

**IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABD
LUCKNOW BENCH LUCKNOW**

R.S.NO.2/1950

O.O.S. NO.1 OF 1989

Gopal Singh Visharad (Deceased)

Rajendra Singh

.....

Plaintiffs

Versus

Zahoor Ahmad & Others

.....

Defendants

STATEMENT OF D.W.1/1

SHRI RAJENDRA SINGH

**HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF ALLAHABAD, LUCKNOW BENCH,
LUCKNOW OTHER ORIGINAL SUIT No. 1 OF 1989**

Gopal Singh Visharad (Deceased)

Rajendra Singh

.....

Plaintiffs

Versus

Zahoor Ahmad & Others

.....

Defendants

Main statement, Affidavit Rajendra Singh–Plaintiff, under order 18 Rule 4
Code of Conduct

I, Rajendra singh, aged about 65 years, S/o late Shri Gopal Singh Visharad, Resident of Tulsi Park, Balrampur, District Balrampur, hereby make the following statement on oath:

1. That my father late Shri Gopal Singh Visharad had filed a suit No.2-year 1950 on the court of Hon'ble Civil Judge, Faizabad which was against Zahoor Ahmad and eight others. In the said suit, my father while filing the case against the defendants, had sought relief to the effect that the plaintiff has the right to have darshan of and offer prayers at Lord Ramchander at the birth place details of which are given below without any dispute and disturbance, as per his religious customs and rites and that the defendants 1 to 6 have no right to infringe upon this right.
2. That the father of the plaintiff has also requested for a permanent and continuous prohibitory orders against the defendants to the effect that the defendants and his associates should not remove the idols of Lord Ramchander from Ramjanmabhumi, details of which are given below and that they should not close the entry gate and the other passages of entry and exit to the Ramjanmabhumi and should not put any hurdles in the darshans and prayers.

Details of the disputed site

East -	The bhandar and chabutra of Janmabhumi
West -	Parati
North -	Sita Rasoi
South -	Parati

3. That my farther Shri Gopal Singh Visharad died on 28.12.1985 and after his death, I submitted an application to the effect that in lieu of my deceased father Shri Gopal Singh Visharad, who was the original plaintiff, my name should be substituted which was accepted by the Hon'ble Court on 22.02.1986 and now I am the original plaintiff in the said suit. I recognize the signature of Shri Gopal Singh Visharad on the original suit document No. 3/1(A)-3/4(A). I have seen him reading and writing and I am fully familiar with his signature and handwriting.
4. I recognize the signature of late Shri Gopal Singh Visharad – the original plaintiff on the rejoinder document No.A 236/1 to A 236/4 dated 5.12.52 as I am fully familiar with his handwriting.
5. That I fully accept the plaint and the rejoinder submitted by late Shri Gopal Singh Visharad.
6. Regarding the disputed property, the Court of Civil Judge, Faizabad had appointed Advocate Shri Shanker Lal, as commissioner who submitted his report along with the map on 25.05.1950 which is document No. 137 C –1-1376-6. The above application and map were ratified as evidence by the Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 20.11.1950. The map and the facts mentioned in the report submitted by Advocate Commissioner Shri Shiv Shankar Lal are wholly correct and have been shown correctly.
7. The original suit No.2 of 1950 submitted in the court of Civil Judge, Faizabad has been transferred to the Lucknow Bench of the Hon'ble High Court under the orders of the Hon'ble High Court and is now

under the consideration of the Lucknow Bench alongwith other suits. The original suit submitted by the plaintiff is registered as other Original Suit 1 of 1989 in the High Court.

8. The family of the plaintiff is follower of Sanatan Dharm. The father of the plaintiff used to live at the Swargdwar locality of Ayodhya alongwith his family and as per the tenets of his religion, he used to have darshans and offer prayers at the idols of gods and goddesses. The present plaintiff is Sanatan Dharmi also like his late father (original plaintiff) and offers prayers before gods and goddesses and goes for darshans of shrines.
9. My date of birth is 11th January 1939. I spent my childhood at Ayodhya only and my primary schooling, High School and upto the Intermediate level was done at Ayodhya and I passed my High School exam in 1955 from Maharaja Higher Secondary School, Ayodhya and the Intermediate examination in 1957 from the same school. In 1959, I got a job in the State Bank of India, Faizabad and after a few days, I was transferred to the State Bank Branch located in the Akbarpur Tehsil of Faizabad District. I continued working there till 1970 and thereafter I was promoted and I was transferred from District Faizabad to Faridpur, Bareilly.
10. In October 1970, I was transferred to the main branch of State Bank of India, Lucknow, where I worked for four years after which I was transferred to the Balrampur Branch of the State Bank of India. On 31st January, 1944, I took voluntary retirement and after retirement, I am permanently residing at Balrampur.
11. Ayodhya is the most ancient place of pilgrimage of India where Lord Shri Ram was born as an incarnation. The sanctity of Ayodhya is the Saryu river flowing to its north and it is world famous for several religious places and temples. In the Ramkot locality of Ayodhya – is the birth place of Lord Shri Ram where lakhs and lakhs of Hindus and those who believe in Lord Shri Ram go for darshan and offer prayers with full devotion.

12. That right from my childhood, I alongwith my parents, used to visit the temples at Ayodhya for darshan and prayers. At Ayodhya, I would regularly have darshan and offer prayers especially at Hanumangarhi, Kanakbhavan and the temple located at Janmabhumi. My father Shri Gopal Singh Visharad was staunch devotee of the Janmabhumi temple and it was his daily routine that after having his bath, he used to go regularly go for darshan of the temple at Janmabhumi and offer prayers there. In the evenings also, he along with his family used to visit the Janmabhumi temple alongwith other temples at the time of Aarti and Bhog and offer prayers there. He used to go upto the Garbhgriha without any interruption and have darshan and offer prayers there. A little before the Makar Skranti of 1950 – my father Shri Gopal Singh Visharad became unwell and, therefore, could not visit the temples for darshan and prayers. After recovering, when on occasion of Makar Skranti, he went to the Janmabhumi for darshan and pooja, the employees of the State Government stopped him from going inside where the idols of Lord Shri Ramchander and others were there. On making enquiries by my father, he came to know that the defendant No. 6 through his employees – i.e. defendant Nos. 7 to 9 having been unduly influenced by the unfounded and false bias and prejudice of defendant No. 1 to 5 and of others belonging to his religion had deprived the Hindu from their just and fair right of having darshan and offering prayers and defendant No. 6 because of the prejudice of defendant Nos. 1 to 5 declare that in future also, they will deprive the Hindus of their rights like this. As such there was every likelihood of unfair and illegal interference by the defendants in the exercise of the religious rights of the plaintiff and crores of Hindus and that there were doubts that the defendants would remove the idols of Lord Ram and others from their original place. It was with a view to protecting the religious rights of crores of Hindus that the said suit was filed. I have accepted the suit filed by my late father Shri Gopal Singh Visharad – the original plaintiff in order to protect my religious right because there was interference in my religious rights of having the darshan and offering of prayers before the idols of Lord Rama and others located at the disputed site.

13. The boundaries shown at the end of the plaint – inside the same boundaries, the idols of Lord Rama and others have been placed under the middle of the Bhavan under the 'Shikhar' in the Garbhgriha, where the original plaintiff and the present plaintiff and crores of Hindus and devotees of Lord Rama have been having darshan and offering prayers for thousands of years without any interruption whatsoever. All the Hindus, the devotees of Lord Rama, the original plaintiff and the plaintiff himself have been considering this to be the birthplace of Lord Rama. After offering prayers at the Janmabhumi, and thereafter having parikrama of the premises, they consider themselves blessed. The original plaintiff and the present plaintiff also have been having the darshans and offering prayers before the idols of Lord Rama and others and they have also been having parikrama of the Janmabhumi premises. In the Garbhgriha located in the disputed premises, there are pillars of 12 touchstones on which are inscribed the idols of gods and goddesses.
14. That for entering the disputed site, there was Hanumantdwar to the east flanked by pillars of touchstone which were two in number and on these pillars also idols of gods and goddesses were inscribed. To the north of the disputed property mentioned in the plaint was Sita Rasoi where the plaintiff has been going for darshans. To the east of the disputed site was the store (bhandar) of the Janmbhumi and Ram Chabutra where Sadhus and devotees in large numbers kept chanting hymns of Lord Rama. To the north of the Sita Rasoi was the Singh Dwar through which one could go to the north of the premises. To the south and the west of the disputed property, there was parati land through which the devotees have been performing parikrama of the Janmabhumi premises.
15. Everyday thousands of devotees of Lord Rama come to Ayodhya from every nook and corner of India and also from other countries of the world and they have their bath in the Saryu river and have darshans in the thousands of temples located at Ayodhya, prominent among them being the Hanumangarhi, Kanak Bhawan, birth place (Janmasthan) and Janmabhumi temples. At Janmabhumi in particular thousands of devotees have darshans everyday and put the

sacred earth dust of the Janmabhumi on their foreheads and do parikrama of the entire Janmabhumi premises.

