

11385

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

Other Original Suit No. 4/1989

Sunni Central Board of Waqfs

U.P.and Others.....Plaintiffs.

Versus

Gopal Singh Visharad

and Others.....Defendants.

STATEMENT OF DW 20/1

SHASHIKANT RUNGTA

www.vadaprativada.in

www.vadaprativada.in

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

Other Original Suit No. 4/1989

Sunni Central Board of Waqfs

U.P.and Others.....Plaintiffs.

Versus

Gopal Singh Visharad

and Others.....Defendants.

**EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY WAY OF AFFIDAVIT UNDER
SECTION 18 RULE 4 OF CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE**

I, Shashi Kant Rungta, aged about 51 years, Son of Late Shri Bhagwati Prasad Rungta, R/o 13, Chappel Road, Hastings, Kolkata, do solemnly affirm on oath as under :-

1. That I deponent is a Hindu Vaishnav and God Shri Ramlalla is my individual deity and I am witness no. 9 here.
2. That I have passed B.Com examination from the University of Calcutta in the year 1975. After completion of my education I joined my family business and am still in the family business.
3. That I know the disputed site very well and have been visiting the disputed site since childhood along with my father (now dead) and friends from time to time. I have full faith in God Rama and his birth place. That is why I and my family used to visit there quite often.

4. That I went to Ayodhya for the first time in the year 1962. There is a tradition in my family that we start our pilgrimage from Ayodhya. Ayodhya is a great shrine of the world and a greatest city among the seven cities which gives salvation. Ayodhya has the honour of being a birth place of God Shri Rama. It is mentioned in the ancient books, Valmiki's Ramayana and Ramcharitmanas written by Tulsidas. I know that entire Ayodhya is worshipable similar to a deity as a birth place of Maryada Purushottam God Raghvendra Shri Rama and according to the scripture evidences and religious books and faith for crores of years, birth place is in the Ramkot Mohalla of Ayodhya.
5. That I have read and heard that Meerbaki, an associate of Babar, on the order of Babar, a foreign invader and plunderer, had demolished a grand temple in 1528 and tried to give it a shape of a mosque.
6. That I took the darshan of Shri Ramjanambhoomi, Kanak Bhawan, Hanumangarhi, Nageshwarnath and Hanumanbagh etc. at the time when I visited Ayodhya for the first time and took bath in Saryu river before taking darshan.
7. That I bowed before the birth place of God Shri Rama after I have offered flowers and Prasad, when I visited there to take darshan of Janambhoomi and I had faith and belief that one can get salvation from taking darshan of this place.

8. That I went to Ayodhya for darshan at a number of times after 1962. I have not seen any Muslim paying visit or reading namaz there.
9. That Ramnavai which falls on ninth date of Shukla paksha in the month of chaitra has great significance in Ayodhya and birthday of Shri Rama is celebrated with great enthusiasm. Once I got a chance to watch the grand tableau of birthday celebration of God Shri Rama. Lakhs of devotees from the various parts of the country visit there on this occasion with the passion for taking the darshan of Shri Ramlalla.
10. That I have been there at the birth place of Shri Rama, at Ayodhya at the time of worship and Aarti.
11. That I have seen the pillars of kaushiti in the inner part of temple, engraved with the idols of deities, goddess and Yakshas. I have seen that idols of tigers, peacock, bullocks and Varaha God which were in the temple premises.
12. That I am fortunate that I got the opportunity of taking the darshan of God Ramlalla in three fairs of Ayodhya on the occasion of Chaitra Ramnavami, Kartik Poornima and Sawan Jhula.
13. That according to the faith and belief and tradition of Hindu religion, God Shri Ramlalla appeared in Ayodhya in the family of King Dasratha of Ayodhya and Queen Kaushalya at that place. Appearance of God Shri Ramlalla has been described in detail in Valmiki Ramayana, which is contemporary to God Shri Rama and in Ramcharitmanas written by Tulsidas.

14. That according to the belief of Hindu religion, God Shri Rama took incarnation for the abolition of sinful act, to establish the dharma and for the protection of saints. He is worshiped not only in India but throughout the world since time immemorial.
15. That India is recognized throughout the world by God Shri Rama and his birth place Ayodhya. Description about Shri Ram Janambhoomi, God Shri Rama and Ayodhya city is found in details in religious books and in the books of other languages.
16. That God Shri Rama was born on the ninth day of Shukla Paksha of the month of Chaitra and he killed the demon king Ravana. His victory over Ravana is celebrated by Hindus throughout the world as a Vijaydashmi and Dipawali is celebrated since decades throughout the world to mark the return of Shri Rama to Ayodhya after the victory over Lanka. On this day, God Shri Rama came back to Ayodhya after the victory over Lanka.
17. That Shri Ram Janambhoomi was demolished to construct the disputed building and even then it does not took the shape of mosque, because there was no tower or place for "Vazzu" in the disputed building. There were twelve pillars of Kasauti in the disputed building where upon idols of deities and Goddess were engraved with. In addition to this peacock, kalash and birds, as a symbol of Hindu religion have been engraved thereon.
18. That faith and belief of people towards the holiness of Shri Ram Janambhoomi remain intact even after

demolition of Shri Ram Janambhoomi temple and will remain intact.

19. That neither namaz was read there by Muslims nor any Muslim was seen paying visit there.
20. That I went to Ayodhya for a number of times, particularly during the celebrations like Ramnavami in the month of chaitra, Shri Ram marriage ceremony in the month of Aghan and at Jhula in the month of Sawan and took bath in Saryu river. Besides this, I took part in fourteen kosh and fifth kosh parikarma in the month of Kartik.
21. That I have seen thousands of devotees of Rama from abroad at the above said occasions. At these occasions the entire Ayodhya city is lost in the devotion of Rama and entire atmosphere is covered by the resonant by the sound of chanting and bells etc.
22. That Shri Ram Janambhoomi is a shrine of faith and belief for crores of Hindus. One get released from his misdeeds by taking its darshan and get salvation. The city being the birth place of God Shri Rama, and also is the place where one get salvation.

Lucknow

Dated 26.5.2005

Sd/-

Shashikant

Rungta

Deponent

Verification

I, the above named deponent hereby certify that according to my knowledge and faith the contents of para 1 to 22 of

11391

this affidavit, are true. Nothing has been concealed and nothing is false. May God help me.

This affidavit has been certified and signed today i.e. on 26.5.2005 in the premises of Hon'ble High Court at Allahabad, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Lucknow

Sd/-

Dated 26.5.2005

Deponent

Authentication

I, verify the signature of Shri Shashi Kant Rungta who signature in my presence.

Sd/-

Ranjana Agnihotri

Shri Shashikant Rungta, Deponent, identified by Ranjana Agnihotri, Advocate in the premises of Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow on 25.5.2005 at 10:00 am, with the statement that deponent had read and understood the contents of affidavit very well. Thus I am full satisfied about the deponent

Sd/-

Before: Hon'ble Special Full Bench, High Court,
Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Sunni Central Board of Waqfs

U.P. and Others.....Plaintiffs.

Versus

Gopal Singh Visharad

and Others.....Defendants.

Other Original Suit No. 4/1989

(Regular Suit No. 12/1961)

Dated 25.5.2005

D.W. 20/1, Shashikant Rungta

Examination in chief affidavit, page 1 to 5 of Shashikant Rungta S/o Late Shri Bhagwati Prasad Rungta, aged about 51 years, resident of 13 Chappel Road, Hastings, Kolkata submitted and taken on record.

(Cross-examination on oath of witness by Shri Tarunjeet Verma, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, Nirmohi Akhara begins.)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

My date of birth is 13.9.1954. It is not possible to analyze the Vaishnav dharma in full. However in short we can say that Vaishnav are those people who believe in God Rama as their Lord. My family is in the business of manufacturing the jute-bags and do steel trading also . I know that I am deposing on behalf of a committee. I cannot tell the full name of the committee but it is related to Ramlalla trust. I am not able to tell the name of committee; however it is related to Ramlalla trust. Its

name perhaps is Ramlalla renovation committee. It may be possible that its actual name would be All India Shri Ram Janambhoomi Renovation Committee. I do not know about its object. In brief I can say that its object is to see that temple of God Rama is constructed and renovated there. There, I mean at the birth place of Rama in Ayodhya.

