

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

**OTHER ORIGINAL SUIT NO. 3/1989  
(REG. SUIT NO. 26-59)**

Nirmohi Akhara and others ..... Plaintiffs.

Versus

Priya Duttram and others ..... Defendants.

**STATEMENT OF D.W. 3/11  
SHRI BHANU PRATAP SINGH**

*www.vadaprativada.in*

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

**OTHER ORIGINAL SUIT NO. 3/1989  
(REG. SUIT NO. 26-59)**

Nirmohi Akhara and others ..... Plaintiffs.

Versus

Priya Duttram and others ..... Defendants.

**EXAMINATION IN CHIEF OF WITNESS NO. 3/11 SHRI BHANU  
PRATAP SINGH UNDER ORDER 18 RULE 4 OF CODE OF  
CIVIL PROCEDURE.**

I Bhanu Pratap Singh, age about 70 years, Son of Shri Ramraj Singh, resident of Village Haliyapur, District Sultanpur solemnly affirm on oath as under:-

PARA 1. That I am the original resident of Haliyapur where my family have been residing from many generations.

PARA 2. That my family is a conservative Hindu religious famiy.

PARA 3. That my Guru Gharana is Nirmohi Akhara and I have had my Guru Mantra from Mahant Dinendra Das Mathia Mahant.

PARA 4. That the name of my Grand Father was Shri Shankar Singh son of Shri Bali Singh who was

quite religious and he used to come to Ayodhya every year on the occasion of Ram Navami and Sawan Mela (festival). He died in the year 1965.

PARA 5. That I have been coming to Ayodhya from the time of my grand father who used to stay at Nirmohi Akhara. Nirmohi Akhara is in a temple at Ramghat and from there my grand father used to have Visit in the main temples of Ayodhya such as Ram Janambhoomi, Hanumangarhi, Kanak Palace, Chhoti Chhawani, Bari Chhawani, Nageshwar Nath temple etc.

PARA 6. I have been going to the Ramjanambhoomi Temple from the time I came to my senses. I came to my senses at the age of 10 years. Before going to the Ramjanambhoomi Temple on the way there was Hanumangarhi first and then Kanak Palace and after that there was Shri Ramjanambhoomi Temple.

PARA 7. In the beginning I came to know from my grand father about the above Ramjanambhoomi Temple that Lord Ram who is our household deity incarnated in this very land. Later from the hermits and my Guru Maharaj I knew it. Wherever I have heard Ram Story discourse at Ayodhya I came to know about this fact from the story tellers.

PARA 8. Towards the east of the main temple, Ramjanambhoomi there is a door. On entering this door there is Ram forum Temple on the south side and on the north side there is Sant Niwas and Storage House as well as space for

the saints of Nirmohi Akhara to live in which I have been seeing from the beginning. Outer courtyard which was covered by the boundary wall is towards the north side gate. On going towards east side from the North side door there was a ladder towards the north. This road on North side was upto the Hanumangarhi cross way. On the North side Chhathi Poojan Sthal, four Foot prints, Chakla, Flatterenedrod, Hfarth I have been viewing from the beginning.

PARA 9. There had been was wooden throne inside the Ram forum Temple which had borders of gold and silver. On this throne there was childhood idol of the Lord Ramlalla, idols of all the three brothers and idols of Hanuman Ji and Saligram Bhagwan were also there.

PARA 10. The Ram forum Temple was three and half feet in height and on the east and west side of it there was square cave in which there was idol of Lord Ram in the lap of Kaushlaya Ji and on other side there was the idol of Bharat Ji which was one and half to two feet in height. I know it that it is called Ramkot Mohalla where Ramjanambhoomi is situated. I am B.A. pass and I knew it from the saints, the Guru of Gurugharana and my father that meajority of temples at Ayodhya are of Ramanandi sact. Nirmohi Akhara is also the temple of the Ramanandi sect .

PARA 11. The promoter of the Ramanandi sect was Ramanand Ji. On becoming adult I myself have been doing the Visit of Ramjanambhoomi



regularly in festivals. There are three famous festivals at Ayodhya - Ramnavami, Sawan and Kartik festival.

PARA12. From the time I came to my senses whenever I came to Ayodhya for Visit of the said Ramjanambhoomi Temple on the occasion of worshiputsav Samaya, Aarti and Prasad distribution I noticed that the saints there are of Nirmohi Akhara and they possessed the place.

PARA 13. I know the inner part also which has three peaks and which is inside the bars. I have seen it. In the year 1950 I came to know that the portion having done has been attached and it has been locked and Visit of Loard Ramlalla could be done from the door having bars.

PARA 14. Before 1949 I used to go inside to have Visit of Lord Ramlalla and at that time the Lord was on the wooden swing at times and sometimes seated at the place over high ladder. The worship inside was performed by the saints of Nirmohi Akhara. Among these saints I know Mahant Bhaskar Das who is the Mahant of Naka Hanurnangarhi. Three -four years before the attachment I saw him there. Attachment was done in December, 1949.

PARA 15. I know that there is litigation between Sunni Central Board and Nirmohi Akhara.

PARA 16. In December 1992 the whole structure was demolished but the Lord Ramlalla is there inside the tent. The Lord is worshipped under the control of the Government. From the time I came

to my senses I saw no Muslim offering Namaj at the Ramjanambhoomi premise.

Dated: 28.04.2004

DEPONENT

Lucknow

Sd/-

Bhan Pratap Singh

**VERIFICATION**

I, Bhanu Pratap Singh the deponent hereby affirm that the statement given at para 1 to 16 of the affidavit is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Nothing has been concealed nor any thing false has been stated therein. May God help me.

Verified today on dated 28.04.2004 at the premise of High Court, Lucknow bench.

DEPONENT

Sd/-

(Bhan Pratap Singh)

I Ranjeet Lal Verma Advocate know the swearer witness Bhanu Pratap Singh who has signed in this affidavit before me.

Sd/-

Ranjeet Lal Verma

Advocate

28.04.2004.

Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,  
Additional District Judge/ Officer on Special Duty,  
Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Appointed Commissioner by Hon'ble full Bench Lucknow's  
order dated 16.4.2004.)

Other Original Suit No. 3/1989

R.S. No. 26/1 959

Nirmohi Akhara and others..... Plaintiffs.

Versus

Baby Priya Dutt Ram and others..... Defendants.

**Dated:28.4.2004**

**D.W.3/1 1 Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh.**

Affidavit filed in Examination in chief of Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh, age about 70 years, Son of Shri Ramraj Singh, Resident of Village Haliyapur, Distt. Sultanpur - from page 1 to 3 presented, which is taken on record.

(Cross examination of D.W. 3/11 Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh on behalf of Defendant No. 17 Shri Umesh Chandra Tripathi and Defendant No.22 Shri Umesh Chandra Pandey in other original suit No. 4/89 starts under oath by Shri Veereshwar Owivedi, Advocate.)

XXX

XXX

XXX

Haliyapur is situated in Isauli Pargana. Its Police Station at present is Haliyapur itself which was Valdiraya earlier. I am Vaishya Thakur. I do not have much knowledge about the lineage of Vaishya Thakurs but I know this much that we have migrated from Raibarelli

District. I passed my B.A. Examination from Kissan Degree College, Basti in the year 1962. I appeared in this examination as a private student.

I have come to know from my Guru Gharana that the Ram Janam Bhoomi Temple is in Ramkot Mohalla of Ayodhya. My grand father Guru Jantri Das told me about this. My grand father enlightened me about Ramanandeeya sect. Nirmohi Akhara is the temple of Ramanandeeya Sectt. I know about Nirmohi Akhara from the time I came to my senses. Within Ramanandeeya sect, there are other Maths also in addition to Nirmohi Akhara but they are managed from Nirmohi Akhara. I do not know the name of any Math among those Mathas. The meaning of the temple as I understand is the place where God is worshipped. I have read the Ramcharitmanas written by Tulsidas to some extent. I have read the Sundar Kand of the Ramcharitmanas. I have also read that part of Sundar Kand in which there is mention of Hanumanji's visit to Lanka, I have also read in the Sundar Kand that when Hanumanji visited Lanka he saw many temples there. It is mentioned in Ramcharitmanas in Sundarkand I have read "Mandir Mandir Pratikar Shobha". The temples mentioned in the Sundar Kand by Tulsidas are the temples of the God or not I do not know. I have not read "Gayeeo Dashanan Mandir Mahi" in the Sundar Kand. The temples I am mentioning are of different Gods and Goddesses such as Shankarji, Hanuman Krishna Ji and Devi Ji. The owners of these temples are not the Gods and Goddesses installed in them but the owners are the people who perform worship in them. There is trust of temples. The owners or the temples are priests but the right of ownership is of different kinds. There is trust of the temples and the temples are managed by them. Volunteer: that Panchayati Akhara is Math. I have come here to make a statement

about the Ram Janam Bhoomi Temple. The owner of this temple is the Mahant of the Panchayat. Volunteer: that the priests of the temples are different. I can not say anything as to when the Ram Janam Bhoomi temple was got constructed by the Nirmohi Akhara Panchayat. Ramanand Ji promoted his math in the year 1300. Whether Ram Janam Bhoomi temple was constructed in the year 1300 or when was it constructed, I do not have any knowledge about it. Whether Ramanand Ji set up only this Akhara or any other Akhara also, I have no knowledge about this. Besides Nirmohi Akhara I have heard the name of Nirvani Akhara also. As to when Nirmohi Akhara was constructed, I have no knowledge.

I have had Gurumantra from Mahant Dinendra Das Ji at the age of about 50-55 years. I had this Gurumantra at the place named Mathia. Till now I know about only one temple of the Nirmohi Akhara i.e. Ram Janma Bhoomi Temple. I do not know about any other temple which is related to the Nirmohi Akhara.

I have know knowledge as to when the case was filed in which I am a witness. In my examination-in-chief statement I have stated about the attachment of the temple. This attachment was done in the year 1949. At that time I was about 30 years old. When used to come for Visit of Hanumangarhi and Ram-Janam Bhoomi Temple situated at Naka Mujaffara Faizabad I generally met Bhaskar Das Ji. Due to the visit I am familiar with him. I have no friendship with him. The temple situated at Naka is the temple of Hanuman Ji. Kanak Palace temple is the temple of Ram and Sita Ji. Hanuman Garhi temple situated at Ayodhya is the temple of Hanuman Ji. It is incorrect to say that the owner of the temple is the God or Goddess of that temple. I have heard about the Nageshwar Nath

temple situated at Ayodhya. This temple is of lord Shiva. It is correct to say that the priests of the temple are the servant of the temple, they are not the owners of the temple. The Mahant of the Math can be the owner of the temple but intact the owner is the Panchayat. It is incorrect to say that no trust can be the owner of the temple. It is incorrect to say that if a trust of Panchayat gets a temple constructed the owner of the temple becomes the Lord of that temple. It is incorrect to say that I am making incorrect statement in this regard that the owner of the Ram Janam Bhoomi temple is Nirmohi Akhara.

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 17 Shri Umesh Chandra Tripathi and defendant No. 22 Shri Umesh Chandra Pandey in other original suit No. 4/89 by Shri Veereshwar Dwivedi Advocate concluded.)

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 2/1 Mahant Suresh Das in other original suit No. 4/89 and 5/89 by Shri Madan Mohan Pandey begins.)

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

The followers of the Hindu religion treat Ayodhya as a very important pilgrimage. The Hindus believe that Lord Rama was born at Ayodhya. They also believe that the place of birth of Lord Ram is the Ramjanambhoomi temple. I also believe that the disputed site is the place of birth of Lord Ram and hence I do perform worship at this place. I certainly go to Ayodhya one or two times in a year. I have been going to Ayodhya from my child hood i.e. from the time of my grand father. Whether there are thousands of temple at Ayodhya or not, I can not say but there are several temples at Ayodhya. Ayodhya is called the city of

Hindu-Temples. On the north side of Ayodhya is the Saryoo river. On all sides of the Ram Janam Bhoomi temple, I am making statement about, there are several temples. Every year there are many fairs held at Ayodhya and religious functions are performed. Among these there are three famous lairs. In these main three festivals first is the Snan of Kartik month, second is Chhaitra Ramnavami and the third one is Sawan-Jhoola. I mostly go to Ayodhya in the month of Kartik and on the occasion of Chhaitra Ramnavami. On these occasions from every corner of the country lacs of Hindus come to Ayodhya, take holy bath and have Visit and perform worship. On these occasions there is rush of those who want to have Visit at the Ram Janma Bhoomi Temple. All Visitors this regard the disputed site as the birth place of the Lord and have its Darshari and perform worship here. The disputed site is the birth place of Lord Ram is known to me from the time when I was ten years old. I came to know about this from my grand father and hermits as well as saints of Ayodhya. When I came to my senses, I started going to Ayodhya. From then on I did not see any one the follower of other religion say Muslims at the disputed site or around it. The famous pilgrimages at Ayodhya are Kanak Palace, Hanumangarhi, Bada-Sthan and Ramjanambhoomi. Rotation (Rotation) also held at Ayodhya. It is performed three times in a year. For these Rotation also lacs of Hindus throng from the country and abroad and participate in the Rotation. The Rotation is held two times in the month of Kartik and once on the occasion of Sita Navami. The names of these Rotation are Panchkosi, Chaudahkosi and Chaurasikosi. I have also performed Parichkosi and Chaudahkosi Rotation. Panchkosi Rotation is the Rotation of the whole Ayodhya. Chaudahkosi Rotation includes Ayodhya and some parts of Faizabad. Chaurasikosi Rotation includes Faizabad, Ayodhya, Gonda, Basti and

some parts of Bharatkunda. In theology I have read the Ramayana, where in Ayodhya is mentioned as the birth place of Lord Ram. I have also read, Janambhoomi mam puri Suhawani, Uttar Disi Bah Saryu Pawani. (The city of my birth place is beautiful and on the north side of it flows the river Saryu.) in the Ramayana. The Hindus treat the river Saryu a sacred river. I have read the Ramcharitmanas by Tulsi but I have not read Valmiki Ramayana. I have heard religious stories from saints and Pandits also. In these stories also Ayodhya is stated to be the birth place of Lord Rama. In Ramcharitmanas there is full detail of the birth of Lord Ram son of Dasrath at Ayodhya and his child hood. Hanwnangarhi is also situated at Ayodhya. Hanumangarhi is of Nirmohi Akhara. Again said, as to which Akhara the Hanumangarhi belongs , I can not state. I have stated that I am the disciple of Nirmohi Akhara but how many Akharas are there I have no knowledge.

I have heard the name of Paramhans Ramchandra Das Ji of Ayodhya. I have had Visit of him. I have not gone to his place at Digambar Akhara. In this case whether Paramhansa Ramchandra Das Ji was plaintiff or defendant or none I have no much knowledge but I had heard that he was plaintiff in this case. Paramhansa Ji was associated with the Ramjanambhoomi liberation agitation since the year 1949. From the beginning it was his effort that a huge temple should be constructed at Ramjanambhoomi.

I have no knowledge as to how many cases are there in courts regarding the disputed site. I know that the place Ramjanambhoomi is disputed and litigation in this regard is on since 1949. I know that Nirmohi Akhara has raised a dispute regarding the disputed site. Nirmohi Akhara has filed writ regarding the disputed site in 1949 and before it



also. Before 1949 also Nirmohi Akhara had filed writ that temple should be constructed there. This writ was filed ten to twenty year before 1949 or how many years before, I have no knowledge.

Before the collapse of the structure I had gone to the disputed site. At the south eastern corner of the place having three domes there is a place known as Ramforum. Here was also the Court of Lord Ram and priest lived there. The priests lived outside the place having three domes. I had also seen Sitakoo (Sita well) outside the premise. Inside the premise and outside the boundary wall of it many saints and sages used to sing religious songs. I have had discussion with the Mahanats and Panchs of Nirmohi Akhara but this discussion was not in proper way. In this case there is dispute between Sunni Board and Vishwa Hindu Parishad. Nirmohi Akhara is also associated with this dispute. When did I come to know about this dispute among these three, I can not state exactly. I knew about this dispute 20-25 years before.

Question- Whether Vishwa Hindu Parishad considering the disputed site as Ramjanambhoomi wants to construct a huge temple there?