16. Every year on the occasion of the Savan Mela at Ayodhya, there is a fair of lakhs of Hindus and devotees of Lord Rama. The devotees start pouring in the beginning of the Savan month and this goes on till the festival of Raksha Bandhan. All the devotees of Lord Rama coming there, take bath in the Saryu river, have darshans and offer prayers in temples particularly they have darshans of the idols of Lord Rama and others located in the Janmabhumi premises and offer prayers ther after which they have the parikrama of the Janmabhumi premises and offer prayers and thus consider themselves blessed.
17. Every year in the month of Kartik, a Kartik fair is held which goes on from Kartik Shukl Ekadashi till Kartik Purnima. In this fair also, lakhs of Hindus and devotees of Lord Rama assemble at Ayodhya. On this occasion, the devotees of Lord Rama do panchkosi and chaudah kosi parikrama. The devotees come from every nook and corner of India and from foreign countries also. Bathing in the Saryu river is the main attraction of the Kartik fair. The devotees of Lord Rama after having bath in the Saryu river have darshans and offer prayers. The devotees of Lord Rama have darshans and offer prayers before the idol of the Lord Rama at Janmabhumi temple at the birth place and as a matter of reverence put the earth dust of that sacred place on their foreheads and thereafter they have the parikrama of the Janmabhumi and consider themselves blessed.
18. Every year on the occasion of Ram Navmi, the birth festival of Lord Rama is celebrated on Chaitrashukl Navmi with great fanfare. On this occasion, the whole of Ayodhya and the Choudah Kosi and Panchkosi area located there is totally immersed in the colour of Lord Rama. The birth festival of Lord Rama is celebrated in every temple in which lakhs of devotees take part. These devotees come from all corners of India as also from abroad. The devotees of Lord Rama visit the Janmabhumi temple and have darshans of Lord Shri Rama in the temple and offer prayers there. They also put the earth dust of

the Janmabhumi on their foreheads and do parikrama of the janmabhumi and thus, consider themselves blessed.

19. Ayodhya occupies the first and foremost place among all the places of pilgrimage because Lord Rama was born there as incarnation of God and thereby did good to the whole mankind. Lord Rama and his birthplace in Ayodhya is the symbol of the faith and belief of the crores of Indians and devotees of Lord Rama. The plaintiff also has the same faith and belief in Lord Rama and accordingly, he has been and will always continue having the darshans and offering prayers before the idols of Lord Rama and other gods and goddesses located at the janmabhumi.
20. That even after the demolition on 6th December, 1992 of the building where Lord Rama was seated, he continues to be present there and the devotees and the plaintiff himself have been having darshans and offering prayers there.
21. That no defendant has the right to create any hurdles in the way of having darshans, performing pooja and parikrama before Lord Rama and other deities at the birth place and in the Janmabhumi premises and the suit is wholly justifiable for the passing of a decree in favour of the plaintiff.

Dated : 22nd July 1993
Witness/Plaintiff

Deponent/

Sd/-
(Rajendra singh)

I, the above mentioned deponent, do hereby testify on oath that the statements made by me in para No. 1 to 21 in this affidavit, have been written under my instruction which I have thoroughly read and understood. According to my knowledge and belief all the statements are true. May God help me.

Deponent/ Witness/Plaintiff

Sd/-
(Rajendra singh)

I, Puttu Lal Mishra, advocate know and recognize Shri Rajendra Singh, who has signed this affidavit this day the 22nd of July, 2003 in my presence.

Sd/-
(Puttu Lal Mishra)

Lucknow

Advocate

Dated 22nd July 1993

Plaintiff/Deponent

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW BENCH, LUCKNOW

(R.S.No. 2/1950)

O.O.S.No. 1 of 89

Gopal Singh Visharad (Deceased)

Rajendra Singh

.....

Plaintiffs

Versus

Zahoor Ahmad & Others

.....

Defendants

D.W. 1/1

RAJENDRA SINGH

The affidavit of the main examination of Rajendra Singh, aged about 65 years S/o late Shri Gopal Singh Visharad, R/o Tulsi Park, Balrampur, District Balrampur was submitted on page No. 1 to 9, which was taken on record.

On behalf of defendant No. 11 Nirmohi Akhara – arguments by Advocate Shri Ranjit Lal Verma begun under oath:-

X

X

X

X

X

My father Gopal Singh Visharad was not the original resident of Ayodhya but he had been living at Ayodhya since 1942. He was employed in the Samthar Estate of Janpad Jhansi and was the original resident of Samthar. He was a Kshatriya, wore a Janeu and was Sanathan Dharmi. He had come to Ayodhya because it is a place of pilgrimage. He was a devotee of Lord Rama and that is the reason he came to Ayodhya. At Ayodhya, he used to live in the Swargdwar Mohalla which is situated on the bank of the Saryu river. The distance of Ramkot Mohalla from Swargdwar would be about 2 kms. I was born and educated at Samthar and not Ayodhya. My father Gopal Singh Visharad practiced law at Faizabad but he lived at Ayodhya. I know about all the monasteries, temples and Akharas at Ayodhya. It is true that at Ayodhya, 95% temples are of the

Ramanandiya Sect and the remaining 5% temples are of other Acharyas. The revered God of the Ramnandiya Sect is Lord Shri Ram. At Ramkot Mohalla, the disputed site is at some height and below this Kot, the sites and temples of Nayak-Upnayak as mentioned in the Valmiki Ramayana are there – e.g. Hanumangarhi, Jamvant Teela, Mattgajendra, Nal –Neel etc. Hanumangarhi is the temple of Lord Hanuman. Hanumangarhi is under the Nirmohi Akhara. There are several other temples in the Hanumangarhi premises e.g. Thakur Ram – Janaki temple, Narsimha temple and Lord Shri Ram temple. There are about twelve temples in the Hanumangarhi premises. There can be several temples within a single Akhara and all these temples are run and managed by the Akharas only. There is a panchayat in an Akhara and pattees also. The Akharas are managed by the Panchayats. Akharas where there are Pattees – have Mahants and they manage the temples. Mahants are duly elected and there is no family legacy as such. I have heard of Digambar Akhara whose Mahant is Paramhans Ramchander Das. I have no knowledge about the Nirmohi Akhara. When my father was alive, I had no knowledge about the plaint, the suit and the evidence details of this suit. After the death of my father, when I submitted an application for substitution in this case, it was then that I had gathered details about this suit before February 22, 1986. In 1949, I was only 10 years old. At that time, I had got my senses and used to understand every thing. Prior to the incident of 22/23 December 1949, I used to go to the disputed site for darshan with my father. Two years prior to the incident of 22/23 December 1949, I had gone there. At the age of eight, I had started understanding Darshan, Prasad and Hanuman – Ram etc. It was at the age of 8, that for the first time, I had gone to the disputed site through the eastern door. After entering through the eastern door, there was a courtyard which was barricaded by an outer wall. Thereafter, there was a wall of iron bars on the west. Between the outer wall of the east and the wall of iron bars in the west, there was cemented floor. While entering from the eastern gate towards the left, i.e. towards the south, was the Ram Chabutra temple. On the said Ram Chabutra, there was a wooden

temple where the idol of Lord Rama was placed. On entering from the eastern side towards the rights, i.e. towards the north, there was the store (Bhandar Griha) over which there was a thatch. It is likely that some living accommodation might be there inside but I considered it as a store house (Bhandar Griha) only. Bhandar Griha means where the Prasada of the Lord is prepared. To the west of the Bhandar Griha, there were Char Charan Choolha (four foot – prints hearth) and Chakla –Belan made of marble. When I had gone to the disputed site for the first time, Lord Rama's idol was not there in the wall of iron-bars but people did go inside occasionally. There was no idol of any God in the inside of the iron bar wall. There was no idol of any deity under the dome (gumbad) nor was there any picture of any deity. It was not locked, i.e. there was no idol of the Lord there when the attachment of the disputed site took place, but there was a Lord there after it was locked. Prior to 1949, we used to go with our father for the darshan of Ram Chabutra. My father after having the darshan of the Ram Chabutra would sometimes go inside but I used to stay out. The witness read out his statement in para 2 of his affidavit and said that the boundary (Choudahi) mentioned therein relates to the year after 1949. My father used to go inside and pay obeisance there. The witness himself said that there were idols inside the pillars and my father used to have darshans of those idols also. The attention of the witness was drawn to para 3 of the plaint after reading which he said that when his father went to the disputed site for the darshan of Lord Rama, he was stopped. Prior to 1950, idol had come in the disputed site. I was not informed by my father because he was unwell. That Lord Rama had made his appearance in the disputed building. Whatever has been mentioned in para 3 of the plaint, is correct, i.e. on 14 January 1950, when my father went to the Jnmabhumi for darshan and prayers, defendant No. 6, i.e. the employee of the Government of U.P. prevented him from going inside where there was the idol of Lord Rama. It came to light then that defendant No.6 being influenced by the baseless and false prejudice of defendant Nos. 1 to 5 and his colleagues in collusion with his employees, i.e. defendant No. 7 to 9 had deprived the Hindus of their

relevant rights of having darshan and offering prayers. Prior to 16th January 1950, everybody was not permitted to have the darshan and offering prayers in the disputed building, i.e. below the building with three domes (gumbad). Some people used to go there after taking permission but so far as darshan is concerned, they used to have it through the wall with iron bars. I had no knowledge whether the middle portion of the disputed building had been attached as per the proceedings under section 145. I have no knowledge about the Suit No.5/1989 of Bhagawan Shri Ram Lala Virajman etc. versus Rajendra Singh and others. In my statement in the affidavit, I have made mention of the map which was prepared by the advocate/Commissioner.