I went to Ayodhya in 1962 for the first time. At that time I was 8 years old. I went to Ayodhya from Calcutta. I do not remember, where exactly I stayed in Ayodhya, perhaps in some *Dharamshala*. Thereafter I went to Ayodhya in 1967-68 for the second time. I do remember certain things of that period when I went to Ayodhya for the first time. I do remember the things, I have seen during my visit to Ayodhya in 1967-68. In 1967-68 I went to Ayodhya with my friends and stayed there for four or five hours. Thereafter I went back. The temples which I have seen in Ayodhya during my second visit were Shri Ramlalla temple, Hanuman temple, Aadi temple. I do not remember the name of other temples. I have visited Ayodhya for four-five times since 1962. It is correct that I have in para 6 of my affidavit, given the name of other temples other than Shri Ram Janambhoomi, Hanumangarhi, which I visited. But I could not tell the name of all these temples, in my statement, in the court because I am getting a little nervous. I have not given any statement in any court before this. This is very first occasion. I do not have the knowledge about geographical situation of the temples situated in Ayodhya i.e. at what distance any particular temple is situated from other temples and in which direction. During my visit to Ayodhya, I also met the Sadhus and Saints present there, while taking darshan of temples. But no special relation and introduction was held. During my four-five visits, I stayed in different *dharamshalas* and not in a particular

dharamshala. I went to see Shri Ram Janambhoomi sometimes by tonga and sometime by car. From Banaras, I sometimes came by car. I can not say through which route one goes to Ram Janambhoomi in Ayodhya. I went to Ayodhya in 1990-91 for the last time i.e. I did not go to Ayodhya after 1990-91.

I used to go with flowers and prasad to see Ram Janambhoomi. I used to purchase the flowers and prasad from nearby place to Ram Janambhoomi. I also used to take darshan of Ganeshji, Hanumanji, Kartikeyaji, near the Ram Janambhoomi place. I have seen Ramchabutra, idol of Ramchanderji, idol of Shivji, idol of Ganeshji, idol of Parwatiji, idol of God Nandi and some pictures in the premises, at Ram Janambhoomi site. In addition to these, I have seen the pillars of kasauti. I do not remember whether there were pillars of Kasauti during 1990-91 or not. I cannot say from which metal the above idols were made of. I have not read the Valmiki's Ramayana and ancient books referred to in para-4 of my affidavit. But I have read "Ramcharitmanas". I have read Ramcharitmanas during the worship but not in depth. It is correct that Ramcharitmanas contains much about Ayodhya but I cannot say much about it. I can say only about a few things. "Ramcharitmanas" is about Shri Ramchanderji. About ancient book, I have heard from my Guru and Sadhu-saints.

The matter written in para-5 of my affidavit is based on the history books. I have read these books during my student life. I also heard about it, from the people. I do not know about the entire history, I know only few things. The facts that "Meerbaki an associate of Babar had demolished a grand temple and tried to give it a shape of mosque"

written in para-5 of my affidavit is based upon the sayings. I have not read it, in any history book.

I do not remember if I have read any book other than Ramcharitmanas about Ramchanderji or Ayodhya. I have also seen the *Kanak Bhawan* in Ayodhya. There is an idol of Ramchanderji in *Kanak Bhawan* alongwith the other idols. But I do not remember whose idols were there. Perhaps of Sitaji and Laxmanji. I do not know about the importance and history of *Kanak Bhawan*. I have heard that mother Kaikayee had given *Kanak Bhawan* to Sitaji in *Muh-dikhai* ceremony.

Shri Ram was born in Tretayua. However I cannot say how many year or lakhs of years before Rama was.

I know that various fairs like Ramnavami fair, Sawan jhula fair are organized in Ayodhya. Parikarama fair is also organized in Ayodhya. Choudha koshi parikarma and Panch koshi parikarma is organized. I do not know about 84 koshi parikarma of Ayodhya.

The worship and aarti, referred to by me in para-10 of my affidavit is conducted in the evening and aarti is conducted there after. During the visit to Ayodhya, I some times used to go to see Shri Ram Janambhoomi in the noon and sometimes in the evening. I have seen Priests, performing worship and aarti there. I have also seen the Priests present there, during the time of taking darshan of Janambhoomi. But I do not know much about them. I have seen Shri Ramlalla being worshipped in the building when I went there for darshan but I have not seen aarti being performed. I know about Sita Rasoi but not about Sant Niwas in the Janambhoomi premises. I do not remember about Sumitra Bhawan, Lomash Chaura, Katha Mandap

etc. situated around Janambhoomi premises. I have also seen Manas Bhawan near Janambhoomi premises. I cannot say in which direction, either in east or in which direction of the Ramjanambhoomi premises, Manas Bhawan is situated.

There were in all 14 pillars of Kashoti, 12 in Janambhoomi building and 2 at the gate. Pillars of Kashoti are fixed in the temple only. I know that Hanumanji had brought 84 pillars of Kashoti from Lanka. These 14 pillars may be among from those pillars. I cannot say that idols of which deities were engraved on them.

I have referred to in para 11 of my affidavit about the idols of tigers. This reference was about the idols of tiger fixed at Singh dwar. Idol of Varaha was in the premises but idol of Ramlalla was on the chabutra outside of the building. An idol of God Varaha was in the outer part at the Hanumat dwar. I have not seen an idol of God Varaha in any part of the country except there. God Varaha is also regarded as an incarnation. I do not know, at what place an idol of peacock and bullock, which I referred in para 11 of the affidavit, were, but I have seen these. I have seen an idol of bullock i.e. Nandi under a tree of *Neem* and *Peepal* and in front of *Shivlinga*. I have in last line in para-13 of my affidavit referred about the appearance of Shri Ramlalla. Appearance of Shri Ramchander is also written in Ramcharitmanas.

Among the 14 pillars of Kashoti, mentioned above, 12 were in the building of the temple. The word "immemorial" used in para 14 of the affidavit means lakhs of years.

I know only about those suits, relating to Janambhoomi, which appear in newspapers, but I cannot say how many suits are subjudice. I do not know about the incidents that happened in 1949 concerning Janambhoomi. I went to Hanumangarhi in Ayodhya for darshan. I do not know in which posture an idol of Hanumanji is, in Hanumangarhi. I have also seen the other small temples in Hanumangarhi and had their darshan.

I know that Ramchander ji went in exile for fourteen years. It is correct that geographical situation of the route by which Ramchanderji went in exile, remained unchanged. Rameshwaram is the most important place which falls on that route. Ramchanderji crossed this place by constructing a bridge there.

I have referred to in para 17 that there was no tower and arrangement for Vazzu in the disputed building. I have stated this because I have not seen these two things in the disputed building. I have in para-19, stated that namaz had not been read in the disputed building and no Muslim was seen going there. I have stated this thing on the basis of sayings of others.

I have read a lot about the book Mahabharata written Ved Vyas. I have read about Bhim and Hanumanji also; I mean to say that Mahabharata period confirm the presence of characters during the period of Ramayana.

Picture of God Varaha is seen in picture no. 16 of the colour album document no. 200 C-1, filed by Director of Archaeological Directorate of U.P. This picture was in the outer wall of the disputed building. Picture no. 40 of this album is the picture of Singhdwar, wherein two lions and a *Garur* in between the two lions are seen in this picture.

Garur is a carrier of God Vishnu. Entrance gate of the disputed building is seen in picture no. 46. Two pillars of Kashoti are seen in this picture. A pillar of kashoti with a *kalash* is seen in picture no. 52.

