

WELLINGTON SPCA
INSPECTOR REPORT

IIGR09075

Complaint Reference No.

Building:
Street: 65 DURBAN STREET
Suburb:
Postal Code: 6849
Inspector: INSPECTOR ONE
Date of Inspection: 2026-08-03
Time of Inspection: 08:40

RESPONDENT'S DETAILS

Name: CHRISTO VAN DYK
Company:
Identification:
Email:
Tel 1:
Tel 2: 0813470599

REPORT

Access Granted By: E Van dyk
Comment:
Were Animals Seen on the Property: Yes
Relationship to Property Owner: Owner
Captured By: INSPECTOR ONE 2026-08-12 12:30

CHECKLISTS

WATER AVAILABLE	Yes
ADEQUATE SHELTER AVAILABLE	Yes
ADEQUATE SPACE AVAILABLE	Yes
CLEAN LIVING ENVIRONMENT	Yes
ANIMALS IN GOOD CONDITION	Yes
VETERINARY PROBLEMS / HEALTH CO	No
CONFINEMENT OF ANIMALS	Free roaming - in property

General Report Comments:

Inspection Report

Date Complaint Received: 24 July 2026 at 16:30

Inspection Date: 27 July 2026 at 10:41

Respondent: Dr. Christo van Dyk

ID Number: 7106165059088

Magistrate Authorisation

At approximately 08:00, Monia Stadler requested Worcester authorisation from the NSPCA on my behalf, which was received at approximately 10:41.

At approximately 11:00, Monia Stadler and I, Inspector Hugh Lewis, travelled to Worcester. We arrived at the Worcester Magistrate's Court at approximately 12:20 and waited for the magistrate for approximately one and a half hours. At approximately 14:00, I was authorised by the Magistrate of Worcester, who advised that she was in a hurry.

Inspection of Premises

At approximately 14:10, we arrived at 65 Durban Street, Worcester, and entered the premises, as the gate was open. We proceeded inside, where the owner of "Gertyjvr," a business operating from the same premises, granted us access.

We introduced ourselves to Gerty and explained the reason for our visit, as well as the nature of the complaint received. She advised that she did not wish to become involved, as doing so could compromise her professional relationship with Dr. Christo van Dyk, from whom she leased the premises for her business. Nevertheless, she agreed to escort us to the dogs, as the practice had already closed for the day.

We viewed the dogs through a glass window. Upon initial observation, I noted one tan, unsterilised female Pit Bull/Staffordshire Bull Terrier cross and one brown-and-white Pit Bull/Staffordshire Bull Terrier cross. Both dogs appeared to be in fair body condition. Gerty advised that both dogs were over eight years of age.

I asked Gerty whether the dogs had access to adequate shelter, and she confirmed that they did. She explained that the shelter was situated at the side of the yard and was therefore not visible from our location.

Both dogs approached us, and I observed what appeared to be a mild case of suspected fly strike affecting both ears of the tan Pit Bull/Staffordshire Bull Terrier cross.

Gerty further informed us that the brown-and-white dog, Rooies, had a veterinary appointment scheduled for Friday for further investigation, including a blood smear.

There were faeces present within the enclosure; however, the accumulation was not excessive. The area appeared clean, well maintained, and free from any obvious hazards.

I asked Gerty whether the dogs were neglected in any way. She stated that they were well cared for and explained that her children regularly visited the premises after school to play with them.

She further advised that there was a gym situated in front of the practice and that Dr. Christo van Dyk would occasionally be there.

We proceeded outside and looked through the windows of the gym area but found nobody present.

We then walked to the side of the property where Gerty had indicated the shelter was located.

However, we were unable to view it, as doors on both sides separated the front yard from the rear yard.

We attempted to contact Dr. Christo van Dyk using the telephone numbers available to us; however, both calls were diverted to voicemail, as the practice had already closed.

We returned to the premises, where Gerty once again granted us access. At this stage, she appeared visibly frustrated and explained that our repeated interruptions were delaying her work while she was attending to a client.

We asked whether she would be willing to provide us with Dr. Christo van Dyk's contact details. She declined, stating that she did not wish to become involved, as the dogs were not hers.