(This question was objected by the learned Advocate of plaintiffs in other original suit No. 3/89 Shri Ranjeet Lal Varma that this tact has not been taken in pleadings. Vishwa Hindu Parishad is not a party and the plaintiff Ramchandra Das Paramhans has accepted the claim of Nirmohi Akhara hence permission to ask such questions can not be granted.)

(The above question was also objected by the learned Advocate of defendant No. 11 in other original suit No.

3/89 Shri Abdul Mannan that neither Vishwa Hindu Parishad is a party nor it has any concern with the disputed site hence permission to ask such questions can not be granted.)

Answer- I have no knowledge in this regard. I know about Niarmohi Akhara.

As to how many temples of Nirmohi Akhara are at Ayodhya I do not know exactly. Besides the disputed site the Ramjanambhoomi Temple there are other temples of Nirmohi Akhara at Ayodhya or not, I have no knowledge. Volunteer : that the temple of the Akhara at Ayodhya is at Ayodhya itself. The temple of Nirmohi Akhara is situated at Ramghat. In the temple of Nirmohi Akhara situated at Ramghat the Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara and other saints live. The mahant is elected by the Panchs of the Akhara. Mahant is not supreme, Panchs are only supreme. The genuine right to take decisions vests in Panchas only.

Question- Does the Mahant elected by the Panchas has the right to manage the temple or not?

(This question was objected by the learned advocate of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 3/89 Shri Ranjeet Lal Varma that this question has been asked many times and it has been replied to that the Mahant is not supreme. Despite asking such question is objectionable. Paramhans Ramchandradas has himself accepted that the tradition of the Akharas is similar and he himself was the Mahant of the Digambar Akhara and he has made statement in this regard.)

Answer- The Mahant elected by the Panchas does not have supreme power because Mahants are

elected by the Panchas and they can also be dismissed by the Panchas.

I know the ex Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara Ram Kewal Das. I do not know for how many years he had been the Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara. Ram Kewal Das Ji was the Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara in the year 1963, 1984, 1985 and 1986 or not I have no knowledge because he was removed of this responsibility later. As to when was Ram Kewal Das Ji removed I have no knowledge. It is incorrect to say that being the disciple of Nirmohi Akhara I am making false statement that the disputed site is under the ownership of Nirmohi Akhara.

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 2/1 Mahanat Suresh Das Ji in other original suit No. 4/89 and 5/89 by Shri Madan Mohan Pandey concluded.)

(Learned advocate Shri P.L. Mishra and D.P. Gupta of the Plaintiff in other original suit No. 1/89 stated that they do not intend to cross examine this witness of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 3/89.)

(Cross examination on behalf of plaintiffs in other original suit No. 5/89 by Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate begins.)

xxx                      xxx                      xxx                      xxx

I have done the Rotation of Ramjanambhoomi temple. For Visit of Ramjanambhoomi people from all the corners of the country used to come. Among them some people did Visit and Rotation both and some people did Visit only. I have had Visit by going inside the Ramjanambhoomi before the year 1950. Like me other

people also had been doing Visit by going inside. Permission from any body was not required for having Visit. Every Hindu understood that it was their deity so he used to go for Visit authoritatively. The Lord took birth at this very place so this place only is worth worshipping. Recognition had it that under the middle dome of the place having three domes, Lord Ram took birth. This faith is intact until now. Lord Ram took birth in Treta Period, From then on this place is considered the birth place of Lord Ram. December 1992 the door of the main building was towards the east side which was known as Hanumat Dwar. On entering through the Hanumat Dwar towards the south side there was Ram forum. On the north side there was Shiv Darbar and (religious singing): were held there and saints used to sit there. At the south-east corner of Ram forum, a two in one, tree of Neem and Peepal was there under which there was Ramforum. Some idols of Shivas family were kept there.

The witness was shown the photo No. 59,60 and 61 of the coloured album paper No. 200C-i and he was asked whether these are the idols of that Shiva's family. The witness stated that those were the idols of the Shiva's family. These idols are of Lord Ganesha, Lord Kartikeya, Nandishwar and Parvati Ji. Before Nandishwar, Shivlinga is kept in the Arghe. On entering inside the Hanumat Dwar there was Storage house and residence of saints on the north side where offerings of the people such as rice, flour etc were kept. For Rotation, south turn was taken from the Hanumat Dwar. I had not seen the idol of Varah Bhagwan there. The witness was again shown the photo No. 14, 15 and 16 of coloured album paper No. 200 C-1 and it was asked,

whether there was the idol of Varah Bhagwan on the wall on turning towards the south? The witness told that this

idol was not clear and people used to say that this was the idol of Varah Bhagwan. In photo No. 14, 15 and 16 there is photo of the same idol. On the door towards the north in the disputed premise two lions were drawn and in between them idol of Garur was there. The witness was shown the photo No. 38, 39 and 40 of the coloured album and it was asked that are the idols of lions and Garur seen in these photos over the doors? The witness stated that the idols of both the lions and Garur are seen in these photos. Before entering any house the permission of the owner of the house is required. Visit in all these temples is permissible. I have seen many other people going for Visit. I have seen that the people rest their heads at the door before entering the temple or touch the door with hand. Some people enter the temple with applausive shouts (Jaykara). Before entering the temple, resting head at the door, touching the same and making applausive shouts shows that the person wishing to have Visit is giving regard to the idol installed inside the temple and seeking its permission to enter. On the occasion of fairs and at other times whenever the people came to this Ramjanambhoomi for Visit they entered inside making applausive shouts.

The witness was shown photo No. 9 and 10 of black and white album paper No. 201 C-1 and it was asked whether in these photos the idols of the same Varah Bhagwan is seen which was mentioned by the witness earlier. The witness stated yes, the idol of the Varah Bhagwan is seen in these photos. Photo No. 20 of this very album was shown to the witness and it was asked whether this photo is of the north side door of the disputed premise. Are there two lions and Garur in this photo? The witness stated that this is the same photo. Photo No. 32 and 33 were shown to the witness and it was asked whether this photo is of the family of Lord Shiva situated

at the south-east corner of the Ramforum. The witness answered in affirmative.

On entering the disputed premise from the north side door there was Sita (kitchen) where Hparth-wash and flattened rod was kept. There were Foot Prints also. For entering the disputed premise, the door on the north side was known as Singh door. The door for entering from the east side was Hanumat door. Besides these two doors there was no any other door for entering the disputed premise. I have not seen any Muslim offering Namaj inside the disputed premise or entering the premise.

(Cross examination on behalf of plaintiffs in other original suit No. 5/89 by Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey, advocate concluded.)

*www.vadaprativada.in*

Statement read and verified

Sd/-

Bhanu Pratap Singh

28.04.2004

The Stenographer typed in the open court as dictated by me. The case be presented on dated 29.4.2004 for further cross examination. The witness remain present on next date.

Sd/-

Commissioner

28.04.2004

*www.vadaprativada.in*

**Dated – 29.04.2004**

**D.W. 3/11 Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh**

Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,  
Additional District Judge / Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble  
High Court , Lucknow Bench Lucknow.

(Appointed Commissioner by Hon'ble full Bench,  
Lucknow's order dated 16.4.2004)

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 20 in other  
original suit No. 4/89 by Kumari Ranjana Agnihotri,  
Advocate begins.)

I have stated in para 2 of my examination in -chief  
affidavit that I am from conservative Hindu religious  
family. Its meaning is that I am the follower of Hindu  
religion and having faith in Lord Ram. I am having faith  
and belief both in Lord Ram. In para 4 of my examination-  
in-chief affidavit the name of my grand father is written as  
Shankar Singh and in para 5 it is stated that I have been  
going to Ayodhya from the time of my grand father. The  
word Baba used in para 4 and the word grand father used  
in para 5 have the same meaning. I am B.A. Pass. Hindi,  
Political Science and Geography were my subjects in B.A.  
I have studied all these subjects to my capacity. In the  
subject Hindi I have studied the literature of Goswami  
Tulsi Das, Surdas and Kabirdas. I have studied the  
literature of Raheem also. I have read the life history of  
these poets. Some portion of Ramcharitmanas was there  
in my course. Besides the course I have read and recited  
the Ramcharitmanas. In the Bal Kand of Ramcharitmanas  
under the couplet 191 I have also read, Bhay-Pragat  
Kripala '. Its meaning is that Ramchandra Ji incarnated in  
the home of Kaushalyaji. Ramchandraji incarnated in the

home of Kaushalyaji for destroying the devils and for the happiness of King Dashrath. I am Vaishnav. Vaishnav are those who believe in the incarnation of Rama and Krishna. The household deity of my family is Lord Shri Ram. My household deity is also Lord Shri Ram. I had visit Ram Janambhoomi many times. I like the infant form of Lord Shri Rama. I, according to my faith and belief still go for having Visit of the infant form of Lord Rama. In para 7 of my examination-in-chief affidavit I have stated that I came to know about Ramjanambhoomi temple from my grand father and he told me that Lord Ram is our household deity. I had this information from my grand father, Guru Maharaj and by reading the Manas. I came to know about it from saints and hermits also. This I have heard from the story tellers also. These story tellers are those who tell the stories of Lord Ram. I have heard the stories of Ram from Asharam Bapu, Murari Bapu and Rambhadracharya. (I have heard this from many other people but I do not remember their names. I have heard story of Asharam Bapu and Murari Bapu 2-3 times). Story from Rambhadracharya, I have heard recently at Nandi Gram. I heard this story during Navratri. Again said that I had heard the story of Murari Bapu during Navratri. Nandi Gram is called Bharat Kunda also. Other people call it Bhadrassa also. This place is towards the south. It is at a distance of 17-18 km. from Ayodhya. The duration of the Katha discourse of Murari Bapu was perhaps for a week. I went to the Janambhoomi for the first time before the year 1949. There I had seen the poles of Kasauti. I had also seen the figures and pictures drawn on the poles. The figures were of Brahma, Vishnu and Devanganas. Some flowers and leaves were also carved on these poles. I have mentioned above about hearing the discourse of Rambhadracharya. he is the same Rambhadracharya who lives at Chitrakoot. The promoter of Ramanandi sect was



Adi Ramanandacharya. I have had Deeksha of Ram Mantra. I have not taken Deeksha of Vugal Mantra. I have not come for this evidence at the instance of anybody. What I have said is true.

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 20 in other original suit No. 4/89 by Kumari Ranjana Agnihotri, Advocate concluded.)

(Besides the other defendants of suit No. 4/89 and learned advocates of defendants 4, 5, 6 and 26 in other original suit No. 5/89 nobody is present for cross examination on behalf of any other defendants. Hence cross examination on behalf of Shri Mohammad Farook Ahmad defendant No. 11 by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate begins. )

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

At present my age is about 70 years. I had gone to Ayodhya before the year 1949. I remember the things when I went to Ayodhya for the first time. After that I used to go to Ayodhya regularly one or two times in a year. I would have gone to Ayodhya approximately for fifty times. I did not see three domes, I had seen three peaks. Dome and peak is not the same thing. These three peaks were round in shape. I can not state the length and breath of the three peaks even though I have seen them. I can not state this length and breath by guessing. I would have seen these domes 40-50 times. The peaks (domes) were at a height of 80 to 100 feet from the ground. All the three peaks were separate and connected to one another. I can not state the length and breadth of the disputed building by guessing. I had gone inside. I have gone inside the disputed building 40-50 times but I have not seen the depth of the disputed building. The ground surface under

the dome(peak) would have been 30-40 feet in breath and about 120 feet in length. Again said that this length would have been 120 to 130 feet. The height of the dome (peak) could be between 80 to 100 feet. I am stating this height by guessing. I have been going to Ayodhya from the age of 10 years with my grand father. I had gone to Ayodhya for the first time 60 years before from now. When I went to Ayodhya for the first time there were three (peaks) domes in the disputed building. I appeared in the B.A. examination from Kissan Degree College, Basti. I passed this examination in the year 1962. I appeared in this examination as a private candidate. When I went to Basti for appearing in the examination, at that time also I used to go to Ayodhya. Before going to Basti for appearing in the examination, I do not remember, as to how many times I had gone to Ayodhya. For appearing in the examination I stayed at Basti for about 20 days. I had stayed at Basti proper for appearing in the examination had appeared in this examination with the subjects Hindi, Political Science and Geography. I had studied political science. In political science something was taught regarding citizenship and under the law, international law and marine related law was taught. Besides, topics related to transport were taught. This study I did at home only. My home is in Haliyapur village of Sultanpur District. I did preparation for the B.A. examination living in village Haliyapur. I went to Basti from Haliyapur two days before the date of examination. After writing the examination I returned back from Basti to Haliyapur. I am still living at Haliyapur. I live at Hallyapur and visit Ayodhya from time to time. I go to Ayodhya for Visit or in connection with some work. I certainly go to Ayodhya twice in a year for having Visit. When I go to Ayodhya for Visit I see the temples there and stay at my Guru Gharana the Nirmohi Akhara. Nirmohi Akhara is situated at Ayodhya. Nirmohi Akhara is situated

at Ramghat. Nirmohi Akhara is towards the east from Hanuman Garhi. At present the Ramghat is not at the bank of the river. The place Ramghat is situated in which village, I am having no knowledge. My Guru's place is at Ramghat. This Guru place is in Nirmohi Akhara. My Guru Dinendra Das Ji live at Ramghat. Mahant Jagannath Das Ji and Bhaskar Das Ji also live there who are the disciples of the Mahant. Among disciples Ramdas, Nirmal Das and I myself live there and I visit there. My Akhara is at the distance of one or one and half km. from the river Saryu. The disciples of my Guru live there. When I visit to Ayodhya I also stay there. At the place of Guru the arrangement of etables as chapati, Dal, rice and vegetable exists. The arrangement for food is done by the disciples. The disciples prepare the food. They bring the material for food from the village of the Mahant Ji where some cultivation is done. In addition to this some disciples also bring vegetables etc. and Mahant pays the money. Mahant brings the money from the village where he has some property. Some donation to the Nirmohi Akhara is also done by me. I sometimes give cereals as donation and some times do so in Rupees. As many time I go there I certainly donate something. I do not know about Babari Masjid. I only know about the temple, the structure of which was demolished. This structure was demolished in 1992. This structure was demolished for renovation. When the structure was demolished, whether there was Jansangh or public present or not, I can not state because I was in the village at that time. The structure of the Mosque was not demolished but the temple was renovated. How many people were present at that time, can be stated by the media because I was at the rural area at that time. I had come to Ayodhya 15 days after the demolition of the structure. After 15 days when I came to Ayodhya, I heard that, for the renovation of the temple the

structure has been demolished. I did not meet any such person who did participate in the demolition of the structure. Whether the people from all over India had come or not, I can not state. Whether there were two to three lac people present there at the time of demolition of the structure or not, I can not state. I heard about the demolition of the structure the next day of the happening. My village is at a distance of 54 km. from Ayodhya. From Faizabad my village is at a distance of 48km. The news of the demolition of the structure reached in my village the next day of the happening. As to when was the disputed structure constructed, I have no knowledge. I did not read in the history as to who got it constructed. There were three domes (peaks) in the disputed building. I did not see Minaret this building. I know about the Minaret, which are in Mosques but the Minaret were not there in the disputed building. When I came to Ayodhya after demolition of the structure I stayed at the place of my Guru Ji. At that time there were four- five people at the place.

None among those was such a person who told me that he participated in the demolition of the structure. I stayed at Ayodhya at that time for only one night. Next day I returned. After staying over night at Ayodhya I went back to my home the next day. When I was returning to Ayodhya, none on the way me informed about the demotion of the structure. After demolition of the structure the national leaders made any statement of not I do not remember. After demolition of the structure the national leaders kept quiet in this regard or not I have no knowledge. I know Atal Bihari Bajpayee. I am Thakur by caste. The Thakur are considered a little lower than the Brahmins. Vaishya is the caste of Thakurs and they are called Trilokchandi Vaishya.

Question. The Brahmins generally do not marry in other castes?

(This question was objected by the learned Advocate of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 5/89 Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey that the question asked was not related to any suit. Therefore, such irrelevant questions could not be allowed.)

Answer. It is correct that generally the Brahmins do not marry in other castes. Thakurs also generally do not marry in other castes.