Idols of Ganeshji, Nandiji, Shivji and Parwatiji on the chabutra under a tree are seen in picture no. 59. A chulaha on the chabutra is seen in picture no. 71 which gives impression of a kitchen. Idol of Laddoo Gopal and Ramlalla are seen in picture no. 154.

I have no knowledge about Akhara.

(Cross-examination of the witness by Shri Tarunjit Verma, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, Nirmohi Akhara, concluded)

(Cross-examination on an oath of witness by Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 9 and 10/1, Mahmood Ahmad and Mohd. Farooq begins.)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

Ramchanderji perhaps was born on the ninth day of Shukla paksha of the month of chaitra in Tretayuga. In simple language, Tretayuga is called a Satyug. However I have no correct knowledge about it.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Shashikant Rungta

25.5.2005

Typed by the stenographer as dictated by us in the open court. In continuation to this suit for further cross-examination on 25.5.2005. Witness be present.

Sd/-

25.5.2005

Before: Hon'ble Special Full Bench, High Court;
Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated: 26.5.2005

DW. 20/1, Shashikant Rungta

(In continuation to dated 25.5.2005, cross-examination of D.W-20/1, Shri Shashikant Rungta by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 9 and 10/1, Mahmood Ahmad and Mohd. Farooq, continued on oath)

I cannot say how many lakhs years back Tretayug was. According to me it would not be correct to say that Tretayug was fifty thousand years back from today. I cannot say how long Tretayug was. There must be a period of Tretayuga but I do not know. Shri Ramchanderji was born in Tretayuga. It is written in Ramayana and Sadhu-saints also says, when Ramchanderji was born. I cannot say how many hundred years or thousand years or lakhs year back Ramchanderji was born. I celebrate the birth of Ramchanderji on ninth day i.e. Navami and accordingly perform worship. Hence, I know that he was born on Navami. Shri Ramchanderji was born in Ayodhya. Shri Ramchanderji was not born at the bank of Saryu River but at a distance from the bank towards Ayodhya. He was born in the family of Dasratha. King Dasratha had four sons. Shri Ramchanderji was awarded exile for 14 years when the question of his coronation was arising. I do not know that on which date he left for exile for 14 years. I cannot even guess about it. I cannot say how much time it took him to reach Sri Lanka from India. I do not know whether it took him eight days and eight nights from Rameshwaram to Sri Lanka or not. Sitaji, Laxmanji and Hanumanji were with him, when Shri Rama left for exile from Ayodhya. Further said that only Sitaji and Laxmanji

were with him and not Hanumanji. I do not know at what place Hanumanji met Shri Ramchanderji. Ayodhya was a large city during the period of Shri Ramchanderji.

I live in Calcutta since the age of four-five years. My father and grand father were from Rajasthan. I was born in *Chaiwasa*. *Chaiwasa* is in the Jharkhand state. At the age of four-five years, I came to Calcutta along with my mother, father and stayed there. I have passed B.Com. Examination from Calcutta. Thereafter I joined the Jute-bags business.

I went to Ayodhya in 1962 for the first time. At that time I was 8 years old. By that time I started understanding the things. I do not know for how many days I stayed in Ayodhya at that time. Perhaps for two days. I came to Ayodhya for the first time with the desire to take darshan of the shrine. I stayed in a *dharamshala* at that time. My mother and father were also with me.

I cannot say how many temples are there in Ayodhya. I remember only Ramlalla temple, Kanak Bhawan, Nageshwar temple and Hanumangarhi. Among these, I have seen some from a close distance and some from a distance. An idol of Rama, Laxman and Sita were there in Kanak Bhawan, I do not remember what specialty these idols have. I cannot say from which metal or stone these idols were made of. I have seen the idols from a distance. I have seen the idols kept in Kanak Bhawan from a distance of 10 feet. There were three idols in Kanak Bhawan. These idols were about one or one and half feet in height. Than said that these idols were in decorated position so I cannot say what was the height of these idols. Then said that these temples were about four to five

feet in height. These idols were in the standing posture in Kanak Bhawan.

I have seen Shiv Ling of Shivji and Argha of snakes above it in Nageshwar Nath Mandir.

I took the darshan of God in Ramlalla temple from a distance. There was a little idol of Ramchanderji in decorated position. I have seen this idol from a distance of about 35-40 feet.

I have not seen any mosque at the place where I have seen a little idol of Ramlalla and took his darshan in 1962. There was a building with three domes at that time. All these domes were in a line.

I went to Ayodhya again in 1967. At that time I stayed in Ayodhya for four-five hours only. Sawan fair was going on there at that time. I took the darshan of Ramlalla from the same place from where I took his darshan at the first time. I went to some other temples at that time too. But I do not remember which temples I visited. At that time I could not thought that I have to depose here, so I should remember which temples I have visited. I was quite mature at the time when I visited in 1967, in comparison to my first visit.

I went to Ayodhya in 1988 for the third time. I stayed in Calcutta in between. During this period I was engaged in jute-bags business.

I took the darshan of Hanumangarhi during my second visit to Ayodhya. An idol of Hanumanji was there. I do not remember what other special thing was there. I

took the darshan of Hanumanji from the outer part of Garbh Griha.

I do not know that an idol of Ramlalla and other idols were kept in the building with three domes on the night of 22/23rd December, 1949, from the out side chabutra or not.

I also do not know whether Ram Dev Dubey, S.O. Ayodhya had lodged any FIR on 23.12.1949 in connection with the above incident or not.

I have not heard that disputed building was constructed as a mosque in 1528. However, I have heard that it was tried to give to it a shape of mosque to the disputed Bhawan in 1528. It is not correct to say that a mosque was constructed there in 1528. In accordance with the tradition disputed Bhawan was being worshipped as Ramjanam place. It is not correct to say that disputed Bhawan has been a mosque. It is also not correct that worship was never performed therein. It is also not correct to say that disputed Bhawan was a mosque and some Hindus have destroyed its one dome and it was repaired later. I do not know Whether collective fine was imposed on Hindus after the above incident of 1934. I also do not know that mosque was repaired from the money collected as a fine. I have not heard that namaz was being read therein after the above incidents of 1934. It is not correct to say that disputed Bhawan with three domes was being called a mosque. No body has demolished the mosque. However, temple was destroyed for its renovation, reconstruction i.e. repairs. It was not a mosque but a temple which was demolished on 6th December, 1992, for renovation. Since I was not present in Ayodhya on 6th December, 1992, so I cannot say whether some leaders

were present there or not. I have read about the incident of 6th December, 1992. Since I was not much interested in the incident, so I read the headlines only and not the whole news. I was in Calcutta on 6th December, 1992. I did not come to Ayodhya after the incident of 6th December, 1992. Except in the newspapers, I have not read anywhere about the said incident. Since there was no mosque at that place so question of demolition of mosque does not arise. Since I did not go to the disputed site after 6th December, 1992 so I cannot say about the factual position there. Since I did not go there so I cannot say that any temple was constructed there or not. Temple might have been constructed there, but I cannot say what was constructed there. I went to the disputed site in 1990 for the last time. I have seen the pillars of Kasauti there. These were 14 in number. I did not pay any attention towards that. Pillars of Kasauti were not fixed in there from ground to roof. Because there was no mosque so presence of tower does not matters. I cannot say about the length and width of the disputed Bhawan. I cannot say about the height of the three domes above the disputed Bhawan. I also cannot say about the width of these domes.

(Cross-examination by Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 9 and 10/1, Mahmood Ahmad and Mohd. Farooq, concluded)

(Cross-examination by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no.-1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf and plaintiff no. 6/1 and 8/1 Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzarrahan, begins on oath)

XXX

XXX

XXX

XXX

I have, in the last three lines of para four of my affidavit, stated that according to the scriptural evidences, religious books and tradition of crores of years Janambhoomi or Janamsthan is in Ramkot Mohalla of Ayodhya. In my view "Janambhoomi" and "Janamsthan" are two separate things. Janambhoomi means the entire Ayodhya and Janamsthan means a particular place where God appeared. According to my faith, the place under the middle dome is a "Janamsthan". According to me, this faith is being continued for crores of years. According to me, the place under the middle dome is "Ramjanamsthan". This is a faith that this place is known as a Ramjanamsthan for crores of years. This means that Ramchanderji was born at this place crores of years back.