The witness after seeing the map filed with his plaint document No. 136C-1/6 said that the Ramchabutra shown in the map is the same on which there was the idol of Lord Rama and he used to go for the darshan of the same and the Bhandar Griha mentioned in the map is also the same of which he had made mention in his statement above. Similarly, the Sita Rasoi mentioned in the map is also the same place which had the Chakla- Belan and four foot-prints. The witness said, "I have no knowledge about the sumitra Bhawan, which had been shown in this map. The report annexed with the map (the witness said this after seeing document No. 136C-1/4) was read by me." He said that he had seen Sumitra Bhawan in front of which on a Shilalekh four and Sumitra Bhawan is mentioned and that is the temple of Sheshavatar Lakshamnji. A similar Shilapatt is there on the eastern door of the Ramjanmabhumi and on that "Shri Ramjanmabhumi Nityayatra" is mentioned.

The learned advocate who was arguing the case showed to the witness the photograph Nos. 44 and 45 of the coloured album document No. 200C-1 filed in other original suit No. 4/89, on seeing which the witness said that the shiapatts shown therein were the same about which he had made a statement above. On seeing photograph No. 57 of the same he said that, this is the picture of

Ramchabutra temple. On seeing photograph No. 71 and 72 of the same very album, the witness said that the places shown therein are the same where I had stated Chakla-Belan and four foot-prints were. In the south-east corner under the papal tree inside the boundary wall, was Shankar Darbar in which the idols of Ganeshji, Shankerji, Nandeshwar and Parvatiji were there. On seeing photograph Nos. 59 and 60, the witness said that those pictures are of the same place which he had mentioned as Shankar Darbar. Near the Sitakooop was a Shilapatt on which was written Sitakooop and he had seen that. The same very Sitakooop has been shown in the south-east in Commissioner-map 136C-1/6. The witness added, "When we used to go for darshan of the Sitakooop we used to take the holy water of this koop (well). I do not know whether in the Puranas, whether there is any mention of Sita Koop or not. In the first gate of the Janmabhumi which is in the east and which is called the Hanumatdwar, two stones are fixed on which are inscribed the idols of some gods and goddesses, but of which gods and goddesses these idols are, I cannot say". On seeing photograph Nos. 45 and 46 of the same album, the witness said that those were the photographs of the same touchstones and added that similar touchstones were fixed in the interior portion also. People have parikrama of the Janmasthan. The witness said that he also had done parikrama and he had seen other devotees also doing the parikrama.

The witness said that after January 1950 also he had gone there to perform parikrama and pooja. After 1950 when he went to have the darshan of Ram Chabutra temple, Sitakooop, Sitarasoi and Shiv Darbar, he could have the darshans without anybody stopping him, i.e. there were no restrictions from the police in having the darshans of those places. The police restrictions were on offering prayers in the inside portion of the iron bar wall or on offering prayers inside the Janmabhumi temple. Whenever he and other devotees went to the above mentioned places for prayers etc., they would buy Batasha, fruit and flowers from the eastern gate where it was sold. It is true that at the Ram Chabutra temple, the pujariji used to give them

Prasada after the bhog ritual. The witness said that he had not seen any devotee offering clothes or money. Pujariji used to give Charanamrat also. The witness said that he had never gone to the Ramchabutra temple for prayers etc. at a time when aarti was being performed or temple bells were ringing. There was no pujari at Sita Rasoi and Shiv Darbar – the devotees on their own used to make offerings of Prasad and money. The Prasad and cash of which the people made offering at Sita rasoi and Shiv Darbar would not be found there the next day. Some Sadhus appeared to be living at store (Bhandgriha). As and when he went for darshan to Ramchabutra, he came across the same pujari (priest) over and over again. Usually, he used to go for darshan in the evening – as such the same puajari used to be there – it is likely that during day time, only one pujari was getting prayers etc. done. Till 1959, he used to live at Ayodhya permanently and thereafter, he was transferred to Akbarpur. Since Akbarpur is only fifty miles away from Ayodhya, he (witness) used to visit Ayodhya once a week for darshan. Till 1959, he used to go there four to five times a week. Whenever he went to the disputed site, Sadhu – Vairagis of Ramanandi Sect could be seen there. He got familiar with the pujari whom he used to meet at the time of darshan. He used to recognize him. Pointing towards Mahant Bhaskar Das, who was present in the court then, the witness said that he (the said Mahant) used to meet him whenever he went for darshan. The witness said, “In Section 22 of the reply filed by my father. It has been correctly mentioned that after 1934, there was no Namaz in the disputed building”. The fact mentioned in section 31 of the replies that, “If and when any Muslim tried to assert his right, the same was opposed and those living there beat them away from there” means that people belonging to the Ramanandiya Sect and Vairagis put up this resistance. My father and my grand father had told me that in 1934, Hindu-Muslim riots had broken out at Ayodhya. I came to know this also that these riots took place in the context of the disputed building and several Muslims were killed in those riots. I came to know this also that after the 1934 riots, a sense of awe and terror had overtaken the Muslim community and they were afraid of

going towards the disputed building. I do not know whether it were the Hindus only from whom riot-tax was charged. My father also did not tell me anything about this. I recognize the signature of my father Shri Gopal Singh Visharad.”

The word ‘Devsthal’ means the abode of the God. In my plaint, document No. 242C, which is the Vakalatnama – on that the signature of my father and Advocate Shri Pindi Das Goswami are there. Whichever temple I visited at Ayodhya – had idols placed there – i.e. no temple was without an idol. Whenever I went to the disputed site, I found people from outside Ayodhya doing recitals (Path), devotees get Havan and Bhandaras also done. Such Havan and Bhandara used to be got done though the Sadhus living at the disputed site. Such Path- havan and Bhandara used to be organized on occasion of three famous fairs of Ayodhya – i.e. Sampuran Kartik and Lord Rama’s marriage. In such Havans and Bhandaras, mostly devotees from Bihar and Gujarat had faith and at times even from Delhi devotees came and organized Path etc. I have not seen the pilgrims of Karnataka and Andhra. May be they also visited Ayodhya on such occasions, of course pilgrims from Madras did come. I can recognize them from their dresses. Three important fairs at Ayodhya are organized in the months of Savan, Kartik and Chaitra. In Chaitra, a fair is organized at the disputed site on the occasion of Ramnavmi which attracts the largest number of people. During the fair, the Singhdwar which opened out near the Sitarasoi and the devotees would enter from the eastern door and make their exit from the northern door. On the occasion of the Ramnavmi fair, Panjiri Prasad used to be given to all the devotees in the Ramjanmabhumi temple. The distribution of this prasad was organized by the pujaris living at the disputed site. In para 12 of my affidavit, the reference to Aarti means that the pujaris present at the dispute site used to perform Aarti by ringing the temple bells and blowing the conch shell and at the same very time lighted a lamp also. As I have stated above in the Bhandar Grih and in the temple at the disputed site, the total number of sadhus and pujaris whom I saw was 5 to 6. The temple known as

Sakshi Gopal is situated towards the north – eastern corner of the eastern door of the disputed building. The crossing opposite the Sakhshi Gopal temple is called the Janmasthan Chauraha. To the north of the road across the disputed site is the Gurdartar Janmasthan, Sitarasoi temple. This Janmasthan temple has nothing to do with the disputed site.

On page No. 31 and 115 of the file pertaining to the suit regarding plaint No. 145CRPC – has the signature of my father. 20 – 22 days before the incident of 22/23 December, 1949, sadhus and saints in large numbers had collected and the paath of Ramayan was going on continuously. It was heard that some people of Muslim religion from Faizabad would come and oppose the Kirtan and Paath of Ramayan being held there. However, no such group came there. In section 25 of the reply filed by my father, it has been correctly mentioned that being influenced by the false statements of defendant No.1 to 5, action under section 145 Cr.PC, was taken to stop the Kirtan and Paath. I have heard that the Chairman of the Faizabad Municipal Committee, Babu Priya Datta Ram was appointed the Receiver of the disputed site. I do not remember correctly whether my father had filed this suit before or after the appointment of the Receiver. I do not remember the date of appointment of the Receiver. In his plaint, my father had made a written request that the idol installed at the disputed site should not be removed and there should be no restriction on offering prayers there. After the demolition of the disputed building, the idol of Lord Rama is still there as has been mentioned by me in pare 12 of my affidavit. In 1950, sometime prior to the Makar Sakranti, when my father was prevented from going to the disputed site, the idol of Lord Rama was present there. However, I cannot say since when that idol was there nor can I say who got theat idol installed. In pare 13 of my affidavit, I have got this written that according to what I have heard for thousands of years, crores of Hindus and devotees of Lord Rama have been offering prayers etc. there and all this was told to me by my father and grand father. I cannot say that in every temple there is a Sarvarakar or

Mahant but a pujari is necessarily there in every temple. According to my information, in the bigger temple, there is a Mahant while in a smaller temples, there are pujaris who act as managers. In the northern door of the disputed building, there were pictures of two lions and in between was the picture of some bird. I do not remember whose picture was there in the eastern door. The picture of lion and bird in the northern door had been inscribed in the wall itself. It is true that Nirmohi Akhare was adjoining the Ramjanmabhumi.

(The argument concluded by Shri Ranjit Lal Verma, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 11, Nirmohi Akhara.)

Statement read and verified

Sd/-

(Rajendra Singh)

22.07.2003

This was dictated by me and typed by the Stenographer in the open court. Be present for cross-examination on 23.07.2003 in continuation of this.

Date 23.07.2003D.W.1/1 – Sh, Rajendra Singh

(In continuation of the argument held before the Hon'ble full Bench on 22.07.2003 – the cross examination of D.W.1/1 Shri Rajendra Singh began under oath)

(Argument began by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of defendant No.1/1 – Farooq Ahmed).

