

KP

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA****CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 10866-10867 OF 2010****IN THE MATTER OF: -**

M. Siddiq (D) Thr. Lrs.

... Appellant

**VERSUS**

Mahant Suresh Das &amp;Ors. etc. etc.

... Respondents

**AND****OTHER CONNECTED CIVIL APPEALS****NOTE ON EXHIBITS AND OTHER RELEVANT  
DOCUMENTS FILED BY PLAINTIFFS IN SUIT 5 OF  
1989****BY****DR. RAJEEV DHAVAN, SENIOR ADVOCATE**

S.NO	PARTICULARS	Page Nos.
1.	Overview	A-E
2.	Note on Exhibits Filed by Plaintiffs in Suit 5	1-57

ADVOCATE-ON-RECORD: EJAZ MAQBOOL

## OVERVIEW

1. The exhibits can be broadly divided into the following categories:-
  - a) Exhibits which cannot be relied upon as they were rejected by the Hon'ble High Court.
  - b) Exhibits which were improperly rejected by the Hon'ble High Court.
  - c) Some on which there is over reliance like travelers, gazetteers etc.
  - d) Exhibits which were held to be irrelevant
  - e) Exhibits which were discussed but no specific finding has been given by the Hon'ble High Court.
  - f) Exhibits which were not discussed at all
2. In this overview, we have attempted to provide a sample list of exhibits which fall within these categories, however it is submitted that this may not be treated as an exhaustive list. A detailed chart which discusses the exhibits in detail, is provided in the later section of this note.

### A. EXHIBITS WHICH CANNOT BE RELIED UPON AS THEY WERE REJECTED BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT.

S.NO.	PARTICULARS
1.	<b>Exhibit 1:</b> Plaint in Suit No. 29 of 1945 filed by Shia Central Board of Waqf against the Sunni Central Board of Waqf, claiming the rights on the Babri Mosque. [Pgs. 1-11/Vol. 73 and finding at Pg. 1412, Para 2357/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]
2.	<b>Exhibit 22&amp; Exhibit 50:</b> Excerpt of the book Ayodhya Ka Itihas by Hindi Sudhaker Rai Bahadur Sri Awadh WasiLalaSita Ram book Hindustani Academy 1932. [Pgs. 202-220/Vol. 73 and finding at Para 1479 @ pg. 1012-13/Vol. 1 of the Impugned Judgment]
3.	<b>Exhibit 23, Exhibit 56 to Exhibit 67:</b> Different portions of Book "Ayodhya" by Hans Baker. [Finding at Para 3541 @ pg. 2050/Vol. 1 of the Impugned Judgment] <i>rv. P.N. Mishra</i>
4.	<b>Exhibit 27&amp; 28:</b> Government Orders relating to grant of permission to six Muslim individuals to institute a suit U/s 92 C.P.C. [Pgs. 251-53/Vol. 73 and finding at Para 3101-3102 at pgs. 1724-25/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]
5.	<b>Exhibit 68:</b> Photocopy of the extract Indian Architecture (Islamic Period) by Percy Brown. [Pg. 664-679/Vol. 75 and finding para 3430-3432 @ pgs. 1938-1942/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]
6.	<b>Exhibit 114:</b> Presidential Address by S.P. Gupta (OPW 3) on Sri Ram Bhumi Controversy. [Pg. 735-786/Vol. 75 and finding at Para 4027 @ pg. 2492/Vol. 2]
7.	<b>Exhibit 115:</b> Article written by Dr. S.P. Gupta (OPW 3) "Ram Janam Bhumi Babri Masjid – Revisited". [Pg. 787-791/Vol. 75 and finding at Para 4028 @ pg. 2492/Vol. 2]
8.	<b>Exhibit A14&amp; A15:</b> Copy of the objection and affidavit by Dharam Das dated 16-07-1982 in the court of A.D.M/ Nazul Officer. [Pg. 1480-1486/Vol. 79 and

A

	<i>Finding at Pg. 1669, Para 3012(B)/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</i>
9.	<b>Exhibit M1:</b> Copy of the Application dated 11.06.1956 moved by Abhiram Das in the Court of Additional District Magistrate, Faizabad in Case No. 58/73, Misc. Application P.S. Kotwali district Faizabad. [Pgs. 1953/Vol. 81 and Finding at Para. No. 3000 at Pg. No. 1663 of Vol. II]
10.	<b>Exhibit M7:</b> Copy of the record of the right (3 yearly) from 1374 to 1376 F, village Dihwa, Pargana Pratamganj, Tahsil Nawabganj. [Pg. 1501/Vol. 79 and Finding at Pg. 1664, Para 3000 (G)/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]

**B. EXHIBITS WHICH WERE IMPROPERLY REJECTED BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT**

S.NO.	PARTICULARS
1.	<b>Exhibit 45:</b> "Historian's Report to the Nation" "Babri Mosque or Rama's Birthplace" [Pgs. 432-449/Vol. 74 and finding at Para 3622 @ pg. 4090/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]

**C. SOME ON WHICH THERE IS OVER RELIANCE LIKE TRAVELERS, GAZETTEERS ETC.**

There has been over-reliance on some exhibits which are mainly, Vishnu Hari Inscriptions (Exhibit 2), accounts of Traveler's, Gazetteers, history books and religious texts like Skandapurana, which will all be dealt with in a separate submission.

**D. EXHIBITS WHICH WERE HELD TO BE IRRELEVANT**

S.NO.	PARTICULARS
1.	<b>Exhibit 21:</b> Encyclopaedia Britannica XV edition 1978, photocopy of page and pages of the book 693 and 694. [Pgs. 198-201/Vol. 73 and finding at Para 3533-3534 @ pgs. 2036-2037/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]
2.	<b>Exhibit 36:</b> Relevant portion of Book "Itihas Darpan". [Pgs. 2270-2274 and finding at Para 4153-4154 @ Pgs. 2574-78/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]
3.	<b>Exhibit J21:</b> Photo copy of the book titled as "Kalhan's Rajtarangani" by M. A. Stein Vol-2. [Pg. 1608-1612 /Vol. 79 and finding at Para 4315 @ pg. 2688/Vol. 2]
4.	<b>Exhibit Q4:</b> Page 8 of "The disputed Mosque" [Pgs. 1763-64/Vol. 80]
5.	<b>Exhibit A12:</b> Certified copy of the statement of Abhiram Das Chela Saryu Das in the Court of D.J. Fazizabad in case no. 12/61. [Pg. 1462-1465/Vol. 79 and Finding at Pg. 1669, Para 3009-10/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]
6.	<b>Exhibit A3A:</b> Death report of Mohd. Shami Mohalla Raiganj Ayodhya dated 26.6.1958. [Pgs. 1159-1160 /Vol. 78]

**E. EXHIBITS WHICH WERE DISCUSSED BUT NO SPECIFIC FINDING HAS BEEN GIVEN BY THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT**

S.NO.	PARTICULARS
-------	-------------

B

1. ✓	<b>Exhibit 13:</b> Uttar Pradesh District Gazetteer, Faizabad. [Pg. 113/Vol. 78]
2.	<b>Exhibit 14:</b> Extract of -Indian Archaeology, a review, 1976 [Pgs. 120-127/Vol. 73]
3.	<b>Exhibit 44:</b> Relevant portion of Book "Satyarth Prakash". [Pgs. 231-2366/Vol. 82]
4.	<b>Exhibit 51:</b> Copy of article on Ayodhya and God Rama by Ajay Mitra Shastri Dept. of Ancient History and Archaeology, Nagpur University. [Pgs. 490-493/Vol. 74]
5.	<b>Exhibit 95:</b> Annexure to the Affidavit of OPW 14 [Pgs. 1783-1788]
6.	<b>Exhibit 132:</b> Catalogue of Historical Documents in KapadDwar Jaipur Plan Front piece foreword by Bhawani Singh of Jaipur M.V.C and page 36 along with two maps. [Pg. 1127-1132/Vol. 77]
7.	<b>Exhibit A10:</b> Appendix 'A' to the book "A Historical Sketch of The Faizabad" by P. Carnegi, Officiating Commissioner and Settlement Officer. [Pgs. 1445-1461/Vol. 79]
8.	<b>Exhibit B1:</b> Copy of Bandobast Map 1944-45 F Babat Mauza Ramkot Pargana Haveli Awadh Faizabad. [Pg. 1502-1503/Vol. 79]
9.	<b>Exhibit B2:</b> Copy of NaqualKhasraKishtwarBandobast of the year 1344-45 F Mauza Ramkot, Pargana Haveli Awadh, Faizabad with Hindi copy. [Pg. 1514-1518/Vol. 79]
10.	Exhibits B5 to B 13, all refer to accounts with respect to Guru Nanakji/JanamSakhis of different editions by different people.
11.	<b>Exhibit B14 &amp; B15:</b> Annex. 10 & 11 in the statement of D.W.2/1-1 [Pg. 1575-1583/Vol. 79]
12.	<b>Exhibit J10:</b> Fasanae-E-Ibrat Page 71 by Mirza Baze Ali Beg [Pg. 1593-1598/Vol. 79]
13.	<b>Exhibit J26:</b> Photo copy of the Extract of the book titled as "Indian Antiquities" edited by Richard Carnac Vol. XXXVIII- 1908. [Pg. 1639-1644/Vol. 79]
14.	<b>Exhibit J29:</b> Extract from the report of "Tours in the Central Doab and Gorakhpur in 1974-75 and 1875-76" by A.C.L. Carlieyle under the Superintendence of Major General A Cunningham Vol. XII. [Pgs. 1679-1688/Vol. 80]
15.	<b>Exhibit J30:</b> Ayodhya in Ancient India by B.C. Law, report of B.C. Law (Journal of Jha Research Institute Vol.1, page 423-443). [Pgs. 1689-1718/Vol. 80]
16. ✓	<b>Exhibit J31:</b> Holy Quran Majid, Page 324 written by Maulana Sayed Farman Ali. [Pgs. 1719-1726/Vol. 80]

#### F. EXHIBITS WHICH WERE NOT DISCUSSED AT ALL

S.NO.	PARTICULARS
1.	<b>Exhibit 17:</b> Extract from the book "Babri-Masjid" "TarikheiPash-mannjarAurPeshManjar Ki Roshni Mein" by Syed ShahabuddinAbdur Rehman, 1987 Edition. [Pgs. 150-160/Vol. 73]
2.	<b>Exhibit 18:</b> Extract of book Amir Ali Shaheed AurMarka-I-Hanuman Garhi

C



	by Shah Mohd. Azmat Ali AlviKakorvi, published by Dr.ZakiKakorvi in 1987, publisher Markaz Adab Lucknow.[Pgs. 161-189/Vol. 73]
3.	<b>Exhibit 29:</b> Newspaper report with photostat copy page no. 3(city) of Hindustan Times Lucknow dated 13.11.97. [Pgs. 254-255/Vol. 73]
4.	<b>Exhibit 31:</b> Affidavit filed by Sri Arvind Verma, Commissioner, Faizabad (the authorized person under the Ayodhya Act,1993) on 13.5.1993 stating that some changes were made in order to maintain the makeshift structure.[Pgs. 270-305/Vol. 74]
5.	<b>Exhibit 32:</b> Affidavit dated 6.8.1993 of Radhey Sham Kaushik A.No. /92 in C.P. No. 97/2002 Aslam Bhoorey Vs. Union of India stating that the sign boards which the Petitioner has demanded to be removed were outside the acquired land and were and have been there even prior to 1992.[Pgs. 306-322/Vol. 74]
6.	<b>Exhibit 33:</b> Book "Ram Janam Bhumi Ayodhya-New Archaeological discoveries" by K.S. Lal, President of the Historian forum Ayodhya.[Pgs. 323-342/Vol. 74]
7.	<b>Exhibit 34:</b> Relevant portion of Book written by Patrick Thomas Hughes "A Dictionary of Islam" [Pgs. 2265-2266/Vol. 82]
8.	<b>Exhibit 37:</b> Booklet written by Mohd. Hashim Ansari- "Babri Masjid kiVajayabikeliye" [Pgs. 343-400/Vol. 74]
9.	<b>Exhibit 38:</b> Letter dated 3.11.89 addressed to Prime Minister from Babri Masjid Action Committee.[Pgs. 401-405/Vol. 74]
10.	<b>Exhibit 39:</b> Press release dated 3.11.1989 by Babri Masjid Action Committee [Pgs. 406-408/Vol. 74]
11.	<b>Exhibit 40:</b> Declaration of Delhi on Babri Masjid adopted by all India Babri Masjid New Delhi.[Pgs. 409-426/Vol. 74]
12.	<b>Exhibit 41:</b> Relevant portion of Book "Ram Janam Bhumi-Babri Masjid, Satya Kya Hai". [Pgs. 2275-2278/Vol. 82]
13.	<b>Exhibit 46:</b> Photocopy of the article "Glazed Ware in India" Written by K.K. Mohammad.[Pgs. 450-455/Vol. 74]
14.	<b>Exhibit 47:</b> Photocopy of the title page and pages of the book "Babari Masjid" with page 5, Admitted by Sri M.A. Siddiqui on 1.5.08.[Pgs. 456-459/Vol. 74]
15.	<b>Exhibit 53:</b> Photocopy of page 9 of the book "Religious policy of the Mughal emperors" by S.R. Sharma published by Asia Publishing house 1962[Pgs. 501-502/Vol. 74]
16.	<b>Exhibit 71:</b> Extract from the book "The Disputed Mosque" A Historical Enquiry by Susheel Srivastava, Chapter V, "Did Babar build the Masjid"[Pg. 707-726/Vol. 75]
17.	<b>Exhibit 72-91,Exhibit 94, Exhibit 96-104, Exhibit 106- Exhibit 113:</b> These are annexures to the affidavits of PW 17,PW 18,PW 19 and OPW 18,OPW 19, OPW 14,OPW 17,OPW 2
18.	<b>Exhibit 105:</b> Extract from Mayamatam, edited by Bruno Dagens Vol.I [Pgs. 1854-1862/Vol. 80]
19.	<b>Exhibit 117:</b> Original Book "Hindu Vishwa" Oct. 92 Vol 28 No.2 Kartik 2049 Vikrami, edited by H.C. Srivastava.[Pgs. 798-845/Vol. 76]
20.	<b>Exhibit 118:</b> Report written by Pt. Hari Saran Dwivedi, 305, Bahadur Ganj,

