In many cases the person bringing in an animal to the veterinarian may not volunteer information about abuse — for instance, where the person is responsible for the abuse to protect the health or welfare of “a person,” not just that of “the companion animal or the public.” The law therefore also mandates reporting animal abuse when a veterinarian believes doing so will protect a particular individual — a key feature because of the link between animal abuse and interpersonal violence. See Section II.B below.

Violating the reporting requirement would constitute professional misconduct. N.Y. Educ. Law § 6509(21) (deeming “professional misconduct” “[c]ommitting unprofessional conduct, as defined by the board of regents in its rules”); 8 N.Y.C.R.R. § 29.1(b)(6) (Board of Regents rules deeming “unprofessional conduct” “failing to file a report required by law or by the Education Department”). A violation is also potentially subject to disciplinary proceedings before the New York State Education Department Office of Professional Discipline. N.Y. Educ. Law § 6510; see also N.Y. Educ. Law § 6503 (providing for involvement of the state board for veterinary medicine). Penalties can include censure and reprimand, licensing penalties, monetary fines, and required training, education, or public service. N.Y. Educ. Law § 6511. For additional information on veterinary professional misconduct in New York, see New York State Veterinary Medical Society, Professional Misconduct (2016), https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nysvms.org/resource/collection/E45CA734-8B73-4255-B861-5BED0FCBBAC9/LegalProfessionalMisconduct.pdf.


8 Melanie A. Benetato et al., The Veterinarian’s Role in Animal Cruelty Cases, note 7 above, at 33.
or is afraid to report it because they fear for their safety or the animals’ safety. In other cases, the person bringing in the animal may not even be aware that the animal’s injuries or illness stem from abuse or neglect — for instance, if the abuse or neglect happens at a daycare, grooming center, or boarding facility. Accordingly, a veterinarian may also be one of the only witnesses to the abuse or neglect, or at least one of the only ones in a position to report it.

Veterinary reports are key not only to identifying, but also to stopping animal abuse. Animal abuse and neglect cases are difficult to prosecute because the animal cannot speak for itself, and human witnesses are often not available to substantiate the charge. Lack of sufficient evidence accordingly results in few cases being brought to trial and even fewer ending in convictions. A veterinarian, however, can provide essential evidence by documenting an animal’s injuries and condition close in time to the incident, conducting laboratory tests and, when necessary, conducting necropsies. The veterinarian can also be called as an expert witness at trial to render a professional opinion on the cause, severity and duration of an animal’s injuries, the cause of its death, or the extent to which it suffered pain. Such evidence and testimony can help establish the legal elements of a cruelty case.

Requiring veterinarians to report animal abuse and neglect is therefore instrumental in stopping it: without their expertise and information, animal abuse will often go undetected and unprosecuted. In this respect, the rationale for mandatory animal abuse reporting parallels the rationale for mandated reporting of child abuse.

**B. The Proposed Legislation Protects Humans.**

Mandatory reporting of animal abuse also protects humans. Numerous studies have demonstrated the connection between animal maltreatment and interpersonal violence, including child abuse, elder abuse, and domestic violence — a connection widely known as “the link.” For

9 See Section II.B below.
10 Melanie A. Benetato et al., The Veterinarian’s Role in Animal Cruelty Cases, note 7 above, at 33.
11 Id. at 32.
12 Id. at 33.
13 Id.
14 Id. Under N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 350, “cruelty” includes every act, omission, or neglect, whereby unjustifiable physical pain, suffering or death is caused or permitted.
instance, many perpetrators of domestic violence harm companion animals to intimidate or control their partners, who are deterred from leaving home out of fear for their animal’s safety. More generally, animal abuse may indicate or predict interpersonal violence.

Substantive literature has likewise addressed a veterinarian’s role in recognizing this link. Veterinarians who observe animal abuse should understand that domestic violence may also be present. To that end, many colleges of veterinary medicine and continuing veterinary medical education also offer education on the issue.

In light of the “link,” requiring veterinarians to report suspected animal abuse may therefore have the secondary effect of identifying and preventing abuse of persons too, including people living with an abused companion animal as well as the broader public. As the American Animal Hospital Association (AAHA) observes in its position statement supporting mandatory reporting laws, “[r]eporting suspicions of animal abuse is important as it will trigger an investigation that may ultimately protect both animals and humans.”

In that respect, mandated reporting of animal abuse also accords with the Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics of the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA). Those provide that “[t]he responsibilities of the veterinary profession extend beyond individual patients

---


18 Phil Arkow, Recognizing and Responding to Cases of Suspected Animal Cruelty, Abuse, and Neglect, note 17 above, at 350.

19 Phil Arkow, Recognizing and Responding to Cases of Suspected Animal Cruelty, Abuse, and Neglect, note 17 above, at 350-51.


21 Id. at 351.


and clients to society in general.”

C. Numerous States and Organizations Have Already Recognized the Importance of Mandatory Reporting Laws.

As noted above, mandated reporting of animal abuse can be justified on similar grounds to mandated reporting of suspected child abuse and maltreatment: without such reporting, the abuse will often go undetected and unpunished.