X X X X X

When was Babri Masjid constructed, whether it was constructed or not - I do not know. I never saw or heard any Namaz being performed at the Babri Masjid. In 1949, there used to be no Namaz in the Babri Masjid. I do not know anything about this that in 1949 people had forcibly entered into the Babri Masjid and placed the idol of Lord Rama there. I do not have any knowledge that in 1949, the SO had lodged any report in this regard. In 1949, I had heard that Lord Rama had made appearance in the Garbh Griha. After the appearance of Lord Rama, when restrictions were imposed on my father for going there, he had filed a suit for going to the Garbhagriha. There was no case regarding placing of idol. I have no knowledge regarding this whether in 1949, any arrests were made or not. My father was not present at the disputed site when idols were placed there. I do not know whether or not idols were placed on the night of 1949. In 1949, my father was alive and at that time, he was about 46 years of age. I do not know whether towards the end of 1949 anybody had entered in the Babri Masjid or not and nor was I present on any such occasion. I am 65 years of age now and in 1949, I was just ten years of age. In this suit – first my father was the plaintiff and after his death, I am the plaintiff. In the suit, his claim is not that it was a Masjid and that they should get it. In 1528, Mirbaki had tried to construct a mosque but he could raise only a structure and could not give it the shape of a mosque. It is wrong to suggest that from 1528

to 1949, the disputed building was being used as a mosque. It is also wrong to say that after the placing of idol in 1949, Namaz stopped being read in the disputed building. I do not know this also that when the idol appeared in the disputed building, the next day was Jumma (Friday congregation). I also do not know that the next day the City Magistrate had come and had said that he would have the Masjid vacated in one day. I do not know this also that the City Magistrate had told the Muslims to after the Friday Namaz somewhere else. It is wrong to say that I have given any false evidence.

(Argument by Advocate Shri Abdul Mannan on behalf of defendant No. 1/1 Farooq Ahmed concluded).

Arguments on behalf of defendant No. 10 Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. begun by Advocate Shri Zaffaryab Jilani.

X X X X X

It was at the age of 8 that I had gone to the disputed building for the first time with my father. At that time, I had gone upto the Ramchabutra in the disputed premises but my father had gone inside the wall of the iron – bars. It was morning time and to the east of the iron-bar doors, there were two doors with iron bars were not locked and they were just latched. When my father had gone inside the iron-bar wall and entered the disputed building – at that point of time, nobody else was there. During the period between my going to disputed building for the first time and the time when there was police vigil over there, I have been to the disputed site only once and that too in the evening after the sunset, there was no light in the disputed building at that time and as a matter of fact, till that time, electricity light had not been fixed in the disputed building. At that time, there was gas light at Ramchabutra in the disputed building. I had gone there in the evening alone and not with my father. On that day, I did not notice whether both the doors of the iron-barred wall were locked

or not. I also did not notice whether there was anybody in the disputed building or not.

I will also not be able to tell as to how much time before 14 January 1950, the police vigil on the disputed building had started. Prior to the police vigil on the disputed building, I had gone there towards the end of 1948. A year after the police vigil on the disputed building, I had gone there once again. So long as I was at Ayodhya, i.e. till 1959, I used to go to the disputed premises once in a month. Between 1950 and 1959, whenever I went to the disputed site, nothing was visible inside the door or the iron-barred wall but it appeared that something was placed there which I thought was Lord Rama's idol and thus, I used to have darshan. At that point of time, I had no idea as to how big the idol of Lord Rama was inside and what type of idol it was. I had also no idea whether it was the idol of Lord Rama only or the idol of Lakshman Ji and Sita Ji was there or not. From the place near the door of the iron-barred wall where I used to stand and the place where the idol appeared to be placed, the distance was about 12-15 yards. It appeared that the idol was placed on some throne. From outside, it was difficult to guess whether that throne was adjoining the wall or was at some distance. At this point of time, the learned Advocate arguing the case drew the attention of the witness to photograph Nos 152, 153, 154 filed with document No. 200C-1 of other original suit No. 4/89, on seeing which, the witness said that, at that time, i.e. between 1950 and 1959, the throne inside the building was placed in the same manner as shown in the photograph. In this photograph, the throne is more clearly visible whereas it could not be seen that clearly at that time.

Between 1986 and 1992, I have been to the disputed building 2-3 times, but I do not remember whether the throne was the same or not as shown in these photographs. Between 1986 and 1992, I had the darshan of the throne from a distance of 5-6 feet. The height of the idol of Lord Rama placed on the throne was three quarter of a feet. I could not see the idols of Sitaji, Lakshmanji and Hanumanji on

the throne at that time. After the lock of the disputed building was opened, it was a year and a half after that, that I had gone to the disputed building for the first time, and when on 6th December 1992, the disputed building was demolished, I had gone to the disputed building for the last time, a year and a half prior to that. Between 1986 and 1992, whenever I went to the disputed building, I had gone upto inside the door beneath the middle dome (gumbad). I never went inside the door below the northern and southern dome (gumbad). In the middle door of the disputed building six pillars of black stone could be seen. Then he said that not 6 but 8 pillars could be seen. The remaining four pillars would also be there in the middle door but I did not notice them. Between 1986 and 1992, whenever I went to the disputed building, I stayed there for two to three minutes and after having darshan of Lord Rama, I used to return. At that time, I did not get an opportunity to see other things in the disputed building. On seeing the photograph document paper No. 154C-1/13 of the disputed structure enclosed with the report of the Commissioner filed in the same suit, the witness stated that the picture appeared to be that of the corner inside the Garbh Griha. In this picture, a throne is placed on three stairs over which there is a small idol but in this picture, it is not clear whether the idol of Lord Rama is placed near the throne or not. Between 1950 and 1959, when I used to have darshan through the iron-bar door of the disputed building, the three stairs shown in this photograph could not be seen because it used to be dark inside. Between 1959 and 1988, I had gone to the disputed site 10-12 times. After 1986, whenever I went for darshan there, the stairs shown in the photograph could not be seen because of the darkness there. However, one could guess that something was lying there. Between 1950 and 1986, I never saw any curtain on the middle door of the disputed building used to be drawn in the afternoon. Whatever I have stated above about a curtain being drawn in the afternoon, relates to the position, as it existed after 1950. I have no knowledge whether there used to be any curtain on the door below the domes (gumbads) in the north and the south. Ever since I started going to the disputed premises, from then till 1986, I had gone

there in the morning three to four times between 8 and 9, I have gone to the disputed premises both in summer and winter in the morning. I did not notice that when I went to have darshan at 8 or 9 in the morning, whether the sunlight reached the western wall inside the building. It is wrong to state that at 8 or 9 in the morning, the sunlight passing through the doors of the gumbads reached inside western wall of the building and that everything below the dome (gumbad) was clearly visible. At this stage, the learned advocate arguing the case drew the attention of the witness to photograph Nos. 84 , 85 and 86 of document No. 200C-1 filed with other original suit No.4/89, on seeing which the witness stated that he had not seen the kind of curtains shown in the photograph. On seeing photograph Nos. 99 to 100 of the same album, the witness said that since he had gone to the building in the morning and evening, he had not seen the drawn curtains as shown in the photographs.

On seeing photograph No. 66 of the same album, the witness stated that the thatched roof visible in the photograph is above the Ram Chabutra and the rear, i.e. the southern portion of the Chabutra of the disputed premises. I cannot say whether in photograph No. 63 and 64, the same thatched portion was there as shown in photograph No. 66. In photograph No. 56 and 57, the front portion, i.e. the northern portion of the same thatch, is visible which has been shown in photograph No. 66. The tin shed visible in photograph No. 56 is that of the Bhandargrih. The lower portion is the open part of the front, i.e. the southern side. The tin shed in photograph No. 59 is that of the southern-eastern corner of the disputed premises. I do not know whether the front portion opposite the tin shed in photograph No. 56 is of eastern side or not. I have no knowledge whether this tin shed was constructed in the south of the southern door of the iron-barred wall after 1950. To say that the tin shed visible in photograph No. 56 is not a part of the Bhandargrih - I cannot say whether it is right or wrong. It is correct to say that the door of the iron – barred wall shown in photograph No. 77 is the door beneath the northern gumbad (dome). In my opinion, this is the door beneath the middle

dome. The door visible in photograph No. 79 is not the door below the southern dome of the disputed building but the door below the northern dome. The stairs shown in photograph No. 83 were towards south of the disputed building. In photograph No. 81 and 82 stairs and trees are, no doubt, visible, but one cannot make out their location. I cannot say that the trees which one can see in photograph Nos. 79 and 80 are the same ones shown in photograph No. 81 and 82. This is correct that the small wall opposite the wall in the photograph No. 79 and 80 is the southern wall of the disputed courtyard. The door visible in photograph No. 79 and 80 is the door of the courtyard below the southern dome and not the northern door as I had wrongly stated above which is about one foot above the floor.

