

10182

**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 Dutt Ram and others ...Defendants

**STATEMENT OF D.W. 3/14
JAGADGURU RAMANANDACHARYA SWAMI
HARYACHARYA**

www.vadaprativada.in

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 Dutt Ram and others ...Defendants

**MAIN EXAMINEE AFFIDAVIT JAGADGURU
RAMANANDACHARYA SWAMI HARYACHARYA D.W.
3/14, UNDER ORDER 18 RULE 4 CODE OF CIVIL
PROCEDURE**

I, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya, aged 69 years, disciple of late Mahant Ram Balak Dass, Hanumangarhi Ayodhya and disciple of Mahant Parmeshwar Dass Haridham, Gopal Mandir, Ramgbat, Ayodhya, hereby solemnly affirm that: -

1. I am consecrated to the post of Sampradacharya of main seat of Ramananda Sect.
2. I am the 25th Ramananda Sampradacharya of Ramananda Sect.
3. I am a Vyakaranacharya (scholar of Grammar) literature, Vedantacharya (expert of Vedant philosophy) and M.A.
4. I have studied Ved-Purans, Smriti, Religion, Poetry, History and all the practice under sanatan Dharm.

5. I have studied Sanskrit language.
6. I have studied Valmiki Ramayana too.
7. I have been a Principal of Yogiraj Sanskrit Vidyalaya (School). I have been a Grammar professor in Anadi Digambar Jain Gurukul for 6 years and Head of the Department of Grammar Science in Shri Niwas Bodhayan Ramanuj Sanskrit University, Uttar Totadri Math for 18 years.
8. I came to Ayodhya in the year 1945, at the age of 10 year (approx.) and opted the Ramanandiya Sect, after becoming the disciple of Swami Ram Balak Dassji, Patti- Sagariya of Hanumangarhi and studied in Ayodhya while residing at Hanumangarhi and Kashi.
9. I have written the following Granth (books):
 - 1) Sri Sampradaya Manthan (in seven volumes) published from Ayodhya and Vijak Karm Samvat 2048.
 - 2) Sri Sampradaya Samay Teeka book.
 - 3) Vedon Main Avtar Rahasya.
 - 4) Shri Ramcharitmanas ka Vadiatwa.
 - 5) Brahm Sutra Sanskrit Teeka.
 - 6) Upnishad Irsa Vasthoya Nisad Haribhasya
 - 7) Geeta Bhakti Darshan.
 - 8) Nan Tu Narayani.
 - 9) Sri Ram Satavraj.
 - 10) Pnchmukh Mangal Hanuman.
 - 11) Sri Sampradaya Darshan.

10. I am a Founder Editor Chairman of Avadh Saurabh monthly magazine.
11. I have delivered discourses at various places, in districts and in metro cities for the propagation of Sanatan Dharma and have been debating from the student life.
12. I have studied Vedic Literature, Ved, Vedang, Purans, Upanishad, Smriti and Bhasya etc. and also studied other religious books. I have studied Valmiki Ramayana, Ramcharitmanas written by Tulsi Dass. I have read Ekadash books written by Goswami Tulsi Dass.
13. Vedic Literature has great importance in studying the ancient history.
14. Rigveda has a great importance in Vedic literature. And similarly Brahman's books also have great importance for every Veds.
15. In Atharv Veda Prithiviti was said to be king of Karauva.
16. There is a systematic description of ancient Indian history in Puranas. Five subjects were illustrated in Puranas : -
 - 1) Canto (Primordial world).
 - 2) Prati Sarg (re-generation after universal destruction.)
 - 3) Vansh (Genealogy of Gods and Rishies.)
 - 4) Manwantar (great age of Kalpa, creator of which was Manu.)
 - 5) Genealogy (History of ancient King's dynasty.)

17. Genealogy Matyasya Puran, Vishnu Puran, Brahman Puran, Bhagwat Puran etc.
18. Garur Puran also contains tables of Porav, Itchwanku and Brihdat etc. royal dynasty.
19. Smriti Manu, Bhardwaj, Yagyawalkaya, Narad, Brahaspatti, Parashar etc.
20. All Smrities contains the subject. General Varnashram Religion, duties of a King etc. Among these, Manu Smriti is the base of Vedic Sanatan Dharma.
21. Sanatan Hindu Samaj recognized Manusmriti an authenticated. Nothing against Manu Smriti is adhered. According to Manusmriti, King is also governed by Religion. No King can take the temple.
22. Dharmo Vishawasasya Jagat Prathistha. (Manu Smriti.)
23. I have studied Valmiki Ramayana in Sanskrit and Hindi Translation.
24. Maharishi Valmiki, in Valmiki Ramayana, has described the character of Ram, my adorable, my God, in a live description.
25. Valmiki Ramayana contains the description of Ayodhya and Saryu and geographical situation of all these rivers and ways through which Rama went to forest, is unchanged even to-day. Saryu River,

Nandigram, Panchwati, Rameshwaram, Ganga, Bhardwaj Ashram, Lanka etc. all are there.

26. According to Atharv Veda: -

Ayodhya is the city of God, having eight wheel nine gates, full with glory and gold, lighted by the luster of heavens. There are a number of learned Brahmgyani (one who has a deep knowledge of Brahm) in Ayodhya and full of gold. The city full of fame and invincible. Such Ayodhya is described in Vedas.

