Royal Hanneford Circus has failed to meet minimum federal standards for the care of animals used in exhibition as established in the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) has cited Royal Hanneford numerous times for failure to provide veterinary care and meet minimum space requirements. An elephant with Royal Hanneford rampaged during a performance, causing spectators to run for safety. Elephants with Royal Hanneford have been treated for a human strain of tuberculosis. As of October 2005, Royal Hanneford Circus no longer has its own USDA license and leases animal acts from other circuses, including Carson & Barnes Circus.*

*Contact PETA for documentation.

**November 30, 2016:** In the USDA consent decision and order issued to settle the April 27, 2015, AWA complaint, Royal Hanneford was assessed a civil penalty of $7,000 and ordered to “cease and desist from violating the Act and Regulations and Standards issued thereunder.”

**April 27, 2015:** The USDA filed an AWA complaint against Royal Hanneford for mishandling elephants, resulting in injuries to the elephants. Royal Hanneford leased elephants from Carson & Barnes Circus for a performance in March 2014. While three elephants were being escorted to an enclosure, the handlers lost control of one of them. Royal Hanneford employees had encouraged audience members to make loud noises, stressing the elephant and causing her to escape from the handlers, resulting in abrasions and lacerations to her right side. A second elephant also sustained lacerations, to her left and right sides. (See March 22, 2014.)

**March 22, 2014:** While Royal Hanneford Circus, appearing as Moolah Shrine Circus, was performing at The Family Arena in St. Charles, Missouri, elephants reportedly escaped from their handlers in the area where children were being given rides. They were loose for about 45 minutes and damaged multiple cars before the handlers were able to regain control of them.

**March 1, 2005:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to correct a previously identified noncompliance requiring a written protocol for elephant foot care and arthritis management. Royal Hanneford was also cited for failure to provide both Asian elephants with adequate foot care. The inspector wrote, “Most of Tina and Ina’s nails are overgrown and there is excessive tissue over their cuticles. One of Tina’s nails has a crack from the outside of her nail to the cuticle.” Royal Hanneford was also cited for failure to provide a record of tuberculosis tests.

**May 21, 2004:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to correct a previously identified noncompliance requiring a written protocol for elephant foot care and arthritis management and for failure to provide an adequate written program of veterinary care.

**June 24, 2002:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to provide all three of its elephants with adequate veterinary and foot care.

**December 18, 2001:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to provide three elephants with adequate veterinary care.

**October 9, 2001:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to have a complete program of veterinary care.

**July 9, 2001:** A USDA inspector noted that Royal Hanneford had no documentation to show that the elephants were being given rides. They were being subjected to loud noises, which would cause stress to the elephants. The inspector wrote, “[H]ousing does not fully meet the needs for considerable and complex social...

**April 12 and 13, 2008:** Royal Hanneford’s appearance in East Lansing, Michigan, featured elephants from Carson & Barnes Circus and its trainer Tim Frisco, who, in his capacity as animal-care director, was videotaped viciously attacking terrified elephants with sharp metal bullhooks and electric prods. Frisco instructed other trainers to hurt the elephants until they screamed and sink the bullhook into their flesh and twist it, and he cautioned that the beatings must be concealed from the public.

**April 19, 2001:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to provide all three of its elephants with adequate veterinary care. Two elephants were suffering from nail infections, a potentially life-threatening condition in captive elephants.
interactions of chimpanzees. The trainer stated that he keeps the chimpanzees in solitary confinement for the majority of the time so that they will be more motivated to perform. The inspector noted that the chimpanzees had sparse hair coats with bare patches and that the two adult chimpanzees didn’t have canine teeth. Kalmanson was also cited for poor lighting in the trailer where the chimpanzees were stored in cages.

**December 20, 2000:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to provide adequate veterinary care. The inspector wrote, "All three elephants are in need of foot care. The cuticles and pads of the elephants are overgrown and must be trimmed."