I do not know whether in 1950 Shri Bashir Ahmed Khan, Pleader/Commissioner had filed some photographs in this case or not. I cannot say that the small wall which can be seen in photo document No. 154/16 is the wall constructed on the same chabutra which is visible in photo No. 79. It is correct to say that the status of the disputed building as shown in photo document No. 154/7 and 154/10 is that of 1950. This is correct to say that the gate visible in photo document No. 154/5 is the northern gate of the disputed premises. It is also correct to say that the status as shown in the photo is that of the year 1950. In the same photograph, a chabutra is visible from the southern side but I cannot say whether it was grave or not. I cannot make out whether or not the upper portion of the building visible in photo document No. 154/12 is the upper portion of the western wall of the disputed building. The black stone pillars fixed in the inside doors of the disputed building, I had seen them closely at the time of having darshans. As I have said above, it took me 2-3 minutes to have darshan during which period, I saw those pillars were fixed outside the middle door while two were fixed inside the same door. The rest of the four pillars were fixed in the eastern wall below the middle dome of the disputed building. I had seen the inside four pillars standing near the middle door. The curtain which is visible in

the upper portion of the opposite door in photo No. 103 of album paper No.200C-1 used not to be there always. I cannot say from which location I had the darshan of Lord Rama. I also cannot say whether I had the darshan from the place where a gentleman in sherwani can be seen in photograph No. 103. I cannot make out whether the gentleman in black coat in photograph No. 117 is at the western corner of the middle door or he is inside. When I went inside the disputed building for darshan, perhaps there was an iron barrier in the western corner of the middle door beyond which the devotees were not permitted to go. I am not sure whether the picture of Lord Rama visible in photograph No. 116 was in the northern or southern wall of the middle door but I do remember vividly that a picture was hung there. I cannot say whether pictures of any deities were inscribed on the 8 pillars I had seen inside the disputed building. In photo Nos. 115 to 120, pictures of deities are not visible in photo Nos. 115 to 120. Similarly, in photograph Nos. 121 to 127, no pictures of any deities are visible and similar is the case with photograph Nos. 121 to 127, no photograph of any deities are visible. In the pillars shown in photo Nos. 139 to 147, no photograph of any deity is visible. In the pillars in photo Nos. 160 to 167, some picture, figure is there in the portion painted red but since that picture is also in red colour, it is not easy to make out – when I had seen these pillars on the spot at that time they were not painted red and therefore, I could see a figure inscribed on these pillars. It was in 1989 that I had seen these pillars for the last time. The red colour seen on the pillars in photo Nos. 176 to 200 was not there in 1989 when I saw these pillars on the spot. In the pillars in photograph Nos. 176 to 200, whichever pillars have been painted red, on pillar Nos. 176, 177, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 187, 188, 189, 190, 193, 194, 195, 196, 199 and 200, pictures can be seen. Of all the pillars, it is only in picture No. 199 that picture of Lord Hanuman is visible on the pillar while it is difficult to make out which deity's picture is there on the remaining. I cannot say whether or not in the above – mentioned pictures, all those pillars are shown which I had seen in the disputed building. Of course, whatever pillars I had seen myself in the disputed building – their photos are visible in the

photographs under reference. I cannot make out from the photos as to which are the pillars fixed on the Hanumat Dwar nor can I say as to which photographs are of those eight pillars which were fixed in the middle door.

Statement read and verified

Sd/-

(Rajendra Singh)

23.07.2003

This was dictated by me and typed by the Stenographer in the open court. In continuation of this, be present before the Commissioner on 24.07.2003 for additional cross- examination.

Date 23.07.2003

D.W.1/1 – Sh. Rajendra Singh

Before Commissioner Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Magistrate/Officer on Special Duty – Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Commissioner appointed vide order dated 23.07.2003 of Hon'ble Full Bench)

(In continuation of 23.07.2003, the cross – examination of D.W. 1/1 Shri Rajendra Singh on oath was begun by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani – the learned advocate of defendant No. 10)

I have not seen the remaining four pillars out of the ten black pillars in the disputed building. The remaining four black pillars were fixed on the pillars of the western wall of the disputed building. When I went to see them, they were covered. Subsequently, he said that when he went inside the disputed building for darshan, he had seen those four pillars fixed there. All the four pillars which were fixed in the western wall could be partly seen from outside i.e. from the iron-

barred wall. From the iron-barred wall, one could not make out whether there were any pictures carved out in those pillars or not. In the last sentence of para 13 of page No. 6 of my affidavit of my main examination, as stated, out of 12 touchstone pillars, in eight of them I had seen the idols of deities while in the remaining four, I had not seen any idols.

The witness was shown photo No. 9 of coloured album document No. 200C-1 by the learned advocate arguing the case, on seeing which, the witness stated that it is the picture of the first gate of the disputed building. On seeing photo Nos. 31 to 35, the witness said that these are the pictures of the rear portion of the disputed building. On seeing photo Nos. 40 and 41 of the said album, the witness stated that these are the pictures of the Singh Dwar and on seeing photo No. 57, the witness said that the tiles visible in the photograph were seen by him in 1957-58 fixed like that only. On seeing photo Nos. 68, 72, the witness stated that the tiles visible in the photograph, he had seen them in 1987 or 1988. He said that he did not remember whether or not in 1957-58 or from 1957-58 to 1987-88, he had seen those tiles fixed there. On seeing photo No. 99 of same album, the witness stated that appeared to be the main gate of the disputed building. He stated that he did not remember whether or not he had seen on the site the signboard on which Janma Bhumi Sewa samiti is written. The width of the middle door of the disputed building would be about 9 or 10 feet. About the doors flanking, the middle door, i.e. the northern and southern door or it was the same. On seeing photograph Nos. 128 and 129 of the same coloured album, the witness stated that he could see the picture of Guru Dutt Singh in those photos. He said that he had not seen that picture of Guru Dutt Singh in the disputed building. He had seen the northern and southern wall of the disputed building, i.e. the building with three domes, from inside. At the time, he had seen those walls, the picture of Guru Dutt Singh was not there on the walls. On seeing photo No. 148, the witness said that he can see somebody's face in that photo but can not tell whose face it was. On seeing photograph No. 153, he

said that he can see some people standing in the picture but he can not recognize any of them. Similarly, he can not recognize the person in photograph No. 154. On seeing photograph No. 156 of the same album, the witness stated that in that photograph the floor of the lower portion of the dome of the disputed building was visible. This type of flooring is slightly different from the flooring of other temples, i.e. he had not seen this style of flooring in any other temple. On seeing photograph No. 103, the witness stated that the floor in that photo was different from the floor of photograph No. 156. The gate visible in photo No. 201 is that of the disputed building and it is the southern gate of the iron-barred wall. When I used to enter from the main gate, i.e. the Hanumat Dwar, this gate was opposite to that gate. This photograph has been taken from the western side, i.e. from the domed building side. On seeing photograph No. 205, the witness stated that in that photo, he can see his advocate Shri Puttu Lal Mishra but he can not say of which place that photograph is and from where it had been taken.

I do not know how many times after 1986, my advocate Shri Puttu Lal Mishra had gone to the disputed site under the orders of the court. I do not know whether or not he ever went to the disputed site for inspection. I had never got any such information that there were some such orders of the court under which the party concerned and his advocate had to go to the disputed site for inspection. I have no knowledge about it that after on the spot inspection done by Shri Shiv Shankar Lal, Advocate Commissioner whether or not any examination/ inspection of the disputed site was done.

The witness was shown photograph No. 37 of black and white album document No. 201 by the learned advocate arguing the case, on seeing which, he said that he did not remember whether or not the white coloured tiles on which something is written in black were there in 1957-58. When he had gone to the disputed building for darshan after 1986, he had seen those tiles. On seeing photo no. 39, the witness stated that on the canopy type thing visible in the photo,

Kaushalya Rasoi appears to have been written. The witness stated that he did not remember whether or not in 1957-58 when he had gone to the disputed building, this canopy was there. When after 1986, he had gone there, he had seen that canopy. At Kaushalya Rasoi canopy, he had also seen Sita Rasoi written in 1957-58. I had known this place by the name of Sita Rasoi. I consider this canopy (Mandap) both as Sita Rasoi and Kaushalya Rasoi and according to me, there is no difference between Sita Rasoi and Kaushalya Rasoi. Prior to seeing photo No. 39, I did not know that this mandap is Kaushalya Rasoi. In the affidavit of my main examination wherever I have mentioned Sita Rasoi, I mean Sita Rasoi and not Kaushalya Rasoi. The witness was shown photograph No. 81 and 82 of the same album, on seeing which, he stated that in that picture, there is the framed picture of Lord Rama over the throne and beneath that an idol is placed. The idol shown in these pictures is not clear and it is about this idol that he had said that its height is 9 inches. He did not see the idol lying in the throne at the Ramchabutra. At Ramchabutra, he had seen the idols of Lord Rama and Sita which was not of their childhood and in front of this idol he had seen the idol of Lord Rama pertaining to his boyhood which was about 4 inches in height, while the idol of Lord Rama and Sita would be about 5 inches high.

I have seen some papers filed by some parties in this case. Out of the five Muslim defendants of this case, I have seen one document filed by one defendant Zahoor Ahmed. I have also seen the reply filed by Zahoor Ahmed. I have not seen any recorded evidence filed by any of these Muslim defendants. I do not know as to how many and which papers were filed by these people in this suit in 1950 or thereafter. The witness stated that out of these five Muslim defendants, he remembers the name of Zahoor Ahmed. The witness said, "I do not have this information whether my father had made Sunni Central Board of Wakf as a party in the suit itself or afterwards." It was in 1990 that I read for the first time, the plaint filed by my father. Before 1990, I had only heard about the plaint. I had not seen it. In my suit, the controversial place is the northern

boundary, the boundary wall of Singhdwar and the Parikrama Marg outside that and its eastern boundary, Hanumant Dwar and the Parikrama Marg outside that . I have not made mention of these boundaries in section 2 of my affidavit but that means that the Hanumat Dwar portion covers the boundary mentioned in this section.