27. In 15th and 16th slok (couplet) of second chapter of Shiv Santuta, description of Ayodhya, Saryu was given as under: -

**Astchakra Navdwara Nagari Dharmasampada!
Dristvevam Gyannentran Dhaytavya Saryusththa!!**

(Shiv Sanhita 20/15/16)

28. Ayodhya situated at the bank of Saryu and full of wealth, fame and glory. The detail of which was given in fifth slok of fifth canto, in Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana.

29. According to Valmiki Ramayana, Bhagwan Rama himself said that Ayodhya is his birth place.

30. Rudryamal is an ancient book, 500 years old and a recognized one. In accordance with the Rudryamal, Ayodhya was described as under:-

Ayodhya is situated on the Sudarshan Chakkra of Mahavishnu. It gives birth to the holy person. It is merry-making place

of Shri Sitaram. Fixing the limit of inner home of God, Shankar says to Parveti it is spread over from Sahastra Dhara, Golaghat, Laxman Fort, upto for four miles in the east, 4 miles in the west. In North and south, from Saryu to Tamsa River (near Bharat Kund). In west direction it is like a fish-head in area and in east, like a tale.

31. Lomas Rishi Ashram is in the east of the present Shri Ramjanrn Bhoomi Mandir, about which a case is subjudice. Where there is a Ramgulella Mandir, there is a stone in the name of Shri Lomasji. Bighneshwar Bhagwan is in the west side of Ram Janm Bhoomi Mandir. Which is in the west side of Vasisth Bhawan Mandir. The proof is enclosed at list 'A' of an affidavit.
32. Swami Ramanandacharya has introduced the Vasistadwet Darshan Ramanandiya Veragi Sect, approx. 700 years ago. Bhagwan Ram is the God of Ramanandiya Sect.
33. Akharas of Ramanandiya Vaishnav Sect were established by Balanandji Maharaj, 500 years before. There are a number of Nirmohi Akharas at various places in India and a number of temples are under its control.
34. Nirmohi Akhara is Religious Trust, which is managed by Panchs. This Akhara is a public Math. There is Mahant, elected by the Panchs. He works in accordance with the advise of Panchs. Mahant cannot donate the property of Akhara.

35. Famous Hanumangarhi, Kapil Muni Mandir and 12 temples of Hanumangarhi comes under the Nirvani Akhara. Similarly Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir has been under Nirmohi Akhara. Ramghat is an ancient place of Nirmohi Akhara. Ramapura, Khurdabad, Sumitra Bhawan, Sita Koop, Naka Hanumangarhi are the temples of Nirmohi Akhara.
36. Annee Akharas are the military organization of Shri Chatu Sect of Vaishnava Ramananda Vishnu Swami Nimbark and Madhavacharya.
37. Customs, traditions of Nirvani Annee, Nirmohi Annee and Digambar Annee are similar. I have been a Sadhu of Nirvani Akhara. I know all traditions, customs. The customs, tradition of Hanumangarhi are similar to Nirmohi Akhara and Digambar Akharas.
38. I alongwith with the students and Saints of Hanumangarhi used to visit Ramjanambhoomi Mandir daily for darshan from the day I came to Ayodhya.
39. I have been taking darshan of Bhagwan Rambila sitting below the middle pitcher of all the three pitchers, from the time I came to Ayodhya, and upto the date of its attachment.
40. As per my knowledge it was attached in December, 1949. Since than Darshan of Bhagwan Ramlalla is made from the outside of the Grill-door.
41. Before its attachment the Puja-Path, Utsav, Sameya of Bhagwan Ramlalla, sitting below the pitcher were being performed by the Nirmohi Akhara. There were

priest of Nirmohi Akhara. Baldev Dassji was a priest there at the time, when I visited for the first time. After sometimes, I saw his disciple Bhaskar Dass there. At present Bhaskar Dass is Mahant of Hanumangarhi. There were other assistant priest whose names are not known to me.

42. After attachment, receiver was appointed in the last days of December, 1949, for looking after the arrangements.
43. There was a Ramchabutra Mandir in the outer part on entering from eastern door. An idol of Bhagwan Ramlalla and three brothers, in their childhood, were there on the chabutra. Its Puja-Path, Utsav, Samaiya etc. were being managed by Nirmohi Akhara. I also took darshan there.
44. On entering from eastern gate, there were store room, Saint Niwas adjacent to the wall of gate, where priest, Panchs and Sadhus of Nirmohi Akharas resides.
45. The chabutra was 3 feet in height, 20 feet in length and 17 feet (approx.) in width. There was a throne made of wood on the chabutra and it was covered by chhappar from the above. There were caves doors on the two sides of chabutra. On one side an idol of Kaushaliya, with Rama in her lap, and on the other side there was an idol of Bharatji, made of stone and 2 feet in height.
46. There was also a door in the outer courtyard, which opens only during the fair. There was a chhatti Pujansthal in the outer courtyard in the south of

northern gate, where there were the foot prints of all the four brothers and Belana-Chakia and Chulaha. This place was treated as sacred place.