There are four *Yugas* in a *Chaturyug*, namely *Satyuga*, *Tretayuga*, *Dwaparyuga* and *Kalyuga*. At present *Kalyuga* is going on. I do not know that *kalyuga* is going on for about five thousands years. I do not know the period of *Dwaparyuga*. I cannot say that *Dwaparyuga* is equivalent to four lakhs and some thousand years. I have heard that the period of *Dwapar*, *Treta* and *Satyuga* is of lakhs of years. I cannot say whether the total period of four *yugas* is less then that of the period of fifty lakhs of years or more than that. I do not know that only one round of four *yugas* has been completed or one fourth *yuga* has already been passed away. I have heard and not read that according to the scriptural evidences, religious books, this faith is in prevalence for crores of years that *Ramjanamsthan* is in *Ramkot Mohalla* of *Ayodhya*. I have not heard the name of entire scriptural evidences and religious books, wherein such faith has been described. I have not read any ancient book wherein reference about *Janamsthan* has been described. I cannot name any ancient book which contains such reference. I do not

remember whether any particular birth place of Ramchanderji was referred to in Ramcharitmanas or not.

I cannot name the book wherein I have read the matter which I have written in para 5 of my affidavit. I have read about it in eighth and ninth class during my student life. I have read that Babar had attacked for looting. I have heard and not read the things which I have produced in para-5. But from whom I have heard, I do not remember. I went to Ayodhya for four times in the year 1962, 1967, 1988 and 1990 and I stayed in Ayodhya for one or two days, each time and went for darshan of the disputed site once or twice each time. I went inside the building at two times, in 1988 and 1990 during my visit at four times. At two times I have taken darshan from outside of the wall with grill. I stayed at the disputed site for maximum half and one hour each time. I never performed parikarma of the disputed site, only took darshan of four places of the disputed premises. The matter written in para-8 that neither any Muslim was seen paying visit there nor reading namaz. This fact is about the period when I was present there for half to one hour. I cannot name the person from whom I have heard the facts, which I have written in para-8. I cannot say whether these people were from Ayodhya or any other place. They may be from Ayodhya and also from other places. But these people met me in Ayodhya. I have heard the matter, written in para-8, in Ayodhya. I have heard that no namaz is read there. I myself has not asked anybody about this. I have heard about this within or outside the premises. I have not heard about it in Hanumangarhi and Kanak Bhawan and in any other temple in Ayodhya. I neither have asked anybody in the disputed site nor a talk was held with anybody, whether Muslims used to come there or not and namaz is read there or not.

The worship referred in para-10 of my affidavit means offering flowers and Prasada and from Aarti I mean performing an Aarti of idol by the *pujari*. I have, during my visit, seen Aarti being performed for once and worshiped there for four times but not seen the flowers being offered. I have seen that flowers have already been offered. Whenever I took darshan from outside the wall with grill, I saw flowers were already offered there. Whenever I took darshan from outside, I took darshan from the door fixed at the wall with grill, which is opposite to Hanumat dwar. This dwar remains locked and a sepoy remains on duty there. I took darshan at four times, two times before noon and two times before sunset, at the time when it was locked. I do not remember whether there was electric or gas light in the inner portion, but there was a light. I have seen the light of *diya* at both the time. I cannot say whether this light of *diya* was lighted from ghee or oil. I do not remember whether *diya* was kept in a shelve or on a table or stool. I only used to watch the flame. An idol was, perhaps at a distance of 30-35 feet from the place of darshan.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Shashikant Rungta

26.5.2005

Typed by the stenographer as dictated by us in the open court. In continuation to this the suit for further cross-examination for 27.5.2005 before the commissioner. Witness be present.

Sd/-

26.5.2005

Before: Commissioner, Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,
Additional District Judge/Officer on special duty, High
Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 27.5.2005

D.W.-20/1, Shri Shashi Kant Rungta

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide order
no. 26.5.2006, in Other Original Suit no. 4/89)

(In continuation to dated 26.5.2005 Cross-examination on
an oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of
plaintiff no.-1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf and plaintiff
no. 6/1 and 8/1, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzarrahan
begins)

I do not remember if I have seen the electric pole at
the disputed site, when I visited there in 1962 for the first
time or not. There was an electric light when I went the
under dome situated in the disputed Bhawan in 1988. I
went under the dome in 1988 for the first time. I took
darshan at a distance of four-five feet from the wall with
grill when I visited the disputed building in 1988 for
darshan. I stayed there for more than four to five minutes
but actual time period I do not remember. There was a
huge gathering, because it was time of darshan. I went
inside from the same door from where I used to take
darshan. I do not remember whether I came back from the
same door or not. I do not remember whether the people,
who were going in from this door, also coming back from
same door or not or were coming back by another door.
There were 20-25 devotees in the disputed premises when
I entered from Hanumat dwar. There were idols under the
middle dome. I took the darshan of these idols from a
distance of five to seven feet. The same situation was

there when I went for darshan in 1990 and I took darshan from the same distance. These idols were at the same place in 1990, at which place these were in 1988, when I went there for darshan. I do not remember whether these idols were at the same place in 1988, where these were in 1962, when I took darshan.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 153/13 filed in Other Original Suit No. 1/89 (Shri Gopal Singh Visharad V/s Jahoor Ahmad and others). Witness after seeing it said that idols are seen in this picture. An idol of God Ramchanderji is seen in the middle. An idol of Durga Devi is seen in the right side. Thus, total two idols are seen in it. Idol of Ramchanderji is on the throne and that of Durgaji is on the chabutra. Three steps of a stair are seen in it. Two idols are on the upper step. I am stating the upper step as a chabutra. Similarly I do not remember if I had seen the idols kept there in the disputed Bhawan or not. I do not remember whether I have seen the staircase seen in this picture in the disputed Bhawan or not. So far as I remember I have not seen these stairs in the disputed Bhawan. When I went for darshan in 1962 and 1968, these idols were kept on a chabutra in the disputed Bhawan but that chabutra was not same as seen in picture document no. 154/13. I went into the disputed Bhawan in 1967 for the second time. I did not go to Ayodhya in 1968. I have by mistake said that I went to Ayodhya in 1968. I do not remember the length and width of chabutra on which idols were kept, under the mid dome in 1962 and 1967. I do not remember at what distance from the door under a dome, the chabutra was. Chabutra was about one-one and half feet in height. I cannot say whether that chabutra was made of wood or cement. This chabutra was not in the side of western wall of the disputed Bhawan. I do not

remember whether this chabutra was situated in the middle under a dome or not.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture document no. 154/7 filed in the above suit. Witness after seeing this picture in reply to a question said that this is a picture of Ramjanambhoomi. I cannot say from which direction this picture was taken. Part of which direction of the disputed Bhawan is seen in this picture, I cannot say. However, it appears from seeing the picture that rear part of the disputed Bhawan is seen in this picture.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture document no. 154/9. Witness after seeing the picture said that it is a picture of Singhdwar of the disputed Bhawan.