The Brahmins do not marry in Sudras. Brahmins do marry in Brahmins only. They do not marry in other castes.

I have no information that the disputed building was built in the year 1528. I have studied History upto High School. Whether the Governor of Babar, Meerbanki got the disputed building constructed at Ayodhya or not I have no knowledge about that. Whether this building was, constructed by Meerbaki in the year 1528 or not, I have no knowledge of it also. It is incorrect to say that after 1528 Namaj was regularly offered in the disputed building. The Namaj is happened in the disputed building. I regularly go there from the time when I was 10 year old. Something's of that time when I was 10 years old, I do remember and something's I have forgotten. At the age of 10 I had gone inside the disputed building having three domes(peaks). I had also seen its nearby areas by walking. Volunteer: that he saw the area roughly not as inspection. I have seen Minaret in all the Mosques seen by me. I can not say in this regard whether there are Mosques without Minaret or not. Where Meerbanki lived I have no knowledge in this

regard. Meerbanki was the resident of Fargana or not I have no knowledge. Whether Meerbanki got the Babri Mosque constructed or not I have no knowledge in this regard. I have no knowledge whether Meerbanki was appointed at Ayodhya in the year 1528 or not. It may be possible that some may be saying that the Babari Mosque was got constructed by Meerbanki but I do not say it that the Babari Mosque was got constructed by Meerbanki. It is incorrect to say that Namaj was offered regularly in the disputed building. It is incorrect to say that till 1949, Namaj was regularly offered in the disputed building. I had gone inside the disputed building in 1949. Volunteer: that I went inside the disputed building in 1949 two times on the occasion of festivals, On 23rd December, 1949 the Sub Inspector of Ayodhya Shri Ramdev Dubey got the report registered in respect of the disputed building. I have knowledge about it. Volunteer: that this report was got written by the Govt. under the pressure of the renowned Muslims of that area.

Question- Whether it is also written in this report that Ramdas etc. and his 50-60 associates installed the idol inside the Mosque and desecrated the Mosque?

(This question was objected by the learned Advocate of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 5/89 Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey that question regarding the contents of the record submitted as evidence can not be asked. Besides this witness is not named in this first investigation report and neither he is the resident of Ayodhya and in no way he is related to the first investigation report. Therefore permission to ask such questions can not be granted).

Answer- This report is incorrect. This report was got written fictitious.

At the time when report was got written I was not present there. It was heard that this report was got written fictitious. It is mentioned in the report that this report was got lodged by Ramdeb Dubey. I can not state that this report was got written by him or not.

Question- Was this report got lodged by Ram dev Dubey?

(This question was objected by the learned Advocate of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 5/89 Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey that the question asked is not related to any point of any suit. Therefore, permission to ask such irrelevant question can not be granted.)

Answer- On reading the report, it is evident that the report was got written by Ramdev Dubey Sub Inspector, Kotwali Ayodhya. It is written in this report that the Mosque was desecrated.

I can not state that this report was got written in the night or in the morning. The witness stated that I saw that the report was written but I can not say whether this report was written in the night or in the morning because the Police keep the daily report book blank and write the report later therein. It is incorrect to say that Namaj was offered till one day before the date of lodging the report.

Question- It is written in this F.I.R. that by keeping the idols in the Mosque it was desecrated. In your view is it offence or not?

(This question was objected by the learned Advocate of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 5/89 Shri Ved Prakash that the witness has not lodged the F.I.R. hence the contents of the F.I.R. can not be asked.)

(Again it was objected that the witness is neither an Advocate nor a Police person, hence this question should not be allowed.)

Answer- I can not state whether this act it offence or not.

I can not state as to who were associated in the demolition of the disputed building and also who demolished it. At the time of demolition of the disputed structure which persons of Ayodhya were present, I can not state. That place is called the disputed structure wherein our Ramlalla was installed.

Question:-Was the disputed building demolished on 6th December,1992?

(This question was objected by the learned advocate of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 5/89 Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey that this question is being asked again and again, therefore it can not be allowed.)

Answer- On 6th December, 1992 the disputed structure was not demolished but renovated.

Whether the disputed building crumbled down on 6th December, 1992 in the evening at 4.00p.m. or not, I have no knowledge. After crumbling down of the disputed building lacs of people assembled there or not and they ran away with the stones of the crumbled building or not, I have no knowledge about this. I do not remember the day I went there after crumbling down of the disputed building. I



have no knowledge about Babari Mosque, therefore, I can not state as to when it crumbled down.

Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 11 Shri Moham mad Farook Ahmad by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate concluded.)

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 9, Sunni Central Board of Wakf, Uttar Praoesh by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate starts.)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

When I passed B.A. my age was 28 years. Before passing B.A. I had passed Intermediate Examination in the year 1954. At the time of passing the Intermediate Examination my age was 20 years. I passed Intermediate Examination from Manohar Lal College, Faizabad. At that time I lived at Faizabad at the home of my maternal uncle. Maternal uncle's home was in the rural area. On seventh or eighth day I used to go to my home. The home of my maternal uncle was near Rani Market hamlet known as Sariyanva "Merai Singh". The Merai hamlet was at a distance of 11-12 km from Manohar Lal College, Faizabad. The hamlet Merai was at a distance of 3km from Rani Market towards the west on Faizabad Raibareli road. I used to go to the Manohar Lal College from the village of my maternal uncle by a cycle. I passed High School also from the same College. I passed High School in the year 1952. I was 18 years old when I passed the examination of High School. After passing Intermediate I lived at home and stopped studies. Many members of my family died so my studies were discontinued. Volunteer: that lack of money was also a reason. My date of birth in the certificate of High School is written as 1 July 1936 but in my horoscope it is written as Sambat, 1990. I have not brought the certificate of High School today, it is kept at home. I got admission in that

School in 1945, wherefrom I passed the High School examination. Before the year 1945 I studied at District Basti. I did my schooling in Bakhira town of Basti. This study was done in the Zila Parishad primary school. I passed class 4th from Bakhira. I got admission in the Manohar Lal College in class 3<sup>rd</sup>. After admission in Manohar Lal College I lived in the house of my maternal uncle at the hamlet of Merai and used to go home on seventh or eighth Day. After admission in class 3<sup>rd</sup> I used to go to the

Manohar Lal College daily by cycle from the hamlet of Merai but due to disorder in cycle I did not go to School on some days. When I went to my home from the hamlet of Merai I used cycle as conveyance. In 1945 my home was in village Haliyapur. From Haliyapur the distance of the hamlet of Merai is 36-37 km. The population of Haliyapur was about 3000 in the year 1945. In the year 1945 there was Primary School at Haliyapur but there was no Junior High School. At present there are Intermediate College and Degree College at Haliyapur. Inter College was set up at Haliyapur in the year 1978-79. When I used to live in the Hamlet of Merai my grand father used to come there to take me to Ayodhya or I used to go with him there from my home. I used to come to Ayodhya from the hamlet of Merai by cycle or Ikka or Horse-Cart. My grand father also used to come by bicycle to Ayodhya. My grand father's age was about 50-55 years in 1945. My father had expired in 1945. My grand father was the father of my father. My grand father died around the year 1970. Again said, my grand father died around the year 1972.

I did never go to Ayodhya with my father. The name of my grand father was Shri Shankar Singh. I have called him my Pitamah. When I visited Ayodhya with my grand father, I went there from my village Haliyapur. When I

visited Ayodhya for the first time I had got admission in the Manohar Lal College, Faizabad. At that time my age would have been 10-11 years. For the first time I went to Ayodhya by Ikka. From Haliyapur to Milkipur I came by bullock cart. From Milkipur to Barun I came on foot and from there I came to Ayodhya by Ikka. The distance of Milkipur from Haliyapur was 10 miles, which is now 16 kms. The distance of 10 miles from Milkipur to Barun, I scaled on foot. The bullock cart was returned from Milkipur because bullocks were needed for cultivation. When me and my grand father came Barun from Milkipur we had only a bag as luggage where in food items were kept. The bag was with my grand father. We started from Haliyapur at two-thirty or 3 A.M. at night and reached Ayodhya in the evening. It was the Hindu month of Falgun. Again said that it was the time of Chaitra Ram Navami. It was a little summer at that time and it was not raining. The distance of Ayodhya from Barun is 13-14 miles. We got Ikka at Barun. On reaching Ayodhya in the evening I went to my Guru Gharana, Nirmohi Akhara. At that time I went to the temple of Nirmohi Akhara which is towards the east side of the Hanumangarhi. Till that time I did not have taken Guru Mantra. Volunteer: I adopted Guru in the year 1980. The Guru of my grand father was Mahant Jantridas Ji. Mahant Jantridas used to live at Mathia but when he visited Ayodhya he used to stay at his Guru Gharana the Nirmohi Akhara temple situated at Ramghat. Mathia is to the north-west side of Goshaiganj at a distance of 5-6 km. and is within the District Faizabad. From Haliyapur, Mathia is at a distance of 90 km. When I went to Ayodhya for the first time I stayed there for two nights and 3 days. When I reached Ayodhya the first day, it was evening I did not go to see any temple. The next day I took bath in Saryu, offered water in Nageshwarnath and after that I went to Hanumangarhi, Kanak Palace and thereafter I went to the

Janmasthan Ramjanambhoomi. When I reached Janambhoomi the time would have been 10 O'clock. Again said when I reached Janambhoomi the time would have been 9-10 O'clock. Only me and my grand father were there for Visit. Volunteer: that many other people from the Akhara were also there with me. After entry from Hanumat Dwar I first went to the disputed building. There I went upto the interior under the middle dome. I met Baldev Dasji there at that time . The priest was sitting inside but I do not know the name of the priest. Baldev Das Ji was sitting outside i.e. near the Ram Forum. I did not offer flowers under the dome because nothing was available there at that time. At that time neither flowers nor sweets were available there. Outside the Hanumat Dwar there was no shop at that time. I offered coin under the dome. I myself and my grand father also offered the coin. I would have offered fifty paise or one rupee. At that time fourana-eightana and coin of copper were in use. Idol was kept there at that time. No cash box was kept there at that time and money was offered at the feet of the idol which was picked up by the priest. There was a throne of wood which was in the form of small throne and idol of infant Lord was kept there. This throne of wood was kept on the ground. This throne of wood was 6-7 feet in breadth and 7-8 feet in length. Of which wood was this throne of wood was made, I can not state. There was no bed sheet spread on this throne of wood. Volunteer: that the idol was covered. The idol was covered with small clothes. This idol was of Ramlalla and Laxman Ji. Both these idols were kept on the throne of the throne of wood. The throne of the throne was of brass but how big it was, I do not remember. Throne was only one and both the idols were kept on it. Both these idols were kept similarly after the year 1986 also. I went inside the disputed building under the dome last time in 1991. I did not go there in the year 1992. When I went

there in the year 1991 then also both the idols were kept on the throne of wood in the same way as I had seen them first time in the year 1945.

On viewing the photo in paper No. 154/13 of other original suit No. 1/89 the witness said that idol kept on the staircase is seen in this photo. I did never see this staircase placed under the middle dome of the disputed building. As the idols are seen kept on the staircase in this photo, likewise, I saw the idols kept on the staircase under the middle dome after the year 1986 till the year 1991. After the year 1986 those idols were kept along with the throne of wood on the staircase in such a way as are seen in this photo. In this photo I see throne of wood on the staircase. In this photo I see the throne of wood kept on the step after three steps of the staircase. This is the same throne of wood which was 6-7 in breadth and 7-8 feet in length.

Statement read and verified.

Sd/-

Bhanu Pratap Singh

29.04.2004

The Stenographer typed in the Open Court as I dictated. In this order the case be presented on 30.04.2004 for additional cross examination.

Sd/-

Commissioner

29.4.2004

**Dated 30.4.2004**

**D.W. 3/11 Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh**

Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,  
Additional District Judge/ Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble  
High Courts, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Appointed Commissioner by Hon'ble full Bench Lucknow's  
order date- 16.4.2004).

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 9 Sunni  
Central Board of Wakf, U.P. by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani,  
Advocate continues.)

The disputed building having three domes was  
attached in the year 1949. After attachment the door of the  
wall having bars was locked. After this door being locked  
no Visitors used to go under the place having three  
domes. They had Visit only from outside of the wall having  
bars. The priests remained seated inside the bars and  
used to carry the offerings of the Visitors. Volunteer: that  
at times they after offering the Prasad to the Lord used to  
return it back to the Visitors. The door of the wall having  
bars was locked after 1949 and upto 1986. Volunteer: that  
the lock was opened in the year 1986.

The learned advocate cross examining the witness  
showed Photo No. 77 of the coloured Album paper No. 200  
C-1 and asked whether he could see the door in that  
photo? On viewing which the witness answered in  
affirmative that he could see the door in it. This photo is  
not of the door having bars, it is the photo of outer wall.  
The outer wall mean the wall having Hanumat Dwar in it.

This is the photo of that door. People used to go in side and come out from the door seen in photo No.77. In the year 1949 the inner portion of the disputed building was attached and the outer portion was not attached. The witness was shown photo No. 75 of this very album. The witness stated that the place where the Constable is standing and where there is a tree, is that part of the disputed building which was not attached. The attached building was called the disputed building. The disputed premise was the whole area which had retaining wall on all the four sides. In photo No. 75 the wall seen near the tree, is the outer most wall of the disputed building and it is the wall towards the east of the Hanumat Dwar. The wall seen in photo No. 37 of this album is the east side wall of the disputed premise in which Hanumat Dwar is seen. In the photo No. 38 of this very album Singh Dwar is seen. The wall seen in photo No. 63 of this album that is not the wall having bars. This wall is the west side wall of the building having dome. Again said that this wall is the east side wall of the building having dome. The wall seen in the photo No. 63 is the wall having bars. In photo No. 63 main gate is not seen. The priest who used to take offering from the Visitors, sat inside on the left side of the main gate. In photo No. 64 and 65 of this album the same wall having bars is evident. In photo No. 64 and 65 the place where the priest sat is not seen. The gate seen in the photo No. 78 of this very album is the eastern gate known as Hanumat Dwar. The priest used to reach at this gate and at this very gate the offerings were given to the priest. In the photo No. 76 of this album wall is seen but any gate by the side of tree is not seen. The gate seen in the photo No. 75 of this album is Hanumat Dwar. The wall seen in photo No. 68 of this album is the wall having bars. In photo No. 68 of this album three windows having bars are seen. I did not use to have Visit from these windows

but I have had Visit from near the gate. The gate seen in the photo No. 201 of this album is the small gate on the eastern wall having bars. There would have been total 7-8 windows in the wall having bars. There was only one door in this wall which is seen in photo No. 201. People used to go inside and come out side through this door. It is incorrect to say that there were two doors in the wall having bars. The gate seen in the photo No. 201 was not locked in the year 1949, the inside wall was locked where Ramlalla was seated. During the period from 1950 to 1986 also the door seen in the photo No. 201 used to remain open. In between 1950 to 1986 I had gone inside through the door seen in the photo No. 201. I have gone inside through it 25 times between 1950 to 1986. It is incorrect to say that when attachment was done in 1949, the gate seen in photo No. 201 was locked and that lock was opened in the year 1986. It is incorrect to say that people were not allowed to go inside through the gate seen in the photo No. 201 from the year 1950 to 1st Feb., 1986. No priest used to sit at the gate seen in the photo No. 201. In photo No. 11 of this album a wall is seen which is the eastern wall of the portion having peak in the disputed premise. There was gate in this very wall but the wall seen in the photo No. 11 was whether on the north side or south side of the gate, I can not state. in photo no. 12 also that very wall is seen. inphoto No. 12 on the inner side of the wall a tree is seen in the corner. This was a Peepal tree. This tree was inside the disputed premise. In photo No. 15 of this album nothing is seen to me clearly. In photo No. 13 of this very album a wall is seen. Nothing else except the wall is seen in this photo. In the photo No. 17 and 18 of this album a wall is seen. The wall seen in the photo No. 17 and 18 is the eastern wall of the disputed premise. In photo No. 14, the wall is not seen clearly. Besides it nothing else is seen clearly. In photo No. 16 also nothing



is seen clearly. In photo no 16 the wall is also not seen to me clearly. In photo No. 19 of this album, the eastern wall of the disputed premise is seen. In photo No. 20 peak and a wall is seen. The wall appears to be of west side and north side. In photo No. 24 of this album the western portion of the disputed premise is seen. In photo No.26 of this album, portion of the north -west corner of the disputed premise is seen. In the photo No. 27 of this album the back portion of the disputed premise is seen. In photo No. 35 of this album the back side wall of the temple is seen. In photo No. 40 two fish are seen in the upper part of the photo. In photo No. 44 of this album I see a stone fixed. This stone was fixed at the Hanumat Dwar. In photo No. 47 and 48 of this album pillars are seen, which were in the building having the dome. These pillars are of the side dome but were these of north or south dome, I can not state. The pillars in photo No. 49 to 54 were there under the dome. There pillars were under the dome on north side, on south side or in the middle, I can not state. In photo No. 58 it appears to be Ramforum. Shiv's family was kept on Ramforum. In addition to Shiva's family there were many small idols. Whether the idols of Ram lalla and Laxman Ji were there or not I can not state in this regard.