D

	Allahabad-3 dated 21.10.1989. [Pgs. 847/Vol. 76]
21.	<b>Exhibit 119:</b> Matter written by Pt. InduShekhar Pandey, Parashar-Jyotish Bhawan- 2/22 Bhadaini, Varanasi. [Pgs. 849/Vol. 76]
22.	<b>Exhibit 120:</b> Letter of Syed Shabuddin, M.P. (Lok Sabha) to Mr. Anjum Qader. [Pgs. 852/Vol. 76]
23.	<b>Exhibit 121:</b> Letter of Prince Anjum Quder to Sri Shabuddin dated 2.9.88 King of Oudh's Mausoleum, Garden Reach Calcutta, 24. [Pgs. 855/Vol. 76]
24.	<b>Exhibit 122:</b> Letter of Prince Anjum Quder to Sri V.P. Singh, Prime Minister of India dated 26.2.1990. [Pgs. 857-858/Vol. 76]
25.	<b>Exhibit 124:</b> A note on essentials and characteristics of a Mosque prepared by Sri D.N. Agarwal, a retired Judge, Allahabad High Court. [Pgs. 868-880/Vol. 76]
26.	<b>Exhibit 125:</b> List of documents examined by NAI from Sri Kishore Kunal, O.S.D., Ministry of State Home by Director General (Archive) dated 16.5.1991 along with list of the documents. [Pgs. 904-954/Vol. 76]
27.	<b>Exhibit 126:</b> Details of photographs (ten photographs) [Pgs. 955-977/Vol. 76]
28.	<b>Exhibit 127:</b> Letter to Prince Anjum Qudar President All India Shia Conference dt. 13.12.1988 Pakistan Addressed to Sarkar Tajaul-Ulem M.S.M. Naqvi (Fatwa with Hindi and English translation) [Pgs. 983-984/Vol. 76]
29.	<b>Exhibit 128:</b> Indian History and Cultural Society, New Delhi workshop seminar 10-13 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 1992 Ayodhya. Two resolution, signature of T.P. Verma at Serial No.214 [Pg. 985-991/Vol. 76]
30.	<b>Exhibit A13:</b> Certified copy of the charge sheet under session trial no. 49/83 in the court of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Additional Session Judge as per list 269C1, marked as paper no. 270C1/1-7. [Pg. 1473-1479/Vol. 79]
31.	<b>Exhibit A16:</b> Affidavit of DW 3/20 Ann. 19, page 16/51, Sri Ram Chandracharya (Statement). [Pgs. 1951-1952/Vol. 81]
32.	<b>Exhibit B3:</b> Photograph back view of the building [Pg. 1519/Vol. 79]
33.	<b>Exhibit J1:</b> Photocopy of the photograph of Babri Masjid without Minars [Pg. 1584/Vol. 79]
34.	<b>Exhibit J3:</b> Maharishi Valmiki Praneet Valmiki Ramayan Sloka-6. [Pgs. 1954-1955/Vol. 81]
35.	<b>Exhibit J11:</b> Extract of the Book Titled as "The Disputed Mosque" Page no. 22. [Pg. 1599-1600/Vol. 79]
36.	<b>Exhibit J12:</b> Last page of the cover of the book titled as "Disputed Mosque". [Pgs. 1956/Vol. 81]
37.	<b>Exhibit J20:</b> Photo copy of the Extract of the book "History of the Buddhism In Kashmir" by Dr.Sarla Khosla. [Pg. 1603-1607/Vol. 79]
38.	<b>Exhibit J28:</b> Extract from book titled as "Babur" by Dr.RadheyShyam. [Pg. 1645-1678/Vol. 79]
39.	<b>Exhibit T4:</b> Photocopy of the pages from the book "RamcharitManas" TikakarDr. Raj Bahadur Pandey. [Pgs. 1730-1761/Vol. 80]
40.	<b>Exhibit V1:</b> Copy of the page 334 of the book entitled as "Dictionary of Islam" by Thomas Patric Huge Court order dated 11.11.97 (P.W. 11 Statement, at page 58) [Pg. 1762/Vol. 80]
41.	<b>Exhibit Q5:</b> Photocopy of the extract of the book "Dictionary of Islam" by Thomas Patrick. [Pg. 1765-1766/Vol. 80]

## NOTE ON EXHIBITS FILED BY PLAINTIFFS IN SUIT 5

### A. INTRODUCTION

1. The Plaintiffs in Suit 5 have filed 10 volumes of exhibits [ Running Volume No. 73 to 82], which include the following:-
  - i. The 133 exhibits filed by Plaintiffs in Suit 5
  - ii. The 10 exhibits filed by Defendants in Suit 1
  - iii. The 7 exhibits filed by Plaintiffs in Suit 3
  - iv. The 20 exhibits filed by Plaintiffs in Suit 4
  - v. The 52 exhibits filed by Defendants in Suit 4
2. With respect to 1 (ii) & (iv) , it is relevant to note that these exhibits were actually filed by Muslim parties before the Hon'ble High Court and they have been filed by the Plaintiffs in Suit 5 before this Hon'ble Court only for the purpose of ease of reference.
3. With respect to 1 (iii), it is submitted that these exhibits have already been dealt with while replying to Suit 3. Further the exhibits at 1(iv) will be discussed when arguments pertaining to Suit 4 begin.
4. In this note, the exhibits mentioned in 1 (i) [i.e. the Exhibit of the Plaintiffs in Suit 5], 1 (ii) [i.e. Exhibits of Defendants in Suit 1] and 1(v) [i.e. Exhibits of Defendants in Suit 4] have been discussed.

#### *Exhibits by Plaintiffs in Suit V [133 Exhibits]*

5. It is submitted that out of the 133 exhibits filed by Plaintiffs in Suit 5, 67 exhibits have not been discussed at all. These are Exhibit Nos. 17-18,29,31-34,37-41,46-47,53,71-91,94,96-113 and 117-128.
6. Apart from the above, there are 7 exhibits which though have been referred & discussed, but no categorical finding has been given in respect of these exhibits. These are Exhibit Nos. 13-14,44,48,51,95 and 132.
7. Further 23 exhibits have been rejected/ not relevant. These are Exhibit Nos. 1,21-23,27,36,45,50,56-68 and 114-115.
8. The remaining 26 exhibits have though been considered, it has not been possible to arrive at a clear finding even after such consideration. For instance:-
  - a) After referring to the accounts of Travelers & gazetteers etc, the Hon'ble High Court has recorded that no clear picture emerges [Para 3672 @ pg. 2142/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment].
  - b) Further, in respect of the Hindu religious texts, the Hon'ble High Court has observed-*"The religious texts like Valmiki Ramayan and Ramcharitmanas of GoswamiTulsidas and others like Skandpuran etc. mention that Lord Rama was born at Ayodhya and it is his place of birth but do not identify any*

particular place in Ayodhya which can be said to be his place of birth.”[Para 4372 at pg. 2784/Vol. III of the Impugned Judgment]

**Exhibits of Defendants in Suit 1[10 Exhibits]**

9. Out of the 10 exhibits , only 1 exhibit [Exhibit A3A] has been found to be not relevant, rest all have been discussed and relied upon in the Impugned Judgment. It is relevant to mention that these exhibits though filed before this Hon'ble Court by Plaintiffs in Suit V , were actually filed by the Muslim parties before the Hon'ble High Court.

**Exhibits of Defendants in Suit 4[52 Exhibits]**

10. Out of the 52 exhibits, there are 15 exhibits which have not been discussed at all. These are Exhibit A13, A16,B3,J1,J3,J8-J9,J11-13,J20,J28,T4,V1 and Q5.
11. Further, 20 exhibits have been referred and discussed, but specific finding *qua* these exhibits has not been given in the Impugned Judgment: These are Exhibit Nos. A10, B1-B2, B5-B15, J5,J10,J26 and J29-31.
12. Further, 12 exhibits have been rejected/not relevant. These are Exhibit Nos. A12,A14-15,M1-M7,J21 and Q4
13. Remaining 5 exhibits have been considered and discussed in the Impugned judgment, in order to support the findings.
14. In view of the foregoing , it is necessary to examine the exhibits filed by the Plaintiffs in Suit 5 and a detailed chart reflecting as to how each exhibit has been dealt with has been provided in the next section of this note.

**B. DETAILED CHART ON THE EXHIBITS FILED BY PLAINTIFFS IN SUIT 5**

[RUNNING VOLUME - 73]

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
4.07.1945	<b>EXHIBIT-1*</b> This is a copy of the plaint in Suit No. 29 of 1945 filed by Shia Central Board of Waqf against the Sunni Central Board of Waqf, claiming the rights on the Babri Mosque. [Pgs. 1-11/Vol. 73] <i>Ex A-8 Pg 1411 / Para 2355</i>	<u><b>Finding/ Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b></u> If a document is filed in an earlier litigation and after obtaining a copy thereof from that Court, if it is filed in another Court, it would not be a public document merely because a certified copy has been issued by the Court. The person who is filing it has to prove the same. [Pg. 1412, Para 2357/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]

		<p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> This Suit was dismissed on March 30, 1946 and it was held that the mosque in question is a Sunni Mosque. [Pgs. 4202-4208/Vol. III of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p>Shia Wakf Board has argued that at the time when the judgement dated 30.03.1946 was rendered, the notification dated 26.02.1944 was pre-existing. Subsequently, during the hearing of the suits, this notification was set aside held to be deficient by the Learned Civil Judge on 21.04.1966. It was therefore argued that since there was no notification existing as on date categorizing the disputed mosque as Sunni Mosque, the prayer of the Shia Waqf Board that the disputed Mosque was a Shia Mosque be allowed.</p> <p>It is submitted that Shia Waqf Board, though being a party to the Suits never entered appearance in the same. Even after, the notification dated 26.02.1944 was held to be deficient on 21.04.1966, the Shia Waqf board took no steps whatsoever to challenge the judgement dated 30.03.1946.</p> <p>This judgement dated 30.03.1946 is now being sought to be set aside by filing SLP (Diary No. 22744 of 2017) titled 'Shia central Board of Waqf U.P. Vs. Sunni Central Board of Waqf' on which notice is not issued.</p> <p>Under such circumstances, when Shia Waqf board has slept over its rights to challenge the same for over half a century, there is no basis either for condonation of delay or re-opening of the Judgment dated 30.03. 1946 by way of Special Leave Petition.</p> <p>It is reiterated that they never raised their point either in 1945-46, or in 1966-89 or in 1989-2017.</p>
3.2.2002	<p><b>EXHIBIT-2*</b> Report of Dr. K.V. Ramesh about the Ayodhya Vishnu Hari Temple Inscriptions. [Pgs. 11-25/Vol. 73]</p>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> In the Impugned Judgment, though it has been noticed that these inscriptions make no reference to Lord Ram and only show that there existed a Vishnu Hari Temple in Ayodhya, it has been presumed that since</p>

		<p>Ayodhya is known in reference to Lord Rama, one can presume that the religious structures must have connection with Lord Rama in one or the other way. [Para 4384 at pg. 2975/Vol. 3 of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b></p> <p>Relevant to note that these a photo of these inscriptions was handed over personally by Deoki Nandan Agarwal to Dr. K.V. Ramesh, and a personal request was made to Dr. Ramesh to translate the same. It is relevant to note that Deoki Nandan Agarwal is Plaintiff No. 3 in the Suit 5. [Para 6 of Examination in Chief Affidavit of Dr. K.V. Ramesh at para 6/pg. 1816 of Vol. 23]</p> <p>Further these inscriptions were discovered by OPW-8, who claims to have seen the slab containing the inscription falling from the disputed structure at the time of the demolition. It is submitted that this claim of OPW-8 is doubtful, for the following reasons: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>He states in his examination in Chief Affidavit that he was standing on the western side of the disputed building at the time of demolition. [Pg. 1226- para 7/Vol. 21]</li> <li>He states in his cross that he was standing on the southern side of the disputed building at the time of demolition and that nothing was clearly visible because of the dust. [Pg. 1263/Vol. 21]</li> <li>Despite the above, he claims to have seen the slab containing the inscription falling. [Pg. 1228/Vol. 21]</li> <li>He then states that on the next day after demolition, he along with Dr. Sudha Mallaya and Dr. S.P. Gupta went to click pictures of the inscriptions, which had been collected at one place by the Kar Sevaks. [Para 13 at pg. 1229/Vol. 21]</li> </ol> <p>Further, Dr. S.P. Gupta who is OPW 3 in the present matter has accepted that he has been a member of RSS since before 1975. [Pg.</p>
--	--	---

		<p><b>597/Vol. 18]</b></p> <p>Further Dr. K.V. Ramesh, who is OPW 10 has stated that he had the occasion of sitting with Dr. S.P. Gupta and others in the Delhi office of Archaeological Society of India- which was headed by Dr. S.P. Gupta, and at that time they discussed this inscription. [Pgs. 1830-31/Vol. 23]</p> <p>It is therefore submitted that translation of the inscriptions in question was done at the behest of Plaintiff No. 3 of suit 5 and was done in consultation with OPW 3 who is a member of RSS. Further the method of discovery of the inscription, by a random journalist, who is unable to even clarify as to which side of the disputed structure was he standing, makes the entire process of recovery and translation of the inscription doubtful.</p> <p>In any event, these inscriptions, make no reference to Lord Rama.</p>
1995	<p><b>EXHIBIT -4</b> Extract of the book Hindu World – An Encyclopedic Survey of Hinduism by Benjamin Walker. [Pgs. 26-30/Vol. 73]</p> <p>This extract only mentions that the place where Lord Rama was born was once marked by a temple which was destroyed and converted into a mosque by Babur.</p>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b></p> <p>In the impugned judgment a separate extract of the book has been relied upon to construe the meaning of Vedic Literature at pgs. 2550-2564/ Vol. III of the Impugned Judgment at paras 4111-4112; 4114,4116, 4124, 4130.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b></p> <p>It is submitted that this book is published in 1995, after the desecration as well as demolition of the mosque and all information herein is hearsay.</p>
1854	<p><b>EXHIBIT -5</b> Gazetteer of Edward Thornton[Pgs. 31-37/Vol. 73]</p>	Discussed in the traveller's note.
1862 1863 1864 1864	<p><b>EXHIBIT -6</b> Archaeological Survey of India – 4 reports 1862-63-64 and 65 by Alexander Cunningham, C.S.I. [Pgs. 38-46/Vol. 73]</p>	Discussed in the traveller's note.
1877	<p><b>EXHIBIT -7</b> Gazetteer of Oudh, Vol. 1, 1877[Pgs.</p>	Discussed in the traveller's note.