47. Outer part was remained under the control of Nirmohi Akhara, even after attachment but it was also attached 22 years ago, due to dispute, of Nirmohi Akhara. Receiver has been appointed for this place too. Receiver was the same person, for both the places, outer or inner part. His name, I am not recollecting.
48. Prior to 1949, when it was attached, the inner and outer part, both were under the control of Nirmohi Akhara.
49. Structure i.e. outer and inner part was demolished in December, 1992 by the gathering but Bhagwan RamLalla, which was under the middle pitcher, is sitting as before, in the tent, which is under the control of Central Govt. I came to know from others that darshan are being allowed as before. I have not visited there for darshan after demolition.
50. There was a Shiv-darbar in the outer part under the pipal tree at the east-south corner of Ram Chabutra Mandir. It was also managed by Nirmohi Akhara.
51. Like me, all the people of India, takes darshan of Bhagwan Ramlalla sitting in the inner or outer part and other religious places, like Shiv Darbar and Chhatti Pujan Sthal etc.
52. I have been visiting the inner and outer part of Ramjanambhoomi Mandir, since the time I came to

Ayodhya, for darshan. I have never seen any Muslim reading Namaj there in the disputed Bhawan.

53. Vedic proof of Saryu River, is in 9th mantra, 64 chapter, 10th mandal of Rigved and similarly in 9th mantra, 53rd chapter, 5th mandal, which read as under:

Oh, Saryu River appears in adhisasthree form alongwith the waves for the security of our yagna being performed at the time of Patresthi yagna of Maharaja Dasrath.

54. Vedic proof of the word "Ram" is as under: -

In 10th Mandal (tenth division of Rigved)/93rd translation/4th Mantra and 10th Mandals/3rd translation/3rd Mantra of Rigved and 59th Mantra of 29th chapter of Madhyanandini part of Sukra Ayjurved, 1st Mandal/31st translation/1st Mandal of Atharved, 1 Mantra/2nd translation/15th Mandal of Samved, 7th Mantra/111 translation/10 Mandal of Rigved, 13th Mantra/8th translation/5th Mandal of Tetriya Aaryakya and in the creation of Ketao Ramvindan etc. by exposition of Ram, his roopleela (deeds) and place was described. The specific principles of Ramanandiya Sect have been reproduced in the above mantra.

55. Vedic proof in regard to Maharaja Dasrath is as under: -

Maharaja Dasrath had 40 types of colour horses who live near Kamboj, Bahlik and Sindu Rivers.

56. The detail of Ayodhyapuri, described in 6th slok of 5th canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana, is as under: -

The Ayodhya city in that district is famous all over. This city was built-up and inhabited by Maharaj Manu himself.

57. Following has been described in 5th slok of 5th canto, in Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana: -

There is a great district named Kaushal, situated at the bank of Saryu, progressing day by day and is full of delight.

58. In accordance with the Valmiki ramayana, Devtas prayed the Bhagwan Vishnu and he resolved to descend on the earth and according to his resolution he descended. It was described in 31st and 32nd slok of 15th canto of Balkand.

59. I have read the "History of Shri Ramanand Sect" 700 Jayanti Samarak Smriti book of Anand Bhaskar Jagadguru Shri Ramanandacharya and Jayanti Smarak book, written by him. Swami Hariprasadacharya, Swami Sitaramacharya and Swami Ram Swaroopacharya were in the editor group. It was published from Ahmedabad, Gujarat. The Lawyer of Nirmohi Akhara has told me that these two books have been filed in the suit. These two books are recognized in our Sect.

60. The document "Ayodhya Mahatamya" is enclosed at list No. "a" with the affidavit, is authentic.

Verification

I, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Haryacharya solemnly affirm that para 1 to 12, 28, 31, 34 to 52 and 60

based on my knowledge and para 14 to 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 53 to 59 based upon the knowledge I gain from books and para 13 on the basis of my belief, are true to the best of my knowledge. I again solemnly affirm that nothing is false or nothing has been concealed. May God help me. Solemnly affirmed at Lucknow High Court, Lucknow.
Dated 23.7.2004

Witness

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya
Swami Haryacharya

I, R.L. Verma, Advocate, know the above witness. He put his signature in my presence.

(R.L. Verma)

Advocate

23.7.2004

Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow
Nirmohi Akhara V/s Baboo Priya Dutt Ram
D.W. No. 3/89

CLASSIC PROOF OF SHRI RAM JANAMBHOOMI

ANNEXTURE. "A"

Attached with affidavit

After bathing in the water of Sarayu one should even worship Pindarak, the one who puts the evil doers into delusion and bestows the virtuous with understanding.

During Navaratri one should make a pilgrimage to him (Pindarik) at a period when Pushya Nakshatra reigns and without fail should worship Ganesh on his western side.

Not an iota of impediment remains for one who visits him (Vighneshwara). For this reason Vighneshwara, the endower and every desired reward is venerable.

From this spot, Ishanward lies Ram Janambhoomi. This place of birth is held to be the bestower of liberation and other rewards.

From this spot, Ishanward lies Ram Janambhoomi. This place of birth is held to be the bestower of liberation and other rewards.