The idol of Ramlalla kept under the dome was a hand-span in height. One hand-span has the scale of 5-6 inches. This idol was of eight metals (Astadhatu). The idol of Laxman Ji kept with Ramlalla was also of the same height. When the disputed building was attached that idol could not be seen while viewing from outside. Volunteer: only this much was revealed that some idol has been kept. The portion attached was illuminated between 1950 to 1986 for some time but as to when was this arrangement was done, I can not state. There was light during the day but in the evening the arrangement of light was done by

lighting a lantern or a lamp. In 1991 when I went to the disputed building for the last time, there was electric light and electric fan also, but from when this arrangement was done, I have no knowledge.

Before the year 1991 I had gone to the disputed building in the year 1989 and 1990. Before that I went there every year for visit but it may be possible I could not have gone there some year. For having visit after the Sun set, I had gone there one or two times near about 1952. At that time lighting was done by lantern or a lamp because these only were in use at that time. The place, standing where, I used to have Visit was the same place outside the wall having bar dock after locking was done. The distance of the idol from there was 25-30 feet. During day time also after the Sun reaching towards the west, it was dark inside the portion under the dome. From the place of locking, the distance of the place where idols were kept was not 40-50 feet but in my view this distance was 25-30 feet.

The learned advocate cross examining the witness showed the photo paper No. 154/12 of other original suit No. 1/89 to the witness, on viewing which the witness said that he is unable to identify the photo. I can not state whether this photo is of the western wall under the middle dome or not. Whether photo paper No. 154/14 and 154/15 are of any part under the dome of the disputed building or not, I can not state. Photo paper No. 154/5 is the photo of the north portion of the disputed building. In this photo, opposite the gate, on the right side a forum is seen. Whether this forum is the grave of anybody or not, I can not state. Volunteer: that it could be a Samadhi (tomb). In photo paper No. 154/13 the big picture, appearing in the wooden frame on the wall, was seen by me. This picture is

of the adulthood of Ramchandra Ji. For the first time I saw this picture there thoroughly in 1947. I have been seeing this picture there till the year 1991. Before attachment there was no bar for entering to any part inside the building having three domes. I have also gone towards the south side of the disputed building. The area between the south ward dome and the south side wall of the disputed premise would have been 6-7 feet. I can not state whether this area would have been 18-20 feet or not. On that side there was any staircase for going upwards or not, I have no knowledge. I can not state whether the photo album No.154/16 is of the area between the south side dome and south side wall of the disputed premise or not. I can not state whether the area seen in this photo was for urination or not. Volunteer: that the place could be for urination. The area on the south side of the disputed building where the wall of south side dome ended was somewhat uneven. There was no flooring and grits were strewn there. On viewing the photo No. 79 of the coloured album paper No. 200C-1 the witness stated that this photo is of the south-eastern part of the disputed building. South-west part is not seen in this photo. At the place where the south side wall of the dome ends, a tree is there. The same tree is seen in photo No. 81 and 82 of this very album. In photo No. 79 of this album, where two-three people are seen standing, it was not the courtyard of the disputed building, It was called premise. The front area opposite the three domes of the disputed building can be call courtyard or premise. In photo No. 83 of this album I can see staircase. This staircase is on which side I can not state.

I have never heard about sahen. There is courtyard (Angan) in my house. I am well aware with the word "Angan". The open area in front of a constructed area having no roof over it is called a courtyard (Angan). I can

not state that Courtyard and Sahen are the same or not. In the statement made by me, 'the area in front of the place having three domes in the disputed building can be called Sahen or Parisar', the word mentioned as "Parisar" is correct but the word Sahen written for the front area of the place having three domes is written wrong.

In photo No. 80 of the coloured album paper No. -200 C-1 the portion in front of the place having three domes. where there are three openings and premise in front of it is seen. One door is seen in the east side also. From this door the distance of east side wall of the building would have been 25-30 feet. There was metalled-floor of lime and grits there but this floor was not cemented. I can not call this open area a courtyard. I did not see any worship being performed in this open area. Later stated that I noticed religious songs being recited at this place. This I saw this before unlocking in 1986. After attachment and before unlocking I have seen this type of religious songs at this place. In photo No. 80 a tree is seen towards the south. After the tree the south side wall of the disputed building is seen. This tree would have been of Neem or Peepal. On seeing the photo No. 79, it appears that the surface of the place having the tree would have been at a height of one or two feet from the surface of the premise. The distance of the south side wall of the premise would have been 8-10 feet from the corner of south side wall of the disputed building. This distance can not be 18-20 feet. In photo No. 84 of this album under the portion having dome, opening is seen. This opening is under the north side dome. It is incorrect to say that this photo is of the opening under the dome on south side. The openings seen in photo No. 85 and 86 are under the dome on the north side. It is incorrect to say that both these openings are under the dome on south side. The openings seen in the

photo No. 99 and 100 of this very album are under the dome on the south side. It is incorrect to say that these openings under the dome are on north side. In photo No. 99 where the constable is standing, above that a board is kept on which Ram Sewa Samiti is written. I had seen this board at the site. I had seen this board kept there after the attachment of the disputed building. Curtains are seen hanging in photo No. 84, 85, 99 and 100. I had seen these curtains hanging there after the attachment. Before unlocking also I had seen these curtains there. Before attachment I had never seen these curtains. In photo No. 84, 85, 86, 99 and 100, where the constable is seen standing, I saw Police there after attachment. After attachment upto unlocking and after unlocking also I saw these constable at this place. The portion seen in photo No. 90 belongs to which part of the disputed premise, I am unable to remember. The portion seen in photo No. 90 is seen in photo No. 89 also and I am unable to remember as to which part of the disputed premise belongs to this photo. The portion seen in photo No. 87 and 88 is of the northern part of the disputed building. It is incorrect to say that the wall seen in photo No. 87 and 88 is the south side wall of the middle dome of the disputed building.

The portion seen in photo No. 89 and 90, I do not remember, whether is of eastern wall of the middle dome or not. The parts seen in photo No. 91, 92, and 93 are the photos of the same place. The portion seen in photo No. 91, 92, and 93 may be the upper part of the middle dome of the disputed premise. In photo No. 93 some writing is seen on the wall but it is in which language or it is written on the stone or riot, I can not state. Whether I had seen any such stone fixed on the wall of the middle opening of the disputed building or not I do not remember. The dome seen in the photo No. 98 of this very album is of the north

side dome of the disputed building, in photo No. 102 the wall seen behind the constable and by the side of the board is the north side wall of the disputed building. The wall seen in photo No. 97 is on the north side of the disputed building. It may be possible, the wall seen in photo No. 97 is the north side wall of middle opening of the disputed building. Taakhe are seen on this wall. In photo No. 87 and 88 also Taakhe are seen. Had I ever seen any idol kept on those Taakhas or not, I do not remember. The lower portion of the middle opening of the disputed building is seen in photo No. 103 of this album. In this photo white stone having black strips is seen. Such flooring was not done under all the three domes of the disputed building but it was done only under the middle dome. In this photo only two pillars are seen evidently. I have seen these pillars from a distance of one- two feet. After opening of the lock I saw these two pillars from distance. Again said that he had seen these pillars before unlocking by going nearby. I have seen such 12 pillars set up in the disputed building. I had seen such 4 pillars in the middle opening. Similarly there were four pillars in the north side opening and four pillars in the south side opening. Such pillars are seen in photo No. 103 in the outer of the middle opening. Such pillars are seen on the outer portion of the other openings also. Two pillars are seen set up in outer part. May be it that two pillars each were set up inside these openings. Then he clearly stated that two pillars each were inside and two each outside. In photo No. 99 of this album similar pillars are not seen as there are in photo No. 103. When I went at the site, pillars were there in this opening. In photo No. 90 inside portion is not seen but outer portion is seen and there are pillars also. The opening seen in photo No. 99 is not having such pillars inside as are seen in photo No. 103. Inside the opening seen in photo No. 99 the pillars were of

brick and connected to the wall. These brick- pillars are not seen in photo No. 99. It is incorrect to say that there were no pillars in the north side and south side openings. It is incorrect to say that I did never see 12 pillars in the disputed building. I have not gone in through the openings seen in photo No. 85, 86, 99 and 100. I would have gone through these openings 10-15 times. Before attachment of the disputed building and later also I have passed through these openings. The same floor of white stone with black strip is seen in photo No. 85 as is seen in photo No. 103. The floor seen in both the above photos is seen in photo No. 103. I do not remember whether the floor seen in photo No. 156, similar floor was there, under the all three domes. It is incorrect to say that such flooring is in Mosques only and such flooring is not done in temples. I do not remember whether the opening seen in photo No. 86 was in the east side wall of the building having three domes or not. The opening seen as in photo No. 86, similar opening was there in the east side wall of the disputed building.

Question- Five minute earlier you have stated that I do not remember that the opening seen in photo No. 86, whether that was in the east side wall of the disputed building having three domes or not.' and just after that you have stated that ' The opening seen as in photo No. 86, similar opening was there in the east side wall of the disputed building. Should I understand that your memory has become so weak that you forget things within five minutes and after five minutes you memories also?

Answer- My memory is somewhat weak. Earlier I made statement and after putting stress on my brain I

remembered the fact stated in the statement made later on, therefore, I answered the facts related to the above asked question.

The east side wall which is seen in the photo No. 86 of the disputed building, behind that in the west side wall were there any Taakhe made or not I do not remember. On the back side western wall of the opening seen in the photo No. 86, there was no idol.

There were no openings in the north side and south side walls of the disputed building. The north side and south side walls under the dome had no pictures made on them and there were no idols made or. them. The picture seen in the wooden frame in photo No. 116 of this album was hanging in which part of the disputed building, I do not remember. I never saw such picture hanging in the disputed building. In photo No. 128 and 129 a picture is seen in the wooden frame which is of Thakur Guru Datt Singh. Had I seen this photo fixed in the disputed building or not I do not remember. In photo No. 131 of this album, the picture having three idols is seen on the wall. This photo was fixed under the middle dome behind the idols. I had seen this picture before the attachment and after opening of the lock also upto 1991 I saw this picture. This picture was in the wooden frame mounted with glass but it would have been of paper.

Statement read and verified  
Sd/-  
Bhanu Pratap Singh  
30.04.2004

The Stenographer typed in the Open Court as I dictated. In this order for further cross examination the case be presented on 4.5.2004. Witnesses be present.

Sd/-  
Commissioner  
30.04.2004



**Dated- 6-5.2004**

**D.W.-3/1 1 Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh**

Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,  
Additional District Judge/ Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble  
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Appointed Commissioner by Hon'ble full Bench Lucknow's  
order dated 16.4.2004)

(Cross examination in continuation to dated 30.4.2004 on  
behalf of defendant No. 9 Sunni Central Board of Wakf by  
Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate begins.)

The pillars seen in photo No. 104 to 108 of coloured  
album paper No. 200 C 1, were set up there in the  
disputed building. The pillars seen in photo No. 104 to 108  
were set up in the opening on left side. My meaning of left  
side is south side. The pillars seen in these photos were  
whether inside the opening or outside or where these were  
exactly, I do not remember. The pillar seen in all these  
five photos is one and the same pillar. The red colour  
wherever seen in these photos is the idol of Hanumanji,  
which is visible in the photo. Besides Hanumanjis no other  
idol is seen in these photos. Photo No. 109 to 114 of this  
very album, are the photos of one and the same pillar.  
This pillar existed on the south side of the middle dome.  
Whether this pillar existed inside or outside on the south-  
side of the middle dome, I can not state. My meaning for  
south side of the middle dome is the portion on south side  
under this dome. In photo No. 103 of this album the pillar  
on south side in the outer part of middle opening is seen.  
The pillar seen in photo No. 109 to photo No. 114 is not  
the same pillar as is seen in photo No. 103. The idol of  
Shiva is seen in the pillar No. 113 and 114. The idol of

Hanuman Ji is seen in photo No. 109 and 110 but no idol is seen in photo No. 111. In photo No. 112 the idols of saints- Lomas, Angira and Vashisth are seen. These idols are seen upwards in photo No. 112. In photo No. 109 and 110 no idol other than Hanumanji is seen clearly. In photo No. 113 and 114 only one idol of Shiva is seen clearly. This idol of Shiva is by the side of the red colour. The pillars seen in photo No. 115 to 120 of this very album is one and the same pillar, not separate pillars. The pillars seen in photo No. 116 and 117 appear to be on the wall. Both these photos are of the same pillar. The pillar seen in photo No. 115 is different to the pillar seen in photo No. 116 and 117 or not, I can not state. It is incorrect to say that the pillar seen in photo No. 115 is different to the pillars seen in photo No. 116 and 117. It is possible that the pillar seen in photo No. 109 is different to the pillar seen in photo No. 110 and 111. My statement made earlier today that the pillars seen in photo No. 109 to 114 is one and the same pillar is not correct. On the contrary the statement now given that the pillar seen in photo No. 109 may be different to the pillar seen in photo No. 110 and 111, is correct. In photo No. 115 the idol of Hanumanji is seen clearly and no other idol is seen clear. An idol is seen in pillar that is in photo No. 116 but it is not clear. An idol is seen upward in the pillar seen in photo No. 116 but downward where red colour is seen there appears to be no idol. In the pillar seen in photo No. 117 idol is seen upwards but no idol is seen clearly downwards. In photo No. 117 where red colour is seen, there appears to be no idol. Idols are seen on the pillars in photo No. 118 and 119 but that are not clear. Many idols are seen on the pillars seen in photo No. 118 and 119 in the upper portion, but no idol is clear. The idol seen in photo No. 118 and 119 are of Gods and Goddesses. By counting the idols seen in photo No. 118 and 119 I can not state their exact

number. Volunteer: that because of idols being small their number can not be stated. In photo No. 120 where there is red colour the idol of Hanumanji is seen at that place. Except Hanuman Ji no idol is seen clearly. In photo No. 122 to 126 the pillars seen are one and the same pillar but the pillar seen in photo No. 121 may be different. In photo No. 121 where red colour is seen the idol of Hanumanji is there but no other idol is seen clearly. In photo No. 122 the idol of Hanumanji is seen at red coloured place but no other idol is seen clearly. In photo No. 123 to 126 of the album the idol of Hanumanji is seen at red coloured place but no other idol is seen clearly. In photo No. 124 and 125 no idol is seen. The pillar seen in photo No. 122 and 123 was set up under the southern dome in the opening. Whether this pillar was inside or outside, I can not state. The photo No. 79 of this album is the photo of south-eastern opening. Photo No. 86 is also the photo of the same opening. In photo No. 79 no pillar is seen clearly. Pillars are seen in photo No. 86 but these are the pillars seen in photo No. 122 and 123 or not, I have no knowledge. In photo No. 86 pillars are seen but these pillars are of Kausati or some other thing, I do not remember. It is incorrect to say that no pillar is seen in photo No. 86. The pillar seen in photo No. 127 is different to the pillar seen in photo No. 136, 137 and 138 and the pillars seen in photo No. 136, 137 and 138 are one and the same pillar. In photo No. 127 where there is red colour, the idol of Hanumanji is seen but other idols being small are not visible. The pillar seen in the photo No. 127 was set up in the south side opening of the building. This pillar was set up inside the south side opening. The pillar seen in photo No. 136 was set up in the north side opening. This pillar was set up inside the north side opening. In photo No. 99 and 100 north side openings are seen. Pillars are seen in both these photos and these