Witness after seeing the picture document no. 154/4, filed in the suit, said that I cannot say which part is seen in this picture. A part of the disputed premises is seen in this picture, but which part is seen, I cannot say. Since I did not go into rear part of the disputed Bhawan, hence I cannot explain about it. I have no knowledge of the direction concerning to that part.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 4 of black and white album document no. 201 C-1. Witness after seeing the picture said that a dome of this disputed Bhawan is seen in the picture. I cannot say which part of the disputed Bhawan is seen in this picture. Upon seeing the picture no. 7 of this album, witness said that a part of the disputed Bhawan is seen in this picture but which part, I cannot say. Front portion of the disputed Bhawan is seen

in this picture. A wall of the disputed Bhawan is seen in picture no.8. But which side's wall is this, I cannot say. This wall would have been 5-6 feet in height. I do not remember if there was a gate in this wall or not. God Varaha is seen in picture no. 9. This idol of God Varaha was made of stone. I cannot say about the length and width of this idol. This idol was in a sitting posture. It was one-one and half feet in length. I cannot say at what distance from the wall, this idol was. However this idol was leaned against the wall. I have offered flowers on this idol. I have not offered money there as I used to give the money to the *pujari* and put it into donation box. There was no idol at that place when I went there. It is not correct to say that there was no idol of God Varaha and that place was a pushta of wall and it was tried to construct an idol of God Varaha. A gate is seen in picture no. 23 of this album. Singhdwar of the disputed Bhawan is seen in this picture. Pillars of Kasauti are seen in picture no. 25. These pillars were fixed at Hanumat Dwar in the disputed building. The same scene as seen in picture no. 26. There appears to be an idol on both the pillars. I cannot say whose idols were these. A pillar of Kasauti is seen in picture no. 27 of this album. This pillar was outside the disputed building. There appears to be an idol on the pillar but I cannot say whose idol is this. This idol was in the part, which is little above than the bottom part. This idol is near the mid dome. Upon seeing picture no. 29 and 30 of the album, witness said that a part of Ram chabutra of the disputed building is seen in this picture. Idols are seen on the chabutra. I cannot say whose idols are these. Than said that it is an idol of Ramchanderji. Besides, an idol of Ganeshji is seen in these pictures. Idols are clearly seen in picture no. 29. Picture no. 30 is not clear so idols are not visible. An idbl of Ramchanderji, of his childhood is seen in picture no. 29. An idol of Sitaji

is not seen in picture no. 29. It is not correct to say that no idol is seen in picture no. 29.

There was a cave under the chabutra. I do not remember whether there was an idol in the cave or not. I do not remember in which side of the chabutra, the cave was. There was an idol in the cave. There was an idol of Hanumanji when I saw it. I do not remember whether there was one idol or many idols. Witness after seeing the picture no. 36 of this album said that front door of the disputed building and Hanumat dwar is seen in picture no. 36 of this album. It is not correct to say that Hanumat dwar is not seen in picture no. 36 and a door of a wall with grill is seen in this picture. A chulaha is seen in picture no. 36 of this album. A curtain like thing and a chakla is seen in picture no. 39 of this album. There are pictures of fishes. A drawing is seen above. Where this drawing was; it cannot be said by seeing the picture. A place of Sita Rasoi is seen in this picture. The chabutra at this place was one and half feet in height. This chabutra was constructed of bricks and sand. Chulaha and belan were made of stone. According to my faith and belief this is the place of Sita Rasoi. Sitaji had been living in the palace of Ramchanderji. Sita Rasoi was also in his palace. I believe that it was a part of a palace of Ramchanderji, during the period of King Dasratha. I cannot say whether these things had been there from the time of Ramchanderji, or not. I cannot say whether these things are 100, 200 years or much more old or not. Wall of the disputed place is seen in picture no. 47. However, this is a wall of a middle dome of the building with three domes. I saw these two pillars fixed on the disputed building from a distance of one or two feet when I visited the disputed building in 1988. I have not seen other pillars so closely. I have not seen the pillars fixed in the disputed building closely in 1990

because I came back after darshan and respectful greeting. I have seen the two pillars very closely when I visited the disputed building in 1988. I have seen 12 pillars in all. At that time I went through the door under the middle dome. But I do not remember through which door I came out from the disputed building. Than said I came out through the door under the mid dome. After entering into middle dome I went ahead towards left. No sepoy had stopped me from going there. I moved ahead upto four-five feets on the left. Thereafter I came out from the middle dome. I did not go under the southern side dome. Except this I did not go there i.e. in the inner side. I never went under the southern side dome. I found four pillars of Kasauti under the middle dome. Thus, I have seen total 8 pillars, four pillars under the left side dome and four pillars under the middle dome. I have seen the four pillars of south side from the place under the middle dome. I have not seen these pillars closely. As such I have seen these pillars only once from the place under the mid dome. I am talking about the year 1988, about 16-17 years back. I do not remember that which idol was on a particular pillar. I do not remember the deities whose idols I have seen. I have seen an idol of Yaksha on the pillars. Yaksh is deity and Goddess both. I think that I have seen an idol of Yaksha only. Except this I do not remember if I had seen an idol of any deity or Goddess.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 55 and 56. witness after seeing these pictures said that idols are seen on these pillars but whose idols are these, I cannot say. This idol is in the upper part on the pillars seen in picture no. 56. Attention of witness was drawn towards picture no. 57, 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 71 to 76. Witness after seeing these pictures said that picture of

Hanumanji is seen in picture no. 60. An idol of Ganeshji is seen in picture no. 74. It is not correct to say that no idol is seen in the picture shown to me. Upon seeing the picture no. 81 and 82 of the album, witness said that a temple of Ramlalla is seen in these pictures, which was under the middle dome. I saw it in 1988. I have not seen such scene in 1962.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 89, 90, 91 and 95 to 106 of this album. Witness after seeing these picture said that an idol of Ganeshji seen in picture no. 91 and an idol of Hanumanji is seen in picture no. 104. Idols of deity Goddess are not visible in any other picture.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 39 and 40 of colour album document no. 200 C-1. Witness after seeing the pictures said that fishes are seen in these pictures. Pillars fixed at Hanumat Dwar are seen in picture no. 47 and 48 of this album but idols fixed on these pillars are not visible. Idol is at the place where red colour is painted with. This idol is above the kalash. Pillars fixed in the disputed building are seen in pictures but these are not visible. Hand and foot are seen in picture no. 50 but head is not seen. A face is seen at the place above where red colour is painted with in the picture no. 54. But whose picture is this, I am not able to recognize.

Question: Is there any difference in between the human figure and figure of a Deity or Goddess, on the basis of which, without seeing the face, it can be said that the hands and foot of this figure are of a human or a deity or goddess?

Answer: These pillars were in the temples and these idol were on the pillars. Hence there should be the idol of deities and goddess.

It is not correct to say that no face of a deity of goddess is seen in the pictures which were shown to me during the course of cross-examination. Upon seeing the picture no. 77 of this album witness said that a gate is seen in this picture. I do not remember if such gate was in the disputed premises or not. The throne like thing seen in the picture no. 71 and 72 of this album. Kaushalya Rasoi is written above in picture no. 72. The same would have written in picture no. 71 but it is not clear. This kaushalya Rasoi is at the same place which I have referred above as Sita Rasoi in my statement. Wall of *kothari*, from where I took darshan in 1962 and 1967 is not seen in picture no. 68. Wall of the disputed premises is seen in picture no. 68. I do not remember, from which direction i.e. north or south of the wall seen in this picture from where I used to take darshan. A part of the disputed premises is seen in picture no. 79 and 80 of this album but I do not know which part is seen in this picture. A scene of mid door is seen in picture no. 84, 85 and 86 of this album. It is not correct to say that southern door of the disputed building which was situated under the northern dome, is seen in picture no. 84, 85 and 86. A scene of a part under the dome is seen in picture no. 98, 99 and 100. But I cannot say which part, either part under the northern dome, part of southern dome or part of middle dome, is seen in the pictures. No pillars of Kasauti is seen in picture no. 84, 85, 86 and picture no. 98, 99 and 100. A scene of main gate is seen in picture no. 103 of this album. Two pillars of Kasauti are seen. Whether any idol of a deity or goddess is seen in this picture or not. I do not remember. Upon seeing the picture no. 114 to 115, witness said that among