While all 50 states and the District of Columbia now mandate reporting of child abuse, twenty states also require veterinarians to report reasonably suspected animal abuse or fighting.

26 Melanie A. Benetato et al., *The Veterinarian’s Role in Animal Cruelty Cases*, note 7 above, at 32.
27 Alabama ( Ala. Admin. Code Rule 930-X-1-.10(16), requiring veterinarians to report to the proper authorities any grossly inhumane treatment to animals of which they have direct knowledge); Arizona (Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 32-2239, requiring veterinarians to report reasonably suspected abuse, cruelty or animal fighting, as well as suspected cases of abuse of livestock); California (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 4830.7, requiring veterinarians to report if they have reasonable cause to believe an animal under care suffered abuse or cruelty; Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 4830.5, requiring veterinarians to report if they have reasonable cause to believe that dog has been injured or killed through participation in a staged animal fight); Colorado (Colo. Rev. Stat. § 12-64-121, requiring veterinarians to report if they have reasonable cause to know or suspect animal in their treatment has been subjected to cruelty or animal fighting; Colo. Rev. Stat. § 12-64-121, requiring veterinarians to disclose records to law enforcement investigating animal cruelty); Illinois (510 Ill. Comp. Stat. 70/3.07, requiring veterinarians to report any animal presented for treatment of aggravated cruelty or torture); Kansas (Kan. Admin. Regs. § 70-8-1, deeming as unprofessional conduct veterinarian’s failure report cruel or inhumane treatment to animals, where veterinarian has direct knowledge of such treatment); Maine (Me. Stat. tit. 7, § 4018, requiring veterinarian to report reasonably suspected aggravated cruelty); Maryland (Md. Code Agric. § 2-313.1, requiring veterinarians to report if they have reason to believe that animal that has been subjected to cruelty or fighting); Massachusetts (Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 112, § 58B, requiring veterinarians to report to authorities any known or reasonably suspected animal cruelty); Minnesota (Minn. Stat. § 346.37(6), requiring veterinarians to report to peace officers and humane agents known or suspected cases of abuse, cruelty, or neglect); Mississippi (Miss. Code § 73-39-83, requiring veterinary records be provided to public, animal health, animal welfare, wildlife or agriculture authorities with a legal or regulatory interest in records for the protection of animal and public health); Missouri (Mo. Code Regs. tit. 20, § 2270-6.011, requiring veterinarians to report if abuse or neglect “cannot be resolved through education”); Nebraska ( Neb. Rev. Stat. § 28-1020, requiring animal health care professionals to report if they reasonably suspect that animal has been abandoned, cruelly neglected, or cruelly mistreated); North Dakota (N.D. Cent. Code § 36-21.2-10, requiring veterinarians to notify law enforcement if they determine reasonable cause to believe animal has been neglected, abused or treated cruelly; N.D. Admin. Code § 87-05-02-01, deeming as unprofessional conduct veterinarian’s failing to report inhumane treatment to animals, including staged animal fights or training events for fights, that veterinarian reasonably believed occurred); Oklahoma (Okl. Stat. tit. 21 § 1680.3, requiring veterinarians to report suspected cases of animal abuse within 24 hours of examination or treatment); Oregon (Or. Rev. Stat. § 686.442, requiring veterinarians to report aggravated animal abuse); Pennsylvania (49 Pa. Code § 31.21, requiring veterinarians to report matters involving animal abuse or neglect by a professional colleague); Virginia (18 Va. Admin. Code § 150-20-140, deeming unprofessional conduct veterinarian’s “[f]ailing to report suspected animal cruelty to the appropriate authorities”); West Virginia (W. Va. Code § 7-10-4a, requiring veterinarians to report “any animal found, reasonably known or believed to be abandoned, neglected or cruelly treated”); Wisconsin (Wis. Stat. § 173.12, requiring veterinarians to report animals involved in animal fighting).
Two more states impose similar reporting obligations on other officials who encounter abuse. In addition, the American Animal Hospital Association encourages mandatory reporting laws that grant veterinarians immunity from legal liability if they report their observations in good faith — an immunity that New York law already provides. And while to our knowledge the American Veterinary Medical Association has not issued an official position on mandatory reporting laws, the organization urges veterinarians to promptly report suspected abuse to protect the health and welfare of animals and people and encourages states to pass laws providing immunity for good faith reporting.

### III. COUNTERARGUMENTS

One potential argument against mandating reporting of animal abuse is that it may deter people from seeking medical help for their companion animals — for instance, because they fear being reported for animal abuse. Yet even at present, the law leaves reporting to the discretion of the veterinarian. And while veterinarians are ethically obligated to protect clients’ personal privacy in certain cases, the Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics likewise already recognize that veterinarians may reveal confidences — without notice to the person — when “it becomes necessary to protect the health and welfare of other individuals or animals.” Accordingly, because a person bringing in an animal for treatment cannot under current law stop the veterinarian from reporting, it is unclear that mandating such reporting would significantly deter that person from bringing in the animal. Further, although around twenty states mandate reporting of suspected animal abuse or fighting, we are aware of no data showing a decline in treatment due to mandated reporting.