pillars are of Kausati. It is incorrect to say that there is no pillar seen in photo No. 99 and 100. In photo No. 136 and 137 the idol of Hanumanji is seen and no other idol is seen. In photo No. 138 idol of none is seen. In photo No. 139, 140 and 141 there is only the same pillar and in photo No. 142, 143 and 144 there is another pillar. The pillar seen in photo No. 139 to 141 was set up in the north side opening and the pillar seen in photo No. 142 to 144 was also set up in the north side opening. Both these pillars were in inner part of the north side opening. In photo No. 140, 141, 142 and 143 the idol of Hanumanji is seen at red coloured portion but in photo No. 139 to 144 no idol is seen clearly. Photo No. 145 and 146 are of the same pillar. These photos are of the inner part of the north side opening. In this photo No. 145 small idols are there but these are not visible clearly. In photo No. 146 and 147 the idol of Hanumanji is seen. In photo No. 146 and 147 no other idol is seen. Photo No. 157, 158 and 159 are of the one and same pillar but photo No. 160, 161 and 162 are of other pillar. The pillar seen in photo No. 157 was on the back side in the northern opening. The pillar seen in photo No. 160 may also be in the middle of the north side opening. The pillars seen in photo No. 157 and 160 were side by side of each other. The pillars seen in photo No. 157 and 160 were there in the opening seen in photo No. 99 on the north side. These pillars are seen in the north portion of the photo No. 99. It is incorrect to say that no pillar is seen in the north or south part in photo No. 99. In photo No. 157 where there is red colour, the idol of Hanumanji is seen there but no idol is seen in photo No. 158 and 159 as these idols are small and not clear. In photo No. 157 no other idol is seen except Hanumanji's on the pillar. In photo No. 160, 161 and 162 the idol of Hanumanji is seen and any other idol is not seen because of not being clear. Photo No. 163, 164, 165, 166 and 167

are of the same pillar. The idol of Hanumanji is seen in photo No. 163, 166 and 167 but the idols being small in photo No. 164 and 165, are not clear. In photo No. 163, 166 and 167 other idols are not seen except Hanumanji because of these being small. This pillar was there in the disputed building inside the opening on north side. The portion where the pillar in photo No. 163 was set up in the north side is not seen in the photo No. 99. It is incorrect to say that the pillar seen in photo No. 163 to 167 was not there in the north part of the disputed building. The pillars seen in photo No. 176 to 180 is one and the same pillar. This was inside in the north side opening. This pillar is also not seen in photo No.99. The idol of Hanumanji is seen in photo No. 176,177 and 180 in addition to it no other idol is seen because of being small. The idol of Hanumanji is at the red coloured spot. Photo No. 181 to 186 are the photos of the same pillar. This pillar was there in the north side opening. On the pillars in these photos No. 181 and 186 the idol of Hanumanji is seen and this idol is at the red coloured spot. Besides Hanumanji no other idols are seen because of being small. It is incorrect to say that any pillar seen in photo No. 181 to 186 was not there in the opening on the north side, It is incorrect to say that photo No. 181 and 182 are of different pillars. The pillars seen in photo No. 187 to 192 is one and the same pillar. This pillar was there inside in the north side opening. It is incorrect to say that the photo No. 187 and 188 are of the different pillars. It is also incorrect to say that the pillars seen in photo No. 187 to 193 were not there in the north side opening. In photo No. 188,189 and 190 the idol of Hanumanji is seen at red coloured spot. No other idol is seen because of being small. In addition to it no other idol is seen because of being small. Besides no other idol is seen in photo No. 187,191 and 192 because of being small in size. Photo No. 193 to 198 are of the

same pillar. This pillar was there inside in the north side opening. It is incorrect to say that photo No. 193 and 196 are of the different pillars. It is also incorrect to say that none of these pillars was set up in the north side opening. In photo No. 193, 194, 195 and 196 the idol of Hanumanji is seen at the red coloured spot. Besides no other idol is seen because of being small. No idol is seen in photo No. 197 and 198 because of being small. Photo No. 199 and 200 are of the same pillar which were outwards at the Hanumat Dwar. This pillar was outside the Hanumat Dwar on the north side of the door. Photo No. 9 which is of Hanumat Dwar, in that, the pillar seen in photo No. 199 and 200 was on the north side. In photo No. 199 and 200 the idol of Hanumanji is seen at the red coloured spot and no other idol is seen because of being small. It is incorrect to say that the pillar seen in photo No. 199 and 200 was in the lower part of the dome. It is also incorrect to say that this pillar was not there at the outer door. It is incorrect to say that in my above statement wherever I have stated about the idols of Hanumanji and Shivji and other idols being unclear, any such idol was not there in any pillar.

Till date I have not heard that the disputed building having three domes was called by Muslims 'Babari Mosque'. I have not heard the name of Babari Mosque till date. On 6th December, 1992 the disputed structure was not demolished but that was renovated.

Question-Is it not necessary to demolish a building to renovate it?

Answer- It is necessary and not necessary also to demolish a building for renovation.

Reconstruction is done in renovation.

Question- Is it not necessary to demolish the existing building for reconstruction.

Answer- For reconstruction it is necessary to demolish the building. Volunteer: it is necessary and not necessary also.

Question- The building that existed at the disputed site till 5th December, 1992 was demolished on 6th December, 1992 or not?

Answer- Yes sir. The building that existed at the disputed site on 5th December, 1992 was demolished on 6th December, 1992.

I have not read the news of demolition of that building in any newspaper till date. I had information about it at home. This information was given by many people of the village. I have read newspaper in my life time but I rarely read the newspaper. I read Dainik Jaagran only. Four to six times whenever I come at road head from the village only then I read the newspaper. I started reading Dainik Jaagran from the year 1985-86. Last time I read the newspaper day before yesterday on coming here. I use to have heard Radio but not at my home. Whenever I go to a relative, I hear radio. I had not seen television at home and I do not have television at home. I watch television on going to the home of a relative. I have never heard the name of Babari Mosque on Radio or Television and neither read its name in the newspaper. I am hearing the name of Babari Mosque first time today from the learned advocate cross examining the witness.

The statement made by the witness on 29.4.2004 from last line of page 24 to the fourth line of page 25 was read for

the witness and it was asked whether this statement is true? That witness stated yes this is true.

Question- Today you have made the statement that you have heard the name of Babari Mosque first time today and in the above statement of 29.4.2004 you have used the name Babari Mosque many times, so are you making wrong statement in this regard.

Answer- I myself did not say the name Babari Mosque.

Question- Whether the part of statement in above page 24 and 25 was not made by you ?

Answer- I have made this statement.

It is incorrect to say that when I used to go to Ayodhya I was knowing that the disputed building was called the Babari Mosque.

Question- If you knew it that the Muslims have been talking of offering Namaj in the disputed building, then in para 16 of your affidavit why have you written that you have not seen any Muslim offering Namaj there?

Answer- To my knowledge no Muslim offered Namaj in Ramjanambhoomi premise.

On showing the photo No. 43 of album paper No. 201 C-1 the witness said that this photo may be of the south side opening of the disputed building. In photo No. 53 of this album north side is seen. In photo No. 53 the north side of the disputed building is seen. The pillars seen in photo No. 55, 56, 57 and 58 are there in the disputed building but at which place of the building, I can not state.



The pillar of photo No. 55 and 58 is seen completely but any reason, as such, of my inability to state that at which place it was in the disputed building, I can not state. In photo No. 55, 56, 57 and 58 no idol is visible because of it being unclear. The pillars seen in photo No. 59, 60, 61 and 62 of this album were there in the disputed building, but in which part of the building, I can not state. The pillars seen in photo No. 55 and 58 is the same. It is incorrect to say that the pillar seen in photo No. 55 is different and that seen in photo No. 58 is different. The pillars seen in photo No. 59 and 61 are different. In photo No. 59 to 62 no idol or picture is seen clearly because of it being black. The pillars seen in photo No. 71 to 74 were there in the disputed building. Whether all these four photos are of the same pillar or different pillars, I can not state. The pillars seen in photo No. 71 to 74 were inside of the disputed building or outside, I can not state. No idol is seen clearly in all these four photos. The pillars seen in photo No. 75 and 76 are the pillars of the disputed building but these were of which part of the disputed building, I can not state. The pillars seen in photo No. 75 and 76 appear similar. It is one and the same pillar. No idol is seen clearly in these photos. Again said idols are there. It is not clear as to which God these idols belong. In photo No. 75 the idols are seen in upper portion. In photo No. 76 idols are seen in lower portion. In photo No. 87, 88, 89 and 90 pillars are seen but these pillars were in which part of the disputed building, I can not state. All these four photos are of two pillars. Photo No. 87 and 88 are of the same pillar and photo No. 89 and 90 are of the other pillar. In photo No. 87 to 90 no idol is seen clearly. The pillar seen in photo No. 91 is the same pillar as seen in photo No. 90 or different pillar, I can not state about this. The pillar seen in photo No. 91 was at which part in the disputed building, I can not state. In photo No. 91 no

idol is seen clearly. In photo No. 95, 96, 97 and 98 the pillars seen are of the disputed building itself but these were in which part of the disputed building, I can not state about this. All these four photos appear to be of the same pillar. In all these four photos no idol is seen clearly. The pillars seen in photo No. 99 to 102 of this album is one and the same pillar. Volunteer: that all these four photos are of the same pillar. These pillars were at which place of the disputed building I can not state. No idol is seen clearly in all the four photos. It is incorrect to say that the pillars seen in photo No. 99 and 101 are photos of different pillars.

Statement read and verified

Sd/-

Bhanu Pratap Singh

6.05.2004

The Stenographer typed in the open Court as I dictated. In this sequence for next cross examination the case be presented on dated 7.5.2004. Witness be present.

Sd/-

Commissioner

6.5.2004

**Dated-7.5.2004**

**D.W.-3/11 Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh**

Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,  
Additional District Judge/ Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble  
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Appointed Commissioner by Hon'ble full Bench Lucknow's  
order dated 16.4.2004)

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. -9, Sunni  
Central Board of Wakf, Uttar Pradesh by Shri Zaffaryab  
Jilani, Advocate continues in continuation to dated  
6.5.2004.)

The learned Advocate showed the photo No. 103 of the  
black and white album paper No. -201 C-1 to the witness.  
On viewing which the witness said that the pillar seen in it  
was inside the north side of the disputed building. The  
pillar seen in photo No. 104 was on the north side in the  
Hanumat Dwar. The pillars seen in photo No. 105 and 106  
were on the north side in the Hanumat Dwar. The witness  
said again that the pillar seen in photo No. 104 was there  
inside the north side of the disputed building. By mistake I  
have stated that this was on the north side of the Hanumat  
Dwar. It is incorrect to say that the pillar seen in photo No.  
103 and 104 were not there inside the north side opening  
of the disputed building. Similarly it is incorrect to say that  
the pillars seen in photo No. 105 and 106 were not in the  
Hanumat Dwar. The pillars seen in photo No. 103 and 104  
is one and the same pillar. Similarly the pillars seen in  
photo No. 105 and 106 is the same pillar. The pillars seen  
in photo No. 103 to 106 , idols are seen in photo No. 103  
only but these are not clear. In photo No. 104, 105 and  
106 no idol is seen. During evidence in all the photos

shown to me in coloured as well as in black and white album, in any of them I did not see any idol of Brahma, Vishnu which was clear. In these photos I did not see any idol of Krishna Ji or Lakshmi Ji clearly. It is incorrect to say that as I have stated about the idols of Lomash, Angira and Vashistha in the photos, such idols are not in these photos. It is also incorrect to say that as I have stated about the visibility of idols in the photos on the pillars, there are no idols of any God and Goddesses in these pillars. Volunteer: that these idols and pictures are not shown in the album clearly.

Besides, Ramforum there was Chhati Poojan-Sthal in the disputed premise. I used to do Visit of Chhati Poojan Sthal also and bowed my head there. On the sixth day of the birth of Lord Ram Chhati Poojan was done at that place, that is why, that place was called Chhati Poojan Sthal. Chhati Poojan Sthal has been mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana and Ramcharitmanas. I have read about it in both these books. In Valmiki Ramayana this place is mentioned in Balkand, but at which place it has been mentioned in Balkand, I can not state. The witness on viewing the Valmiki Ramayana paper No. 261C-1 and 261 C-1/2 stated that in these books at which place there is mention' of Chhati Poojan Sthal, I can not state. Valmiki Ramayana is originally in Sanskrit and I have read the Hindi translation of it. The witness stated that I can only state at which place there is mention of Chhati Poojan Sthal only on going through the above Valmiki Ramayana. I could not see the mention of Chhati Poojan Sthal in Ramcharitmanas but there is mention of Chhati Poojan in it. In Ramcharitmanas at which place is the mention of Chhati Poojan, I can only state on seeing the book. I would not be able to state today itself by reading these books that at which place there is mention of Chhati Poojan Sthal in these books but I would be able to answer

in this regard by reading these books after today. To the best of my knowledge. I have not gone through any mention of Chhati Poojan Sthal in any book. There was Kitchen and hparth-wash in the disputed premise on the basis of which I am stating that there was Chhati Poojan Sthal in the disputed premise. In the disputed premise the hparth was of soil Chauka was of stone and flatherned rod of wood. Hparth was there from the time of construction of the disputed building. Bricks were also fixed in that Soil hparth. This brick was Lakhori brick. This hparth was one foot in length and 6 to 8 inches in height. The earth of this hparth was changed but this was never done in my presence. The disputed building was constructed in 13th century. Again said that the disputed building was constructed in 13th or 14th century and it was approximately 800 years old. This building was got constructed by the king Vikramaditya. It was the same King Vikramaditya in whose name Vikrami Sambat is in vogue. King Vikramaditya would have got constructed the above hparth. The witness was shown photo No. 38 of the black and white album paper No. 201 C-1. The witness said that Chhati Poojan Sthal is seen in it. The tin shed seen in this photo was earlier thatched roof and later it was converted into the tin shed. The door seen in this photo was in the eastern part of the disputed premise which was called Hanumat Dwar. I used to enter into the disputed premise through this Hanumat Dwar. After entering I used to go to Chhati Poojan Stha!. Photo No. 39 of this album is also of the Chhati Poojan Sthal. In this photo kitchen is seen by the side of the hparth. Kaushalya Kitchen was written on it. There was Kaushalya Kitchen also in the disputed premise which was situated towards east-south side. Kaushalya Kitchen was there by the side of Chhati Poojan Sthal. The forum seen in photo No. 39 is the forum of Chhati Poojan Sthal which was 15-16 feet in

breadth and 20-22 feet in length. The stones seen in this forum, in which black writing is there in white stones, I have been seeing after 1950 at the above place. The height of this forum was about three- three and half feet. Flatternrod is seen kept on this forum Chauka is also seen on this forum. Chauka was made of stone. In photo No. 39 in addition to hparth-wash, and flatternrod, Foot Prints are seen but not clearly.

Foot Prints are of Lord Ramlalla and Laxman Ji. Four foot prints are seen in this photo. Two are of Lord Ramlalla and two that of Laxman Ji. All these four foot prints are small and about three-four inches in area. These foot prints were also of stone. These foot prints are from the time of Lord Rama which were preserved at the time of construction of the temple also. I had seen these foot prints. I used to touch these foot prints.

How many years before it was Treta Period. I have no knowledge. After Treta Period it was Dwapar Period and after that Kali Period which prevails now also. I am not having this knowledge that Dwapar Period was for a period over eight and half lac years. It is Kali Period now, this I know.