We subsequently contacted our NSPCA Liaison Unit Officer, Madelyn Venter, and informed her of our findings. Based on the information provided, she instructed us to issue a warning requiring veterinary treatment for the suspected fly strike affecting the tan dog's ears and to request a veterinary report for Rooies following the scheduled veterinary consultation.

Warning Issued

I, Inspector Hugh Lewis, issued Warning 123 requiring the owner to:

- Provide veterinary treatment for Rooies within 7 days and submit proof thereof in the form of a veterinary report.
- Provide appropriate veterinary treatment for the tan Pit Bull/Staffordshire Bull Terrier cross for the suspected fly strike affecting both ears within 7 days.

I followed several clients into the practice and informed Gerty that I would leave Warning 123 on the reception desk for Dr. Christo van Dyk. Gerty acknowledged this and indicated that she understood.

We thereafter departed from Worcester and returned to Wellington.

Email Correspondence

At approximately 16:00, we arrived back in Wellington. At approximately 16:25, I sent an email to Dr. Christo van Dyk requesting additional information and photographic evidence to assist in

concluding the investigation.

The email read as follows:

Good afternoon, Dr. van Dyk,

I trust you are doing well.

We have received an instruction from our governing body, the National Council of SPCAs (NSPCA), to conduct a welfare inspection of the two dogs at your practice in Worcester.

An inspection has since been carried out. We did not identify any significant welfare concerns that would substantiate the complaint received. However, as we are required to comply with the NSPCA's investigation procedures, we kindly request the following information in order to finalise and close the matter:

- The name, age, and sex of both dogs.
- Details of any veterinary treatment or medication they are currently receiving.
- Photographs of the shelter provided for the dogs, as we did not enter the rear section of the property during our inspection.

During the inspection, we noted that the tan-coloured dog appeared to have a mild case of suspected fly strike affecting her ears. We would appreciate it if this could be treated with an appropriate fly repellent, such as Shoo-Fly, or any other suitable veterinary product.

Overall, we found both dogs to be in fair body condition. They do appear to be elderly; however, age alone does not constitute a welfare concern or support the allegations made in the complaint.

We would appreciate it if you could forward the requested information at your earliest convenience so that we may conclude our investigation.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Feedback to Complainant

Feedback regarding the outcome of the inspection was provided to the complainant via email on 3 August 2026 at approximately 12:14.

Follow-up

On 3 August 2026 at approximately 08:44, Mrs. E. van Dyk responded to my email. She requested a copy of the complaint statement and provided the following information:

Goeiedag

Vertrou dit gaan goed

Hiermee Antwoord op onderstaande epos soos ontvang.

Mag ek asseblief n afskrif van die klagte staat aanvra.

Rooies- Reun 10 jaar

Griet- Teef 10 jaar

Exspot word aan hulle ore gesit elke 4 weke.

Honde ontvang Barvecto Elke 4 maande

Rooies behandeling

DoxyVet 300mg

Heptonic 200ml

Indien enige navraag kontak my gerus

Groete Mev E van Dyk

081 425 2436

Mrs. E. van Dyk also forwarded photographs via WhatsApp showing the dogs' shelter, water, food, veterinary medication, and tick, flea, and fly treatment products.

Telephone Conversation

I telephonically contacted Mrs. E. van Dyk and explained that I was not permitted to disclose any information relating to the identity of the complainant. She acknowledged and understood this explanation.

Based on the information provided, the veterinary treatment administered, and the photographic evidence received, I am satisfied that Mr. and Mrs. van Dyk complied fully with the requirements of Warning 123.

Conclusion

No evidence was found to substantiate the allegations of animal neglect. The dogs were observed to be in fair body condition, had access to food, water, and shelter, and the concerns identified during the inspection were appropriately addressed by the owners within the prescribed timeframe.

ACTIONS

NO ACTION REQUIRED

REPORT OUTCOMES

NO CONTRAVENTIONS OF THE APA -

CHECKLIST COMPLETED - SEE ATTA(

CASE FINALISED - NFA

NO WELFARE CONCERNS FOUND - N

INSPECTION ANIMALS

Description:

1 x DOGS (PITBULL X) - A STERILISED MALE CALLED 'Rooies' (COLOUR: Brown and white) CONDITION: Fair

Description:

1 x DOGS (PITBULL X) - A STERILISED FEMALE CALLED 'Griet' (COLOUR: Tan) CONDITION: Fair