I have not given any list of witnesses in this case. In this case, besides me, some more people will act as witness, but who will give evidence, I do not know. I have not contacted any of those who will act as witness in this case. Ever since this case, in which I am acting as witness has come to the Lucknow Bench of this court – Shri Puttu Lal Mishra is my advocate and prior to him, Shri Ashok Kumar Srivastva was my advocate. When I had submitted an application at Faizabad for becoming the plaintiff in this case, from then and till the time the case was at Faizabad, my advocate used to plead my case. Ever since this case has come to this High Court, I have appeared twice in the court before acting as witness and for the third time in 22nd July, 2003 when my affidavit was filed for the main cross-examination. I had come to this court for the first time when I had appointed Shri Puttu Lal Mishra as my advocate and for the second time, I had come to this court 7-8 months prior to this day.”

The witness was shown the list of witness dated 11.07.2003 containing the names of 87 witness and he said that beside himself, he did not know any other witness. The witness said, “The substitution application in which my identification was done by Shri Hari Prasad Tiwari who was a respectable person and whom I had met at Faizabad. I am the son of Shri Gopal Singh Visharad and not an adopted son. In my substitution application, I have mentioned the date of death of my father as 28.12.1985 which is correct. By mistake in the affidavit filed with that application, the date of the death of my father has been mentioned as 18.12.1985. I do not remember as to how many days after the coming of this case to the High Court, I had appointed Shri Puttu Lal Mishra as my advocate.” The witness was shown the document No. 20C-1 Vakalatnam, on seeing which, he

said that he had appointed Shri Puttu Lal Mishra as his advocate through that Vakalatnama only in 1989. The witness was shown section 22 of the reply filed by his father, on seeing which, he said that whatever is written therein, is correct. He said that he did not know whether or not prior to 1934, Namaz was offered in the disputed building. Namaz is held on the Masjid only.

Question: It appears from what has been mentioned para 22, your father considered the disputed building a Masjid and that is why he has talked of Namaz in that?

Answer: After 1934, no Namaz was offered in that building and my father considered that to be Garbhgriha and used to go there for the darshan of his revered God. The witness subsequently, said that his father used to go there to offer prayers.

My father was born around 1903 and in 1934, he did not live at Ayodhya. As a matter of fact, he started living at Ayodhya from 1942. I have no knowledge about the counter – replies filed by Government officers like City Magistrate, Faizabad District Magistrate, Faizabad and S.P. Faizabad. After 1992 also, I have been to the disputed site for darshan twice – one in 1993 and the second time in 1998. On both the occasions, I had gone for darshan through the passage where was railing done with huge iron- pipes. I had my darshan from the same place from where other people were having darshan. The last time, I had darshan at the disputed site, was in 1998.

In 1986, when the lock was opened, at that time, I did not live at Ayodhya and it was two years after the lock was opened that I went to the disputed building for darshan. In 1992, when the disputed building was razed at that time also, I was not at Ayodhya, at that time, I was at Baharaich. It was after about one year of the demolition of the disputed building, that I went to the disputed site for the first time for darshan. I did not meet any of the persons who had demolished the disputed building.

I have no knowledge that when the disputed building was demolished whether or not the idols were taken out from there and if at all they were taken out, when they were taken out. I also do not know the time when the middle dome of the disputed building was demolished and also when action for demolishing the middle dome started. I also do not know how many persons were present on the day when disputed building was demolished and how many were there till the demolition was done which pujaris were there in the disputed building on 6th December 1992. I know Param Hans Ramchander Dass personally. Param Hans Ramchander Dass is an elderly person and is one of those whom my father knew. I do not discuss anything with him about the disputed building. Even after 6th December 1992. I had no discussion with Param Hans Ramchander Dass. I do not remember that when after 6th December 1992, I went to the dispute site in 1993, the distance would have been 8-10 feet when I went for darshan in 1998. In 1993, when I had darshan, the idol used to remain covered. Only face was visible. I cannot say of which metal that idol was, whose I had darshan in 1993 and 1998 but one thing is certain that it was made of metal and not of stone.

The witness was shown para 31 of the reply filed by his father on 5th December 1952, on seeing which, he said, I do not know to which` case the forged and conspired admissible evidence of the Muslim pertains to which a reference has been made therein.

Question: On what basis have you written in para 31 of your that if at any time any Muslim tried to assert any right, his right was refuted and the Hindus especially those living at that place beat them and made them run away?

(At this stage, the learned advocate of the plaintiff Shri Puttu Lal Mishra raised an objection saying that the reply was filed by Shri Gopal Singh Visharad on 05.12.1952 and has been attested by him only and as such, question pertaining to that attestation/ verification can be asked from the witness)

Answer: All that has been mentioned before in the paragraph 31, on that basis only these things have been got written.

I have no personal knowledge about all these things, what has been got written is on the basis of what was heard. I did not file the counter-reply to the reply filed by the defendant Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 to the plaint filed by my father. I have read that the Central Government made this suit of mine 'await' in 1993 through a Bill. I did not challenge that Bill in any court of law. I was not satisfied with the passing of that bill but I did not pay any attention to challenging that bill. I do not remember whether or not after the decision of the Supreme Court regarding that bill came. I had made any amendment in my plaint or not or whether or not the advocate of Shri Umesh Chander Pandey, Shri Vireshwar Dwivedi had submitted any application to the effect that since I had not challenged the bill, my suit should be dismissed. After the case came to the High Court, I had perhaps appointment Shri Hari Shankar Jain once or twice.

At a distance of about twenty five- thirty yards to the east of the disputed building, Sumitra Bhawan was located. The last time, I had seen this Sumitra Bhawan it would be about 25-30 feet high while its width would be 20-25 feet. This Sumitra Bhawan was a temple but I cannot say whose idol there was in this temple – because I never went inside that temple. I do not remember whether there was any samadhi or Markandey Muni or Angira Muni near the disputed building. I have heard about the Narad Chabutra but I do not know where it is situated. I do not remember whether or not near the disputed building there was any place known as Tulsi Choura. I do not remember this also whether or not there were any samadhis by the names of Sanak, Sanandan, Sanatan Sanatkumar near the disputed building. I do not remember whether or not there were any samdhis of Munis by the name of Garg, Gautam, Shandilya near the disputed building, I do not remember whether or not I have read the report of Shiv Shanker Lal, Pleader Commissioner. I do not remember this also whether or not I have read the name of Tulsi Choura in his report. I have not read the name of Lomush Choura either and I do not know whether or not there was any place by the name of Lomush Choura near the disputed building. I am familiar with the name Garud which is a bird and which is treated like God by us. Whether or not

that bird has any other name, I am not aware. I do not remember whether or not in the report of Shri Shiv Shanker Lal, Advocate Commissioner, there is a mention of Garud and Lomush choura. What I have stated in para 6 of my affidavit of my main examination, that the facts described in the map submitted by Shvi Shanker Lal, Advocate Commissioner are correct and have been correctly shown has been written. After seeing the report, but at this point of time, I do not remember the report and the map.

Sanatan Dharam takes within its fold the people belonging to the Ramanandi and Vaishnav Sects. I belong to the Ramanandi Sect and not to the Vaishnav Sect. As per my faith and belief, Lord Rama was born lakhs of years ago. I had heard this from my ancestors and my faith is based on what I have heard from my ancestors. That the disputed site is the Shri Ramjanmabhumi and the birth place I have heard from my ancestors and I have read this also. I had read this about a year and a half back in some book. However, at this point of time, I remember neither the name of the book nor the name of its author and that is the only book I have read in this regard. The reference to Janmabhumi and Janmasthan in para 11 of my affidavit means the place where one is born and the Garbhagriha and the Janmasthan means the whole building where birth takes place. If in the Ramayana, Ayodhya has been called the Janmabhumi, there is nothing wrong in it. I was told this by my father and my grand father and the elderly people of Ayodhya that Lord Rama was born beneath the middle dome of the three domed building and that is what is known as Garbh Griha. There is no difference between taking birth, and incarnation because whenever God has incarnated himself, it has been by taking birth. I do not remember whether or not, to the east or east north of the disputed building, there is a place called Kaushalya Bhawan. I do not remember whether or not there is any building by the name of Kaushalya Bhawan. I have heard about Dashrath Mahal but where it is situated, I do not remember. I have heard about Kaikeyi Bhawan at Ayodhya, but I do not know about its location. I do not remember whether between the disputed building and Manas Bhawan, there is any building by the above names or not. It is wrong

to state that there is no building between the disputed building and Manas Bhawan, but I cannot say which building or buildings is/are there between them. It is correct to say that to the north of the disputed building is the Janmasthan temple.

Question Is there janmasthan temple only to the north of the disputed building and not the above mentioned three buildings?

Answer: I do not know whether or not to the north of the disputed building, there are the three buildings with the above names.

There was no building to the west or south of the disputed building. As far as I guess, the oldest building at Ayodhya is Janmabhumi only. This building is 80,90 or 100 years old. I have heard that it was sometime in the year 1500 that some Mir had started getting this building constructed which the Hindus claimed to be a temple and in this controversy, it could neither a temple nor a Masjid and it is heard that the building was left incomplete. The basis of what I have written in para 12 of my affidavit of my main examination that "After my father found out.....have accepted as plaintiff" is that when my father was prevented from going there, he had filed a writ which I had read. The witness subsequently said that my father had filed a suit which I had read and on that basis only I have written this.