The man who dwell in the hermitages and asceties, who perform thousand Rajsuya Sacrifices every year and Agnihotra, those who specially visit men undergoing religious observations at the Janambhoomi and the men who serve parents and Guru, obtain that kind of reward which is obtained the moment one sees Ram Janambhoomi.

On the eastern side of Vighneshwara, on the northern side of Vashishtha's hermitage, on the western side of Lomasha (hermitage) lies situated His (Ram birth place (Janambhoomi).

Seeing which human beings beset of penance and the act of sacred offerings, even without making pilgrimages and performing sacrificial rites get released from the cycle of birth.

By visiting the Janambhoomi one obtained results which is equal to that of giving away of one thousand Kapila cows each day.

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004.)

Other Original Suit No. 3/1989

R.S. No. 26/1959

Nirmohi Akhara ...Plaintiffs

Versus

Baboo Priya Dutt Ram and others...Defendants

Dated 23 .7.2004

**D.W. 3/14 Jagatguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryachaiya**

Main examinee affidavit - page No. 1 to 13, of Jagatguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya, aged 69 years, disciple of Late Mahant Balak Dass of Hanumangarhi, Ayodhya and Sadik disciple of Mahant Parmeshwar Dass Haridham, Gopal Mandir, Ramghat, Ayodhya was submitted and taken on record.

(Cross-examination by Km. Ranjana Agnihotri, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No. 20, Akhil Bhartiya Shri Ramjanambhoomi reconstruction Committee in Other Original Suit No. 4/89, begins.)

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

I became the Sampradhacharya of main seat of Ramananda Sect during last Kumbh in 1985-86. I am 25th Ramananda Sampradacharya of Ramananda Sect. First

Ramanandacharya was 700 years ago. Main seat is situated at Panchagangaghat Varanasi. Sampradayacharya of main seat can reside at the places other than Varanasi. I am a Vyankaranacharya. I have written a number of books on Grammar. Some books are in Hindi and some are in Sanskrit. I have written the book for the ordinary man. Besides I have written the books on other subject also. The book on the subject Grammar, written by me in Hindi are - Vyakaran Rahasya, Vedon main Avtar Rahasya. I could not brought the book with me. Swami Adiramanandacharya has 12 disciples. Their names were - Sursuranandacharya, Bhawanandacharya, Peepaji, Girjanandacharya. The names of others are not remembered to me. Narharyanandacharya was also among his disciple. This is the same Narharyanandacharya, who was referred by Goswami Tulsi Dass in 1 st line of fifth soratha in **Balkand of Ramcharitmanas**. **This Soratha is as under:**

Bandrau Guru Nai Kanj Kripa Sindu Narrop Hari
Mahamoh Tam Punj Bachan Ratri Kar Nikari.

From the word Narhari "Nar Roop Han", Goswamiji means Narharyanandaji. Narharyananda was a Guru Goswami Tulsi Dass. So he praises him. My main study was confined to Sanskrit. I have started studying Sanskrit at the age of 15 years. Before the age of 15 years I was in my native place. I have studied in a Primary School. I was born in village Bandhuwa under Sidharth Nagar, Basti Division. We have concentrated on Valmiki Rainayana. Hence studied it first. I was reading and chanting manas before attaining the age of 15 years.

Ramcharitmanas was written four hundred years ago. I have heard poem, which means.

I published Shri Ramcharitmanas in Ayodhya city on ninth date, Tuesday, in the month of Chaitra. This book was published in 1621. Besides, Ramcharitmanas, I have read the other books written by Tulsi Dass, such as Geetawali, Kavitawali, Vinay patrika, Vairagyasandipani, Barwe Ramayana, Ramlalla Nahchhu, Parveti Mangal, Ramagya Prasan, Hanuma Bahook, Hanuman Chaleesa etc.

The aim and objective of Ramananda Sect is to propagate the Vasistadwet philosophy to preach, to make religious discourses, creation etc. Bhagwan Rama was the God of Ramanandacharya. As an Acharya, he blessed Sita with Ram-mantra. Bhagwan Sitaram was the god of other followers of Ramanandiya Sect. Ramanandiya Sect follows an idol prayer. Janmsthal is also worshiped. Five type of idols are recognized in Ramananda Sect. Among them there are metal's, woods, earth, chih, earth and letters idol. In Vasistadwet philosophy, in addition to an idol, Janmsthan is worshiped. Janmsthali is worshiped at a number of places in India. The birth places of Bhagwan are Ramjanmbhoomi, Mathura and Kashi. In Mathura, birth place of Bhagwan Shri Krishna is worshiped. In Kashi, Bhagwan Shiva is worshiped.

In my main examinee affidavit it was said that I deliver discourses and religious narratives. I mainly deliver the story of Rama. I have studied the Ramcharitmanas in depth. There is a couplet No. 190 in Balkand of Ramcharitmanas, which means as under:

During the time of birth of Bhagwan Rama, the circumstances turned into favour. Everybody was with full of joy because the birth of Rama itself was an indication of joy.