The Kaushalya Kitchen seen in photo No. 39 of the black and white album paper No. 201 C-1 seen is having curtain and behind this curtain Kaushalya Ji is sitting having Lord Ram with her. The idol of Kaushalya Ji was of Asta Dhatu (eight metals). I have had Visit of this idol before and after the year 1949. Visit of the idol could be done till 12 noon. After 12 noon Visit was closed and again in the evening at 3 p.m. Visit was allowed and at about 5 p.m. in the evening it was again losed. Volunteer: that according to weather this time was changed. Kaushalya Kitchen was on the forum which is seen in photo No. 39. Besides this, there was no other Kaushalya Kitchen. Such Kaushalya Kitchen as is seen in photo No. 39, I have seen from the time, I started going at the above site. The Kaushalya Kitchen seen in photo No. 39 was in worn out state earlier and later it was converted in the form as is seen in photo No. 39.

There was no place named as Sita Kitchen in the disputed premise, only Kaushalya Kitchen was there which was called by the illiterate people as Sita Kitchen. Kaushalya Kitchen to me is that place where there was the Kitchen of Queen Kaushalya. This Kitchen was in the palace of King Dashrath. The palace of King Dashrath was very big. The palace of King Dashrath was not that much big as is Ayodhya now a days. The area of that palace was much smaller as compared to Ayodhya of today. The palace of King Dashrath was at a distance of one or one and half furlong from the disputed building.

There is one place at Ayodhya now a days known as Dashrath Palace which is also called Bada Sthan. It is a temple. This Dashrath Palace would have been related to the Dashrath Palace of the time of King Dashrath but I am having no knowledge about it. The place known as Kaushalya-Palace is at Ayodhya now a days. It is also a temple. It is at how much distance and to which side of the disputed building, I have no knowledge. I have never gone to Kaushalya Palace. Present Kaushalya-Palace would have been related to the Queen Kaushalya of King Dashrath. Today Kaushalya Palace is situated at that very place where it was at the time of King Dashrath. Whether there is Kaikeyi Palace near Kaushalya Palace at Ayodhya or not, I have no knowledge. Sumitra Palace and Kaikeyi Palace both are at Ayodhya but at which place I am having no knowledge. Present Sumitra Palace and Kaikeyi Palace at Ayodhya are at the same place where these were at the time of King Dashrath. After marriage of Ramchandra Ji with Sita Ji they both started living in separate palace. This palace was not inside the palace of King Dashrath but it was situated at different place. Ramchandra Ji was not born in the palace of Kaushalya. He was born at Janam Sthan. At how much distance this Janam Sthan was from the palace of Kaushalya Ji I do not have knowledge. This fact that Ramchandrajī was not born in Kaushalya Palace, I read no where in any book but I know it through listening the tales. I listened the tale at Ayodhya and

Chitrakut etc places. I have not read about the birth place of Ramchandra Ji in Valmiki Ramayana or Ramcharitmanas. I have not read about this in any other book also. I have only read that Lord Ram was born at Ayodhya. Laxman J and Bharat Ji were born at which place, I have not read about it in any book. I have not heard about it in any tale also as to which place was the birth place of Laxmanji or Bharat Ji. At the time of King Dashrath his palace was in how much yards, miles or furlongs in length and breadth, I have not read about it in any book or neither heard about it. At the time of King Dashrath how much was the length and breadth of Kaushalya Palace, Sumitra Palace, Kaikeyi Palace or Sitaji's Palace, I have neither read nor heard. I know that the reign of King Dashrath was for over sixty thousand years. The reign of Ramchandrajai is told to be for over eleven thousand years. The reference of the ruling period of King Dashrath and Ramchandra Ji is there in Valmiki Ramayana and Ramacharitmanas but more mention is in Valmiki Ramayana in comparison to Ramcharitmanas. The Ayodhya mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana, accordingly to days Ayodhya is in length and breadth.

Statement read and verified

Sd/-

Bhanu Pratap Singh

7.5.2004

The Stenographer typed in the open Court as I dictated. In this sequence for further cross examination the case be presented on 10.5.2004. Witness be present.

Sd/-

Commissioner

7.5.2004



**Dated- 10.5.2004**

**D.W.-3/11 Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh**

Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,  
Additional District Judge/ Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble  
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Appointed Commissioner by Hon'ble full Bench Lucknow's  
order dated 16.4.2004)

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 9 Sunni  
Central Board of Wakf, Uttar Pradesh by Shin Jataryab  
Jilani, Advocate begins in continuation to the dated  
7.5.2004.)

I am having knowledge and faith in this regard that  
the great annihilation do take place. There are four  
Periods namely Satyug, Treta, Dwapar and Kaliyug. After  
the period of all the four Periods is over, there is  
annihilation. Ayodhya city was also annihilated. I am not  
having knowledge that as to how much lacs or thousand  
years earlier this city was annihilated. The above said  
annihilation did take place after the death of Ramchandra  
Ji. In that annihilation the Ayodhya of the time of  
Ramchandra Ji got destroyed. After this annihilation  
succeeding the death of Ramchandra Ji whether Rishabh  
Dev rehabilitated it or not, I have no knowledge about this.  
I have heard about Rishabh Dev Ji. I have nowhere read  
it in Valmiki Ramayana that after the demise of  
Ramchandra Ji, Rishabh Dev Ji got Ayodhya rehabilitated.  
According to my knowledge and belief after the death of  
Ramchandraj, Vikramaditya rehabilitated  
Ayodhya. Volunteer: that after doing research Vikramaditya  
got Ayodhya rehabilitated. Before Vikramaditya and after  
the death of Ramchandraj Ayodhya was in deserted state.

Volunteer: that at that time Ayodhya was not in its magnificent form but it was deteriorated After Ramchandraji, Lav-Kush ruled in Ayodhya. After Lav-Kush as to who ruled Ayodhya I do not know. The witness was shown Valmiki Ramayana paper No. 261 C-1/2, page No. 820 Shloka No. 10 and the witness also read the translation of this Sloka and told that it is mentioned in this Sloka that after the death of Ramchandra Ji Ayodhya will remain deserted for many days and again it will be inhabited during the time of King Rishabh Dev. This citation of Valmiki Ramayana is correct. I believe in the fact mentioned in this Sloka that after the death of Ramchandra Ji Ayodhya remained deserted and later it was rehabilitated by Rishabh Dev. I am not having knowledge of the fact that Ayodhya was rehabilitated by Rishabh Dev. On the basis of the above Sloka only I am stating about the rehabilitation of Ayodhya by Rishabh Dev. Ayodhya would have been rehabilitated by Rishabh Dev but I am not knowing whether Rishabh Dev rehabilitated Ayodhya or not. Vikramaditya got research done through astrologers about the holy places of Ayodhya. Whether the help of Kamdhenu' was taken in this research or not I have no knowledge. In the stories that I listened, I never heard that for having knowledge of holy places, the help of 'Kamdhenu' was taken.

The portion "Whether the idol of Ram Lalla and Laxman Ji was there or not I can not state" of the recorded statement on 30.4.2004 at page-38 of the witness was read for him. The witness stated that he had made some error in making the statement. This error is in this regard that the idols of Ram, Laxman and Bharat were kept on Ramforum and there was Shiv Darbar at the south-east corner under the tree. This I knew on 30.4.2004 at the time of making statement also but because of hesitation

due to making statement in the High Court for the first time I made the above statement. On Ramforum there were only the idols of Ram, Laxman and Bharat. Volunteer: that idol was kept on the throne of wood but there was no fourth idol. On the side in the throne on the forum, the idol of Hanumanji was kept. This throne was of brass. Wood is called Kath'. This throne was one foot in length and eight-ten inches in breadth.

Question- What was the breadth of the idols kept in this one foot long throne?

(This question was objected by the learned Advocate of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 3/89 that this question is asked about three idols, so asking about the breadth of all the three idols at one go is not possible and it should not be allowed. The breadth of each idol should be asked separately.)

Answer- The breadth of all the three idols was two inch each.

To my comprehension this throne was kept in the middle of the Ramforum. I had seen this throne from a distance of 8-10 feet. I had seen the throne for the first time in the year 1946-47. Last time I saw this throne in about 1990-91. Volunteer: that later in 1990-91, I saw this throne from distance.

The witness was shown photo No. 57 of coloured album paper No. 200 C-1. The witness stated that this photo is of the Ramforum of the disputed premise. I see three openings at the Forum. I saw these openings in the year 1946-47 and after that whenever I went there I used to see these opening upto the year 1990-91. I do not clearly

remember now that whether these openings were made of wood or cement or some metal such as brass.

The witness was shown photo No. 29-30 of the black and white album paper No. 201 -1 and the witness stated that in this photo the same Ramforum is seen which is seen in photo No. 57 of the coloured album. In photo No. 29 -30 of the black and white album no throne is seen but in photo No. 57 of the coloured album a small thing is seen in all the three openings but that is throne or some other thing, I can not state. Where constable is seen standing in all the three photos, by the side of that a notice board is there. The place where constable is standing in this photo, no throne is seen in that opening. The place where the constable is standing may be on the east side of the Forum. Nothing is seen kept at the western opening of the Forum in these photos. In the middle opening some white coloured thing is seen. White coloured thing seen in these photos may be the throne. Though I have stated the size of the throne but this size is estimated. As the size of the throne stated by me is by estimate it may be shorter to that size also. Volunteer: that this size may be bigger also. Under the Forum in photo No. 57 of the coloured album two caves are seen. In both these caves the idol of Kaushalyaji having Ramchandra Ji in her lap was kept. Volunteer: that in one of these caves one idol may be of Sumitra Ji having Laxman Ji in her lap. Both these caves are seen in photo No. 29 -30 of the black and white album. The windows fixed in these caves were about three- three and half feet in height. These windows appeared as of wood. These windows may be having wire mesh. In photo No. 31 of the black and white album a part of Ramforum is seen. In photo No. 31 cave is not seen. It is incorrect to say that this photo is of cave but it is correct that this photo is of

the lower part of the Ramforum. In photo No. 31 three idols are seen kept. These idols are of Ram, Laxman and Bharat. The window seen in photo No. 31 is 5 -6 feet in height. Again said this length may be 6-7 feet by estimate. The breadth of these windows is about three feet each. The breadth of the whole window is 5-6 feet. I had Visit of idols at this place after the lock was opened. In photo No. 31 the idol of Ramchandra Ji is in the middle, on right side of that it is the idol of Laxman Ji and on the left side it is that of Bharata Ji. The photo No. 29 of the black and white album and photo No. 58 of the coloured album are of the same place. The idols kept in both the caves would have been 5 -6 inch in height. The idol of Kaushalya Ji would have been one and half - two feet in height.

Question- In photo No. 31 of the black and white album the three idols stated by you of Ramchandra Ji, Laxman Ji and Bharat Ji had how much height?

(This question was objected by the learned advocate of other original suit No. 3/89 Shri Ranjeet Lal Varma that this question has already been replied to by the witness. The learned advocate cross examining the witness has asked this question to the witness earlier also. So at this point asking the question again and again is harassment of the witness. Therefore, this question should not be allowed.)

Answer. The idols seen in photo No. 31 would have been 5-6 inch in height.

After reading para 9 of his examination-in-chief affidavit the witness said that the facts written in it are correct. In this para I have mentioned about the throne of "Kath" in the Ramforum temple. To me Kath means the

throne made of wood. This wooden throne mentioned in para 9 was seven-eight feet in length. Its breadth was about five-six feet. In page no 72 of my statement the throne of brass as I have mentioned is the same throne which is written as the throne of Kath in para 9 of my examination-in-chief affidavit. This throne was having the borders of gold, silver and brass. I had seen the border of brass also in the throne in addition to the borders of gold and silver but there is no mention of the brass-border in the above para of my examination-in-chief affidavit. Witness Volunteer: that the border of gold I have stated in para 9, may be seen as of brass.

Question- Now you have stated the length of the wooden throne about seven-eight feet and breadth five-six feet but in page 72 of your today's statement you have stated the length of the brass-throne one foot and breadth eight- ten inch so both these statements of your are contradictory. Which of these statements is correct?

Answer- Because of not comprehending the question about the length and breadth of the throne I have given two answers.

Question- Are you still unable to understand the length and breadth of the above throne?

(The above question was objected by the learned advocate of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 3/89 Shri Ranjeet Lal Varma that the said throne asked in it is not clear because the witness has mentioned about two thrones one among them is of wood and the other stated to be of brass. So the question should be asked about the

specific throne about which the learned advocate cross examining the witness wants to know. Therefore, such questions can not be allowed.)

(The learned advocate cross examining the witness in response to the above objection said that in today's statement the witness has said that the throne mentioned in page 72 of the statement is the same throne which is written as the throne of wood in para 9 of the examination-in-chief therefore, in view of this statement of the witness the above objection is completely baseless.)

(On above response the learned advocate in other original suit No. 3/89 Shri Ranjeet Lal Varma counter objected that the above response is not acceptable because the witness has clearly mentioned about the big throne of wood and other throne of brass and it has also been stated that idols were kept on it. So this answer is not adequate and objection made earlier stands.)

Answer- My doubt in this regard has now cleared because one throne was of wood and the other that of brass. I mean to say that the throne of brass was kept on the throne of wood.

Question- Whether this portion of your statement given today in page No. 76, 'the throne of brass mentioned in page 72 is the same throne which has been mentioned as wooden throne in para 9 of your examination-in-chief affidavit' is correct?

Answer- The fact is that the throne of brass was kept on the throne of wood. The portion of my statement in page 76 which I have written in page 72 of my statement as the throne of wood" is

incorrect. It is correct that the throne of wood and brass were different. As to what was the height of the wooden throne, I would not be able to state.

According to para 9 of my examination-in-chief affidavit on the wooden throne in addition to the idol of infantile Ramlalla, idols of all the three brothers and Hanuman Ji were there and thus there were five idols in total among which the idols of Shalikram and Hanumanji were on sides, the idol of Ramlalla was on small throne and idols of all the three brothers were kept in the throne made of wood. The witness Volunteer: that including Shalikram there were five idols not six.

Question- According to above statement in addition to Shalikram and Hanumanji of whom other three or less than that, idols were there on the wooden throne?

(This question was objected by the learned advocate of the plaintiffs in other original suit No. 3/89 Shri Ranjeet Lal Varma that the size and name of each idol has been stated by the witness so this question that other three idols were of whom is confusing and it has been asked to harass the witness. Therefore, such questions should not be allowed.)

Answer- One idol was of infantile God and other three were of all the three brothers. My meaning of all the three brothers is Laxmanji, Bharat Ji and Shatrughan Ji. Thus the number of idols was six.

According to para 9 of my affidavit the number of idols was 5 and Shalikram God was apart. We regard Shalik



Ram and Narwdeshwar adorable therefore, Shalik Ram can be called idol. In my statement above Shalikram has been regarded idol. My this statement of today is wrong that including Shalikram there were five idols not six. On the throne of brass in addition to Ramlalla the idols of all the three brothers were kept. In my statement made today the small throne I have stated in page No. 78, my meaning to that is, the throne of brass. On the throne of brass it was the idol of Ramlalla and idols of brothers Bharat and Laxman Ji. On the throne of brass there was only the idol of Ramlalla, idols of both brothers were on sides. It is incorrect to say that I am making wrong statement in this regard. It is also incorrect to say that in that forum there was neither the throne of wood nor the throne of brass. The facts written in para 10 of my examination-in-chief affidavit are correct. The Ramforum temple mentioned in para 10 of the examination-in-chief affidavit the height of which has been reported three and half feet, is the same Forum which is seen in photo No. 29 and 30 of the black and white album 201 C-1. The three openings seen at the Forum in these photos were of how much in height, I can not state. The height of Ramforum as is written in para 10 of the affidavit was not measured by me but on viewing and on the basis of guess this height has been mentioned in the above para. This estimation I made in the year 1951-1952 that the height of Ramforum temple is three and half feet. The estimation about the height I did in the year 1951-1952 sustained till the year 1992. The square caves mentioned towards east side and west side in para 10 of my examination-in-chief affidavit, are seen in photo No. 29 and 30 of the black and white album. In photo No. 29 only one cave is clear and the other is not clear but in photo No. 30 both the caves are seen clearly. My meaning of square is that having the length and breadth of the same size. Volunteer: that length and breadth may vary to some

extent. If an object is three feet in height and five feet in breadth we would not call it square. The height of the cave seen in photo No. 29 and 30 of the black and white album has been reported correctly by me as three or three and half feet in my statement. In my today's statement the breadth of the windows seen in photo No. 31 of black and white album has been reported by me 3 feet each viz, about 6 feet breadth in total. It is incorrect to say that according to my today's statement above caves would not be called square. This fact mentioned in para 10 of my examination-in-chief affidavit that in one of the both caves there was idol of Kaushalya Ji having Lord Ram in her lap and on one side there was the idol of Bharat Ji measuring one to two feet is correct. In my today's statement at page 74 in the portion", in both the cases the idol of Kaushalyaji having Ramchandra Ji in her lap was kept" the word "both" is wrong because the idol of Kaushalya Ji was in only one cave. Similarly on the very page the statement made by me that in one cave there may be the idol of Sumitra Ji having Laxman Ji in her lap is also wrong.