these pictures, an idol of Ganeshji is seen in picture no. 113. An eye, trunk and feet is seen in picture no. 113. A picture within a frame is seen in picture no. 116 of this album. I have seen this picture fixed in the disputed Bhawan in 1988 and 1990. But at what place this picture was, I do not remember. I do not remember at what place I have seen this picture, either under the northern dome, southern dome or under the middle dome.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 118 to 127 of this album. Witness said that an idol of Ganeshji is seen on the pillars in picture no. 120 and 121 among these picture. Trunk of Ganeshji is seen in both the picture.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 128 to 129 of this album. Witness after seeing these pictures said that I have seen the photos seen in these pictures in the disputed building but at which wall, i.e. either on eastern, western, northern or southern wall, I do not remember. I also do not remember that under which domes these pictures were. Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 136 to 147 of this album. Witness, after seeing these pictures said that among these pictures, an idol of Hanumanji is seen in picture no. 141. An idol of Ganeshji is seen in this picture. His eyes are not seen. Knee is seen but its upper and lower part is not seen. Upon seeing the picture no. 157 to 167 of this album, witness said that a trunk of Ganeshji is seen in picture no. 166 to 167 on the pillars which are seen in these pictures. This trunk is seen at the place where red colour is painted with. I am not recognizing any other idols. Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness

towards picture no. 176 to 200. Witness, after seeing these said that I am not recognizing any idol in these pictures. It is not correct to say that I am not recognizing any idols seen in the pillars in the pictures of black and white and colour album, shown to me. It is not correct to say that no idol of Deity, Goddess or Yaksha was there on any pillar fixed in the disputed building. There are three idols on the chabutra seen in picture no. 61 of the colour album. These were made of stone but from which stone these were made of I cannot say. I also cannot say at which place these idols were.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards para 13 of his examination in chief affidavit. Witness after reading this para, in reply to a question said that mention made in this para about the appearance of God Ramlalla in the family of King Dasratha means, Kaushalya and Dasrathji were the mother-father of Shri Ramchanderji. Kaushalya gave birth to Ramchanderji. In third line of this para the word, "same place" were used which I means the place under the mid dome of the disputed building with three domes. This place was a part of a palace of Kaushalya during the time of King Dasratha. I am stating this on the basis of sayings. I have not read about it in any book. It is not written in Ramcharitmanas that the disputed building with three domes was a Kaushalya Bhawan. I have in fifth line of this para, written that Valmiki Ramayana was contemporary to God Rama. Which I mean that Valmiki Ramayana was lakhs of years old. I have in third and fourth line of para-14 of my examination in chief affidavit said that worship of Shri Ramchanderji, from time immemorial, is not only being done in India but throughout the world. I have, in my statement stated that by the "time immemorial" I mean since lakhs of years. I cannot say

whether worship of Ramchanderji at the disputed site is being conducted since lakhs of years back or not. Since when the worship of Ramchanderji is being conducted there, I cannot say. I have, in para 17 of my affidavit, written that disputed building was constructed by demolishing Shri Ramjanambhoomi temple. Who constructed this temple and when, I cannot say. When the idols, which I have seen under the mid dome of the disputed building in 1962, were kept there, I cannot say. It is not correct to say that the building with three domes, was being used as a mosque since 1528. It is also not correct to say that no Ramjanambhoomi temple was ever there. It is also not correct to say that no evidence is found about that Ramchanderji has taken birth in the disputed premises. It is also not correct that regular five times namaz and namaz of Zumma was being held in the disputed building up to 22nd December, 1949. It is also not correct to say that I never went to the disputed building with three domes and I am making false statement in this regard.

(Cross-examination by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant no. 4, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, plaintiff no. 6/1 and 8/1, Ziyaudding and Maulana Mohd. Fizurrahman, concluded.)

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-
Shashikant Rungta
27.5.2005

Typed by the stenographer as dictated by me in the open court. In continuation to this suit for further cross-examination on 30.5.2005. Witness to be present.

Sd/-
(Hari Shankar Dubey)
Commissioner
27.5.2006

Before: Commissioner, Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,
Additional District Judge/Officer on special duty, High
Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 30.5.2005

D.W.-20/1, Shri Shashi Kant Rungta

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide order
dated 26.5.2006, in Other Original Suit no. 4/89)

(In continuation to dated 27.5.2005, Cross-examination on
an oath of D.W. 20/1, by Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddiqui,
Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff no.-7 in Other Original Suit
No. 4/89, continued)

XXX

XXX

XXX

XXX

Among the shrines, I have visited to Banaras,
Badrinath, Kedarnath, Shakumbhari Devi (Rajasthan),
Tirupati, other than Ayodhya. I also went to other shrines,
but names of these shrines I do not remembered. After
inviting his attention by the learned advocate cross-
examining the witness, witness said that I also went to
Prayag. I do not remember whether I have read any book
concerning to shrines or not. I came from Banaras
yesterday. I have offered milk and flowers in this temple.
An idol of Shiva is there. an idol of Shiva was there in the
form of Argha and Linga. Argha is not covered by snakes
in this temple. I offered water in this temple from a close
distance. I have visited Kashi Vishwanath temple for three
times, so far. I cannot say, in which direction the entry
gate of the temple is. Learned Cross-examiner Advocate,
has asked whether Jagmohan is in kashi Vishwanath
temple or not. Witness said that I do not understand the

meaning of Jagmohan. There are a number of idols in this temple. But I came back after taking darshan of Shiva. I went to this temple for three-four times in all. I cannot say how many idols, 10-5 or 100-200 in number, are there other than the idol of Shiva. There are three doors in the Garbh Griha in Kashi Vishwanath temple. Than said that there are four doors. I came out of the temple through the same way through which I went in. Stones of Kasauti are not at these doors. There are carvings on the walls. Pictures have been engraved on the stones fixed in the wall of the temple. These pictures are at the outer part of the Garbh Griha of the temple. I do not know the number of doors in the outer part of the temple. I cannot say whether carving is there in the Garbh Griha and on all the four walls or not. Shiva has a very important place in Hindu religion. God Rama is regarded as an incarnation of Shri Vishnu.

Vishwanath and Shiva is one and same. I go to Kashi Vishwanath temple to worship. I go to other temples only for the purpose of worship and not for other purposes. The pictures in Kashi Vishwanath temple have been drawn through carving. So far I know, kalash has also been prepared through carving. Besides, there are idols of Deities, Goddess. But I don't know their names because there is a number of deities-goddess in Hindu religion. Further said that an idol of Ganehsji is also there. Since, an idol of Ganeshji is in the temple so I regard this idol as idols of deity. Volunteer: that the photo of a deity, fixed in the house is also worshipped. The kalash kept in Kashi Vishwanath temple are made of Gold. Kalash of Gold has been put in the pinnacle. The Kalash I have referred above are made of stones. Pillars of Kasauti are not there. Kasauti is a stone with black colour and it is regarded as holy one in Hindu society. Stone of Kasauti is worshipable

whether it was engraved with an idol or not. I have heard that it turns in to gold if an iron rod is rubbed upon it. Stone of Kasauti is not an ordinary stone. Goldsmith used to rub the gold on the stone of Kasauti, to testify the originality of gold. From this act one can examine the genuineness of gold. The kalash of Kashi Vishwanath temple, which I have referred above, are engraved on the stones. Kalash are in physical form also. Kalash is also made of earth, brass, copper etc. Kalash is basically used for storing the water. Volunteer:that Kalash is also used in worship.

Beside religious places, I have seen other important buildings. Museums are prominent among these. Besides these, there are other buildings at different places. I did not go to Khazuraho. Wall of museum are carved with the pictures. In addition to these, pictures are fixed on the walls, pictures of Kings and other prominent personalities are fixed on the wall of temples. I do not remember if I had seen the picture of Kalash on the wall of museum or not.