**April 13, 2000:** The USDA confirmed that a Royal Hanneford elephant named Tina had tested positive for tuberculosis and that the other two elephants, Ina and Chandra, had been exposed. The three elephants were returned to Royal Hanneford’s winter quarters for several months of tuberculosis treatment. A USDA inspector noted that “Tina is lean, with some slight loss of body condition” and suffers from ventral edema and a chronically infected nail. Chandra has chronic intermittent arthritis. The inspector noted that for a third time in the last four months, three people with exposure to the elephants failed to have tuberculosis tests. The inspector also wrote, “Other issues discussed with the licensee: adequate protection from sun and heat this summer, obtaining good quality hay during the summer, reducing stress, providing as much free access to outdoors and free unchained movement as possible, mental enrichment, skin care, bathing.”

**March 18, 2000:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to have five elephant handlers tested for tuberculosis.

**December 27, 1999:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to provide a veterinarian’s diagnosis and prescribed treatment for an elephant with infected nails and another with an arthritic hip. Royal Hanneford was also cited for failure to have five elephant handlers tested for tuberculosis.

**February 21, 1999:** An elephant with Royal Hanneford rampaged during a performance in Poughkeepsie, New York. According to eyewitnesses, the elephant left the ring and ran into the bleachers. In a panic, spectators tripped and fell trying to get away.

**February 11, 1999:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to provide elephants, who were in need of foot care, with adequate veterinary care and for failure to provide the elephants with adequate space. The inspector noted that the chains used on them were too short, preventing them from lying down, grooming themselves, and moving their feet. Royal Hanneford was also cited for feeding elephants poor-quality hay.

**October 14, 1998:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for insufficient veterinary care. The inspector noted, “The Elephant Tina’s front feet are in need of foot care.”

**September 14, 1998:** A zebra with Royal Hanneford escaped and was found by police wandering along a busy roadway in Charlotte, North Carolina.

**June 4, 1998:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for insufficient veterinary care. The inspector noted, “Chandra, the largest female elephant, is in need of foot care.”

**October 7, 1997:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for using inappropriate flooring in the dog and cat enclosures. The circus was cited a second time for not providing the dogs with sufficient space. The inspector noted that “a large black dog is housed in an enclosure that is 29”x25”x22” high, the dog is 23 inches long and 20 inches tall at the top of its head. The enclosure does not meet required floor space.” The circus was also cited for failure to have an exercise plan, identification, and records for the dogs.

**July 11, 1997:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failing to provide the dogs with sufficient space. The inspector noted that the dogs had less than 6 inches of headroom.

**March 22, 1996:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for not having records of medical treatment for the elephants’ feet.

**December 6, 1995:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for drainage problems in the elephant barn. The inspector noted, “Liquid (water & urine) was pooled at the back corner of elephant barn. … Pads and cuticles of elephants were overgrown.” This could cause serious problems for elephants, as their feet are prone to foot rot, which eventually can cripple them. The inspector also cited Royal Hanneford for failure to keep records of veterinary care.

**June 23, 1993:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for failure to provide a program of veterinary care.

**January 5, 1993:** During an attempted inspection, a USDA official noted that there was a “failure to make premises, animals & records available for inspection.”

**December 18, 1991:** The USDA cited Royal Hanneford for improper storage of animal food and bedding. Royal Hanneford was also cited for failure to dispose of waste safely, piling manure adjacent to hay pools at the back corner of elephant barn. The inspector noted, “All three elephants are in need of foot care. The cuticles and pads of the elephants are overgrown and must be trimmed.”
storage and animal barns. Citations were issued calling for the repair and cleaning of the elephant barn as well as for failure to provide a resident leopard with a balanced meal. Royal Hanneford couldn’t produce a complete plan of care for regulated animals or any records of veterinary visits or evaluations and was cited for inadequate veterinary care. Asian elephants Ina and Tina required toe and cuticle trimming, and the inspector suspected that Ina was suffering from a “skeletal deformity.”

**May 31, 1991:** Royal Hanneford was cited by the USDA for failing to provide a road show itinerary as previously requested and for being unavailable for a scheduled inspection at home.

**July 14, 1989:** A USDA inspector cited Royal Hanneford for unsanitary feeding equipment and placement of nutritional supplements.