Statement read and verified

Sd/-

Bhanu Pratap Singh

10.5.2004

The Stenographer typed in the Open Court as I dictated. In this sequence the case be presented on 12.5.2004 for further cross examination.

Sd/-

Commissioner

10.5.2004

**Dated- 12.5.2004**

**D.W. 3/11 Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh**

Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,  
Additional District Judge/ Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble  
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Appointed commissioner by Hon'ble full Bench Lucknow's  
order dated 16.4.2004)

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 9 Sunni  
Central Board of Wakf, Uttar Pradesh by Shri Zaffaryab  
Jilani Advocate begins in continuation to dated 10.5.2004)

The witness was shown the portion of his statement made  
on 7.5.2004 at page 64, "After going through the above  
Valmiki Ramayana only I can state at which place there is  
mention of Chhati Poojan in it." The witness stated that he  
had seen the Valmiki Ramayana in this regard. Witness  
stated that there is no mention of Chhati Poojan in Valmiki  
Ramayana, only Ayodhya has been mentioned in it.  
Volunteer: that Ramchandra Ji was born at Ayodhya, it has  
been mentioned in this book. The portion of his statement  
at page 65, "At which place the Chhati Poojan has been  
mentioned in Ramcharitmanas, I can only state on seeing  
the book" was read for the witness. The witness stated  
that on seeing the Ramcharitmanas he did not find the  
mention of Chhati Poojan in the book. Volunteer: only this  
much has been mentioned in it - Janambhoomi Mam Puri  
Suhawani. Uttar Disi Sarjoo bahi Pawani.

The portion of the statement dated 7.5.2004 at page 65  
made by the witness, "The forum seen in the photo No. 39  
is the Forum of Chhati Poojan Sthal which was 15-16 feet  
in breadth and 20-22 feet in length was read for the

witness. The witness stated that the breadth of the above forum was in east-west direction and length in north-south direction. The portion of the statement made by the witness on 7.5.2004, "The Ayodhya mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana, today's Ayodhya is the same in length and breadth" was read for the witness. The witness stated that he has not read about the length and breadth of Ayodhya in Valmiki Ramayana. I have heard about it in the stories but I did not hear in the stories that in Valmiki Ramayana there is mention of length and breadth of Ayodhya. The witness was shown Shloka No. 7 of 5<sup>th</sup> Sarg page No. 41 in Valmiki Ramayana paper No. 261 C-1 and its translation. On reading which the witness stated that the length and breadth of Ayodhya written as 12 Yojan and 3 Yojan in this Sloka, is agreeable to me. I am not having knowledge as to how much miles distance is there in a Yojan.

Question- If you have not read the length and breadth of Ayodhya in Valmiki Ramayana then on what basis you made this statement on 7.5.2004, "The length and breadth of today's Ayodhya is the same as mentioned about the Ayodhya in Valmiki Ramayana'?"

Answer- I made this statement on estimation. I have not read about this in Valmiki Ramayana.

On reading the Sloka No. 8 and its translation in 5<sup>th</sup> Sarg of Valmiki Ramayana the witness stated that the highway gracing the city mentioned in the Sloka is not there in Ayodhya at present. On reading Sloka No. 10 and its translation of the same Sarga the witness stated that like such gates, walls and market as mentioned in this Sloka there are no gate, wall, market, instrument and armaments in Ayodhya at present. On reading the Sloka

12 and its translation the witness stated that the Drama Troops, gardens around the city, the orchards of mango in regard of length and breadth and vastness, and the forest of Sakhu are not there in Ayodhya at present. On reading the Sloka No. 13 and its translation of this very Sarga the witness stated that the Ayodhya of today has no deep trench dug around it and nor the Ayodhya of today is inaccessible and unconquerable. Likewise the animals mentioned in this Sloka in abundance in Ayodhya, at present such animals are not in abundance in Ayodhya. On reading the Sloka No. 15 and 16 of this Sarga the witness stated that the palaces made of gems, sky-high palaces, a number of Kootagar and gold plated palaces are not there in Ayodhya at present. On reading the Sloka No. 17 and its translation the witness stated that the thick population mentioned in this Sloka is not there in Ayodhya today. Neither the water of present Ayodhya is sweet like the juice of sugar cane. Present Ayodhya is not in the form of that Ayodhya as is described in these Slokas. The Sant-Niwas mentioned in second line of para 8 of my examination-in-chief affidavit, was whether at the distance of 10 feet or 50 feet or how many feet on entering the eastern door of the disputed building, I can not state. Similarly at how much distance was this Sant-Niwas from the northern door, I can not state. This Sant-Niwas was 30-35 feet in length and 15-20 feet in breadth. This Sant-Niwas was earlier thatched. Later it was replaced by tins. The walls of Sant-Niwas were of un-connected bricks having the poles of iron on which tin is casted. The thatched roof I saw after 1950 in the year 1951-1952. Tin roofed Sant-Niwas I saw before the year 1960. The Sant-Niwas was at a distance from the northern wall of the disputed premise. Whether the distance of Sant-Niwas was 10-20 feet from the northern wall or how much feet it was, I can not state. The Sant-Niwas was connected to the

eastern wall of the disputed premise. The saints lived and used to sit in it on the basis of which I knew that it is Sant-Niwas.

The store house mentioned in para 8 of my examination-in-chief affidavit was in Sant-Niwas itself. The length and breadth as I have reported 30-35 and 15-20 feet respectively, both Sant-Niwas and Storage House were included in that length and breadth. There was no door in Sant-Niwas and Storage House. The way to enter and exit it was open. Some portion measuring 30-35 feet was open and rest was covered by bricks. The open portion was curtained. Volunteer: that the portion where saints used to live was curtained. In my examination-in-chief affidavit I have mentioned about my coming to senses in para 12. I came to this sense at the age of 10-12 years. In para 12 of above affidavit on growing adult, going to Ayodhya regularly for Visit of Ramjanambhoomi and in festivals has been mentioned. My meaning of growing up is attaining the age of about 18-20 years. According to the age written in my High School Certificate my age was 14 years in the year 1950. On being grown up I used to go alone to Ramjanambhoomi for Visit in fairs. My meaning to it is that after attaining the age of 18-20 years I used to go to Ramjanambhoomi alone for Visit during festivals. Before it I used to go to Ramjanambhoomi for Visit with my grand father. Volunteer: that at times I used to go there alone with other people. I attained the age of 18 years in the year 1952-54. In para 12 of my examination-in-chief affidavit there is mention of Visit of Ramjanambhoomi alone on being grown up and it is also mentioned that there are three famous festivals in Ayodhya during a year. My meaning to it is that I sometimes went in all the three festivals during the year and in some year I went only in one or two festivals. In my

statement recorded on 28.4.2004 in first and second line of page -7. I have stated my age 30 years in 1949. This statement of mine is wrong. At that time my age was not 30 years. At that time as per the certificate of High School my age was 13 years. But in reality my age was 15 years in the year 1949. In para 14 of my examination-in-chief affidavit it is mentioned that I used to go for Visit before 1949 in the interior part, then Lord Ram Lalla was seen seated sometimes on the swing of wood and sometimes at the place having high staircase. On viewing the paper No. 154/13 presented in other original suit No. 1/89 the witness stated that the staircase seen in this photo is the same as I have mentioned in para 14 my examination-in-chief affidavit. The swing I have mentioned in para 14 of my examination-in-chief affidavit is the same swing as is seen in photo No. 152 to 155 of the coloured album paper No. 200C-1. It is incorrect to say that in photo No. 152 a throne is seen and swing is not seen in it. In photo No. 152 to 155, only in photo No. 153 the throne is seen. In any other photo among these throne is not seen. On the basis of the canopy seen in photo No. 153 I am calling the portion under it as the throne. This throne was made of silver. This throne was one or one and half feet long. Again said that it was approximately one foot in length and so in breadth also.

The throne is not seen in photo No. 79 and 80 of the black and white album paper No. 201C-1. The scene appearing in photo No. 81 and 82 was seen by me under the part having dome in the disputed building before attachment. In 1986 after opening of the lock I saw the scene appearing in photo No. 81 and 82, but there was some change in it. It is incorrect to say that the scene appearing in photo No. 81 and 82 of black and white album and photo No. 152 to 153 in coloured album was

not there before the year 1949, but it is the scene of afterwards. The swing made of wood mentioned in para 14 of my examination-in-chief affidavit was kept on the north side of the upper stair of the staircase seen in photo paper No. 154/ 13 of other original suit No. 1189. In para 14 of my examination-in-chief affidavit I have mentioned that the worship was performed inside by the saints and priests among which I know Mahant Bhaskardas, who is the Mahant of Hanumangarhi Naka. I saw him performing worship in 1949 i.e. before the attachment. Among the people performing worship I had seen under the dome of the disputed building before attachment, I do not know the name of any other person except Mahant Bhaskardas. It is incorrect to say that Mahant Bhaskardas and no other person performed any worship in the disputed building upto the year 1949. It is also incorrect to say that I did never go to the disputed site before the year 1949 and I started going to that site after the year 1949. It is also incorrect to say that regular Namaj was offered under the dome of the disputed building upto 22 December ,1949 and Ajan was also held in that building. It is also incorrect to say that upto 22 December, 1949 there was no idol kept under the three domes of the disputed building. It is also incorrect to say that the disputed building was Babari Mosque and Ramchandra Ji was not born there.

(Cross examination on behalf of defendant No. 9 Sunni Central Board of Wakf, Uttar Pradesh by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani advocate concluded).

(Cross examination on behalf of Shri Mohammad Hashim, plaintiff No.7 in other original suit No. 4/89 and defendant No.5 in other original suit No. 5/89 by Shri Mustak Ahmad Siddiqui, advocate starts.)



XXX

XXX

XXX

XXX

On the north side of the main Ramjanambhoomi Temple, as I have mentioned in para 8 of my examination-in-chief affidavit, there were small temples the names of which I do not know. At the south-east corner there was Sumitra Palace and no other temple was there in that direction. On west side there was slope and no temple. On the east side there was Amawa temple. There was no open area between Amawa temple and main Ram Janambhoomi Temple. The temples were small names of which I do not know. On the north side of the main temple there were small temples the number of which I can not state. The number of the small temples on east side also I am unable to state. The small temples on east and north side were small temples of Ram, Kali, Durga Ji and Lord Narsingh. I can not state the size i.e. the length and the breadth of the smallest temple among these. I can not state the size i.e. the length and breadth of the biggest temple among these small temples. There were idols in every temple and no temple was without idol. There were buildings of the temples among which some were small and some were big and as to what was there number, whether one hundred, two hundred or two –four, I can not state. The location of the small temples was the same from the time I started going to Ayodhya. On 6th December, 1992 when the disputed building was demolished, some small temples were also removed, the number of which I can not state. Among the small temples on north side and east side of the disputed building as I have stated in my statement, some were demolished and rest of temples remained intact. I went last time to the disputed site in the year 1991 and thereafter, that after the demolition also I went at the disputed site. I went at the disputed site on the occasion of last Chaitra Ramnavami.

Whether the small temples on the east side and north side of the disputed building were there or not at the time of my going to Ayodhya on the occasion of last Ramnavami, I can not state because of barricading there. Is there any temple at present between main Ramjanambhoomi Temple and Amava temple or not, I have no knowledge. I had gone to the disputed site in 1993. At that time whether there were small temples on east and north side or not I can not state because of barricading and presence of Police there. Barricading is there at the disputed site since 1991. Volunteer: that the Government of Kalyan Singh got this barricading done after acquiring it. There was some barricading before the demolition of the disputed building and rest of the barricading was got done afterwards and this has been done after the demolition of the disputed building. I can not state as to when, after the demolition of the disputed building, this barricading was done. After demolition of the disputed building when the land was acquired, the remaining temples of east and north side were also removed. The land was acquired by the Government. After acquirement of the land the small temples were removed by the people themselves because they were unable to perform worship. Some temples are circular and some square in shape. There is peak in both kinds of temples. I can not state in this regard that some temples were circular and some were square in shape. I can not state about circular and square temples because I have not seen these temples. It is not so that I am concealing facts in this regard. What was on the north side of the small temples to the north of the main temple, I can not state. There was Sumitra Palace on the south side of the main temple but what was on the south side of that Palace I can not state. As I understand there was no other thing between the main temple and Amava temple except small temples. There was nothing between main temple

and Sumitra Palace. On the west side of the main temple there was deep slope baring some places. In the last line of para 10 of my examination-in-chief affidavit it is written correct that Nirmohi Akhara is also the temple of the Ramanandiya sect. It is the same Ram Ghat situated temple where I used to stay. One more temple of Nirmohi Akhara is situated at Naka Mujaffara in Faizabad, which is at Hanumangarhi. I have seen Guptar Ghat situated at Faizabad, there is also temple. Whether the temple situated at Guptar Ghat was of Nirmohi Akhara earlier, I have no knowledge about it. According to my knowledge there are two temples of Nirmohi Akhara, about which I have stated above. One temple is at Ram ghat and the other is at Naka Muzaffara at Hanumangarhi. There is mention of "Utsav Samaya" in second line of para 12 of my examination-in-chief affidavit. My meaning to it is the food and singing at the time of festivity. I had my first meeting with Ram Kewal Das Ji besides Bhaskardas of Nirmohi Akhara. Ram Kewal Das has now died. I met first Bhaskardas Ji and later the same year I met Ram Kewal Das Ji. At that time the Country had become independent. Volunteer: that before this also he had the meeting. At the time of my first meeting with Bhaskardas Ji whether he was holding any post of Nirmohi Akhara or not, I have no knowledge. Ram Kewal Das Ji was the Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara. The mention of worship being performed by the hermits of Nirmohi Akhara, as I have mentioned in my affidavit, was related to the worship in the temples, I have mentioned in my above statement.

I appeared in the examination of B.A. from the District Basti because I wrote the examination as a private student and this facility was not available in Janpad Faizabad. After having this education I had been teacher in Primary School. I was teacher in the School of Janpad

Council. I have retired as Head Master. I am getting pension at present. I retired in the year 1996. I have worked in different schools of Janpad Sultanpur. I am engaged in agriculture.

I am Trilokchandi Vaishya Thakur not Suryavanshi Thakur. In second line of para 7 of my examination-in-chief affidavit Lord Ram is our house hold deity is written, which is correct. It is the same Lord Ram who is called Lord Ramchandra and it is said that he was born at Ayodhya. In this line there is mention of taking birth and incarnation of Lord Ram. Lord Ram had both birth and incarnation and taking birth and incarnation is the same thing. I have heard the name of Ram Janam Sthan temple at Ayodhya but I have not heard the name of Ram Janam Sthan Goodartar temple., Ram Janam Sthan temple is situated in Ramkot Mohalla. There is idol of Ramchandra Ji in this temple also. Janam Sthan temple is not intact at present but it has collapsed. Janam Sthan temple has been demolished. I am stating the disputed structure as Ram Janam Sthan temple. I am having agriculture. Consolidation of holdings has taken place in my area. Consolidation has not taken place again.

Statement read and verified

Sd/-

Bhanu Pratap Singh

12.5.2004

The Stenographer typed in the Open Court as I dictated. In this sequence for further cross examination the case be presented on 13.5.2004.

Sd/-

Commissioner

12.5.2004

**Dated 13.5.2004**

**D.W.3/11 Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh**

Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey,  
Additional District Judge/ Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble  
High Court, Lucknow Bench Lucknow.

(Appointed Commissioner by Hon'ble full Bench Lucknow's  
order dated 16.04.2004.)