I understand the meaning of throne. It is a place where King or Thakur sits. It is of the shape of a plank. A throne like thing is kept on the plank. I do not remember if I have seen the throne in the buildings other than religious buildings. Generally throne is of the shape of a chair. It is bigger than chair in size. Rear part of the throne is triangular in shape. There were other devotees at the time when I went for darshan. Devotees used to talk to each other. In other temples no body talks about that no one comes there to read the namaz. It is only the disputed building where people talk about this.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards a part "lakhs of devotees

were there at this occasion..... with a passion" written at page 3 in para 9 of his examination in chief affidavit. Witness after reading it said that Ramlalla means an idol of Ramchanderji of the period of his childhood, without bow and arrow. I used the word "Ramlalla" in this context. I do not remember if I had read any such book wherein Hindu shrines have been referred in. I have read about the religious places of Ayodhya in the book Ramcharitmanas. There is a reference of the bank of Saryu, Kaushalya Rasoi etc. in "Ramcharitmanas". 'Kanak Bhawan' has also been mentioned in Ramcharitmanas. This Bhawan was gifted to Sitaji in 'Muhana Dikha' ceremony. I do not remember the other shrine mentioned in this book. I cannot say in which Kand of 'Ramcharitmanas' these three places have been referred to. I do not know about the geographical situation of the above three places as referred in "Ramcharitmanas".

I am a graduate. I have read geography. But I am not interested in this subject. According to my knowledge passage of river has not been changed. It flows through the same route at present also. Saryu river bank as referred in "Ramcharitmanas" would be lakhs of years back. Ramcharitmanas was written by Valmiki. Than said that Tulsidas is the writer of Ramcharitmanas. I do not know the period of creation of Ramcharitmanas. This book was written in Ayodhya.

I have not received any summon from this court. I came here to depose on the advice of Shri Madan Mohan Gupta. Shri Madan Mohan Gupta is from Rewa and lives in Rewa. I talked to him over the phone. I know him. I am acquainted with him for the last 15-17 years. He talked to me to depose in this case 10 days back. I expressed my desire to depose in. Upon this he asked me to come to

depose in. Shri Gupta has told me the name of his advocate. He asked me to contact the Advocate. I can meet him at the place where he asked for. This affidavit of mine was prepared in the court. It was prepared in the Hon'ble High Court. It was first written by hand and then typed. I have written the affidavit under my own handwriting. It was corrected. The matter written at page-1 of my examination in chief affidavit is the same, which I have given in writing.

Renovation means to repair a temple which is in tattered position, so that it can be given a new look. Disputed building was demolished on 6th December, 1992. The object for demolition was not good. I was hurt from this incident. Had it not been demolished, I would have not to come here to depose in and this issue could be solved amicably. What was the object behind this demolition, I do not know.

I went to Ayodhya both in winter and summer. Then said that I also went during the monsoon. During 1962, when I visited Ayodhya for the first time at Ramnavami, it was pleasant weather. It was not so hot and not so cold. For the second time, I went to Ayodhya in 1967 in the month of Sawan. In 1988, I went in the month of Agahan (November) and around December in 1990. Was it a last week of October or first week of November, I do not remember. It was a special occasion and many people were gathered there. I do not know whether some incidents happened at that time or not. I do not know whether any incident happened in the disputed Bhawan at that time or not. Lal Krishan Advani might have launched a Rath-Yatra at that time but I do not remember about it. I give more attention to my business. I used to hear everything but do not pay much attention. I have referred

Nageshwar Nath temple in my statement. In my view it is a correct name.

I have been deposing in this court during last week. On 25th and 26th May, 2005 I appeared before the full bench in other court room. I went out from that court room through which I came in. I have seen one door closed. I do not remember about other doors.

Shri Madan Mohan Gupta has told me that I have to go to depose in this case about Ayodhya. He told me that I have to make statement in the suit proceeding. Shri Gupta has not told me about the parties to the suit. He only said that I have to make statement in connection with the Janambhoomi situated at Ayodhya. I know that two parties are involved in the suit. Suit has a subject. I know about it. The subject matter of the suit is "Ramjanamsthan". Who has filed this suit and against whom, I do not know. However, I know that Hindu and Muslims are involved in this suit. I cannot say when I came to know about this suit. I know about the dispute in between the Muslims and Hindus for last 12-15 years. The main contention is that Muslim claim the disputed site as a mosque and Hindus claim it a temple or Janamsthan. This temple is stated to be of God Ramchanderji. Janamsthan is of Ramchanderji. Ramchanderji and Ramlalla is one and same person. Hence I called it a birth place of Ramlalla. I have used both the word "Ramlalla" and "Ramchanderji" in my affidavit. According to me both are one. I have seen an idol of Ramlalla at the disputed site. In my view both, Ramlalla and Ramchanderji is one and same. Hence I regard this idol as an idol of Ramchanderji.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the part "By Ramlalla I

mean, an idol of Ramchanderji of his childhood days without bow and arrow. I used the word Ramlalla in this context of para second of page 40 of the statement given today. Witness said that my statement is correct. Learned Advocate Cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards a part of his statement given by him." I have used both the word "Ramlalla" and "Ramchanderji" in my affidavit. According to me both are one. I have seen an idol of Ramlalla at the disputed site. In my view both, Ramlalla and Ramchanderji is one and same. Hence I regard this idol as an idol of Ramchanderji. Witness said that this statement of mine is correct. There is no contradiction in between my above two statements.

I have heard the name of Swami Swaroopanandji. He is a Shankaracharya of two seats, Joshimath, Badrikaashram and Dwarika seat. There are only four Shankaracharyas in India. I do not know whether Swami Swaroopanandji Saraswati is regarded as a highest Shankaracharya or not. But he is worshipable. He is regarded as an incarnation of Shankarji. I have a relation with him for years. I did not talk with him about Ayodhya. I have no knowledge whether Shankaracharya ji Swaroopanandji had once tried to evolve a solution of the dispute in between Hindus and Muslims. I have no knowledge whether Shankracharya Swaroopanandji has organized a Yagna in 1993 in Ayodhya or not.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards a part of first line of para 3 of his examination in chief affidavit, "I know the disputed site very well". Witness said that "very well" he means the site of worship i.e. temple at the disputed site and not of the geographical condition of the site. It is necessary to have knowledge about history in order to

know a place very well. I know the disputed place as a "Janamsthan" and according to me, it is the history of this place.

I have referred "Ladoo Gopal" in my statement. According to people, Ramchanderji was called "Ladoo Gopal" during his childhood days. "Ladoo Gopal" is used to indicate about his childhood. I have seen an idol of Ladoo Gopal at Ramjanambhoomi site. I do not remember if I have seen an idol of Ladoo Gopal at any other place or not. I have seen an idol of Ramchanderji with bow and arrow but where I have seen it, I do not remember. I also do not remember when I saw this idol.

I have referred Maryada Purshottam Ram in eighth line of para 4 of my examination in chief affidavit. From which I mean Ramchanderji. Ramchanderji is not called iron man. From the word God Raghvendera, I mean Ramchanderji during his childhood. Further said that by the word childhood I mean his whole life. Thus God Raghvendra covers both, childhood and young life. I do not know how many crores of years back, Ramchanderji took incarnation. Faith about his birth or taking incarnation by him is in vogue in Ayodhya since lakhs of years. Lakhs of years, I mean from the time of Valmiki Ramayana and Ramcharitmanas written by Tulsidas. In my view, both, Valmiki Ramayana and Ramcharitmanas written by Tulsidas are not contemporary.

I have used the word "Hanuman bagh" in second line of para 6 of my examination in chief affidavit. This is a place of temple of Hanumanji. Whenever I visited Ayodhya, I went to Hanumanbagh. There is an idol of Hanumanji. There is one idol of Hanumanji. There is no bagh in Hanuman bagh. The name of this place is

Hanuman bagh. It is said that idols of Hanumanji is found in various postures. An idol in Hanuman bagh is in standing posture. I have been to Hanumangarhi also . There is an idol of Hanumanji.

(Upon this above question learned Advocate Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey, in Other Original Suit no. 5/89 has raised an objection that this question has already been asked for. Hence cannot be allowed again.)

Answer: I do not remember properly that in which posture the idol of Hanumanji is in Hanumagarhi. So far I remember it is in sitting posture.