Statement read and verified
Sd/-
Rajendra Singh
24.7.2003

This was dictated by me and typed by the Stenographer in the open Court. Be present for additional cross examination on 25.7.2003 in continuation of this.

Sd/-
Narendra Prasad
Commissioner
24.7.2003

Date 25.7.2003**D.W.1/1****Sh.Rajendra Singh**

Before Commissioner Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Magistrate/ Officer on Special Duty Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Commissioner appointed vide order dated 23.7.2003 of Hon'ble Full Bench).

((In continuation of 24.7.2003, the cross examination on oath of D.W.1/1 Shri Rajendra Singh was begun by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani the learned advocate of Defendant No.10).

What I have mentioned in para 13 of my affidavit of my main examination that, "At the end of the plaint, the Choudahi has been going on for thousands of years" by thousands of years, I mean hundreds of years. The mention of hundreds of years has been made with " reference to the darshan of Garbh Griha and not for the worship of the idols. Idol worship started there from 1950 and before 1524, I have read in some book. However, I do not remember which book it was. I have read somewhere that before 1524, below the middle dome, the idols of Lord Rama and Salikram was placed. I had read this in a book when I was a student of VIII class. That book ran into about 100-150 pages and was in Hindi. That was a History book, and mention of several historical personalities was made therein. The chapter of the book in which this was written related to ancient history and was not especially concerned with Ramchander Ji. That was not a course book for my VIII class. At that time, I was about 12-13 years of age. From that book, I had come to know that at the place beneath the dome, idols were there before 1524. Then the witness said that there was a temple at that place in which idols were placed. After 1524, that temple was destroyed and re construction of the same was started but it could not be completed due to Hindu Muslim clashes. The disputed building, i.e., the building with three domes was built sometime in the year 1950. After 1524, when the temple was destroyed, the idols which were placed there prior to 1524, disappeared. I could not know anything about where the idols disappeared. What I have stated in para 13 of my affidavit of main

examination that I also have done the parikrama of the Janmabhumi on countless occasions, that is correct because in my childhood, I used to have parikarma twenty times and some times even for 50 times and that is why I cannot tell you the exact number of parikramas that I did. This is the reason why the word “countless” has been used which means hundred times that which has not been counted. The witness explained the expression “offering prayers in thousands of temples” at Ayodhya mentioned in para 15 of the affidavit of his main examination, and said that by the above expression he meant that in 1960, there were four thousand temples at Ayodhya, as he had heard. Even today, there must be four thousand temples at Ayodhya of which the biggest temple is the Kanak Bhawan temple whose length is minimum 400 meters and width is 200-250 meters. This dimension is that of the premises of Kanak Bhawan temple. The smallest temple at Ayodhya on this day would be 25-30 feet long and about 20 broad feet broad.

At present, the north south width of Ayodhya city would be about 4-1/2 kms. Which starts from the Saryu river and goes beyond Jalpa drain upto Polytechnic and the east west length of Ayodhya city would be about 5 kms. Out of the three four thousand temples, I have been to thirty five temples which include the temples mentioned in my affidavit. By the mention of Janmabhumi temple in para 15 of my affidavit I mean the disputed building and by the Janmasthan temple mentioned therein, I mean the Janmasthan temple located in the north of the disputed building. The distance of Kanak Bhawan from the disputed building would be about one to 1-1/4 quarter kms. And this Kanak Bhawan is situated in the east north corner of the disputed building. I think Hanumangarhi is to the east of the disputed building and its distance also is about 1-1/4 kms. What I have mentioned about the Janmabhumi premises in the end of para 15 of my affidavit by that I mean the disputed building and its outer wall and the entire area located inside. The north south length of the outer boundary wall would be about thirty five or forty yards and its east west length would be about 35-40 yards. The north south length of the three domed disputed building would be about 50 feet and the east west breadth

would be about 15-18 feet. I have included the diameter of the walls of the three domed building while giving these dimensions of length and breadth. The thickness of the western wall of the domed building would be about 2 ½ feet while that of the eastern wall where doors were there, would be about 2 feet. The witness was shown photograph No.43 of document No.201 of black and white album by the learned advocate arguing the case, on seeing which, the witness stated that the thickness of the eastern wall of the domed building appears to be 3 feet. The distance of the iron barred wall from the Hanumat Dwar would be about 15-16 feet. Similarly, the distance between the Katahara wall and the Singhdwar would be about 12-13 feet. The passage to the north of the northern gate of the disputed premises which led to the road, the width of that passage would be about 8-10 feet. Similarly, the width of the passage leading to the northern road from the eastern gate of the disputed premises would be about 8 to 12 feet. The number of steps of the stairs leading to the road from the northern gate would be about 12-14. I have never entered the disputed premises from the northern gate but I have passed from that side. I would have passed from that gate twice or thrice. I have generally seen the northern gate of the disputed premises open but it is only twice or thrice that I have passed from that side. In clause 15 of my affidavit, I have mentioned. Thousands of devotees have darshans everyday at the Janmabhumi by that I mean that this has been happening everyday from 1947 to 1992 but I saw this only during the time I stayed there which was never more than half an hour. In my presence, the number of devotees at one point of time, has seen three four hundred from which I can guess that their number would be swelling to thousands, By the Janmabhumi parikarma mentioned in para 15 and 16 of my affidavit, I mean the parikrama built around the disputed premises. I do not remember whether or not there was a narrow passage adjoining the western wall of the disputed building. I do not remember as to from where was the passage leading to the north from the western northern corner of the disputed building. On seeing photograph No.39 of black and white album document No.201, the witness stated" I

can see the western corner of the northern wall of the disputed building behind the Kaushalya Rasoi. I do not remember where was the passage leading to the western wall of the disputed building. On seeing photograph No.23 of document No.201C 1 of the same album, the witness said “ I do not remember whether the passage visible in this photograph closed after going to the west or went further ahead. The inside courtyard of the disputed building which was between the Katahara wall and the eastern wall of the domed building, its east west width would be about 6 to 8 yards and east west length was about 20-22 yards. “ On seeing photo No.8 of document No.201C-1 of the same album, the witness said, “ This is the picture of the wall of the disputed building. This wall is the eastern wall of the disputed premises.” On seeing photograph Nos.11 and 12 of the same album, the witness said that both the photos were of the outer southern wall of the disputed building. On seeing photo No.19 of the same album, the witness said that the photo was that of the wall behind the disputed building. The witness was shown photograph Nos.11 and 12 of document No.200C-1 of the coloured album, on seeing which the witness said, “These are the pictures of the outside the eastern wall of the disputed premises”. About photograph No.17 and 18 of the same album, the witness said that he could not make out as to of which wall of the disputed building. On seeing photograph No.19 of the same album, the witness said that this was the picture of the southern wall of the disputed building. On seeing photograph No.36 of the same album, the witness said that in this photograph, some people are shown walking on a road, whose width would be about 5 to 7 feet. I am not clear as to which side of the disputed building this picture belongs. On seeing photograph Nos.51 and 52 of the same album, the witness said, “ In these pictures, I can see the pillars of black stone and these pillars are fixed on the eastern gate of the disputed building. I have been seeing these pillars since the time. I visited the disputed build for the first time. In both these photographs, beside the black stone pillars, there is a white marble stone, on which I can see something written. These marble stones were not there till 1948. I had seen these marble stones for the first

time after 1986. Upto 1958, I used to be at Ayodhya regularly on the occasion of the Kartik fair and thereafter, on the occasion of the Kartik fair, I have stayed at Ayodhya three four times. By the Janmasthan mentioned in clause 17 of my affidavit of my main examination, I mean the entire disputed premises. In para 18 of my affidavit, I have made mention of the occasion of Ramnavmi. Till 1958, I had stayed at Ayodhya on the occasion of Ramnavmi. The special arrangements that used to be made in the disputed building on the occasion of Ramnavmi from 1950 to 1986 were that a special type of Prasad was prepared in which Panjiri was prepared by grinding the roasted coriander seeds and all the Prasad was Falahari. A special aarti was held and that Prasad was widely distributed. I do not know which pujari prepared this Prasad whether it was the pujari of the Ramchabutra or the pujari inside the disputed building nor do I know who used to bear the expenses regarding the preparation of the Prasad. That Prasad used to be kept out i.e. near the iron barred wall and the devotee who came first, he would get it and after the Prasad was finished, it was not distributed. That Prasad was distributed among the devotees by some pujari. I would have gone there on the occasion of Ramnavmi once or twice and every time, I went there, it was around 12'O clock. Whosoever was there at 12, would get the Prasad. From my child hood till date, I would have visited the Kanak Bhawan 100-150 times and Hanumangarhi 60-70 times. On seeing clause No.21 of his affidavit where janmabhumi premises was mentoned by that (i.e. Janmabhumi premises), he meant the portion from the domed building to the iron barred wall and by Janmasthan, he meant Sita Rasoi, Ram Chabutra etc., the whole disputed premises. In this Janmabhumi premises, there was just one idol of Lord Rama and the remaining idols were in the Janmasthan premises, which comprised Ramchabutra Sita Rasoi etc. This is wrong to say that before 1950, I never went to the disputed site. It is wrong to say that till 22nd December 1949, there used to be Namaz all the five times and the Friday Namaz in the disputed building. It is wrong to say that neither Lord Rama was born at the disputed site nor has it been the birth place of Lord Rama. This is also wrong to say

that I have never had any interest in this suit and this is also wrong to say that I have been sent here to give evidence by the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. This is wrong to say that after 1992, I have never been to the disputed premises”.