	47-52/Vol. 73]	
1880	<b>EXHIBIT -8</b> A.F. Millett's "Report of the Settlement of the Land Revenue of the Faizabad", 1880 [Pgs. 53-63/Vol. 73]	Discussed in the traveller's note.
1891	<b>EXHIBIT -9</b> The Monumental Antiquities and inscriptions in the north west provinces and Awadh described and arranged by A. Survey N.W.P and Oudh Allahabad and others at Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, London, Isipaig, by A. Fuhrer. [Pgs. 64-70/Vol. 73]	Discussed in the traveller's note.
	<b>EXHIBIT -10</b> Imperial Gazetteer of India, Provincial Series, United Provinces of Agra and Oudh- Vol. II [Pgs. 71-76/Vol. 73]	Discussed in the traveller's note.
1905	<b>EXHIBIT -11</b> Fyzabad Gazetteer, Volume XLIII of the District Gazetteers of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh by H R Nevill, 1905 Edition [Pgs. 77-91/Vol. 73]	Discussed in the traveller's note
1928	<b>EXHIBIT -12</b> Fyzabad Gazetteer, Volume XLIII of the District Gazetteers of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh by H R Nevill, 1928 Edition [Pgs. 92-104/Vol. 73]	Discussed in the traveller's note
1960	<b>EXHIBIT-13*</b> Uttar Pradesh District Gazetteer, Faizabad.  The following points are recorded:  a) Credit for restoration of Ayodhya goes to Vikramaditya of Ujjain who is identified with Chandragupta II. [Pg. 113/Vol. 73]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> This exhibit has been discussed in Justice Sudhir Agarwal's judgment at Paras 1434 [Pg. 983/Vol. 1], 2627 [Pgs. 1531/Vol. 2], 3530 [Pg. 2031-32/Vol. 2] and 4285 [Pg. 2871/Vol 2], however no specific findings have been given.  This exhibit has been relied upon by Justice Sharma to reason that there was continuity



	<p>b) Babur reached Avadh (Ayodhya) and stayed there for a few days. He appointed BaqiTashqandi as the governor of Avadh, who subdues the rebellious local chiefs. During his regime, Baqi built a mosque in Ayodhya in 1528- gives the translation of inscriptions. [Pg. 116/Vol. 73]</p> <p>c) In 1528, Babur visited Ayodhya and under his orders- Janamsthan temple (which marked the birthplace of Lord Ram) was destroyed and on the site was built the Babri Mosque. [Pg. 116/Vol. 73]</p> <p>d) Material of old temple, particularly the Kasauti pillars were used in building the mosque. [Pg. 117/Vol. 73]</p> <p>e) There are two inscriptions in Persian, one on the outside and other on the Pulpit- bearing the date of 935 Hijri. [Pg. 117/Vol. 73]</p> <p>f) After the clashes in 1855, in 1858 an outer enclosure was put up in front of the mosque and the Hindus were forbidden access to the inner yard and they had to perform their puja on a platform outside. [Pg. 117/Vol. 73]</p> <p>g) Since 1949 position has changed and the Hindus have succeeded in installing the images of Rama and Sita in the mosque. [Pg. 117/Vol. 73]</p>	<p>since times immemorial about the divinity attached to the place Rama Janamshtan not only in the scriptures, worship and devotion in practice but also a recurring continuity even after the construction of the disputed structure. [Pg. 3426/Vol. 3 of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b> It is submitted that this very Gazetteer notes that the Hindus were praying outside the on the Platform in the outer courtyard, while Muslims were praying inside in the mosque. Further, it also mentions the fact of desecration of the mosque in 1949. At no point does the Gazetteer mention that the place of birth of Lord Ram was under the central dome of the mosque. The finding <i>qua</i> the divinity is erroneous to the extent it assumes that the devotion was for the entire area, when in fact the gazetteer clearly mentions that Hindus were worshipping only at the platform outside- which is the Ram Chabutara and hence no question of any divinity attaching to the mosque in the inner courtyard arises.</p>
1976	<p><b>EXHIBIT 14</b> Extract of -Indian Archaeology, a review, 1976[Pgs. 120-127/Vol. 73] This mentions about one previous excavation of Ayodhya under the supervision of Prof. B.B Lall and concludes that on the basis of these</p>	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b> This document has been just referred by PW7 in his testimony to mention about previous excavations in Ayodhya. [See para 498 at pg. 509/Vol. 1 of the Impugned Judgment]</p>

	excavations the antiquity of Ayodhya is ascribable to easy seventh century B.C.	
✓	<p><b>EXHIBIT 15</b> Memoirs of Zahir-Ed-Din Muhammed Babur, Emperor of Hindustan- Translated by John Leydon and William Erskine. [Pgs. 128-132/Vol. 73]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Mentions that Babur camped at the junction of river Gogra and Saru.</li> <li>❖ Mentions BakiShagawel</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b></p> <p>This has been relied upon by Muslim Parties to show that demolition of temples by Muslim rulers was done for wealth and not for any hatred towards the idol worshippers. [Para 3995-3997 at pgs. 2459-2460/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p>Justice Sudhir Agarwal relies on this exhibit to conclude that Babur never crossed saryu or otherwise reached thereto. Therefore, the question that he himself visited Ayodhya &amp; commanded for construction of a mosque thereat does not arise. Similarly, if such a command was given to anyone else was also not shown/proved. The claim of Muslim parties, that as a result of dedication by Babur, they came in possession, therefore is rendered baseless. [Para 2939/Pg. 1645 of Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p><b><u>Comment:-</u></b></p> <p>It is submitted that it is no one's case, that the Mosque was not built by/or under the orders of Babur. The Plaintiffs in Suit 5 have already accepted this position as is evident from Para 23-24 [at pgs. 245-247/Vol. 72- Pleadings Volume]. Thus, the aforementioned finding is erroneous in as much as it negates the factual position which is admitted by both parties.</p> <p>Further, in <i>Miru &amp; others Vs. Ramgopal</i> AIR 1935 All. 891, the Court held:</p> <p><i>"Where there is a mosque or a temple, which has been in existence for a long time and the terms of the original grant of the land cannot now be ascertained, there would be a fair presumption that the sites on which mosques or temples stand are dedicated property. There can be no legal impediment to such a dedication, as the owner of the land can make a grant of the site even to persons of a different</i></p>

		<p><i>community and creed and allow them then to dedicate that site by building a place of worship on it. Where therefore the Court finds that a mosque or a temple has stood for a long time and worship has been performed in it by the public, it is open to the Court to infer that the building does not stand there merely by the leave and license of the owner of the site, but that the land itself is a dedicated property and the site is a consecrated land, and is no longer the private property of the original owner."</i></p> <p>It is therefore submitted when both parties agreed to the existence of the mosque and that it has been established that the mosque was in existence for a long time and Muslims were praying therein, then there arises a presumption of the said land being a dedicate property.</p>
✓	<p><b>EXHIBIT 16</b>  <b>Babur Nama translated by A.S. Beveridge[Pgs. 133-149/Vol. 73]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Mentions that Babur camped at the junction of river Gagar (Gogra) and Sird (a).</li> <li>❖ Mentions BakiShagawel</li> <li>❖ Gives translations of the inscriptions at the Babri Mosque.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b></p> <p>This exhibit has been relied upon by Justice Agarwal and Justice Sharma to point out the discrepancies in the translations of the inscriptions done by various authors and to ultimately hold that the inscriptions were unreliable. [See paras 1441-1444 @ pgs. 987-989/Vol. 1; para 1468 @ pg. 1006/Vol. 1; Para 1480-1484 @ pgs. 1013-1014/Vol. 1; Para 1515-1517 @ pgs. 1020/Vol. 1; Para 1651-1652 @ pg. 1090/Vol. 1; Para 2939 @ pg. 1645/Vol. 2 and Pg. 3242/Vol. 3]</p> <p><b><u>Comment:-</u></b></p> <p>It is submitted that all the inscriptions mention that the mosque was built under the orders of Babur- the only discrepancy is regarding the period of the construction and whether it was constructed by Mir Baqi. It is relevant to note that the Plaintiff of Suit 5 at para 23 at pgs. 245-246 (Vol. 72- Pleadings Volume) itself mentions about the building of the Babri Mosque in 1528 AD by Mir Baqi in 1528. It further mentions that till 1855- Hindus and Muslims were praying alike in the same building and after 1855- Muslims were praying inside in the Mosque and the Hindus were praying outside on a platform, both of which were separated by an enclosure. The Hindus were forbidden access to the inner courtyard.</p>

		Further, the Plaint itself mentions about two inscriptions in Persian which bear the date of 935 Hijri. In such circumstances when there is no dispute between the parties about the construction of Mosque by Mir Baqi in 1528 AD (935 Hijri) under the orders of Babur, it is submitted that the aforementioned findings were unwarranted and irrelevant.
1987 ✓	<b>EXHIBIT 17</b> Extract from the book "Babri-Masjid" "TarikheiPash-mannjarAurPeshManjar Ki Roshni Mein" by Syed ShahabuddinAbdur Rehman, 1987 Edition. [Pgs. 150-160/Vol. 73]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment.  <b><u>Comment:</u></b> It is relevant to note that this Exhibit records the complaint dated 30.11.1858 filed by Syed Mohammad Khateeb and Moazzin stating that in the middle of the Babri Masjid an earthen Chabutra was made by Nihang Fakir and a symbol of idol and adjacent to that a ditch was dug and fire was lit for puja and 'Ram' was written by him with coal within the Masjid Compound. It was further complained that since the Babri Masjid is the place of offering Namaz by Muslims and contrary to that if Puja would be going on the same would lead to communal clash.
1987 ✓	<b>EXHIBIT 18</b> Extract of book Amir Ali Shaheed AurMarka-I-Hanuman Garhi by Shah Mohd. Azmat Ali AlviKakorvi, published by Dr. ZakiKakorvi in 1987, publisher Markaz Adab Lucknow. [Pgs. 161-189/Vol. 73]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> No discussion in the judgment. Only contents of the Exhibit have been reproduced at para 3518 at pg. 2023-26/Vol. 2, but no finding has been recorded.
1608-1611	<b>EXHIBIT 19</b> Photocopy of page 176 from the book "Early travels in India 1583-1619, London 1921", containing the report of William Finch (1608-1611), by William Foster. [Pgs. 190-191/Vol. 73]	Discussed in the traveller's note
1838	<b>EXHIBIT 20</b> Photocopy of page and pages 335 and 336 of Vol.II of the book "History, antiquities, topography and statistics of eastern India – of report Montgomery Martin, British	Discussed in the traveller's note

	surveyor of the year 1838. [Pgs. 192-197/Vol. 73]	
1978	<p><b>EXHIBIT 21</b> Encyclopedia Britannica XV edition 1978, photocopy of page and pages of the book 693 and 694. [Pgs. 198-201/Vol. 73]</p> <p>Records that- <i>Rama's birthplace is now marked by a mosque, erected by the Mughal Emperor Babur in 1528 on the site on an earlier temple.</i> [Pg. 201/Vol. 73]</p>	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b> The Hon'ble High Court observed that the description therein being of 1978 is of no importance as it reiterates virtually what is contained in the earlier books of reference. [Para 3533-3534 @ pgs. 2036-2037/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]</p>
1932	<p><b>EXHIBIT 22</b> Photocopy of frontispiece and pages 59, 60, 150 to 155 and ParishistGha in two pages of the book "Ayodhya Ka Itihas" by Hindi Sudhaker Rai Bahadur Sri Awadh WasiLalaSita Ram book Hindustani Academy 1932. [Pgs. 202-220/Vol. 73]</p>	<p>Discussed in traveller's note.</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b> However, it is relevant to mention that the Hon'ble High Court held that this document was not reliable. [Para 1479 @ pg. 1012-13/Vol. 1 of the Impugned Judgment]</p>
1987	<p><b>EXHIBIT 25</b> Typed frontispiece with photocopy of pages 227-234 typed copy of the note indicates the collection and the sources consulted of the book "A clash of cultures Awadh, the British and the Mughals" by Michel H. Fisher published by Manohar Publication New Delhi 1987. [Pgs. 221-244/Vol. 73]</p> <p>Gives a detailed account of the 1855 riots.</p>	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b> This exhibit has been discussed at paras 3398-3399 @ pgs. 1924-1928/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment and it has been used to conclude that the 1855 riots did take place.</p>
1885 ✓	<p><b>EXHIBIT 26*</b> Copy of plaint dated 19.01.1885 of Mahant Raghubar Das (Hindi transliteration) in Suit No. 61/280 of 1885. [Pgs. 245-250/Vol. 73]</p>	<p><b>Comment:-</b> This is the plaint of the 1885 suit filed by Mahant Raghubar Das to build a temple at the Ram Chabutara. It is relevant to mention that the map annexed to this plaint has not been exhibited here, but it has been exhibited by Muslim Parties[at Pgs. 51-54/Vol. 3] and it shows the existence of a masjid which is in the possession of the muslims. Further, on</p>

		24.12.1885, in the Judgment of the Sub-Judge it was held that the Muslims were praying inside in the Masjid and the Hindus were praying outside at the Chabutara [See pgs. 63-70 @ pg. 68-69/Vol.3]. Subsequently, in the appeal judgment dated 18/26.03.1886, it has been held that the Chabutara is said to indicate the birth place of Ram Chandra. However, despite this finding it has been held that the Chabutara does not belong to the Hindus. [See pgs. 4200-4201/Vol. III at pg. 4201] :
18.12.1929	<b>EXHIBIT 27</b> Copy of G.O. 6373/F2991 dated 18.12.1929 granting permission to six Muslim individuals to institute a suit U/s 92 C.P.C. with respect to the alleged proof relating to the alleged Babri Mosque about 12 Bighas of village Sholapur Pargana Haveli Awadh. [Pgs. 251-52/Vol. 73]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b> These documents show that some Muslim persons obtained permission from the Government under Section 92 for institution of the suit but it is an admitted fact that no record is available to show that any suit actually filed by anyone. No details as to how and why the said sanction was granted and what thereafter happened are available. Due to lack of attending information these documents were not taken into consideration for forming opinion either way in the context of the issue in question. [Para 3101-3102 at pgs. 1724-25/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]
18.12.1929 ✓	<b>EXHIBIT 28</b> Copy of G.O. 6373/F2991 dated 18.12.1929 granting permission to six Muslim individuals to institute a suit U/s 92 C.P.C. with respect to the alleged proof relating to the alleged Babri Mosque about 12 Bighas of village Sholapur Pargana Haveli Awadh. [Pg. 253/Vol. 73]	
13.11.1997	<b>EXHIBIT 29</b> Newspaper report with photostat copy page no. 3(city) of Hindustan Times Lucknow dated 13.11.97. [Pgs. 254-255/Vol. 73]  Report titled- Qadiyanis declared anti-Islamic at Muslim intellectuals' meet	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.
	<b>EXHIBIT 30</b> Photocopy of Hidayat by Charles Hamilton frontispiece of page and pages 239-240. [Pgs. 256-269/Vol. 73]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b> The following passage from the Hidayat has been used by the Hindu parties to allege that the Babri Mosque was not a valid mosque  <i>"If a person convert the centre hall of his house into a mosque giving general</i>

		<p><i>admission into it, still it does not stand as a mosque but remains saleable and inheritable because a mosque is a place in which no person possesses any right of obstruction; and wherever a man has such a right with respect to the surrounding parts the same must necessarily affect the place enclosed in them. The place, therefore, cannot be a mosque; besides it is necessarily a thoroughfare for the family and consequently does not appertain solely to God."</i></p> <p><b>[Para 3224 at pg. 1820 and Para'3503 at pg. 2015/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]</b></p> <p><b><u>Comment:-</u></b></p> <p>It is submitted that the abovementioned paragraph is irrelevant for the present case as there was no obstruction whatsoever in the Babri Mosque and the inner courtyard. It is submitted that all the attempts of obstruction by the Hindu parties were restricted to only the outer courtyard and therefore the question of validity of a mosque does not arise.</p>
--	--	---

[www.vadaprativada.in](http://www.vadaprativada.in)

[RUNNING VOLUME - 74]

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
13.5.1993	<p><b>EXHIBIT-31</b> Copy of affidavit filed by Sri Arvind Verma, Commissioner, Faizabad on 13.5.1993</p> <p>Sri Arvind Verma, was the authorized person under the Ayodhya Act, 1993 and he filed this affidavit in I.A. No. 10 of 1992 in Contempt Petition No. 97 of 1992 [Mohd. Aslam @ Bhure v. Union of India &amp; Ors.], stating that some changes were made in order to maintain the makeshift structure. [Pgs. 270-305/Vol. 74]</p>	Not discussed in the Impugned judgment.
6.8.1993	<p><b>EXHIBIT-32</b> Copy of the affidavit dated 6.8.1993 of Radhey Sham Kaushik A.No. /92 in C.P. No. 97/2002 Aslam Bhoorey Vs. Union of India. [Pgs. 306-322/Vol. 74]</p> <p>Affidavit of Shri RadheyShyam Kaushik stating that the sign boards which the Petitioner has demanded to be removed were outside the acquired land and were and have been there even prior to 1992.</p>	Not discussed in the Impugned judgment.
	<p><b>EXHIBIT-33</b> Book "Ram Janam Bhumi Ayodhya-New Archaeological discoveries" by K.S. Lal, President of the Historian forum Ayodhya. [Pgs. 323-342/Vol. 74]</p>	Not discussed in the Impugned judgment.
	<p><b>EXHIBIT-37</b> Booklet written by Mohd. Hashim Ansari "Babri Masjid KeeVajyabiKeLiye". [Pgs. 343-400/Vol. 74]</p> <p>This records the proceedings of a conference of Muslims regarding</p>	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment



	Babri Masjid where their unhappiness about the desecration and subsequent interim order permitting the Hindu community to continue idol worship in the Masjid. The conference discusses ideas to bring about an amicable resolution of the dispute.	
3.11.1989	<b>EXHIBIT-38</b> Letter dated 3.11.89 addressed to Prime Minister from Babri Masjid Action Committee. [Pgs. 401-405/Vol. 74]  This letter is a request from the Babri Masjid Action Committee that foundation stone of the temple should not be permitted to be laid on the disputed land and shilapoojan ceremonies/shilayatra procession should also not be permitted.	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment
3.11.1989	<b>EXHIBIT 39</b> Press release dated 3.11.1989. [Pgs. 406-408/Vol. 74]  Press release by the Babri Masjid Action Committee stating that to oppose the proposed shilanyas at the disputed site, the Muslims of Faizabad will keep their shops and commercial establishments closed on November 4-5, 1989.	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
23.12.1986	<b>EXHIBIT 40</b> Declaration of Delhi on Babri Masjid adopted by all India Babri Masjid New Delhi. [Pgs. 409-426/Vol. 74] Declaration discussing the illegal dispossession of the Muslims from the Babri Masjid and resolving to take all lawful measures to reclaim the Babri Masjid.	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
	<b>EXHIBIT 43</b> Map of Acquired area under Act No.33/1993. [Pgs. 427-431/Vol. 74]	Requires no comment.