The holy month of Chaitra, Shukla Paksha and Abhijeet Nakshatra are the best occasion for the devotion to Rama. The mid of the day, not so hot and not so cool, is the time for pleasure for the people. Second line of couplet No. 191 of Ramcharitmanas say:- The God, which gives pleasure and wealth and health, was born. The Chhand, next to this couplet says that Shri Rama, good for Kaushalya, kind hearted, compassionate towards poor was born. Kaushalya and sadhus became were overwhelmed with joys on seeing the child Rama. He was so handsome, having beautiful eyes, light blue colour. He was the enemy of Khar demon. Mata Kaushalya said to him that I am blessed with. Are you a Matateet, guranteet, Gyanameem, Haman. Ved Purans says that you are treasurer of pleasure, kind, full with qualities. Ved and Saint praises you. You are born for my welfare and to bless the people with love and brotherhood. You are the source of light. You are the creator of world. You are full with the knowledge. You have blessed me, by taking birth. Upon this Rama gave the knowledge to his mother Kaushalya and gave a smile. Mata Kaushalya again said that she is over whelmed with joy and pray to him that she want to see him as a child. Upon her request Rama started crying.

Slok No. 8, 9 and 10 of eighteen cantos at page No. 69, .of The document No. 261 C/1 of Valmiki Ramayana was shown to witness and he was asked about the meaning. Witness said as under:

6 seasons i.e. 12 month have passed from the day of completion of yagna. On the 9th date of the month of Chaitra, in Aditi Nakshatra, when all God at their best, Kaushalya gave birth to Rama. At that time, Surya, Mangal, Sanni, Guru and Sukra, all the five planets were

in their best places and Chandrma alongwith Brihaspatti were in the lagna. Maharishi Valmiki written the birth place of Bhagwan Rama. Slok No.10 refer the place where people bow with respect. People bow before here being the birth place of Lord Rama. Valmiki Ramayana is a historical book. This proves that Rama was born in Ayodhya. He himself stated that God Rama born 'in twenty-fourth Tretayug. The time period of birth of Rama and composition time of Valmiki Ramayana is the same. Valmiki has described the deeds of Bhagwan Rama.

Puran and Vedas are divine. Valmiki Ramayana is very important to study the history of India. Because it is a primordial book. There was no book before that. Krishndwepayan, Vyasji and Balmiki were the author of Purana.

Sloks No. 8,9,10 and 11 of first canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana were shown to witness through document No. 261 C-1/1. Witness read the sloks and said, these means: The Rama, born in Ichvaku family is a learned, Sagacious, spokesman and destroyer of enemies. He is strongman. His chest is large and bow is big. His arms are lengthy alluring forehead. His physique is well built. His colour was glossy,, eyes are big and chest was bossy. He was renowned.

In para 20 of my main examinee affidavit, I referred about the stages of life described in Ramcharitmanas, which is as under:

“Varnamasthsanghanam” is written in the first slok of Balkand of Ramcharitmanas. The word “Vam” figuring in the slok mean the colour and the second meaning is “Caste system”. In Uttarkand of Ramcharitmanas, next to the

couplet No. 97(b), "Varn Dharm Nahin Asharmchari", word Ashram means, caste system.

I came to Ayodhya at the age of 10-11 years. I have studied in Ayodhya. There are three Akharas of Ramanandiya Sect in Ayodhya. Both the three Akharas are Annee Akharas. Annee stand for the military. Every Akhara is governed by Panchyati system. He himself said Mahant of Akhara is elected. All the three Akharas i.e. Nirmohi, Nirvani and Digambar Akharas are equal. No head Akhara is there. All the three Akharas have one system of working. Three times pooja, early morning, mid of day and at evening, is must in the temples of Akharas. Pooja at three times is performed in the temple of Ramanandiya Sect.

Vyasji has written Rigveda only. Its 1137 branches were not written by Vyasji. These were written by his disciples and disciples of others. There are four parts of Vedas - Bhasya, Sanhita, Brahaman and Upnishad. Each Vedas have separate Brahamn. Their name is - Aranyakya, Maitreya, Satpath Brahaman and Angira. These four are also Vedas. I have been visiting the birth place of Bhagwan Rama for darshan since 1946-47. I was 12-13 years old at that time. He himself said that he used to go for darshan alongwith the students. I went for darshan, for the first time, with my Guru. It is believed that one gets salvation by taking darshan of that place. With this faith and belief, followers of Sanatan Dharma goes for darshan. I went for darshan at hundred times at the occasion of Chaitra Ramnavami, Sarad Ramnavami, Swanjhulnotsav. There used to be heavy crowd at these occasions but one could get darshan easily. At Ramnavami heavy crowd reaches there, not less than three to four lakhs people.

There remains heavy crowd at Sarad Navratra but less than the Chaitra Ramnavami. Devotees from all parts of the country visit there. There are heavy crowd at Sawan Jhula also. At this occasion lakhs of people from every district comes there.

I have performed 14 Kaushi and Panchkaushi parikarma. I have performed parikarma of Ramjanambhoomi at so many times. Jankaura, Gosala Mandir, Gurukul and a number of villages comes under 14 kaushi parikarma. Sheetal Amrai also comes under it. I have performed 84 kaushi parikarma of Ayodhya. So many areas falls under this parikarma. Jamdagni Ashram, situated in Gaunda district falls on the way of parikarma.