(The argument by Advocate Shri Zaffaryab Jillani on behalf of defendant No.10 Sunni Central Board of Wakf was concluded).

(On behalf of plaintiff No.7 in other original suit aNo.4/1989, a request was made by Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqi, Advocate for arguments, whereupon the learned advocate of the plaintiff Shri Puttu Lal Mishra raised an objection saying, “Though the plaintiff’s is a plaintiff in No.7 (4/89) but the plaint is jointly by the Sunni Central Board of Wakf and the other plaintiffs. Sunni Central Board of Wakf is defendant No.10 in the present suit while in other original Suit No.4/89, it is plaintiff No.1. The argument which has been done by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani on behalf of Sunni Central Board of Wakf, has been done by the plaintiffs in the present suit and other original suit No.4/89 and as such, none of the plaintiffs has the right now of cross examining this witness separately and independently. In the light of this, it was requested that this objection should be placed before the Hon’ble Special Full Bench and further action be taken only after the decision regarding the procedure of law in this case because this situation will come up in the case of every witness as also in other suits at the time of evidence).

In reply to this objection, the advocate of defendant No.10 Shri Zaffaryab Jillani said, “The objection of the advocate of the plaintiff is wholly baseless and it is intended to delay the disposal of the case because his other witnesses are not yet present who could appear after Shri Rajendra Singh. It is worth mentioning here that at one time, an application was submitted before the Hon’ble Full Bench to the effect that after his arguments, Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqi should not be given an opportunity to argue but the advocate who submitted such an application could not satisfy the Hon’ble Full Bench. As such the Hon’ble Full Bench has not only given a chance to Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqi to argue with every witness on behalf of plaintiff No.7 of Suit No.04/1989 and on behalf of defendant No.5 (Shri

Mohammed Hashim) of other original suit No.5/1989 but also given an opportunity to argue on behalf of Hafiz Mohammed Siddiq, plaintiff of suit No.4/1989 and on behalf of defendant No.26 of suit No.5/1989 (Mohd. Siddiqi). Apart from this, it is also worth mentioning that Shri Mohammed Hashim is the only the plaintiff in other original suit No.4/1989 but also defendant No.5 in other original suit No.5/1989 and he has filed his reply in suit No.5/1989 which in that suit is different from the reply of Sunni Wakf Board on many counts. As such my argument cannot deprive Shri Mohd. Hashim of his right on behalf of Sunni Wakf Board that his advocate Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqui should argue with the witnesses appearing on behalf of the plaintiff. As such there is no justification in bringing this matter before the Full Bench, nor is there any justification in the request that till then no arguments should be done with the witness. As such Advocate Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqui be given a chance, as has hitherto fore been done, to argue on behalf of Mohammed Hashim and this argument be taken to mean the argument on behalf of Mohammed Hashim defendant No.5 of suit No.5/1989).

(In view of the above objection and reply, as per the decision of the Full Bench, argument by Advocate Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqui begun on behalf of plaintiff No.7 of other original suit No.4/1989 and defendant No.5 of other original suit No.5/1989).

X x x x x x x x x X

At the time of my father's death, I was at Balrampur. At that time, I was in service and had not retired. I had taken part in the last rites of my father. My father died in Baroda. The news of my father's death I got five days after his death and I had reached Baroda five days after I received the information. A month and a half before his death, he was living with my elder brother and prior to that, he had gone from my place at Balrampur to Baroda. However, he lived at Ayodhya. My mother died in 1976. We are two brothers and we have a sister also. The name of my elder brother is Darshan Singh who is living at Baroda and he is a resident of that place. He is five years older than me. He was born at Samthar which is in District Jhansi. My sister is younger than me. So long as my elder brother did not get a

job, he used to live at Ayodhya with my father and went to Baroda after he got a job. My father had no immovable property and at Baroda, he was living in a rented house. The house he had at Samthar, he had given to his friends and had left that. My father had given his Samthar house to his friends by word of mouth. My elder brother might have been visiting the disputed site but I cannot say for certain. The house in which my father lived at Ayodhya was that of a Mahant of Bhagalpur. Till such time, as my father was alive, till two months prior to that he was a tenant. I do not remember the name of the landlord of that house. My father had left the rented accommodation at Ayodhya of his own accord. My father had died at Baroda in the house only. My father used to live in one of the houses of Baroda Gujarat Refinery. My elder brother had got the house because he was employed in Gujarat Refinery.

My father used to give rent for the house at Ayodhya where he lived. I had got some share from the movable property of my father. The house in which my father lived on rent at Ayodhya, the employees of the landlord of that house used to come and collect the rent from my father. I have no receipt regarding the payment of the rent. Ever since his arrival at Ayodhya, my father used to live in that very house, there were five rooms including the drawing room in that house. When my father left that house, the rent of that house was Rs.15/- to Rs.20/- per month. That house comes under the jurisdiction of the Ayodhya Municipality. The water and house tax is charged by the Municipality. The witness was shown the excerpts of clause 12 of his affidavit of his main examination to the effect, "As a result of this unlawful act, the discretionary right..... Had filed the above said suit" and was asked whether besides his own religious rights, his father had filed the suit to protect the rights of the whole Hindu community and crores of devotees of Lord Rama. On seeing that, the witness said, "It is correct, this suit is not for my religious rights alone. The words Hindu people and devotees of Rama (Hindu Janata and Rambhakta) in the above excerpt. I have used for the same purpose. I have affixed my signature only after understanding the affidavit of

the main examination. I am continuing with the suit which my father had filed for his own religious rights as also of the religious rights of the entire Hindu Janata and crores of devotees of Lord Rama. It is wrong to suggest that my father had submitted this suit for his own rights only. I recognize the handwriting and signature of my father. A major portion of my plaint is in my father's handwriting and on the plaint, the signature of my father is also there. The whole first page and clause I of the second page of the plaint which starts from third line from above and concludes with the words "Par Hata Denge" at fifth line from the bottom is not in my father's handwriting. The remaining plaint is in my father's handwriting. Clause 6 of my plaint is in my father's handwriting which is in black ink. On the right hand side at the bottom of the last page of my plaint, words "plaintiff Gopal Singh VisharadAdvocate" is not in my father's handwriting but below that are the signatures of my father. In clause 6 of my plaint, it is written, "that the plaint.....has given rise to" and that is correctly written. In clause 6 of my plaint, the date mentioned is 14th January 1950, whereas at the end of the plaint at the bottom on the right hand side below the signature of my father, the date mentioned is 13.01.1950. The signatures of my father on the last page of my plaint on the right side are in black ink, whereas below that in blue ink is written the dated 13.1.1950. It does not appear logical that my father first signed in black ink and then wrote the date in blue ink. I do not know whether or not in 1950, my father was an advocate, but whatever is written in the plaint, is correct.

The witness was shown para 8 of the objection filed by his father on 18.8.1959 and was asked whether his father had written that he had filed the suit for his personal rights and not for the Hindu people did he consider that to be correct. The witness, after seeing that said, "I do not consider this to be correct that my father had filed this suit for his personal right. On the last page of this objection are the signatures of my father. Before filing this suit, i.e. before 14 January 1950, my father had fallen ill. He was down with typhoid for about a month and during his illness, he could not go to the disputed

premises. My father was an advocate by profession and he had a shop also which was run by a servant. His shop was in Singarhaat. It is wrong to say that my father was a Munim. My father had filed this suit to remove the hindrance that was caused when he went for the darshan of the idol which had appeared on the night of 22/23 December 1949. The disputed building was demolished on 6th December 1992. It is wrong to say that on 6th December 1992, the idol was removed. As a matter of fact the idol is there at the same very place. It is correct that after the demolition of the building on 6th December 1992, the idol was removed and was re installed there. Who established it there, when it was re installed I do not know. I have heard that within twenty four hours of the demolition of the building, the idol had been installed. It is wrong to say that ten fifteen years before 1985, my father had left Ayodhya. It is also wrong to say that I am concealing this thing that my father had left Ayodhya 10-15 years before 1985 and that is because that I am not able to tell the house number of my father and about the landlord and also about the rent receipt. It is wrong to say that I do not keep myself abreast about the proceedings of the case and that I have come to appear as a witness at the instance of others. It is wrong to say that the disputed site has never been the Ramjanmabhumi and this is also wrong to say that till 22nd December 1949, the five time Namaz and Friday Namaz was held there.

(Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqui, Advocate concluded the arguments on behalf of plaintiff No.7 in other original suit No.4/89 and defendant No.5 in other original suit No.5/1989).

(On behalf of defendant No.26 in other original suit No.5/1989, Shri Syed Irfan Ahmed, Advocate accepted the arguments done by the Advocates Shri Abdul Manna, Shri Zaffaryab Jillani and Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqui.)

(Shri Fazle Alam, Advocate on behalf of defendant Nos/61 and 6/2 in other original suit No.3/1989 accepted the arguments done by Advocates Shri Abdul Manna, Shri Zaffaryab Jillani and Shri Mushtaw Ahmed Siddiqui).

Arguments by all defendants/ parties concluded.

Statement read and verified

Sd/-

Rajendra Singh

25.7.2003

This was typed by the stenographer in the open court on my giving him dictation.

Sd/-

Narendra Prasad

Commissioner

25.7.2003