<p><b>EXHIBIT 45*</b>  “Historian’s Report to the Nation”  “Babri Mosque or Rama’s Birthplace” [Pgs. 432-449/Vol. 74]</p> <p>This a report by 4 historians which gives historical facts and concludes that Babri Masjid cannot be the site of birthplace of Lord Ram. Even the Plaintiffs of Suit 4 have exhibited this report as Exhibit 62 (Pgs.1720 – 1757/Vol. 11).</p> <p><b>Also reproduced in the Judgment @ pgs. 2072-2081 at para 3609/Vol. 2.</b></p>	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b>  The Hon’ble High Court did not consider this report as though the said report is claimed to have been written by four persons but in fact it was not signed by Sri D.N.Jha. [Para 3611 @ pg. 9090/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  This report has been exhibited by Plaintiffs of Suit 5 as well as by Plaintiffs of Suit 4.</p> <p>The important points of this report are as follows: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No basis in the Skanda Purana (Ayodhya Mahatmya) to point the site of Babri Masjid as the birthplace of Lord Ram. [Pgs. 436-437/Vol. 74]</li> <li>The carvings on the pillars of the masjid do not show vaishnavite association. [Pg. 437-440/Vol. 74]</li> <li>The Brick bases found by Prof. B.B. Lal have been mentioned by him only in 1990 even though the excavation was conducted about 11 years ago and thereafter he had published several papers. [Pgs. 438-439/Vol. 74]</li> <li>Prof. B.B. Lal does not mention the pillar bases in his report submitted to Archaeological Survey in 1970-77 &amp; 1979-80. [Pgs. 439/Vol. 74]</li> <li>No stone pillars, architraves of roof material of the supposed temple were found in the debris of the trenches where pillar bases stood. [Pg. 439/Vol. 74]</li> <li>No mention of Babri Masjid in Ramcharitamanas composed in 1575-76. [Pg. 441/Vol. 74]</li> <li>The final conclusion was as follows: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ No evidence exists in the texts that before the 16<sup>th</sup> century (and indeed before the 18<sup>th</sup> century), any veneration attached to any spot in Ayodhya for</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
---	--

		<p>being the birth-site of Rama. [Pg. 445-446/Vol. 74]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ There are no grounds for supposing that a Rama temple, or any temple, existed at the site where Baburi Masjid was built in 1528-29. This conclusion rests on an examination of the archeological evidence as well as the contemporary inscriptions on the mosque. [Pg. 445-446/Vol. 74]</li> <li>❖ The legend that the Baburi Masjid occupied the site of Rama's birth did not arise until late 18<sup>th</sup> century; that the temple was destroyed to build a mosque was not asserted until the beginning of the 19th century, when the observer, before whom the assertion was made, disbelieved it. [Pg. 445-446/Vol. 74]</li> <li>❖ The full-blown legend of the destruction of a temple at the site of Rama's birth and Sita-ki-rasoi, is as late as the 1850's. Since then what we get is merely the progressive reconstruction of imagined history based on faith. [Pg. 445-446/Vol. 74]</li> </ul>
	<b>EXHIBIT 46</b> Photocopy of the article "Glazed Ware in India" Written by K.K. Mohammad. [Pgs. 450-455/Vol. 74]	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.
	<b>EXHIBIT 47</b> Photocopy of the title page and pages of the book "Babari Masjid" with page 5, Admitted by Sri M.A. Siddiqui on 1.5.08. [Pgs. 456-459/Vol. 74]	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.
	<b>EXHIBIT 48</b> Memoirs of Z.M. Babur translated by John Leyden and William Erskine Esq. page 378 to 381. [Pgs. 460-468/Vol. 74] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Mentions BakiTashkendi and BakiSheghwel. [Pg. 467-</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b></p> <p>Reproduced at para 3996 @ pg. 2459/Vol. II. No specific finding.</p>

	<p>468/Vol. 74]</p> <p>❖ Mentions that Babur halted in Oudh- 7-8 kos above Oudh on the banks of river Sirwu. [Pg. 468/Vol. 74]</p>	
	<p><b>EXHIBIT 49</b> Photocopy of pages 5, 6, 7 and 19, 20, 21 of the Photograph of the structure at Janam Sthal with the frontispiece of the book "Historical Sketch of Faizabad" with the old capitals Ajodhya and Fyzabad by P. Carnegy officiating commissioner and settlement officer 1870 Awadh Govt. Press. [Pgs. 469-489/Vol. 74]</p>	Discussed in the traveller's note.
Published After December 1992	<p><b>EXHIBIT 51</b> Copy of article on Ayodhya and God Rama by Ajay Mitra Shastri Dept. of Ancient History and Archaeology, Nagpur University. [Pgs. 490-493/Vol. 74]</p> <p>The author notes that the building in dispute was constructed by Babar in 1528 as is evident from the inscriptions fixed on the said building built after demolition of a Hindu Temple and in support of this opinion, he has relied on (a) the Chandravati plates of the Gahadavala King Chandradeva, dated Vikram Samvat 1150 (AD 1092-93); (b) the research work of Hans Bakker; (c) inscription of Jayachachandradev, dated AD 1184 said to have been seen by him when he claimed to have visited Ayodhya in 1992; (d) the stone inscription said to have been found at the time of demolition of the disputed building on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992.</p>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b></p> <p>❖ Discussed at para 4030 at pg. 2493/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment.</p> <p>❖ No specific finding.</p> <p>❖ Relevant to note that the author did not appear as a witness to prove this document.</p>

1902	<p><b>EXHIBIT 52</b> Photocopy of pages 168 and 169 of the Barabanki district gazetteer 1902 edition H.R. Nevill I.C.S. [Pgs. 494-500/Vol. 74]</p>	<p><b>Comment:-</b> In the 1902 Edition, Nevil merely mentions that Janamsthan Temple was destroyed by Babur and was replaced by a mosque. [Pg. 497/Vol. 74]</p> <p>However, in subsequent versions of 1905 &amp; 1928, he also records the following points which show that Muslims were praying at the mosque in the inner courtyard and Hindus were forbidden any access to the inner courtyard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Mosque has two inscriptions, one on the outside and other on the pulpit, both are in Persian and bear the date 935 Hijri. Of the authenticity of the inscription there can be no doubt. (Pg. 4071 &amp; 4076/Vol III of the Impugned Judgment)</li> <li>b) Till 1855, Hindus and Mohemmeddians alike used to worship in the Mosque-Temple. (Pgs. 4072 &amp; 4076/Vol III of the Impugned Judgment)</li> <li>c) A rupture took place between the Hindus and Muslims in 1855 and at that time, the Hindus, in their third attempt took the Janamshtan at the gate of which 75 Mohemmadans were buried in the Martyrs Grave (Ganj Shahid) [Pgs. 4072 &amp; 4076 / Vol. III of the Impugned Judgment].</li> <li>d) Since British rule a railing has been put up to prevent disputes. It is within this railing that the mosque exists and that is where the Muslims pray. Whereas the Hindus pray outside the fence where they have raised a platform. (Pgs. 4072 &amp; 4076/ Vol. III of the Impugned Judgment)</li> </ul>
	<p><b>EXHIBIT 53</b> Photocopy of page 9 of the book "Religious policy of the Mughal emperors" by S.R. Sharma published by Asia Publishing house 1962[Pgs. 501-502/Vol. 74]</p> <p>Notes that by Babur's orders Mir Baqi destroyed a temple at Ayodhya commemorating Rama's birthplace and built a mosque in its place in</p>	<p>Not discussed in the impugned judgment.</p>

	1528-9[Pgs. 502/Vol. 74]	
	<p><b>EXHIBIT 56</b>  Photocopy of frontispiece of part I and pages 44, 45, 128 to 140 there of the frontispiece and pages 143 (Chapter 21) the JanamSthan 144 to 149 thereof of the book "Ayodhya" by Hans Bakker. [Pgs. 503-544]</p>	<p>Discussed in detail in the traveller's note.</p> <p>In respect of the book of Hans Baker, the impugned judgment records as follows:-</p> <p><i>This description of Baker is either a reiteration of the information supplied in various Gazetteers or that contained in History book. However, at places he has simply proceeded by assuming many things on his own without assigning such information. [Pg. 2050 at para 3541/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment.]</i></p>

[www.vadaprativada.in](http://www.vadaprativada.in)

[RUNNING VOLUME - 75]

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
	<b>EXHIBIT-57</b> Photograph of introduction Ayodhya by Hans Baker Vol.I page XV to XVIII[Pgs. 545-552/Vol. 75]	Discussed in detail in the traveller's note.  In respect of the book of Hans Baker, the impugned judgment records as follows:-  <i>This description of Baker is either a reiteration of the information supplied in various Gazetteers or that contained in History book. However, at places he has simply proceeded by assuming many things on his own without assigning such information. [Pg. 2050 at para 3541/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment.]</i>
	<b>EXHIBIT 58</b> Photocopy of "Religious development in Saket" book bearing page no.43. [Pgs. 553-554/Vol. 75]	Contains the photocopy of the page 43 of Hans Bakker's book "Ayodhya" published in 1986
	<b>EXHIBIT 59</b> "The eleventh and twelfth century" page no. 49-59, first chapter 3. [Pgs. 555-571/Vol. 75]	Contains a photocopy of Chapter 3 pages 49 to 59 of Hans Bakker's book "Ayodhya" published in 1986.
	<b>EXHIBIT 60</b> The origin of devotion to Rama within Vaishnavism. [Pgs. 572-585/Vol. 75]	Contains the photocopy of the Chapter 4 pages 60 to 66 of Hans Bakker's book "Ayodhya" published in 1986.
	<b>EXHIBIT 61</b> The development of Ayodhya to Ayodhya Mahatmya. [Pgs. 586-591/Vol. 75]	Contains the photocopy of the Chapter 8 Part I pages 125 to 127 of Hans Bakker's book "Ayodhya" published in 1986
	<b>EXHIBIT 62</b> Part I Chapter VIII, page No.141, 143, 150 and 151. [Pgs. 592-599/Vol. 75]	Contains the photocopy of the Chapter 8 Part I pages 141, 143, 150, 151 of Hans Bakker's book "Ayodhya" published in 1986.
	<b>EXHIBIT 63</b> Part II, Chapter 23, "Ramanavami Mahatmya" (Featuring JanamSthan and Yamasthala". [Pgs. 600-655/Vol. 75]	Contains photocopy of Chapter 23 "Introduction" of Hans Bakker's book "Ayodhya" published in 1986.

	<b>EXHIBIT 64</b> Part II, Chapter 25, "Kaikaiee Bhawan and Sumitra Bhawan" page no. 176 to 177. [Pgs. 656-659/Vol. 75]	Contains photocopy of Part 2 Chapter 25 pages 176 to 178 of Hans Bakker's book "Ayodhya" published in 1986.
	<b>EXHIBIT 65</b> Part II, Chapter 26, "Sita Koop" page no. 178. [Pgs. 660-661/Vol. 75]	Contains the photocopy of the Chapter 26 Part 2 page 178 of Hans Bakker's book "Ayodhya" published in 1986.
	<b>EXHIBIT 66</b> Maps of Ayodhya-Faizabad illustration-II. [Pg. 662/Vol. 75]	Illegible. Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
	<b>EXHIBIT 67</b> Maps of Ayodhya-Faizabad illustration-III. [Pg. 663/Vol. 75]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
	<b>EXHIBIT 68</b> Photocopy of the extract Indian Architecture (Islamic Period) by Percy Brown. [Pg. 664-679/Vol. 75]	This document provides certain basics of construction of a mosque. It has been relied upon by the Hindu parties to aver that a mosque must have minarets and that a mosque in the vicinity of a graveyard cannot be a mosque. The impugned judgment at para 3430 quotes the relevant extract of this document and ultimately concludes that that it has not been proved that a mosque without a Minar is not a valid mosque and that a mosque built in the vicinity of a graveyard would lose its status of mosque. [See para 3430-3432 @ pgs.1938-1942/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]
	<b>EXHIBIT 69</b> Photocopy of "Aine-Akbari" by AbulFazl Vol. II Subaye Awadh, Nawal Kishore Press Lucknow 1881, copy made by B.R. Grover in his own handwriting of page 78. [Pg. 680-685/Vol. 75]	Discussed in traveller's note.
	<b>EXHIBIT 70</b> Photocopy of page 427 on the book "Hadeeqa-E-Shohada" by Mirza Jaan, published in 1956, Lucknow with frontispiece containing Nasbihat-I-Bist-O-Panjum Az Chahal Nisaih Bahadur Shahi daughter of Bahadur Shah Alam Gir. [Pg. 686-706/Vol. 75]	This document mentions that – At the birth place of Lord Ram and the place adjacent to it - called Sita Rasoi, Babur got a mosque constructed under the supervision of Sayaad Musha Ashiqan in the year 923 Hijri.  Relevant portion has been reproduced in the judgment at para 3517 @ pg. 2022-2023/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment.