I have taken bath in Saryu at the time of Chaitra Ramnavami, Kartik Poornima and Jhulvotsav in the month of Sawan. During the month of Kartik, I took bath in Saryu on everyday, had I been there in Ayodhya. After taking bath I used to go for darshan. First of all I used to go to Hanumangarhi, then Ramjanmbhoomi and after that to Kanak Bhawan. Other devotees also takes darshan in the same cycle.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya

Swami Haryacharya

23.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this the suit may be listed for cross examination for 26.7.2004.

(Han Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

23.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 26.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 23.7.2004, cross-examination
by Km. Ranjana Agnihotri, Advocate, on behalf of
defendant No. 20, Akhil Bhartiya Shri Ramjanambhoomi
reconstruction Committee in Other Original Suit No. 4/89,
continues.)

I brought the books with me, which I referred in the
statement given by me on the last date. These books are:
Vedon Ka Avtar Rahasya, Shri Sampradaya Samaya,
Hanumanth Kavach Haribhas, Manas Ka Vedictatwa, Nan
tu Narayani, Brahmsutra Haribhasya, Shriram Asthava Raj,
Geetabhakti Darshan, Ishavsiyounpishad Haribhas, Shri
Sampradayacharya Darshan and Shri Sampradaya Mantha
I have referred various Purans in para 17 of my main
examinee affidavit, in which systematic description of
Indian ancient history was described. Shri Bhagwat Puran
is also a Puran. The Learned Advocate shown the Vishnu
Puran to witness. The witness on seeing the slok No. 13
and 14 of second chapter said there is description of India
in it. Similarly upon seeing the first, second and twenty-
fourth slok, before the second part of third chapter. The
witness said there is description of India and about its
borders, in detail. India described in this Puran, is the

India of to-day. Ayodhya described in Shrimad Bhagwat is the Ayodhya of to-day. Saryu described in it, is the same Saryu of to-day. I used to go to three domes Bhawan for darshan, earlier. I have also taken the darshan of Shri Ramjalla. I took darshan because I believe that one could get salvation by doing the darshan.

(Cross-examination by Km. Ranjana Agnihotri, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 20 Akhil Bhartiya Shri Ramjanambhoomi reconstruction committee in other original suit No. 4/89, concluded.)

(Cross-examination by Shri Beereshwar Diwedi, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 17 Shri Ramesh

Chander Tripathi in suit No. 4/89 and defendant No. 22, Shri Umesh Chander Pandey in suit No. 4/89 begins.)

xxx xxx xxx xxx

Rudryamal is an ancient book. It was written at least five hundred years ago. I do not know the name of writer of Rudryamal. I got a chance to study the book Rudryamal. This book also contains the name of books written earlier about Ayodhya. The books referred in Rudryamal and the book wherein there is reference about Ayodhya, I do not remember their name. Atharved was written much earlier than the Rudryamal. There are references in Rudryamal taken from Atharved, which contains the references about Ayodhya. Brahmpuran and Skandpuran were referred in Rudryamal.

700 anniversary years of first ever Ramanandacharya will be celebrated this year. First ever Ramanandacharya was not a founder of Ramanandiya

Sect, he was the man who gave motion to this Sect. Ramanandiya Sect is very old. It was named after the name of Ramanand. Ramanandji was 700 years before.

Skand Puran was written in Vedic period. Valmiki has discussed the Purana during the time of Bhagwan Ram. These were also mentioned, in Vedas. There was description about Ayodhya Mahatmya in Skand Puran. While describing Ayodhya Mahatmya, birth place of Shri Ramchanderji was also mentioned. The description of Ayodhya in Ayodhya Mahatmya was prior to the time of Ramananda. Mandir is called for the place where God resides. The place of residence of human being is not called Mandir. Goswami Tulsi Dass while referring Dassanan Mandir in Ramcharitmanas said:

There were temples in Lanka, called "Dassanan Mandir". Dassanan was devotee of Bhagwan Shankar. Lanka had a number of temples. There was a temple of Nikumbha Devi. Meghnath was a devotee of Nikumbha Devi. Besides, Mandir of Shankar Bhagwan was there. In the outer part, there was a temple of Sayar. On entering into Lanka, Hanuman met sayar first. Warriors lived in the temples. There were temples of warriors also. Bhawan, Mandir and Mahal are synonym of Mandirs were named after the name of specific God.

The person appointed for rendering service etc. to the God, is called Priest. In my main examinee affidavit, I referred "Annee" which means military. All Akharas were equal in status. Some Annee works under a specific head, who work to render help during Kumbh he remain head of Annee for the rest of time but its main work is to render help during Kumb. There were heads of Annees from Nirmohi, Nirvani Akharas. Akhara also stand for Religious

armament. Military power was necessitated in Hindu Religion because invaders used to come.