It is correct to say that idols of Hanumanji at some place are very large and at some places it is very small in size. An idol of Hanumanji in Hanumangarhi is without hillock. I have not seen any idol of Hanumanji, which is very small i.e. mosquito size. I know about the fact that Hanumanji was capable of reducing and enlarging his size, according to his choice. I have in the statement given above the detail about the two idols, among the idols I have seen in Ayodhya. I do not remember if I have seen any other idol of Hanumanji in Ayodhya or not. Among these, one is in Hanuman bagh and one in Hanumangarhi. The incident of Ramchander's going to exile can be lakhs of year or crores of years back. Ramchanderji, during his exile went to forest from Ayodhya and from there to Srilanka. I do not know how many year after going to forest, he reached Lanka. The forest where Ramchanderji went from Ayodhya is in India. At what place the forest is that ,I do not know. Ramchanderji went to various forests. But I cannot say about the number of forests where he went. These can be 100-200 in number. I have no

knowledge if any forest among these falls in Uttar Pradesh. Besides Uttar Pradesh, which states he went through I do not know. It is not that he went to the forest of another country. I do not remember the name of forest and place from where he went to Lanka. I do not remember through which places he went. Similarly I do not remember through which places in the forest he went to Lanka. Than said that Ramchanderji went to Lanka via Rameshwaram. Rameshwaram is in the south and is a town. Volunteer: that it might be a forest during the time of Ramchanderji. Ramchanderji went by a chariot to the forest from Ayodhya but later he left the chariot and went ahead by foot. Ramchanderji went to Lanka on foot from forest. I came to know about this from Ramayana that Rameshwaram fell in the way of Ramchanderji, when he went to Lanka from forest. Volunteer: that he installed an idol of Shiva there. By idol I mean Linga. I have read about it in Ramayana. Rameshwaram has been referred in Ramcharitmanas but I do not remember whether it is referred as city, port or as what. I do not remember in which kand of Ramcharitmanas it is referred. It is not correct to say that whatever I am stating in this connection is based upon the imagination. I do not remember what I have read in this connection. I have read Ramcharitmanas so many days back, for the last time. Volunteer: that I chant it in the form of couplet with a view of worship. I have read the reference about Rameshwaram, with a view of worship. I might have read Ramcharitmanas for the first time at the age of seven-eight years. I do not remember whether I have read Ramcharitmanas before or after 1962. It is not correct to say that my memory is good and it is not necessary that I remember all things at a time.

Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards para 5 of his examination

in chief affidavit. Witness after reading it said that in my view Babar was an invader. Meerbaki had, on his order, tried to destroy the temple but he could not succeed. According to my knowledge, temple had been in the disputed site since 1528. I have no proper knowledge about the name of this temple and when it was constructed. I also have no knowledge about the size and construction of the temple. Meerbaki might have caused damage to the temple but I do not know up to what extent he damaged the temple. Matter written in para 5 of the affidavit is based on the sayings only. I do not remember, when and from whom I have heard about it. The word "Grand Temple" was used in the third line of para 5 of this affidavit from which I mean a beautiful temple. I have no knowledge about the beauty of the temple. Volunteer: that there was an idol of God and it is a birth place of God. I know this. I have no knowledge about the beauty of the temple. Construction method of temples is one and the same.

Question: Were the size and style and method of construction of the temples, in the various parts of India went under changes during different periods ?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Kumari Ranjana Agnihotri on behalf of plaintiff no. 20 in Other Original Suit no. 4/89 has raised an objection that witness neither is a specialist nor he had a special study in the method of construction of temples. Hence such question cannot be allowed. Moreover, nothing has been mentioned in the affidavit about this. Hence such question is not just.)

Answer: Temples of different times looks like the same. But I cannot say about it in full details.

All the temples which I have seen in India are like one but these are different in view of pitchers. Pitchers and domes are different. Domes are in round shape whereas pitcher is in triangular shape. Temples can have both the pitchers and domes. I do not remember if I have seen a dome in any temple outside of Ayodhya or not. But it appears to me that I have seen such temples somewhere. It is not correct to say that I have not seen a temple with a dome anywhere and I am concealing the truth in my statement. Generally the number of pitchers matched with the numbers of idols of deity or Goddess in a temple. But the main pitcher is one. Nageshwar Nath temple situated in Ayodhya has one pitcher. Where there is one idol. This is an idol of Shiva. There are other idols also. Garbh Griha contains a pinnacle and all the deities and goddess is in the Garbh Griha live in that pinnacle. The temple outside the Garbh Griha has a separate pinnacle. Hanumangarhi is situated in Ayodhya and has a pinnacle. This pinnacle is on the top of Garbh Griha. Hanumangarhi, has the idols of deities other than Hanumanji. I do not remember whose idols were those. Than said that there is an idol of Ramchanderji. Idol of Ramchanderji and Hanumanji are in the same Garbh Griha. Hanuman bagh temple has a pinnacle. This pinnacle is above the Garbh Griha. The temple which contains more than one pinnacle, have various other temples in it. If any temple has various Garbh Griha, in that case each Garbh Griha is treated as a separate temple. The temple situated at the disputed place in Ayodhya and other temples in Ayodhya have pinnacle. I have in my statement stated that the route through which Ramchanderji went to Lanka is in existence today. This statement of mine is correct. I have given this statement in this court yesterday. Today I have expressed my

unawareness about the geographical condition. Learned advocate cross- examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the matter written in second para at page 12 of dated 25.5.2005. Witness said that this statement of mine is correct. I cannot say whether my memory weakened after 25.5.2005 or not.

Question: Did you on 25.5.2005, in para second of page 12 given the statement that "I don not remember whether Ramchanderjireached Lanka after constructing a bridge.

(Learned Advocate Kumari Ranjana Agnihotri, on behalf of plaintiff no. 20 in Other Original Suit no. 4/89 has raised an objection that this question has already been asked by Tarunjeet Verma, and witness has given its reply appropriately. This question is being asked again to throw a challenge to the memory of witness and to harass and confuse the witness. Such type of question cannot be allowed.)

Answer: Yes, my above statement is correct.

There is no contradiction in the statement given by me on 25.5.2005 and today. I do remember that disputed site has been a Ramjanam place since ever. It is not correct to say that I do not remember any other things other than this. Ramjanambhoomi is worshipable as Makka and Madina is for the Muslims and Jerusalem is for Christians so is Ramjanambhoomi for Hindus. Jerusalem is regarded as an important because Jesus was born there. As per my knowledge Makka and Madina is one and same place. It is not correct to say that I have no knowledge about the subject in question. It is not correct to say that my entire statement is based on emotion and imagination. It is not correct to say that I tell only that things which I want to tell and I do not tell other things on the pretext that I do not remember . The fact is this that I

do not tell those things only which I do not remember . It is not correct to say that the building which was constructed at the disputed site in 1528, was a mosque. It is also not correct to say that there was no such faith that there was a Ramjajambhoomi temple before construction of a disputed building at the disputed site. It is not correct that regular five times namaz was being held there in the disputed building after construction of disputed building in 1528 and upto 22nd December, 1949. It is not correct to say that some people, on the night of 22/23.12.1949, after breaking the lock, kept the idols in the disputed building. It is not correct to say that there was no dispute about this place before 22/23 December, 1949.

(Cross-examination by Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit no. 4/89 and defendant no. 5 in Other Original Suit no. 5/89, Mohd. Hassim, concluded)

(Shri Irfan Ahmad, Advocate on behalf of defendant no. 6/1 in Other Original Suit no. 3/89, Shri Fazle Alam, Advocate on behalf of defendant no. 6/2 in Other Original Suit no. 3/89, Shri C.M. Shukla, Advocate on behalf of defendant no. 26 in Other Original Suit no. 5/89, have accepted the Cross-examination conducted by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate, Shri Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate and Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate.)

Cross-examination on behalf of all defendants concluded.
Witness is discharge.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-
Shashikant Rungta
30.5.2005

Typed by the stenographer as dictated by me in the open court.

Sd/-
(Hari Shankar Dubey)
Commissioner .
30.5.2005