	<b>EXHIBIT 71</b> Extract from the book "The Disputed Mosque" A Historical Enquiry by Susheel Srivastava, Chapter V, "Did Babar build the Masjid" [Pg. 707-726/Vol. 75]	This book has not been referred by anyone during arguments. [Para 3661-62 @ pg. 2133-34/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]
	<b>EXHIBIT 92</b> Archaeological Survey report: N.W. Provinces and Oudh (Ayodhya, Bhulia Tal, Sahet and Mahet). [Pg. 727-731/Vol. 75]	Discussed in the note on Travellers.
12.10.1995	<b>EXHIBIT 103</b> Newspaper report page 10 of Amar Ujala Kanpur dt. 12.10.1995, proved by OPW 2 at page 57 of his evidence. [Pg. 732-734/Vol. 75]  Newspaper report regarding some dispute of Mohd. Hashim-unconnected with the present matter.	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
	<b>EXHIBIT 114</b> Presidential Address by S.P. Gupta on 22.12.1989 in Guntoor (A.P.) on the subject "Sri Ram Bhumi Controversy - Passion apart what history and archaeology have to say on this Issue". [Pg. 735-786/Vol. 75]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> The paper only shows the personal opinion of the author. The aforesaid author has appeared as witness O.P.W. 3 on behalf of plaintiffs (Suit-5). No reason to take into account the aforesaid opinion when the author has himself has appeared and deposed as an expert witness (Archaeologist). [Para 4027 @ pg. 2492/Vol. 2]
	<b>EXHIBIT 115</b> Article written by Dr. S.P. Gupta "Ram Janam Bhumi Babri Masjid - Revisited". [Pg. 787-791/Vol. 75]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> No reason to consider this document since it is at the best an opinion of an expert and when the expert himself has deposed his statement; it is better to consider that statement instead of his ex parte opinion. [Para 4028 @ pg. 2492/Vol. 2]
	<b>EXHIBIT 116</b> Description of Ram Janam Bhumi in Ayodhya Mahatmya edited by Sir Krishna Das, Khem Raj Srashi. [Pg. 792-797/Vol. 75]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> The religious texts like Valmiki Ramayan and Ramcharitmanas of GoswamiTulsidas and others like Skandpuran etc, mention that Lord Rama was born at Ayodhya and it is his place

		<p>of birth but do not identify any particular place in Ayodhya which can be said to be his place of birth.[Para 4372 at pg. 2784/Vol. III of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  This is an extract of the Ayodhya Mahatmya which has been used by the Hindu parties to aver that the site of Babri Masjid is the site of the birth of Lord Ram.</p> <p>In this reference reliance maybe placed on the Historians Report to the Nation - which has been exhibited by Plaintiffs in Suit 5 as well as Plaintiffs in Suit 4. It is Exhibit 45 in Suit 5 (Pgs. 432-449/Vol 74) and Exhibit 62 in Suit 4 (1720 – 1757/Vol. 11). The following portion from the Historians report maybe relevant:-</p> <p><i>“The only Sanskrit text the VHP experts have produced in support of claims (1) and (2) is the Skanda Purana. They refer to the Ayodhya-mahatmya, that is, the merits of visiting Ayodhya given in Skanda Purana. We have used the printed version of the Skanda Purana (Kashemarian edn., Bombay, 1910) and two other versions found in Manuscripts in Vrindavan Research Institute, Vrindaban, and the Bodleian Library, Oxford. These texts are of recent origin and the insertion of interpolations in the Ayodhya mahatmya section of the printed Skanda Purana seems to have continued at least till the 18th century. The internal contents of the Skanda Purana including the mention of Vidyapati, who passed away in the first half of the 16th century, show that the core of this Purana itself was not compiled until earlier than the 16th century. Ayodhya-mahatmya given in the printed version has not been compiled by one hand. For example, the course of the description of the tirathas [pilgrimage] in general is interrupted and all of a sudden the glorification of Ayodhya starts. In the case of Ayodhya itself the virtues of visiting and bathing in the Sarayu river are not given at one place, but at two places; in between the contexts have nothing to do with the Sarayu. We also find that in the description of the trithas, Visishta</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p>replaces Agastya as the narrator, and then again the narration is taken over by Agastya. This shows obvious interpolation. The description of Janamasthan occurs in the last chapter of the Ayodhya- mahatmya (Verses 18-25), and is clearly a later addition. It is easier to make insertions at the end of texts.</p> <p>In spite of these various inconsistencies, even if we accept the location of the birthplace of Rama as given in Ayodhya-mahatmya, it does not tally with the site of the Baburi Masjid. Two terms are used for the birthplace of Rama, Janamasthan and Janambhumi. Even if we take the two to be identical, the Ayodhya-mahatmya information about the location of the birthplace does not take us to the Baburi Masjid site. Both the Vrindaban and Bodleian versions of the Mahatmya mention the compass directions and distance from a few states. According to verses 21.24 the birthplace is located 500 dhanus (910 meters) westward of Laumash and 1009 dhanus (1835 meters) eastward of Vighneshvara. According to local Hindu belief Laumash or the place of Lomash is identical with the present Rinamochana Ghat. On this basis the Rama Janambhumi should be located somewhere west, in the vicinity of the Bhahmakunda close to the bed of the Sarayu. Further according to the Mahatmya Rinamochana Ghat, or the place of Lomash, lies 700 dhanus (1274 meters) northeast of Brahmakunda. Both the direction and the distance have been found to be approximately correct by us. It is further stated that the Janamsthana lies northeast of Vighnesh. According to local tradition the place of Vighnesh is marked by a pillar, which lies southwest of Rinamochana Ghat. This again excludes the Baburi Masjid site and places the birthplace somewhere between Rinamochana and Bharmakunda on the bank of the Saraya. Thus, according to Hindu belief as given in the Ayodhya Mahatmya of the Skanda Purana, the birth place of Rama cannot be located on the site where the Baburi Masjid stands. It is argued by experts of the VHP that the location of Rama Janambhumi is given on the basis of</p>
--	--	--

		<p>solar directions and cannot be determined through the use of campus. But even if we take solar directions into account the Janambhumi of the Skanda Purana cannot be located on the site of the Baburi Masjid.</p> <p>The various versions of the Ayodhya-Mahatmya seem to have been prepared towards the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th; even as late as that the birthplace was not considered to be important. It is significant that the Janamsthan is not mentioned even once in any itineracy of pilgrimage given in the Mahatmya.</p> <p>The description of the tirthas in Ayodhya as given in the Ayodhya Mahatmya show that the Svargadvarya tirtha was far more important in the eyes of the compilers of the pilgrimage section than the Janambhumi. Svargadvarya is believed to be the place where Rama left for heaven and is considered sacred because of that reason. The Skanda Purana speaks of two Svargadvarya tirthas in Ayodhya.</p> <p>Whatever might be its real location there is no doubt that in Hindu belief it was far more meritorious to visit this place than other local places of pilgrimage. The earliest mention of this tirtha appears in a Gahandavala inscription of the 11th century, which speaks of the land grant made by king at the confluence of Sarayu and Ghaghara. This grant speaks of the worship of Vasudeva at the confluence site but not of any temple (D.C.Sirkar, Select Inscriptions, Volume II, PP.276-77, lines 20-23). It appears that the sanctity attached to the place of Rama's death was of greater importance in earlier times. It is significant that the Ayodhya-Mahatmya of the printed version of the Skanda Purana devotes one hundred verses to the description of the Svargadvarya which is made to identical with Gopratara-thirtha (b.112-211) and gives only eight verses to the description of the Janamsthana (10.18-25).</p> <p>No place Ayodhya is associated with Rama's birth either in the 11th century or even six</p>
--	--	--

		<p>centuries after. When a place is associated with his birth possibly in the late 18th century its location given in the various Mahatmyas does not tally with the present Baburi Masjid. It. Therefore, seems quite erroneous to hold that according to old Hindu belief the Rama Janambhumi temple was situated at the same site as is now occupied by the Baburi Masjid."</p>
--	--	---

[www.vadaprativada.in](http://www.vadaprativada.in)

**EXHIBITS FILED BY PLAINTIFFS IN SUIT 5**

[RUNNING VOLUME - 76]

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
October 1992	<b>EXHIBIT-117</b> Original Book "Hindu Vishwa" Oct. 92 Vol 28 No.2 Kartik 2049 Vikrami, edited by H.C. Srivastava. [Pgs. 798-845/Vol. 76]	[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]
21.10.1989	<b>EXHIBIT-118<sup>+</sup></b> Report Matter written by Pt. Hari Saran Dwivedi, 305, Bahadur Ganj, Allahabad-3 dated 21.10.1989. [Pgs. 847/Vol. 76]	[Not discussed the Impugned Judgment]  <b>Comment:-</b> It mentions the night of 22/23 1949 and quotes as follows:  <i>"Transferred in the night- the Swami (Principal) SharavanNakshtra is Baikunth, therefore good time for Bairagis"</i>  This exhibit indicates that the idols were indeed transferred in the intervening night of 22/23 1949.
	<b>EXHIBIT -119</b> Matter written by Pt. InduShekhar Pandey, Parashar-Jyotish Bhawan-2/22 Bhadaini, Varanasi. [Pgs. 849/Vol. 76]	[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]
04.07.1987	<b>EXHIBIT -120</b> Letter of Syed Shabuddin, M.P. (Lok Sabha) to Mr. Anjum Qader. [Pgs. 852/Vol. 76]	[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]  <b>Comment:-</b> The letter is against the proposal of shifting the masjid to some other place as the same would open a Pandora box.  It is submitted that the document is not relevant qua adjudication of the dispute.
02.09. 1988	<b>EXHIBIT -121</b> Letter of Prince Anjum Qader to Sri Shabuddin dated 2.9.88 King of Oudh's Mausoleum, Garden Reach Calcutta, 24. [Pgs. 855/Vol. 76]	[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]  <b>Comment:-</b> The letter is reply to some letter dated 29.06.88. It highlights the inter se grievance of shias and sunnis with regard to representation in action committees and on deliberations if indeed mandir was demolished to build Babri

		<p>Masjid and that in such a case Mr.Shahabuddin would himself demolish the mosque.</p> <p>It is submitted that the document is not relevant qua adjudication of the dispute.</p>
26.02.1990	<b>EXHIBIT -122</b> Letter of Prince Anjum Quder to Sri V.P. Singh, Prime Minister of India dated 26.2.1990. [Pgs. 857-858/Vol. 76]	<p>[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  The letter offers a proposal to the then Prime Minister on behalf of Shias to find a solution on the dispute.</p> <p>It is submitted that the document is not relevant qua adjudication of the dispute.</p>
1885, published	<b>EXHIBIT -123</b> Extract from "Encyclopedia of India and of Easter and Southern Asia" by Surgeon General Balfour [Pgs. 860/Vol. 76]	<p>The document has been discussed in a separate note on travelers and Gazetteers</p>
undated	<b>EXHIBIT -124</b> A note on essentials and characteristics of a Mosque prepared by Sri D.N. Agarwal, a retired Judge, Allahabad High Court. [Pgs. 868-880/Vol. 76]	<p>[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]</p>
16.05.1991	<b>EXHIBIT -125</b> List of documents examined by NAI from Sri Kishore Kunal, O.S.D., Ministry of State Home by Director General (Archive) dated 16.5.1991 along with list of the documents. [Pgs. 904-954/Vol. 76]	<p>[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  It is submitted that the document is not relevant qua adjudication of the dispute.  The list is of certain documents related to the Ram Janam Bhoomi Babri Masjid dispute submitted by VHP and Babri Masjid Action Committee.</p>
August 1996	<b>EXHIBIT -126</b> Details of photographs (ten photographs)[Pgs. 955-977/Vol. 76]	<p>[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]</p>
31.12.1988	<b>EXHIBIT -127</b> Letter to Prince Anjum Qudar President All India Shia Conference dt. 13.12.1988 Pakistan Addressed to Sarkar Tajaul-Ulem M.S.M. Naqvi	<p>[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]</p>

	(Fatwa with Hindi and English translation)[Pgs. 983-984/Vol. 76]	
October 1992	<b>EXHIBIT-128</b> Indian History and Cultural Society, New Delhi workshop seminar 10-13 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 1992 Ayodhya. Two resolution, signature of T.P. Verma at Serial No.214 [Pg. 985-991/Vol. 76]	[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]

[www.vadaprativada.in](http://www.vadaprativada.in)



[RUNNING VOLUME - 77]

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
Undated, (most likely post 1992)	<b>EXHIBIT-129</b> Archaeological and art historical evidence of the existence of the Hindu Temple of a Hindu religious structure prior to the construction of the disputed structure. [Pgs. 1041-1082 /Vol. 77]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b> It is claimed to be an Article read by Sri S.P. Gupta in a Conference at Ayodhya in October, 1992. The author himself has appeared in witness box and, therefore, we would consider his evidence along with his oral deposition. [Pg. 2493, Para 4031/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]  <b>Comment:-</b> It is relevant to note that the document acknowledges that Babri Mosque was built by Babar on the basis of inscriptions. @ pg. 1043-44  It is further submitted that the exhibit is post 1992 document and hence inadmissible and not relevant. See pg. 1046
Post 1992	<b>EXHIBIT-130</b> New Archaeological evidence of "An Eleventh Century Hindu Temple at Ayodhya" article by Dr. S.P. Gupta former Director Allahabad Museum. [Pg. 1113-1123/Vol. 77]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment</b> This document was considered with the oral deposition of Dr. S.P. Gupta.[Pg. 2493, Para 4033/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]
Post 1992	<b>EXHIBIT-131</b> Part-II Appendix II to IV from D. Mandal's book 'Ayodhya Archaeology after Demolition'. [Pg. 1124-1126/Vol. 77]	
Undated Most likely between 1988 to 1990	<b>EXHIBIT-132</b> Catalogue of Historical Documents in KapadDwar Jaipur Plan Front piece foreword by Bhawani Singh of Jaipur M.V.C and page 36 along with two maps. [Pg. 1127-1132/Vol. 77]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> The map has been relied upon by Mr. P N Mishra, Advocate and Mr. H S Jain to describe Ayodhya's religious places. [Pg. 2492, Para 4029/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]  <b>Comment:-</b> Irrelevant for the present case.

1786, published (travel account of years 1766-1771.	<b>EXHIBIT-133</b> Extract from the book of description, Historical and Geographical, of India by TyphenThalor, pages 252-254. [Pg. 1142-1155/Vol. 77]	<p>The document has been discussed in a separate note on travelers and Gazetteers.</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  It is relevant to note that the same author had admitted a bedi (craddle) and stated that it was on this where Beshan (Vishnoo) was born in the form of Ram. [Pg. 4119-4120 @ pg. 4120 of Vol. III of Impugned Judgment]</p> <p>It is relevant to note that the bedi was on the outer courtyard on Ram chabootra.</p>
---	---	---

[www.vadaprativada.in](http://www.vadaprativada.in)

# EXHIBITS OF SUIT 1 OF 1989

[RUNNING VOLUME - 78]

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
26.06.1958	<b>EXHIBIT-A3A, Suit 1</b> Death report of Mohd. Shami Mohalla Raiganj Ayodhya dated 26.6.1958. [Pgs. 1159-1160 /Vol. 78]	<b><u>Findings/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> Not relevant exhibit as per High Court list [Pg. 627, Para 601/Vol. I of the Impugned Judgment]
30.10.1865	<b>EXHIBIT-A18, Suit 1</b> Copy of the order dated 30.10.1865 of Assistant Commissioner.  [Pg. 1164-1165/Vol. 78]	<b><u>Findings/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> Nakal Bataur Sanad dated October 30, 1865 whereby possession of Masjid Janamsthan was given to Yabinda Muawza in lieu of cash grant, which was endorsed on December 5, 1865 by Extra Assistant Commissioner. [Pg. 1389-1393, Para 2341/Vol. II; pg. No. 3069/Vol III of the Impugned Judgment]. This Document is Annexure 5.32 @ Pg. No. 4235-4242/Vol III  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> This document shows that disputed structure was considered as a Mosque and was being used as one.
09.03.1950	<b>EXHIBIT-A39, suit 1</b> Naqual Naksha Kistwar Bandobhast.  [Pg. 1166-1167/Vol. 78]	<b><u>Findings/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> It is copy of the map Kistwar Misil Bandobast Sabik Mauza Ramkot Pargana Haweli Tehsil and District Faizabad dated 09.03.1950 and has been relied upon by pro Mosque parties as part of revenue records. No specific finding has been recorded qua this document. [Pg. 1696, Para 3094/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment] This Document is marked as Annexure 5.39/Vol. III  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> This document is a part of revenue record and it shows the existence of Babri Masjid.
Undated	<b>EXHIBIT-A40, suit 1</b> [Pg. 1168/Vol. 78]	<b><u>Findings/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> The map is of residential map of Mauza Ramkot Pargana Haweli Tehsil and District