I have referred "Shiv Sanhita" at para 27 of my main examinee affidavit. The author of Shiv Sanhita was the disciple of Vyasji. It was written during the time of Vedic period. I regard the time of Ved eleven thousand years before. Some says, it was five thousand years before. Vedang, in which there are six darshan came after Purans and Vedang were written after Purans. Last part of Ved is called Vedang. Ved and Vedang are contemporary. Upnishad is formed from the word "Up-Ni-shad". It is not correct to say that the knowledge earned by Rishies from Ved is called Upnishad. Ved is spiritual knowledge and Rishies are its composers. Atharv Ved is not. a last Ved. In this order, it is at the fourth number. I referred in para 16 of my main examinee affidavit that there are five subjects in Purans. These subjects were detailed next to that para, in the form of canto. Genealogy is one of the subjects of Puran. There are various Purans, which are worthy of being mentioned. The details in this connection was given in para 17 of my main examinee affidavit. All Purans were not referred in this para. Hence the word "first ever" was mentioned after Bhagwat Puran. There is description of family of Dasratha in this genealogy. Garur Puran contains the detail of Ichwaku family. The conclusion can be drawn from my main examinee affidavit that their books described the family history of Bhagwan Ram and his ancestors. Skand Puran is also one of them. There is a Vaishnav part in Skand Puran. It contains the entire description, of Ayodhya. Geographical situation of Ayodhya and its important religious places were described in it. This chapter is called Ayodhya Mahatamyā. Geography of Ramjanmbhoomi was described in it. No book negated the geographical situation of Ramjanmsthal.

I referred in my main examinee affidavit that I have studied the books written by Goswami Tulsi Dass. Tulsi Dass, in Ramcharitmanas, said that Bhagwan Vishnu took the birth by the name of Rama. He said:

**“Jehe Din Ramjanm Shruti gawahi,
Tirath Sakal tahan chali Avanhi.**

I referred Vasistadwet in my main examinee affidavit. I define it. Maya, Jeev, Brahm, the three substances, have been accepted as twatraya (Brahm). It means, there are, life and universe, where the God is. This principle of Vasistadwet has been accepted by Vaishnav Sect. According to this principle, the soul and God is one. Bhokta, Bhogya and its Pravek, both the three is God. This is the principle of Vasistadwet which is different from Dwet and adwet. Follower of Ramanand Sect follows the principle of Vasistadwet. In addition to north India, Visistadwet is followed by large number of population in south India. There are persons in Hindu religion who follows Adwet principle. Its followers are called Shev. The followers of dwet principle are Nimbark and follows Madwa Sect. Visistadwet principle was there before Ramanand Sect. Rigved is the first ved among the four vedas. It also contains the description of King Dasratha. I have read the para 59 at page 12, of my main examinee affidavit. I have read the book “Shri Ramanand Sampraday ka Itihas” and “Shri Ramanand Jayanti Smarak Granth” three days before. These two books contain three-four hundred pages, each.

Witness, upon seeing para 60 of my main examinee affidavit and list “a” referred therein, said, a part is in Sanskrit, a part is in Hindi and a part is in English, in the list “a”. I authenticate its correctness. It was referred in list

“a” that there is a birth place of Rama, as mentioned in Skand Puran.

(Cross-examination by Shri Beereshwar Diwedi, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No. 17 in suit No. 4/89, Shri Ramesh Chander Tripathi and defendant No. 22 in suit No. 4/89, Shri Urnesh Chander Pandey, concluded.)

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

xxx xxx xxx xxx

There are 24 incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. Among these are Parsuram, Vaman, Shri Ram, Shri Krishna, Hans, Kalki, Narsingh etc. Matsaya and Barah are also the incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. Slok No. 117 at page 596 of Udh Kand, document No. 261 C-1/2 of Valmiki Ramayana was shown to witness. Witness on reading it said he knows the meaning of this. The subject matter of Valmiki Ramayana is not history. He himself said in Shastras, it is called fifth Ved. Slok No. 123 of Udh Kand was read out to witness, upon this he said he knows what it means. It comes out from it that Valmiki Ramayan is Sahinta. Upon reading the slok No. 25 at page No. 805 of Uttarkand of this book, witness said it means that Maharishi Valmiki is the author of Ramayana. Slok No. 12 at page No. 808 of the book was shown' to the witness, upon which witness said that there is a reference that Sita followed Valmiki. Upon seeing the slok No. 15 and 16, at page 808 of this Kand, witness said that in these sloks Valmiki referred about Sitaji to Rama. Upon slok No. 16 and 17, at page No. 723 and 724 of this book witness said, this slok means:- Bhagwati Sita is pure and virtuous wife. Maharishi Valmiki, friend of Dasratha resides here. You too please reside here with him i.e. Valmiki was

contemporary to Bhagwan Rama. The same Valmiki is the writer of Valmiki Ramayana. Sanatan means "Saswat". i.e. continous and where there is no interval.

(Cross-examination by Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff in other or suit No. 5/89, concluded.)

(Shri Madan Mohan Pandey, on behalf of defendant No. 2/1, Mahant Suresh Dass, in others original suit No. 4/89, has accepted the cross-examination, conducted by Shri Veerswar Diwedi and Ajay Kumar Pandey.)

Learned Advocate Shri K.G. Mishra and D.P. Gupta on behalf of plaintiff in others original suit No. 1/89 said they have not to conduct the cross-examination from the witness.)