28 Connecticut (Conn. Gen. Stat. § 22-329b, requiring animal control officers to file a written report to the Commissioner on Agriculture if they reasonably suspect animal harm, neglect or cruelty); Louisiana (La. Stat. § 14:403.6, requiring state or local law enforcement officers and government employees to report animal neglect or abuse).

29 AAHA, Animal Abuse Reporting, note 23 above.

30 N.Y. Educ. Law § 6714.

31 AVMA, Animal Abuse and Neglect, [https://www.avma.org/KB/Policies/Pages/Animal-Abuse-and-Animal-Neglect.aspx](https://www.avma.org/KB/Policies/Pages/Animal-Abuse-and-Animal-Neglect.aspx). The AVMA also encourages states to pass legislation that make client/patient records relating to suspected animal abuse or neglect exempt from confidentiality restrictions. Id.

32 AVMA, Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics, note 24 above, at § V(a); see also id. at § V(f)(ii) (requiring veterinarians to report to the authorities if the actions of a former attending veterinarian “have clearly and significantly endangered the health or safety of the patient”).

33 N.Y. Educ. Law §§ 6714(2)(a)-(b).

34 See note 27 above.

35 Mary Lou Randour, American Psychological Association, What Every Clinician Should Know About the Link Between Pet Abuse and Family Violence 6-7 (2011), [https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.494.8218&rep=rep1&type=pdf](https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.494.8218&rep=rep1&type=pdf). In addition, while not
Veterinarians may also have concerns about a lack of expertise in identifying animal abuse, or about frivolous litigation from reporting suspected abuse. As an initial matter, “animal cruelty” is ultimately a legal, not veterinary, determination. That legal determination is generally made through the judicial system — by law enforcement, the district attorney’s office, and, ultimately, the judge or jury. Nor are veterinarians required to be “positive” before reporting. Rather, they are responsible for sharing their concerns about abuse or neglect to the appropriate authorities when they reasonably and in good faith suspect it. Training to recognize the symptoms of suspected abuse and neglect is now also widely available, though we encourage the legislature to promote further training on the topic — for instance, by requiring that resources on identifying abuse and neglect be made available on the website of the New York Office of the Professions website for Veterinary Medicine. Further, New York grants a veterinarian immunity from civil and criminal damages where the veterinarian has reported suspected abuse or discloses records about an animal’s condition and treatment based on a “reasonable and good faith” suspicion.

Notably, many in the medical profession expressed reluctance when states first passed laws requiring healthcare professionals to report child abuse. Yet such reporting is now the accepted norm in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. 

37 The Role of the Veterinarian, note 7 above, at 7. 
39 For example, the ASPCA conducts trainings in the clinical identification of animal maltreatment in veterinary colleges and continuing education seminars. Phil Arkow et al., Practical Guidance for the Effective Response by Veterinarians to Suspected Animal Cruelty, Abuse and Neglect, note 7 above, at 9. Textbooks are also available to assist practitioners in diagnosing animal maltreatment, and the AVMA provides veterinarians with numerous resources, including guidelines for veterinarians to respond to suspected animal cruelty, abuse and neglect. Id.; see also The Role of the Veterinarian, note 7 above, at 14. 
40 See New York State Education Department, Office of the Professions, Veterinary Medicine, http://www.op.nysed.gov/prof/vetmed/. 
41 N.Y. Educ. Law § 6714. 
42 Melanie A. Benetato et al., The Veterinarian’s Role in Animal Cruelty Cases, note 7 above, at 32. 
43 Id.
IV. RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that Education Law § 6714(2) mandate reporting suspected abuse of not just a “companion animal” but any “animal.” All animals can suffer abuse, a fact acknowledged by New York’s anti-cruelty statute, which prohibits abuse of any “animal.”

Indeed, this change is warranted even if the legislature decides to maintain discretionary reporting of animal abuse. In particular, because the existing statute provides that a veterinarian “may” report abuse of companion animals, that could imply that a veterinarian “may not” report such abuse for any other type of animals. But there is no reason that New York should prohibit abuse of all animals while allowing abuse reporting for only some animals.

In addition, the Committee recommends that the first sentence of Education Law § 6714(2) be amended to remove any ambiguity about the mandatory nature of reporting and to ensure consistency within the proposed legislation’s amendments. One way to do so is as follows:

A veterinarian licensed pursuant to this article, may disclose records, as defined in this section, concerning a companion animal as defined in section three hundred fifty of the agriculture and markets law which has received treatment by such veterinarian without the consent of the companion animal’s owner under the following circumstances:

V. CONCLUSION

For the reasons above, the New York City Bar Association’s Animal Law Committee urges enactment of the proposed legislation.
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44 N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 350(5) (defining “companion animals” as “any dog, cat, or any other domesticated animal normally maintained in or near the household of the owner or person who cares for such other domesticated animal”).
45 N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 350(1) (defining “animal” as “every living creature except a human being”).
46 See N.Y. Agric. & Mkts. Law § 353.