		<p>Faizabad. No specific finding has been given <i>qua</i> this document.[Pg. 1696, Para 3094/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p><b><u>Comment:</u></b> It is submitted that the map has been relied upon by pro Mosque parties as part of revenue records.</p>
02.01.1936	<p><b>EXHIBIT-A53, suit 1</b> Copy of the application moved by Tahavar Khan Thekedar dated 2.1.1936. <b>Pg. 1169-1170/Vol. 78]</b></p>	<p><b><u>Findings/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b>Application of Tahavvar Khan, Contractor for early payment of his dues in respect of repairs of Babri Mosque filed before the Tehsildar, particularly dealing with houses burnt in riots. Though this document has been discussed, no clear finding has been given. [Pg. 1440-1441, Para 2376/Vol. II, Pg. Nos. 1723-1724 of Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p><b><u>Comment:-</u></b> This document indicates the possession of Mosque with the Muslims.</p>

[www.vadaprativada.in](http://www.vadaprativada.in)

**EXHIBITS FILED BY DEFENDANTS IN SUIT 4**

**[RUNNING VOLUME - 79]**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Particulars</b>	<b>Finding in Judgment and Comments</b>
Undated	<b>EXHIBIT-A10, Suit 4</b> Appendix 'A' to the book "A Historical Sketch of The. Faizabad" by P. Carnegi, Officiating Commissioner and Settlement Officer. <b>[Pgs. 1445-1461 /Vol. 79]</b>	<p>Discussed in detail in note on Travellers.</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  'JanamAsthan' is mentioned at serial no. 1 of Appendix A with particulars. It is relevant to note that the name of 'Ramdas ji' as 'founder or renovator', 'founded or restored' since 166 years is provided here.</p> <p>It is submitted that Carnegi's sketch had also recorded the existence of Mosque. In Appendix C.</p> <p>That further, the aforesaid observation of "since 166 years" and the location is inconsistent with the stand and the evidence produced by the Plaintiffs of Suit No. 5.</p>
18.03.1978	<b>EXHIBIT-A12, Suit 4</b> Certified copy of the statement of AbhiramDas Chela Saryu Das in the Court of D.J. Fazizabad in case no. 12/61, Dated 18-03-1978 <b>[Pg. 1462-1465/Vol. 79]</b>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b>  This document was filed in Suit 4 by the defendants to show that the Muslims were not in possession of the inner courtyard. The Court found that the documents were pertaining to post 1950, when the receiver had already been appointed and therefore no one could have entered the inner courtyard without the permission of the Receiver of the Court..  <b>[Pg. 1669, Para 3009-10/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</b></p>
17.02.1982	<b>EXHIBIT-A13, suit 4</b> Certified copy of the charge sheet under session trial no. 49/83 in the court of 3 <sup>rd</sup> Additional Session Judge as per list 269C1, marked as paper no. 270C1/1-7. <b>[Pg. 1473-1479/Vol. 79]</b>	<p><b>[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]</b></p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  This is the charge sheet in crime No. 87 wherein one complaint was lodged by mahant against other mahant alleging looting of ornaments, documents relating to Nirmohi Akhara re site plans etc. This document is irrelevant for the present dispute.</p>
16.07.1982	<b>EXHIBIT-A14, Suit 4</b>	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned</u></b>

	<p>Certified copy of the objection by Dharam Das dated 16-07-1982 in the court of A.D.M/ Nazul Officer.</p> <p>[Pg. 1480-1483/Vol. 79]</p>	<p><b>Judgment:-</b></p> <p>This document was found to be irrelevant by the Hon'ble High Court. [Pg.1669, Para 3012(B)/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</p>
16.07.1982	<p><b>EXHIBIT-A15, Suit 4</b></p> <p>Certified copy of the affidavit of Dharam Das dated 16-07-1982 in the court of ADM/Nazul Officer, in case no. 101/133/26/866.</p> <p>Pg. 1484-1486/Vol. 79]</p>	
26.06.1956	<p><b>EXHIBIT-M2, Suit 4</b></p> <p>Copy of the order dated 26.6.56 by H.S. Tewari A.D.M. Faizabad case no. 58/73 of 1956, on Misc. Appl of Abhiram Das P.S. Kotwali District Faizabad.</p> <p>Pg. 1489 /Vol. 79]</p>	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b></p> <p>It is the order passed by the Additional District Magistrate ordering no objection if the thatch is repaired. The aforesaid order was placed by the plaintiffs of suit No. 3 in order to show possession. The Impugned order records that it pertains to post 1949 and that it pertains to outer courtyard and therefore does not help the Plaintiffs of Suit 3.[Pg.1663, Para 3000/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</p>
21.12.1962	<p><b>EXHIBIT-M3, Suit 4</b></p> <p>Copy of the application by Abhiram Das dated 21.12.62 before City Magistrate Faizabad.</p> <p>[Pg. 1491 /Vol. 79]</p>	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b></p> <p>This document was filed by Nirmohi and the Impugned judgment records that this document does not help Nirmohi for their claim on inner courtyard. [Pg.1663, Para 3000 (C)/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</p>
21.12.1962	<p><b>EXHIBIT-M4, Suit 4</b></p> <p>Report made by Sri PriyaDutt Ram receiver on Misc. application of Baba Abhiram Das dated 21.12.62.</p> <p>[Pg. 1494 /Vol. 79]</p>	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b></p> <p>This document was filed by Nirmohi and the Impugned judgment records that this document does not help Nirmohi for their claim on inner courtyard.[Pg. 1663, Para 3000 (D)/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</p>
21.12.1962	<p><b>EXHIBIT-M5, Suit 4</b></p> <p>Copy of order dated 21.12.1962 passed by city magistrate S.N. Sharma on Misc. Application of Abhiram Das dated 21.12.62.</p> <p>[Pg. 1497 /Vol. 79]</p>	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b></p> <p>This document was filed by Nirmohi and the Impugned judgment records that this document does not help Nirmohi for their claim on inner courtyard.[Pg. 1663, Para 3000 (E)/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]</p>

26.12.1962	<b>EXHIBIT-M6, Suit 4</b> Copy of order dated 26.12.1962 passed by Sri S.N. Sharma City Magistrate Faizabad on Misc. Application of Abhiram Das. [Pg. 1498 /Vol. 79]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> This document was filed by Nirmohi and the Impugned judgment records that this document does not help Nirmohi for their claim on inner courtyard.[Pg. 1663, Para 3000 (F)/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]
December 1967	<b>EXHIBIT-M7, Suit 4</b> Copy of the record of the right (3 yearly) from 1374 to 1376 F, village Dihwa, Pargana Pratamganj, Tahsil Nawabganj. [Pg. 1501 /Vol. 79]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> This document was filed by Nirmohi and the Impugned judgment records that this document does not help Nirmohi for their claim on inner courtyard.[Pg. 1664, Para 3000 (G)/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]
	<b>EXHIBIT-B1, Suit 4</b> Copy of Bandobast Map 1944-45 F Babat Mauza Ramkot Pargana Haveli Awadh Faizabad. [Pg. 1502-1503 /Vol. 79]	[Not discussed in the judgment]  <b>Comment:-</b> The Map is illegible. The document is not relevant as it pertains to agricultural land.
	<b>EXHIBIT-B2, Suit 4</b> Copy of NaqualKhasraKishtwarBandobast of the year 1344-45 F Mauza Ramkot, Pargana Haveli Awadh, Faizabad with Hindi copy. [Pg. 1514-1518 /Vol. 79]	[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]  <b>Comment:-</b> The document is not relevant as it pertains to agricultural land.
	<b>EXHIBIT-B3, Suit 4</b> Photograph back view of the building [Pg. 1519 /Vol. 79]	[Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment]  <b>Comment:-</b> The photograph is of Babri Masjid.
1883, publication of the book.	<b>EXHIBIT-B5, Suit 4</b> Annexure filed along with the affidavit of Rajendra Singh D. W. 2/1-1 Book titled as "Bhai Bale WaliJanamSakhi". [Pg. 1521-1527 /Vol. 79]  <i>Note: Exhibits B5 to B10 and B12 and B 13, all refer to accounts with respect to Guru Nanakji/JanamSakhis of different editions by different people.</i>	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> The document does not appear to be reliable because paper Nos 208C1/1&2 (this Exhibit) are title covers of which bears no year and 2 bears year of publication to be 2000 AD; on the contrary, Ann 6 filed by the witness is of the year 1883. [Para 4092(E) @ pg. 2529/Vol. III]

1987, publication of the book.	<b>EXHIBIT-B6, Suit 4</b> Annex. 1, Extract from "JanamSakhi Bhai Bala Ka" by Dr. Gurubachan Kaur: (Hindi Transliteration) D.W.2/1-1 (statement) [Pg. 1528-1530 /Vol. 79]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> This has only been referred by DW 2/1-1 in his testimony and the Impugned Judgment has not recorded any finding in respect of this document.[Pg. 319, Para 342/Vol. I of the Impugned Judgment]  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> It is relevant to note that the contents do not identify the exact spot of birthplace of Lord Ram.
1962, publication of the book	<b>EXHIBIT-B7, Suit 4</b> Annex. 2, Extract from "JanamSakhi Sri Guru Nanak Dev Ji" by Sri Mihir Wari Ji Sodi (Hindi Transliteration) D.W.2/1-1 (statement) [Pg. 1531-1533 /Vol. 79]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> This has only been referred by DW 2/1-1 in his testimony and the Impugned Judgment has not recorded any finding in respect of this document.[Pg. 321, Para 342/Vol. I of the Impugned Judgment]  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> It is relevant to note that the contents do not identify the exact spot of birthplace of Lord Ram.
October. 1969	<b>EXHIBIT-B8, Suit 4</b> Annex. 3, Extract from "Aadi Sakhiya" Third Edition published by Lahor Book Shop D.W.2/1-1 (statement) [Pg. 1534-1536 /Vol. 79]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> This has only been referred by DW 2/1-1 in his testimony and the Impugned Judgment has not recorded any finding in respect of this document.[Pg. 324-325, Para 342/Vol. I of the Impugned Judgment]
1969	<b>EXHIBIT-B9, Suit 4</b> Annex. 4, Extract from "PuratanJanamSakhi- Sri Guru Nanak Dev Ji Ki" (Sachitra) D.W.2/1-1 (statement) [Pg. 1537-1538 /Vol. 79]	<b><u>Comment:-</u></b> The exhibit mentions the visit of Guru Nanakji to Ayodhya. It is relevant to note that the exhibit nowhere indicates the disputed site as birthplace of Lord Ram. None of the book's version show exact spot. Further, the 1 <sup>st</sup> edition was in the year 1969, so the document ought not be relied upon.
	<b>EXHIBIT-B10, Suit 4</b> Annex. 5, Extract from "PothiJanamSakhi" D.W.2/1-1 (statement) Pg. 1539-1542 /Vol. 79]	



	<b>EXHIBIT-B11, Suit 4</b> Annex. 6/7, Extract from "Guru Nanak Bans Prakash (Punjabi) by Sukhvasi Ram Bedi, edited by Gurumukh Singh, Languages Dept. Punjab, Patiala, 1986 D.W.2/1-1 (statement) <b>Pg. 1543-1548 /Vol. 79]</b>	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> Only mentioned at Pg. 322, Para 342/Vol. I of the Impugned Judgment, also at Para 4092E @ pg. 2529/Vol. III. No finding has been recorded in this respect.  <b>Comment:-</b> The exhibit is in Gurmukhi transliterated in English.
1962	<b>EXHIBIT-B12, Suit 4</b> Annex. 8, Extract from "JanamSakhi Sri Guru Nanak Dev Ji" by Mihirwan Ji Sodhi D.W.2/1-1 (statement) <b>Pg. 1549-1555 /Vol. 79]</b>	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> This has only been referred by DW 2/1-1 in his testimony and the Impugned Judgment has not recorded any finding in respect of this document.[Pg. 324-325, Para 342/Vol. I of the Impugned Judgment]  <b>Comment:-</b> The exhibit mentions the visit of Guru Nanakji to Ayodhya. It is relevant to note that the exhibit nowhere indicates the disputed site as birthplace of Lord Ram. None of the book's version show exact spot. Further, the 1 <sup>st</sup> edition was in the year 1969, so the document ought not be relied upon.
1962	<b>EXHIBIT-B13, Suit 4</b> Annex. 9, Extract from "JanamSakhi Sri Guru Nanak Dev Ji" by Mihirwan Ji Sodhi D.W.2/1-1 (statement) <b>[Pg. 1556-1574 /Vol. 79]</b>	<b>Comment:-</b> The exhibit mentions the visit of Guru Nanakji to Ayodhya. It is relevant to note that the exhibit nowhere indicates the disputed site as birthplace of Lord Ram. None of the book's version show exact spot. Further, the 1 <sup>st</sup> edition was in the year 1969, so the document ought not be relied upon.
1975	<b>EXHIBIT-B14, Suit 4</b> Annex. 10, Extract from "Sri Guru TeerthSangrah" by Sriman Tara Hari Narottam D.W.2/1-1 (statement) <b>[Pg. 1575-1580 /Vol. 79]</b>	
1948	<b>EXHIBIT-B15, Suit 4</b> Annex. 11, Extract from "Twarikh Guru Khalsa" by Bhai Gyan Singh Ji Gyani D.W.2/1-1 (statement). <b>[Pg. 1581-1583 /Vol. 79]</b>	
	<b>EXHIBIT-J1, Suit 4</b> Photocopy of the photograph of Babri Masjid without Meenars <b>[Pg. 1584 /Vol. 79]</b>	Requires no comment.
1921	<b>EXHIBIT-J5, Suit 4</b> Photograph of the extract from "Babar Nama" Vol.-II, written by A.S. Beveridge, appendix LXVII and LXXVIII and also page LXXVII-XXXI. <b>[Pg. 1585-1588 /Vol. 79]</b>	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b> Only mentioned at Pg. 2779, Para 4361 /Vol. III of the Impugned Judgment, however no finding.  <b>Comment:-</b> This document mentions that Babar crossed Saryu and dismounted on its bank. It further mentions that certain pages were drenched in

		<p>storm and were collected with great difficulty.</p> <p>The foot note 3 at page 679, Baburnama internal page number, mentions that Babar seems to use three epithets for Baqi i.e. ming. Begi, Shaghawal, Tashkindi. [Pg. 1586/Vol. 79]</p>
1921	<b>EXHIBIT-J8, Suit 4</b> Photograph of the extract from the book "Babar Nama" by A.S. Beveridge, pages 656, 657. [Pg. 1589-1590 /Vol. 79]	<p>[Not discussed in the judgment]</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  The book accepts Babar's construction of mosque.</p>
1921	<b>EXHIBIT-J9, Suit 4</b> Photograph of the extract from the book "Babar Nama" by A.S. Beveridge, page 602. [Pg. 1591-1592 /Vol. 79]	
	<b>EXHIBIT-J10, Suit 4</b> Fasanae-E-Ibrat Page 71 by Mirza Baze Ali Beg. [Pg. 1593-1598 /Vol. 79]	<p><b>Findings/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</b>  This document has been mentioned at Pg. 2461, Para 4005 /Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment as a part of Mr. H.S. Jain's submissions. However no categorical finding has been given <i>qua</i> this document.</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  This Exhibit refers to reproduction from the book namely fasane e ibrat, 1887. It is submitted that no further information is provided as to the authenticity of the book or its publisher.</p>
	<b>EXHIBIT-J11, Suit 4</b> Extract of the Book Titled as "The Disputed Mosque" Page no. 22. [Pg. 1599-1600 /Vol. 79]	<p>[Not discussed in the judgment]</p>
	<b>EXHIBIT-J13, Suit 4</b> Photo copy of the Bevridge's translation of the book "Babarnama" page no. 401 and 402. [Pg. 1601-1602 /Vol. 79]	<p>[Not discussed in the judgment]</p>
1972	<b>EXHIBIT-J20, Suit 4</b> Photo copy of the Extract of the book "History of the Buddhism In Kashmir" by Dr. Sarla Khosla.	<p>[Not discussed in the judgment]</p>

