Fake Service Animals and Risks to People and Trained Service Animals

Posted on September 18, 2018

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/fake-service-animals-and-risks-to-people-and-trained-service-animals/

Service Animals and the Growth of Fraudulent Representation

Service animals are receiving increasing attention all over the world. They are perfectly trained to support a disabled person, but increasing misuse and false representation of animals in public is becoming a serious concern. Many people use fake service animals, but it is against federal law to represent untrained pets as service animals. Fake service animals harm disabled people and create obstacles for legitimately trained working animals. Fake service animals are not trained to work in public and pose risks to people and legitimate service animals. Legislative measures should be taken to ensure the proper identification and certification of service dogs (Rodriguez et al. 2017).

The scope of service animals is multidimensional, but it has increased unnecessary questions regarding the identification and scope of service animals in society. These animals provide great convenience to people with disabilities and enhance their quality of life. The legislatures also cover these animals, but compliance must be maintained. Specifically, dogs and other animals are highly trained to perform any task for a person with a disability. Their training is a complex and expensive practice that is undertaken by experts. The experts consider the needs of every disabled person and then organize training sessions for them. The dogs are trained to perform specific tasks based on a particular disability so that they can assist the person according to his or her needs. Some animals are also trained to support people in more than one task so that they can perform different services for the disabled person.

Legal Definitions and the Responsibilities of Service Animals

The Americans with Disabilities Act defines a service animal as a dog individually trained to perform work or tasks for a person with a disability. In limited circumstances, miniature horses may also be accommodated under separate provisions. Emotional support, comfort, or companionship alone does not qualify an animal as a service animal under the ADA because the animal must be trained to perform a task directly related to the person’s disability.

Service dogs can guide people who are blind, alert deaf individuals to sounds, retrieve objects, open doors, provide balance, interrupt harmful behaviour, detect medical changes, or assist during psychiatric episodes. The exact task depends on the handler's disability. A person does not need to disclose a diagnosis publicly, and businesses are limited in the questions they can ask when the need for the animal is not obvious.

A legitimate service dog must also remain under the handler's control and should be housebroken. The ADA does not require perfection, but it permits a business to remove a service animal that is out of control and whose handler does not take effective action, or an animal that is not housebroken. The person must still be offered access to the goods or services without the animal.

Public Access and the Effects of Untrained Animals

A major reason for training a service dog is to prepare it for public access. Working dogs must remain calm in crowded, noisy, and unfamiliar environments. They learn not to bark unnecessarily, approach strangers, steal food, block pathways, or react aggressively to other animals. This behaviour allows the handler to participate in public life without creating danger or disruption.

An ordinary pet may behave well at home but become anxious or unpredictable in a restaurant, airport, hospital, store, or public transport system. If a pet is falsely presented as a service animal, it may bark, lunge, bite, urinate indoors, or interfere with a working dog. These incidents can injure people and make businesses suspicious of all service animals.

Fraudulent representation creates a particular burden for disabled handlers. They may face more intrusive questioning, denial of access, or hostility because staff and members of the public have previously encountered badly behaved pets. A person's independence can therefore be reduced by the actions of individuals who misuse service-animal protections.

Risks to Legitimate Service Dogs and Their Handlers

Untrained animals can distract or attack legitimate service dogs. A working dog must concentrate on the handler and may be monitoring medical or environmental conditions. Distraction can prevent it from providing an alert or assisting with mobility. An aggressive encounter may cause physical injury, fear, or long-term behavioural changes.

The financial consequences can also be severe. Service-dog training may require extensive time and resources. If a trained dog is seriously injured or becomes unable to work after an attack, the handler may lose independence while waiting for recovery or replacement. Veterinary expenses and retraining costs may also be substantial.

The handler may be placed directly at risk during an encounter. A person with limited mobility may fall while trying to separate animals. A blind handler may not be able to identify the source of danger quickly. Someone whose dog provides seizure, allergy, cardiac, or psychiatric alerts may miss critical assistance when the dog is distracted.