(In continuation to dated 12.5.2004 the cross examination  
of Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh D.W. No 3/11 on behalf of  
Plaintiff No. 7 in other original suit No. 4/89 and defendant  
No. 5 in other original suit No. 5/89 Shri Mohammad  
Hashim by Shri Mustak Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate begins.)

I have gone two hundred- four hundred times to  
Ayodhya in my life. I am having knowledge of main routes  
of Ayodhya. I used to go to Nirmohi Akhara Temple by  
coming to Hanumangarhi from Faizabad. There is only one  
Hanumangarhi at Ayodhya. Hanumangarhi is in Ramkot  
Mohalla. On going towards the east from Hanumangarhi I  
used to reach Nirmohi Akhara. The road going to the north  
side of the Hanumangarhi leads upto the river Saryu. Via  
that route I used to go to Bash. I have heard that there is  
Tedhi Market Mohalla at Ayodhya but I am having no  
personal knowledge about it. I have not heard about the  
Dorahi Quan at Ayodhya. I have heard that there is  
Gurudwara of Sikhs at Ayodhya but I have not gone there.  
Gurudwara is situated to which direction and in which  
Mohalla I have no knowledge.

I am the resident of Haliyapur and Muslims reside in  
that village. I have intimacy with Muslims. There is a  
Mosque in my village Haliyapur. People offer Namaj in it. I

have seen people offering Namaj from outside but I have not gone inside the Mosque. The Muslims offer Namaj facing the west. Namaj is offered alone and in group sometimes but I have no knowledge about it. Namaj of Jumma is offered in the Mosque of my village. Whether more Muslims gather in the Namaj of Jumma or not, I have no knowledge. The opening of the Mosque in my village is small which is towards the north direction. There is minaret in that Mosque. Dome I understand, It is circular. There is no dome in the Mosque of my village. I have no knowledge that in some Mosques there is dome and in some Mosques it is not. There is peak in the temple, but where is dome located in a temple I have no knowledge. I have seen dome in one or two temples. To me dome is circular and the peak is longer in shape. The peak is square and circular also. But it is long and whether it is Lamkshana or not I have no knowledge. I have seen dome in Tulsi Ban Temple at Ayodhya and in which other temple I have seen dome, I do not remember. I have seen smaller Mosques at Ayodhya. One Mosque among which is on the way to Ayodhya. I have always gone to Ayodhya via Faizabad. There is a place known as Chauk at Faizabad where there is a Clock Tower and I had visited there regularly. Towards the west of Clock Tower there is a big Mosque. Under it there are shops. But these shops are of jewelers and in addition other shops are also there. The above Mosque situated at the Chauk has minarets and domes also. The mosques i have seen at Ayodhya have minarets. I have gone towards the west of Hanumangarhi. From there two roads lead towards the west. One goes towards the Ramjanambhoomi and the other upto the Kanak Palace. The road going to Janambhoomi, perhaps leads upto Golaghat but I am having no exact knowledge about it. Volunteer: that the road going to Janambhoomi leads further also. The distance of Janambhoomi from

Hanumangarhi would be about 800 meter of one km. On both the sides of this road there are shops and temples. One of these temples is of Maharaja Dashrath which is called Bada (big) temple. Besides, Amawa temple is also on the side of this road. The Amawa temple is on the left side of the road whereas the temple of King Dashrath is on the right side. The temple of King Dashratha as I have stated above is called the palace of King Dashrath.

The palace of King Dashrath is called Bada Sthan. There is peak in the Bada Sthan temple but it is not very big. Whether this peak is only one or more, I have no knowledge because I have not gone inside the temple. Peak is seen from out side the temple, which I had seen. On my viewing, only one peak was seen in that temple. There is peak in Hanumangarhi. There is one big peak in Hanumangarhi and some smaller peaks are also there. I do not know the number of smaller peaks. Janambhoomi temple is towards the south of the road leading to Janambhoomi. Earlier there was temple towards the north but at present, to my knowledge there is no temple. The temple on the north side of the road was not the temple of Lord Ram. I have not gone inside that temple ever. There was idol of Narsingh Bhagwan installed there.

In the case, I am witnessing, is instituted against Sunni Central Board. I am having knowledge that there are Plaintiffs and defendants in a case. The person filing the case is called the Plaintiff. Sunni Central Board is defendant in this case. Nirmohi Akhara is plaintiff. I am not a witness on behalf of the Ram Janambhoomi but I am a witness on behalf of the Nirmohi Akhara. In my statement I have stated that there is Sumitra Palace towards the south-east of Ramjanambhoomi, but as to

what is on the exact south side of the temple, I can not state.

The witness was shown paper No. 45 C-1/2 A, presented in other original suit No. 3/89 and it was asked whether this is the drawing of the main temple Ramjanambhoomi mentioned in para 8 of your affidavit?

(This question was objected by the learned Advocate of Plaintiffs in other original suit No. 5/89 Shri Ved Parakash that the witness has not presented this paper and nor this paper has been prepared in presence of the witness. For confusing the witness such questions should not be allowed. The contents of the record can not be asked to the witness.)

(This objection was counter objected by the learned advocate cross examining the witness that the witness has stated in his testimony that he had gone to the disputed site and to verify this fact this question is being asked to him, which is completely relevant.)

Answer- The main temple Ramjanam Bhoomi as stated in para 8 of my examination-in-chief affidavit is not seen in this drawing. Since no temple is seen in the drawing, question of any thing related to it being seen does not arise.

It is incorrect to say that I have not gone to the disputed site, that is why I am unable to answer in this regard.

The witness was shown the paper No. 45 C-1/1/6 presented in other original suit No. 3/89 by the defendants and it was asked whether the temple mentioned in first list Pukhata May land Mausooma Nirmohi Akhara is that



temple which has been stated Nirmohi Akhara temple situated at Ram Ghat by the witness. The witness stated that this Chauhaddi and description is of the same Nirmohi Akhara which is situated at Ramghat and where I used to stay on visiting Ayodhya. The Chauhaddi and description mentioned at second number of this paper, such place I did not see. I know Ramjanambhoomi situated at Mohalla Ramkot mentioned at second number of this paper. On above paper No. 2 of Chauhaddi of Ramjanambhoomi the Chauhaddi Road Pokhta written is correct but the Chauhaddi of east, west and south is not correct. I have heard the names Ramcharandas, Raghunath Das, Baldev Das, Naga Ram Charandas, Ram Lakhan Das written in para 7 of this paper No. 45 C-1/1/4. Among these I myself have seen Baba Baldev Das and Ramcharan Das and heard about the others. I have heard that these people were related to Nirmohi Akhara and these have been the Panch, Sarpanch and Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara.

According to Hindu faith Ayodhya is a pilgrimage. Besides Ayodhya there are Kashi, Prayag, Mathura, Rameshwar, Dwarakadheesh Pun etc. main pilgrimages in Bharatvarsha (India). The list of these pilgrimages is given in the religious books. In these books first of all the name of Ayodhya is written. I have read in Ramayana about these pilgrimages but in any religious book I have not seen the list of pilgrimages. My meaning to Ramayana is the Ramcharitmanas composed by Goswami Tulsidas. All the four Dhams are also pilgrimages. Badrinath pilgrimages has not been mentioned in the pilgrimages, I have mentioned in my statement above. In my statement dated 28.4.2004 I have stated that Paramhans Ramchandra Das was associated with Ramjanambhoomi liberation movement since 1949. Before the start of the Ramjanambhoomi liberation movement, Paramhans

Ramchandra Das Ji was associated with Ramjanambhoomi. The Ramjanambhoomi liberation movement started in the year 1949. Ramjanambhoomi was to be liberated of the people who had locked it. what I say is correct that it was the desire of Ramchandra Paramhans Das from the beginning that a huge temple should be constructed at Ramjanambhoomi. This was his effort much before the year 1949. There should be huge temple at Ram Janambhoomi this struggle is going on from many days but exactly from when I have no knowledge. In the childhood when I started going to Ram Janambhoomi there was some peace at that time. Before my going to Ayodhya for the first time it was the controversy that there should be construction of huge temple at Ramjanambhoomi. The struggle was going on for construction of a grand temple by removing the already existing temple there. This struggle was in one community only. Some Hindus were in favour of constructing a grand temple and some were claiming their ownership over Ramjanambhoomi. Who were opposing the construction of the grand temple, I have no knowledge. Hindus were the hinderance in constructing the huge temple. The above statement of mine, in this regard, is correct. The people of different Akharas were altercating with one another for the construction of the temple. The dispute of ownership between Hindus has ended. In this regard dispute is between Nirmohi Akhara and Sunni Central Board. What do Sunni Central Board say in this regard, I have no knowledge. The attachment of Ramjanambhoomi was not done because of Sunni Central Board but it was done by the Government. Against whom the Nirmohi Akhara tiled suit in 1949 in this regard, I have no knowledge. I did not hear such statement that Mosque was got constructed by Babar at the disputed site, which is shameful for the independent India, so construction of temple should be

done at that place. In 1949 and before that also Holy & Religious songs was held at the disputed site. Whether the big leaders had started coming there for delivering speech or not, I have no knowledge. On viewing the map in paper No. 21 C-1/2 in other original suit No. 4/89 the witness said that he was unable to identify any thing in that map.

Question - Whether you are able to read the signature of Mahant Raghubar Das in above paper No. 21 C-1/2.

(This question was objected by the learned advocate of plaintiffs in other original suit No. 5/89 Shri Ved Prakash that the contents of any record can not be asked to the witness. This paper is not also presented by the witness so question in this regard can not be asked to the witness.)

Answer- I am able to read the signature done in Hindi Mahant Raghubar Das at the lower end of the paper No. 21 C-1/2. I have not heard the name of 'Raghubar Das.'

I am not having notice of any claim regarding construction of temple in 1885 by Mahant Raghubar Das.

Question- In page 10 of your statement you have mentioned that suit was filed on behalf of Nirmohi Akhara about the disputed site before 1949 also. Whether the suit of 1885 could be the suit filed before the year 1949?

Answer- I can not state in this regard.

In para 7 of my examination-in-chief affidavit I have stated that I came to know about the Ramjanambhoomi

from my grand father. My grand father did not tell me any thing about the suits regarding the Ramjanambhoomi. I came to know about the suits related to Ramjanambhoomi around 1948-49. Nirmohi Akhara had also filed suit before 1949 in regard to the disputed site. Through whom I came to know about this, I can not state. In para 13 of my examination-in-chief affidavit the statement "which is inside having three peaks" I have made about the disputed building. The three peaks I have mentioned in above para 13 were three domes having Kalash over them which are kept on the peaks. This portion may be peak and dome also. I can not exactly state in this regard that whether these were peaks or domes. These domes were round. These domes were having height. In second line of para 13 of my examination-in-chief affidavit the sentence I came to know in 1950 that the portion having dome was attached" is about the part having dome inside the bars. The three peaks mentioned in first line of para 13 are the same peaks which is stated at the "portion having domes" in second line. I have not used the word "peak" and "Dome" differently for creating any confusion. In fact the meaning of both is the same. This statement of mine given today that there are peaks in temples but where is the dome in them I am not having knowledge' is true. The portion having dome written in para 13 of my affidavit is correct. What has been stated in para 13 of my affidavit about the portion having domes is correct. In today's statement what has been mentioned about the dome may be incorrect. These domes were built on the land. The middle dome was bigger among the three. All these three domes were in one row. All the three domes were built on the ground. Dome was on the roof but due to confusion I have made statement that it was on the ground. The length and breadth i.e. the measurement of the dome, I can not state. I am unable to tell the measurement of any

of these domes. There was courtyard towards the east of these domes. Again said that there was open-space. After open-space there was courtyard. Volunteer: that this courtyard was very small. The veranda would have been 5-6 hand measures. Its length would have been 20-25 or 25-30 hand measures. Courtyard was 8-10 hand measures in length. Again said that the length was 20-25 hand measures and breadth 8-10 hand measures. The portion not having roof is called courtyard. It is in open state. The exit of the open-space was towards the east. There was no opening or door in the open-space. Gurumantra is taken only once. I had taken Gurumantra from Baba Dinendra Das Ji. I have had Gurumantra 23-24 years before from now. In the portion of my statement made on 28.4.2004 Ramjanambhoomi Sthal about which I am making the statement, there are many temples around it among many temples only some are intact and majority of temples have collapsed or have been demolished but I can not state the number of all kinds of the temples. Volunteer: that there is no temple towards the west of Ramjanambhoomi. The portion of my above statement that there are temples on all the sides is wrong" because temples were only on two sides. These temples were towards the east and north side of the Ram Janambhoomi Sthal. I do swear before making statement. The day this statement was recorded, oath was taken. I can not state anything about making the wrong statement. I forget some facts owing to which such statements are made. The meaning of forgetting is that at that time I do not remember the facts.

There are many rivers in India. There is no river unholy among these but some rivers are more sacred and some are lesser. River Ganga is more holy. If the list of holy rivers in India is drawn, I will keep the river Ganga in

the first place. In page 18 of statement made on 29.4.2004 'Ram mentioned in fifth line and 'Ram' mentioned at two places in sixth line and similarly "Shri Ram" mentioned in seventh line is one and the same Ram who is Shri Ram Chandra Ji. I consider him the incarnation of Lord Vishnu. He is incarnation as well as the Lord himself. In my statement I have mentioned Devanganao at many places. My meaning to it is the better half's of the Gods. My statement recorded at page No. 20 on 29.4.2004. "I have not seen three domes, I have seen three peaks, dome and peak is not the same thing may be wrong. Dome and peak is one and the same thing. I can not state any reason for this mistake. I know the importance of making statement before the Court under oath but sometimes because of forgetfulness mistakes do take place.

The meaning of renovation is to make a building in a grand shape or in a better way. In it, after removing old building construction of new building is included. In the statement on page 22 made on above date the portion Structure of the Mosque was not demolished but the temple was renovated' is correct. After the building having three peaks, there was veranda and there after there was courtyard. After courtyard there was the wall having bars. This courtyard was not upto the Amawa temple. This ended in the middle. I can not state the height of the disputed building from the ground. Similarly I can not state the height of the dome on the roof. I can not state this height even by guessing. Whether this height was 10 feet or five hundred feet, I can not state. I do not forget anything at this point. In addition to courtyard and veranda there was Forum towards the south and on the north side there was tin shed. The saints lived in this shed and holy songs was held in front of it.

I have stated the length and breadth of the Forum in my statement above but at present I do not remember as to what length and breadth, I had stated. Height of this Forum was three or three and half feet. The building having three domes was very old but how much years old these were, I can not state. I did not have a chance to read about it. To my guess, the disputed building being seen by me, was constructed at the time of King Vikramaditya. On dated 29.4. 2004 at page 20 I have stated that the peaks (domes) were at a height of eighty - hundred feet from the ground. This statement of mine is about the portion of the disputed building having peaks. My today's statement whether the height of the domes was ten feet of five hundred feet from the ground I can not state, is also correct. It is incorrect to say that in making statement I am acting arbitrarily. It is also incorrect to say that I am having no knowledge about the disputed site. Volunteer: that as much I was knowing, I have stated.

As there were three peaks in one row in the disputed building, I did not see in any other temple at Ayodhya such three peaks in a row. It is incorrect to say that the disputed building was Mosque and today also it is a Mosque. It is also incorrect to say that upto 22 December ,1949 Namaj of all the i9ve times was offered in the disputed building and Ajan was also held. It is also incorrect to say that Namaj of Jumma was offered and Namaj of Taraveeh was also offered. It is also incorrect to say that till the night of 23 December,1949 there was no idol in the disputed building and on above date the idol was kept stealthily.

(Cross examination on behalf of plaintiff No. 7 in other original suit No. 4/89 and defendant No. 5 in other original

suit No. 5/89 Mohammad Hashim by Shri Mustaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate concluded.

(The cross examination undertaken by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate, Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate and Shri Mustaq Ahmad Siddique, Advocate was adopted by Shri Fazale Alam, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 6/1 and defendant No. 6/2.)

Cross examination on behalf of all defendants parties concluded. The witness is discharged..

Statement read and verified

Sd/-

Bhanu Pratap Singh

13.5.2004

The Stenographer typed in the Open Court as I dictated.

Sd/-

Commissioner

13.5.2004