	[Pg. 1603-1607 /Vol. 79]	
	<b>EXHIBIT-J21, Suit 4</b> Photo copy of the book titled, as "Kalhan's Rajtarangani" by M. A. Stein Vol-2. [Pg. 1608-1612 /Vol. 79]	<b><u>Findings/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> The Hon'ble Court found this document as irrelevant for the present matter [Para 4315 @ pg. 2688/Vol. 2]
1838	<b>EXHIBIT-J22, Suit 4</b> Photo copy of the book titled as "The History, Antiquities, Topography and Statistics of Eastern India" Vol – II by Montgomery Martin [Pg. 1613-1622 /Vol. 79]	Discussed in the note on Travellers.
May 1845, later published by Atlantic publishers, 1989.	<b>EXHIBIT-J23, Suit 4</b> Photo copy of the Extract of the book titled as "History of India under Babar" by William Erskin. [Pg. 1623-1631 /Vol. 79]	<b><u>Findings/ Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:</u></b> The Hon'ble High Court has relied on this document to conclude that there is nothing to suggest that Babar either entered Ayodhya or gave directions to anyone to construct a mosque or to demolish a temple so as to construct a mosque. [Para 1548 @ 1030/Vol. I.]  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> This document is silent in relation to the facts concerning the present dispute and hence is irrelevant.
1891	<b>EXHIBIT-J24, Suit 4</b> Photo copy of the Extract of the Monumental Antiquities and Inscription in the North Western Provinces and Oudh by A. Fuhrer. [Pg. 1632-1638 /Vol. 79]	Discussed in detail in the note on travellers.
1908	<b>EXHIBIT-J26, Suit 4</b> Photo copy of the Extract of the book titled as "Indian Antiquities" edited by Richard Carnac Vol. XXXVIII-1908.  [Pg. 1639-1644 /Vol. 79]	<b><u>Findings/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> This document is only mentioned at Pg. 2141-42, Para 3669 /Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment, but no discussion pertaining to it has been recorded.  The document mentions nothing about either Babur or Babri masjid and hence not relevant qua adjudication of the dispute.  It pertains to Buddhist temple in Kashmir, which was converted to mosque.

1978	<b>EXHIBIT-J28, Suit 4</b> Extract from book titled as "Babur" by Dr. RadheyShyam. [Pg. 1645-1678 /Vol. 79]	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.
------	--	---

[www.vadaprativada.in](http://www.vadaprativada.in)

[RUNNING VOLUME -80]

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
	<b>Exhibit J29</b> Extract from the report of "Tours in the Central Doab and Gorakhpur in 1974-75 and 1875-76" by A.C.L. Carlieyle under the Superintendence of Major General A Cunningham Vol. XII. [Pgs. 1679-1688/Vol. 80]	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b>  This book notices tampering of inscriptions in respect of another mosque in Sambhal and therefore was relied upon by the Hindu parties to aver that reliance cannot be placed on inscriptions. This is discussed at pgs. 2137-2139- para 3667/Vol. 2 but no specific finding is given.</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  It is submitted that this book relates to a mosque in Sambhal and is unrelated to the present dispute.</p>
	<b>Exhibit J30</b> Ayodhya in Ancient India by B.C. Law, report of B.C. Law (Journal of Jha Research Institute Vol.1, page 423-443). [Pgs. 1689-1718/Vol. 80]	<p><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b>  This book gives details of the kings who are believed to have ruled Ayodhya. The relevant extract of this book is quoted at pgs. 2134-2137- para 3666/Vol. 2 but no specific finding is given.</p>
	<b>Exhibit J31</b> Holi Quran Majid, Page 324 written by Maulana Sayed Farman Ali. [Pgs. 1719-1726/Vol. 80]	<p><b>Findings/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b>  It is relevant to note that this document has been mentioned at para 4006 @ pg. 2461/Vol. 2 but no specific finding has been given.</p> <p><b>Comment:-</b>  This document has been relied upon to controvert the argument of the Muslim parties that the Mughal emperors used to attack the Temples for their wealth and not because of any inbuilt hatred for idolatry. It is submitted that this book only mentions about an incident wherein a mosque was built with ulterior motives [Masjid al-Dirar], hence Prophet Mohammed ordered for the masjid to be burned down. It is submitted that this document does not help the Plaintiffs in so far as they have argued that the Mughals destroyed hindu temples as they were against idolatry.</p>

	<p><b>Exhibit T-3</b> Photocopy of the extracts of "Babarnama" translated by A.S. Beveridge Vol.II.[Pgs. 1727-1729/Vol. 80]</p>	<p>Discussed in detail in the note on inscriptions.</p> <p><b><u>Comment:-</u></b></p> <p>It is relevant to mention that this document has been used to compare the various translations of Baburnama given by different authors and after such comparison it has been observed that the inscriptions are unreliable as they have been differently noted/translated by each author. In this respect it is relevant to note that:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The Plaintiff of Suit 5 itself mentions that the mosque was built under the orders of Babur in 935 Hijri (1528 AD)- specific reference to inscriptions has also been made and nothing has been stated to doubt the said inscriptions. [Para 23 @pg. 245-246/Vol. 72-Pleadings Volume]</li> <li>❖ Further, even though the Hon'ble High Court pointed out that there were discrepancies in the several versions of translations, it is relevant to note that all versions of translations noted that the inscriptions on the mosque bore the name of Babar and was built in</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Exhibit T-4</b> Photocopy of the pages from the book "RamcharitManas" Tikakar Dr. Raj Bahadur Pandey. [Pgs. 1730-1761/Vol. 80]</p>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b></p> <p>This is an extract of Uttar Kand of Ramayana-not discussed in the judgment.</p>
	<p><b>Exhibit V1</b> Copy of the page 334 of the book entitled as "Dictionary of Islam" by Thomas Patric Huge Court order dated 11.11.97 (P.W. 11 Statement, at page 58) [Pg. 1762/Vol. 80]</p>	<p>Not discussed in the judgment</p>
	<p><b>Exhibit Q4</b> Page 8 of "The disputed Mosque"[Pgs. 1763-64/Vol. 80]</p>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b></p> <p>Since the author (PW 15) himself has appeared as witness on behalf of plaintiffs (Suit-4) and the book itself is on record as Book No. 155, there was no occasion to refer the said exhibit and, in fact, it has also not been referred during the course of argument or written arguments by any party. [Para 3659-3662 @ Pgs. 2133-</p>

		2134/Vol. 2 of the Impugned judgment]
	<b>Exhibit Q5</b> Photocopy of the extract of the book "Dictionary of Islam" by Thomas Patrick.[Pg.1765-1766/Vol. 80]	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.
	<b>Exhibit 93</b> Annex. Pages 1/1 to 1/4 to the affidavit of O.P.W. 16 (Extract of Skand Mahapuran Part II, Ayodhya Mahatmya (2-8) with Hindi Translation (5 Pages)[Pgs. 1767-1778]	This is Ayodhya Mahatmya- a part of Skanda Purana. This has been discussed in the traveller's note.  <b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> The religious texts like Valmiki Ramayan and Ramcharitmanas of GoswamiTulsidas and others like Skandpuran etc. mention that Lord Rama was born at Ayodhya and it is his place of birth but do not identify any particular place in Ayodhya which can be said to be his place of birth.[Para 4372 at pg. 2784/Vol. III of the Impugned Judgment]
	<b>Exhibit 94</b> Annex.4, Pages 7/10 to 7/13 to the affidavit of O.P.W. 19 Sri Rakesh Datta (Extract from the "Hindu Iconography" by Sri S.P. Tewari)[Pgs. 1779-1782]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> This was annexed by OPW 19 along with his affidavit. It shows the photo of sculpture of Uma Mahesvara. No discussion or finding has been given regarding this in the impugned judgment.
	<b>Exhibit 95</b> Annex.1, Pages 4/1 to 4/8 to the affidavit of O.P.W. 14 (Ram Katha Kunj Ayodhya Faizabad Mein RakheyAwasheshkiSoochi)[Pgs. 1783-1788]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> OPW 14 has claimed that he had prepared a list of artefacts that he had recovered from Ram Katha Kunj (which is the place where the karsevaks had taken certain debris of the demolished structure). This document along with the relevant portion of the testimony has been reproduced in the judgment.[Para 594/ pgs. 619-621 of Vol. 1 of the Impugned Judgment]  <i>This will be dealt with along with the ASI issue.</i>

14.12.1992	<b>Exhibit 96</b> Annex.2 Page 4/9 to the affidavit filed by O.P.W. 14 Rakesh Tewari on 7.2.2003 (Letter of Alok Sinha to Sri Arvind Verma Commissioner Faizabad Division Dt. 14.12.1992, Paryatan Evam SanskritiKaryaVibhagVidhan Bhawan Lko.)[Pg. 1789]	<b>Not discussed in the impugned judgment.</b>  This is a letter from the Mr. Alok Sinha (Department of Tourism and Cultural affairs, Lucknow) to Shri Arvind Verma (Commissioner-Faizabad Division) stating that Rakesh Tiwari, Director of State Archaeological Department is being sent to prepare a list of art works of archaeological importance found last week in Ayodhya.
1998-99	<b>Exhibit 97</b> Annex.20 to the affidavit of OPW 18 A.K. Sharma Page No. 27/165-169 (2004 Edition) filed on 28.08.2006, Book No. 124 (Indian Archaeology A Review-1998-99).[Pgs. 1790-1794]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment.  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> Discusses excavation in Nagpur- unrelated with the disputed site.
	<b>Exhibit 98</b> Annex.24 to the affidavit of OPW 18, filed on 28.08.2006 with affidavit of Examination-in-chief, page 27/182-192, Book No.140 (Extract of "Pura Prakash" (Dr. Z.A. Desai Commemoration Vol.II, Editor A.K. Sharma, M.I. Quddusi, M.Y. Quddusi, G.S. Khwaja),[Pgs.1795-1805]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment.  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> This document discusses glazing and glazed ware in northern India.
	<b>Exhibit 99</b> Annex.5 of the affidavit of OPW 18, filed on 28.08.2006, 148-page No.27/40-53 Book No.148 ("Ancient India-Bulletin of A.S.I. Number IV", July 1947 to Jan-1948).[Pgs. 1806-1819]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment.  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> This document discusses excavation of some important megalithic tombs- unrelated to the disputed site.
	<b>Exhibit 100</b> Page No.27/30-39, filed on 28.08.2006 with the affidavit of OPW 18 Sri A.K. Sharma, (Extract from "Ancient India-Bulletin of A.S.I. November 2, 1947).[Pgs. 1820-1829]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment.  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> This document discusses the technique of recorded archaeological data.



<b>Exhibit 101</b> Annex.17 to the affidavit filed by OPW 18 on 28.08.2006, page No.27/154-160 (Urdu Hindi Dictionary by Mohammad Mustafa "Maddah").[Pgs. 1830-1833]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment.  <b>Comment:-</b> This is an excerpt from an Urdu- Hindi Dictionary.
<b>Exhibit 102</b> Annex.4 to the affidavit of OPW 17, filed on 17.08.2006, page no. 28/40-43, Book No.124 ("Indian Archaeology 1998-99 - A Review" published by A.S.I.).[Pgs.1834-1837]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment.  <b>Comment:-</b> Discusses excavation at Nagpur- unrelated to the disputed site.
<b>Exhibit 104</b> Annex No.3 of OPW 17, R. Nagaswami, Page No. 28/24-39 (Extract from Mahastham).[Pgs. 1838-1853]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment.  <b>Comment</b> It is a report of archaeological excavation in Mahasthangarh- Bangladesh; unrelated with the disputed site.
<b>Exhibit 105</b> Annex.6, Page No.28/52-60 (Extract from Mayamatam, edited by Bruno Dagens Vol.I).[Pgs. 1854-1862]	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.
<b>Exhibit 106</b> Annex.7, page 28/61-63, by OPW 17, R. Nagaswami (Extract from Vastu-Sastra Vol.II, Hindu Canons of Iconography and painting by D.N. Shukla). [Pgs. 1863-1865]	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.
<b>Exhibit 107</b> Annex.2, page 27/4-8 by OPW 18 (Macmillan Dictionary of Archaeology editor Ruth D. Whitehouse).[Pgs. 1866-1870]	<b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment.  <b>Comment:-</b> Extract of Dictionary of Archaeology- provides meaning of stratigraphy.
<b>Exhibit 108</b> Annex.6 by OPW 18, page 27/54-59 (PuratatvaParibhashaKosh, History Dept., VaigyanikTathaTaknikiSabdawali, Kendriya Hindi Nidesalay Bharat Sarkar 1979).[Pgs. 1871-1876] -	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.

	Translated copy not filed	
	<p><b>Exhibit 109</b> Annex.9, statement page 27/68-92 OPW 18 (Extract from An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology-Edited by A. Ghosh; Vol.I).[Pgs. 1877-1901]</p>	<p><b>Finding/Discussion 'in the Impugned Judgment:-</b> Relied PW 16 in his statement to state that there was no evidence to link the site of Babri Masjid with birthplace of Lord Ram:</p> <p><i>"6.That there is no archaeological evidence regarding the site of Babri Masjid being the alleged Ram Janam Bhoomi or a sacred place associated with it as claimed by the authors of Ayodhya Ka Itihas. No such opinion was given by Sri B.B. Lal also either in his reports published in "Indian Archaeological-A Review" or in 'An Encyclopaedia of India Archaeology' Edited by A. Ghosh and and the assertions made in this respect in Ayodhya Ka Itihas are incorrect.</i></p> <p>....</p> <p><i>9. That, the assertions made in the aforesaid Book regarding the so called conclusion of Prof. B.B. Lal about the pillar bases, allegedly being of the black stone pillars, which might have remained on their original site, are not correct. (As a matter of fact no such conclusion or opinion of Prof. B.B. Lal is given either in his excavation reports published in "Indian Archaeology-A Review" or even in his entry regarding Ayodhya given in 'An Encyclopaedia of Indian Archaeology' Edited by A. Ghosh)."</i></p> <p><b>[Para 477 @ pgs. 490-491/Vol. 1]</b></p> <p>However the said exhibit has not been discussed in the impugned judgment and no specific finding has been given.</p>

**EXHIBITS FILED BY PLAINTIFFS IN SUIT 5**

[RUNNING VOLUME -81]