Emotional Support Animals and Public Confusion

Confusion also arises because emotional support animals and service animals have different legal roles. An emotional support animal provides comfort through its presence and may be protected in certain housing contexts under federal law. However, it does not generally have the same public-access rights as a service dog under the ADA.

Air-travel rules have also changed. The United States Department of Transportation now permits airlines to treat emotional support animals as pets rather than service animals. Psychiatric service dogs remain protected when they are individually trained to perform disability-related tasks. These distinctions are important because a psychiatric disability may be invisible, but the dog can still be a legitimate service animal.

Members of the public sometimes assume that an animal is fake because the handler does not have a visible disability. This assumption is harmful. Conditions such as epilepsy, diabetes, post-traumatic stress disorder, autism, and cardiac disorders may not be apparent. Fraud prevention should not encourage harassment or require people to reveal private medical information.

Identification, Certification, and the Limits of Documentation

The ADA does not require service dogs to wear vests, carry identification cards, or receive certification from a particular organization. Online companies may sell certificates, registrations, and equipment, but purchasing these items does not create legal service-animal status. Status depends on the handler's disability and the dog's individual training.

A mandatory national certification system could reduce some confusion, but it also creates risks. Disabled people may train their own service dogs, and requiring expensive professional certification could exclude individuals with limited resources. A centralized database might also raise privacy concerns and delay access to essential assistance.

A more balanced approach would focus on behaviour, task training, and enforceable penalties for intentional misrepresentation. Optional identification programs may help handlers who choose to use them, but documentation should not become a barrier to civil rights. Any certification system would need accessible testing, low or no fees, privacy protection, and recognition of owner-trained dogs.

Policy and Educational Measures

States can discourage fraud through laws that penalize people who knowingly misrepresent pets as service animals. Enforcement should distinguish deliberate deception from misunderstanding. Penalties may include fines, community service, or education about disability access. Serious cases involving injury, property damage, or repeated misconduct may require stronger consequences.

Businesses and employees also need training. Under the ADA, staff may generally ask whether the dog is required because of a disability and what work or task it has been trained to perform when the answer is not obvious. They may not demand medical records, require the task to be demonstrated, or ask about the nature of the disability.

Education should also explain that legitimate service animals can be removed for specific behavioural reasons. Staff do not need to tolerate aggression, uncontrolled barking, or a lack of housebreaking merely because someone calls an animal a service dog. Enforcing behaviour standards protects access for legitimate handlers.

Public campaigns can clarify the differences among service animals, emotional support animals, therapy animals, and pets. Therapy animals may visit hospitals or schools with permission but do not have general public-access rights. Clear terminology can reduce both fraud and unfair suspicion.

Ethical Responsibilities and Conclusion

People who falsely label pets as service animals may view the act as harmless, especially when they want to avoid fees or bring an animal into restricted spaces. However, the behaviour uses disability protections for personal convenience and shifts risks onto others. It can damage public trust and make everyday access more difficult for disabled people.

Businesses also have an ethical responsibility not to respond to fraud by excluding all animals or treating every handler as dishonest. Civil-rights protections remain necessary because service dogs enable people to work, travel, study, shop, and participate in community life. The solution must target misconduct without weakening legitimate access.

In conclusion, fake service animals create risks for the public, legitimate working dogs, and disabled handlers. The problem should be addressed through accurate education, behavioural enforcement, penalties for deliberate misrepresentation, and careful consideration of optional certification systems. Policies must preserve privacy and recognize invisible disabilities and owner-trained dogs. Protecting the integrity of service-animal access ultimately protects the independence and dignity of people with disabilities.

References

Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101–12213.

Rodriguez, K. E., Bibbo, J., & O'Haire, M. E. (2017). The effects of service dogs on psychosocial health and wellbeing for individuals with physical disabilities or chronic conditions. *Disability and Rehabilitation*.

U.S. Department of Justice. (2020). *Frequently asked questions about service animals and the ADA*.

U.S. Department of Transportation. (2020). *Traveling by air with service animals*.