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
<b>EXHIBITS FILED BY DEFENDANTS IN SUIT 1</b>		
22.08.1871	<b>EXHIBIT-A20</b> Copy of the judgment dated 22.08.1871 dismissing the claim of Mohd. Asghar regarding ownership of Kabristan in the vicinity of Masjid Babar Shah Mauja Kot Ram Chandar while decreeing the claim over the tree of Tamarind ( <i>Imli</i> ). [Pgs. 1919-1922/Vol. 81]	<u><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b></u> This exhibit has been discussed in Justice Sudhir Agarwal's judgment wherein it has been noted that the claim of Mohd. Asgar about ownership of graveyard was rejected <i>vide</i> judgment dated 22.08.1871, however, the claim regarding the tamarind trees was allowed. [Para. No. 2351 at Pg. No. 1402-1404; Para. No. 2977 at Pg. No. 1657 of Vol. II]  <u><b>Comment:-</b></u> This document shows the existence of the Babri Masjid in front of which there was a graveyard and various trees of tamarind in the possession of Mohd. Asghar who was also Mutawalli of the Babri Masjid.
20.03.1950	<b>EXHIBIT-A37</b> Nakal Khasara Abadi Kistwar relating to Mauza Ramkot Paragana Haveli, Awadh tehsil. [Pgs. 1923/Vol. 81]	<u><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b></u> In the Impugned Judgment the Hon'ble Court held that this document pertains to revenue entries which do not create any right. [Para. No. 3093 and 3094 at Pg. No. 1696 of Vol. II]
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT-A38</b> Nakal Khasara Abadi Kistwar relating to Mauza Ramkot Paragana Haveli, Awadh tehsil. [Pgs. 1924/Vol. 81]	[No Translation Available]  <u><b>Comment:-</b></u> Both these documents show the existence of Babri Masjid,
22.03.1950	<b>EXHIBIT-A41</b> Copy of the Khewat Mauza Bahoranpur in relation to Ares/Plot No. 151 Bigha 3, Biswa 5, Biswansi. [Pgs. 1925-1927/Vol. 81]	<u><b>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</b></u> In the Impugned Judgment this exhibit has been referred in the list of revenue records. [Para. No. 3093 and 3094 at Pg. No. 1696 of Vol. II]  <u><b>Comment:-</b></u> This document shows the existence of the Babri Masjid. In the said revenue record name of Mohd. Zaki Nabi Hasan has been recorded

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
		as a resident of the Area/Plot Not 151 Bigha 3, Biswa 5, Biswansi and having possession over the said property.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT -A71</b> Copy of ShajraNasab (family tree) of owners of Mauza Bahooranpur, Pargana Haweli Oudh, Tahsil and district Faizabad HaqqiatMaafi in the form of Zammdari. [Pgs. 1928/Vol. 81]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> Though referred in the Impugned Judgment, no categorical finding has been given in relation to this exhibit. [Para. No. 3106 at Pg. No. 1744 of Vol. II]  [A major portion of the document is illegible.]
<b>EXHIBITS FILED BY DEFENDANTS IN SUIT 4</b>		
29.12.1950	<b>EXHIBIT A16</b> Affidavit of DW 3/20 Ann. 19, page 16/51, Sri Ram Chandracharya (Statement). [Pgs. 1951-1952/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
11.06.1956	<b>EXHIBIT M1</b> Copy of the Application dated 11.06.1956 moved by Abhiram Das in the Court of Additional District Magistrate, Faizabad in Case No. 58/73, Misc. Application P.S. Kotwali district Faizabad. [Pgs. 1953/Vol. 81]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> In the Impugned Judgment the exhibit has been referred as a document filed by the plaintiff (Suit-3) to support their claim for possession. However, the Court has discarded the same stating that they fail to establish their claim within inner courtyard. [Para. No. 3000 at Pg. No. 1663 of Vol. II]
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT J3</b> Maharishi Valmiki Praneet Valmiki Ramayan Sloka-6. [Pgs. 1954-1955/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT J12</b> Last page of the cover of the book titled as "Disputed Mosque". [Pgs. 1956/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
1344-45 FASLI	<b>EXHIBIT B2</b> Copy of NaqualKhasraKishtwar Bandobast of the year 1344-45 F Mauza Ramkot, Pargana Haveli Awadh, Faizabad with Hindi copy. [Pgs. 1957-1980/Vol. 81]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> In the Impugned Judgment no categorical finding has been given in relation to this exhibit but it has been mentioned only as a part of the submissions made by Mr. P.N. Mishra,

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
		Advocate. [Pg. No. 3184-3186 of Vol. III]
<b>EXHIBITS FILED BY PLAINTIFFS IN SUIT 5</b>		
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 72</b> Affidavit of PW 17 Ann. 5, page 28/44 to 28/51. [Pgs. 1981-1988/Vol.81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 74</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 1, page 27/1-3. [Pgs. 1989-1991/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 75</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 3, page 27/9-29. [Pgs. 1992-2012/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 76</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 7, page 27/60-64. [Pgs. 2013-2017/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 77</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 8, page 27/65-67. [Pgs. 2018-2020/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 78</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 10, page 27/93-99. [Pgs. 2021-2027/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 79</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 11, page 27/ 100-121 [Pg. 2028-2049/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 80</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 12, page 27/ 122-126. [Pgs. 2050-2054/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 81</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 13, page 27/ 127-138. [Pgs. 2055-2066/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 82</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 14, page 27/139-145. [Pgs. 2067-2073/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 83</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 16, page 27/150-153. [Pgs. 2074-2077/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 84</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 18, page 27/158-160. [Pgs. 2078-2080/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 85</b> Affidavit of PW 18 Ann. 27, page 27/204-207. [Pgs. 2081-2085/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 86</b> Affidavit of PW 19 Ann. 1, page 7/1-3. [Pgs. 2086-2088/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 87</b> Affidavit of PW 19 Ann. 2, page 7/4-6. [Pgs. 2089-2091/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 88</b> Affidavit of PW 19 Ann. 3, page 7/7-9. [Pgs. 2092-2094/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 89</b> Ann. 25, Page 27/193 to 197 of the affidavit filed by OPW 18 Sri A.K.Sharma (Extract from "The Excavations at Kaushambi" by G.R. Sharma). [Pgs. 2095-2099/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 90</b> Ann. 26, Page 27/198 to 207 of the affidavit filed by OPW 18 Sri A.K.Sharma (Extract from "Perspective in Social and Economic History of Early India" by R.S. Sharma). [Pgs. 2100-2103/Vol. 81]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
NIL	<b>EXHIBIT 91</b> Ann. 28, Page 27/208 to 210 of the affidavit filed by OPW 18 Sri	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
	A.K.Sharma (Extract from "AncientIndia" by R.S. Sharma). [Pgs. 2104-2106/Vol. 81]	

[www.vadaprativada.in](http://www.vadaprativada.in)

[RUNNING VOLUME -82]

Date	Particulars	Finding in Judgment and Comments
	<b>Exhibit 20 (Suit-3)</b> Relevant portion of Book "Srimadbhagwad Gita" [Pgs. 2164-2168]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> Not discussed in the impugned judgment. Only cited by M.M Pandey Advocate, appearing for hindu parties to state that the fact of Ram's Manifestation is borne out in Chapter X verse 31 of Shrimad Bhagwad Gita (Ext. OOS 3: 20) where Lord Shri Krishna has mentioned that among 'warriors I am Ram'. [Para 4092(D) @ pg. 2528/Vol. II of the Impugned Judgment]
	<b>Exhibit 21 (Suit 3)</b> Relevant portion of Book "Rajasthan Ki Bhakti ParampareavamSanskriti". [Pgs. 2169-2174]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> This book provides the pedigree of disciples of Ramandancharya and on the basis of this book the Hon'ble High Court concludes that the establishment of Nirmohi Akhara at Ayodhya from Jaipur cannot relate with beyond 1734 AD but it must be sometimes between 1734 AD to 1800 AD. [Para 798 @ pg. 751/Vol. 1]
	<b>Exhibit A9 (Suit-4)</b> Relevant portion of Book "Geetawali by GoswamiTulsi Das". [Pgs. 2175-2193]	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.
	<b>Exhibit B4 (Suit-4)</b> Relevant portion of Book "SukhItihas Mein Sri Ram Janam Bhumi". [Pgs. 2194-2200]	Not discussed in the impugned judgment.
	<b>Exhibit J2/1 and J2/2 (Suit-4)</b> Relevant portion of Book Srimad Valmiki Ramayan". [Pgs.2201-2202]	This exhibit only contains shloka 6 which states that Ayodhya was built by Manu.
	<b>Exhibit T-1 (Suit-4)*</b> Relevant portion of Book "Puratattva" Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of India. [Pgs. 2203-2210]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> No specific finding in the impugned judgment.  <b><u>Comment:-</u></b> This bulletin contains an article written by K.V. Ramesh on the Vishnu Hari Inscriptions which have allegedly been discovered in Ayodhya from the debris of the disputed structure.



	<p>In the Impugned Judgment, though it has been noticed that these inscriptions make no reference to Lord Ram and only show that there existed a Vishnu Hari Temple in Ayodhya, it has been presumed that since Ayodhya is known in reference to Lord Rama, one can presume that the religious structures must have connection with Lord Rama in one or the other way. [Para 4384 at pg. 2975/Vol. 3 of the Impugned Judgment]</p> <p>Relevant to note that these a photo of these inscriptions was handed over personally by Deoki Nandan Agarwal to Dr. K.V. Ramesh, and a personal request was made to Dr. Ramesh to translate the same. It is relevant to note that Deoki Nandan Agarwal is Plaintiff No. 3 in the Suit 5. [Para 6 of Examination in Chief Affidavit of Dr. K.V. Ramesh at para 6/pg. 1816 of Vol. 23]</p> <p>Further these inscriptions were discovered by OPW-8, who claims to have seen the slab containing the inscription falling from the disputed structure at the time of the demolition. It is submitted that this claim of OPW-8 is doubtful, for the following reasons: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) He states in his examination in Chief Affidavit that he was standing on the western side of the disputed building at the time of demolition. [Pg. 1226- para 7/Vol. 21]</li> <li>b) He states in his cross that he was standing on the southern side of the disputed building at the time of demolition and that nothing was clearly visible because of the dust [Pg. 1263/Vol. 21]</li> <li>c) Despite the above, he claims to have seen the slab containing the inscription falling. [Pg. 1228/Vol. 21]</li> <li>d) He then states that on the next day after demolition, he along with Dr. Sudha Mallaya and Dr. S.P. Gupta went to click pictures of the inscriptions, which had been collected at one place by the Kar Sevaks. [Para 13 at pg. 1229/Vol. 21]</li> </ol>
--	---

		<p>Further, Dr. S.P. Gupta who is OPW 3 in the present matter has accepted that he has been a member of RSS since before 1975. [Pg. 597/Vol. 18]</p> <p>Further Dr. K.V. Ramesh, who is OPW 10 has stated that he had the occasion of sitting with Dr. S.P. Gupta and others in the Delhi office of Archaeological Society of India- which was headed by Dr. S.P. Gupta, and at that time they discussed this inscription. [Pgs. 1830-31/Vol. 23]</p> <p>It is therefore submitted that translation of the inscriptions in question was done at the behest of Plaintiff No. 3 of suit 5 and was done in consultation with OPW 3 who is a member of RSS. Further the method of discovery of the inscription, by a random journalist, who is unable to even clarify as to which side of the disputed structure was, he standing, makes the entire process of recovery and translation of the inscription doubtful.</p> <p>In any event, these inscriptions, make no reference to Lord Rama.</p>
	<p><b>Exhibit 3 (Suit-5)*</b> Relevant portion of Book written by S.P. Gupta and T.P. Verma "Ayodhya Ka Itihas Evam Puratattva Rig Ved Se Abtak". [Pgs. 2211-2216]</p>	<p><b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> This book has been written by OPW 9 (Dr. T.P. Verma) and OPW 3 (Dr. S.P. Gupta). The conclusions drawn in this book have been refuted by PW 16 as not being based on any authentic archaeological evidence. [Para 476-477 @ pgs. 489-493 of Vol. I]</p> <p><b><u>Comment:-</u></b> The portion of the book exhibited here is the picture of the Vishnu Hari inscriptions. The authors have accepted the inaccuracies in their translations of this inscriptions. [Para 3643 @ pg. 2125/Vol. II]</p> <p>In fact, at para 3871 [Pg. 2348/Vol. II] it has been recorded that the contents of the book in so far as they relate to SalarMasud's alleged attack of Ayodhya are also incorrect.</p>

	<b>Exhibit 23 (Suit-5)</b> Relevant portion of Book "Ayodhya" by Hans Baker. [Pgs. 2217-2253]	Discussed in the traveller's note.
	<b>Exhibit 24 (Suit-5)</b> Relevant portion of Book "Sri Ram Janam Bhumi Ka Pramanik Sachitra Itihas" by Dr. Radhey Shyam Shukla. [Pgs. 2254-2264]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
	<b>Exhibit 34 (Suit-5)</b> Relevant portion of Book written by Patrick Thomas Hughes "A Dictionary of Islam" [Pgs. 2265-2266]	Not discussed in the Impugned Judgment.
	<b>Exhibit 35 (Suit-5)</b> Relevant portion of Book written by Percy Brown "Indian Architecture". [Pgs. 2267-2269]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> This exhibit only shows a picture of a sample mosque. However impugned judgment at para 3430 quotes the relevant extract of this book which is exhibited as Exhibit 68 [Pg. 664-679/Vol. 75] and ultimately concludes that that it has not been proved that a mosque without a Minar is not a valid mosque and that a mosque built in the vicinity of a graveyard would lose its status of mosque. [See para 3430-3432 @ pgs.1938-1942/Vol. 2 of the Impugned Judgment]
	<b>Exhibit 36 (Suit-5)</b> Relevant portion of Book "Itihas Darpan". [Pgs. 2270-2274]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b> This was filed to show the manner in which the stone inscription of 1992 was deciphered, but since K.V. Ramesh OPW 10 has submitted his own translation which all the parties have admitted, this document has become totally irrelevant. [Para 4153-4154 @ Pgs. 2574-78/Vol. 2]
	<b>Exhibit 41 (Suit-5)</b> Relevant portion of Book "Ram Janam Bhumi-Babri Masjid, Satya Kya Hai". [Pgs. 2275-2278]	This document mentions that neither Babur nor Aurangzeb destroyed any mosque in Ayodhya. However, this document has not been discussed in the impugned judgment.

	<b>Exhibit 42 (Suit-5)</b> Relevant portion of Book "Ram CharitManas". [Pgs. 2279-2310]	<b><u>Finding/Discussion in the Impugned Judgment:-</u></b>  Relied upon by Muslim parties to state that Tulsidas' Ramcharitmanas came into existence in a very short time after Babur, yet there was no mention of construction of a huge mosque at Ayodhya by Babur or anyone else. [Para 1638 at pg. 1085/Vol. I of the Impugned Judgment]  The Hon'ble High Court has observed that though this document mentions Ayodhya as the birthplace of lord Ram, it does not identify any particular place as the site of birth of Lord Ram. [Para 4372 at pg. 2784/Vol. III of the Impugned Judgment]
	<b>Exhibit 44 (Suit-5)</b> Relevant portion of Book "Satyarth Prakash". [Pgs. 2311-2366]	No finding given by the Hon'ble High Court.
	One Video Cassette Ayodhya December 1992, prepared by Jain Studio of Delhi; And One video cassette Archaeological Evidence of Ram Janam Bhumi.	NA.

### C. CONCLUSION:-

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that more than half of the exhibits filed by Plaintiffs in Suit No. 5 have not even been referred to and/or discussed before the Hon'ble High Court or before this Hon'ble Court.

The only exhibits which have been relied upon before this Hon'ble Court are pertaining to Travelers, Gazetteers and religious texts (like Skanda Puran and Ramcharitmanas) which will be discussed in a separate note. Apart from the said exhibits, reliance has been placed on several versions of Babarnama in an attempt to discredit the inscriptions on the mosque, this issue is also discussed in a separate note.

Lastly, reliance has been placed on the Vishnu Hari inscriptions and as demonstrated above, the recovery as well as the process of translation of the same is highly doubtful. Moreover, the said inscriptions do not show that the disputed site was the birthplace of Lord Ram.