(None on behalf of defendants except the advocate on behalf of defendant in others original suit No. 4/89 and defendant No. 4,5,6 and 26 in others original suit No. 5/89, was present for conducting cross-examination. Hence the cross-examination by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 11 of this suit begins.)

xxx xxx xxx xxx

I am 69 years old. I have done my schooling in Janmbhoomi, Ayodhya and Kashi. I was born in Distt. Basti, which at present is under the Distt. Siddarth Nagar. My house is at a distance of 90 kilometer from the Siddarth Nagar headquarter. I have studied at my home town upto the age of 11 years. I used to go to study in Primary School. I got my primary education from Primary School. This school is at a distance of half Kilometer from

my house. Its name is Primary School, Majhuwa. This school is at a distance of half Km. from my village. Only one village called Pispohar falls on the way. My father was overseer. My father died in the year 1965, at the age of 55 years. He left the service and came to India from Nepal because he was not keeping well. My father was overseeing the work of construction of road at Surkhet in Nepal. He stayed there for eight years. I was with my father in the town. I have been with my father in Nepal for two years at the age of 8-9 years, where I have studied 'Varnmala' book. I have studied in the school, meant for children, where 10-20 children study. One of my villagers was in Nepal and I came back to my native place with him. My father was working at that place which was at a distance of 250 Km. from the place called Rupehidiha at India-Nepal Border, it was a hilly area. The place where my father lived was a big town but what was its population, I have no knowledge about it. I could not remember how much we had to travel through hilly area to reach the town where my father was residing. My father was living in a rented room. His work was to measure the road along with his 2-4 associates. He himself said, he also used to prepare the map in regard to the land to be occupied for constn of Road. Where there is a house and at which place the bridge is to be constructed. My father sometime took me to his work place and sometime left me back with a midwife. In Nepal no signboard were there to indicate the distance. People make an estimate about distance. The town where we lived was at a great height and even vehicles used to get tired while reaching there. I lived in Nepalganj. Roads were there at that time too but were not concrete road. Since there was no bus service available, so I used to go by an old jeep. Most of the people come to Nepalganj for marketing, on foot. I cannot say, at what distance the Nepalganj is, from my place because I was

10-11 years old at that time. I do not know how far my native place is from Nepalganj, the India-Nepal border.

Question: Whether the distance from your village to above Indo-Nepal Border was 10-12 miles?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri Ved Prakash, on behalf of plaintiff in others original suit No. 5/8 9, has raised an objection hat the question asked for was not related to any point of suit and it is simply a wastage of court's time. The question is being asked as to harass the honourable witness. Such question cannot be allowed.)

Answer: It is not correct that the said border is at much distance from my village.

There is a railway station called Gaisari station near my village. If the train started in the evening, it reached there at 8 A.M. on the next day. My father, keeping my interest in learning Sanskrit, got me enrolled in the school run by the than seated Mahant, Shri Swami Rambalak Dass of Hanumangarhi, Manager of Sanskrit Vidyalaya, five years after I came to Ayodhya. Before this I practised wrestling for five years. I started studding Sanskrit at the age of 16 years. Prior to this I was in an Ashram. I have studied in the said school for 13 years. I have studied in Ayodhya for 12-13 years. He himself said that he got the final degree from Kashi. I have studied upto the age of 25-26 years. I have continued my education even after. I have passed Vedantacharya, Sahityacharya and M.A. I have completed first two parts of Acharya from Raj Gopal Sanskrit University, Ayodhya and last part from Gaay Ghat Varanasi. I was 27 years old at that time. I was, thereafter, appointed as a Grammar Teacher in Jam Gurukul School, Ayodhya at the age of 28-29 years at an adhoc pay of Rs. 29/- only. I have done teaching work there for five years. Than I was appointed a Principal in Yogiraj Sanskrit Vidyalaya, Ayodhya, and I have worked there for two years.

This Vidyalaya still exists. I left the job because the Managers of that Vidyalaya were corrupt. They used to give me less money and obtained my signature at high amount. I was the Principal of that school upto 1956-57. After that I have joined Shri Niwas Bodhayan Sanskrit University as a Head of Department of Grammar, I worked there for 18 years, at the pay of Rs. 10 thousand. 15- 16 years have been passed away since I left the school. Thereafter, the followers of Ramananda Sect have requested me to join them as a Sampradacharya. In 1989, I joined as a Sampradacharya of Ramanand Sect at fourth Sampradaya Khalsa Camp, at the time of anniversary of Swami Ramanandacharya, on 26th or 27th January in a function. In the function Sita Ram Saran Maharaj, Manas Markand, Shri Prem Dassji Maharaj, Mahant Nirtya Gopal Dassji, Mahant of Chhavani, Mahant and Swami Shri Gyan Dassji Maharaj ji have delivered the speeches on the creation of Shri Ramananda Swami. Approx. four thousand people have attended the one day's meet. Dand was offered to me before the photo of my earlier guru, Acharya Shivramacharya. It was resolved that all the followers of Sistadev principle, the Vaishnav will propagate the principle and will create awareness wherever this principle is being eroded.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

26.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer who typed it in the open court. Suit may be listed for cross-examination for 27.7.2004.

(Han Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

26.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 27.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 26.7.2004 cross-examination
by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of defendant
No. 11, continues.)

I have been living in Ayodhya for last 50 years. I am not aware whether Babri Masjid was built in 1528 or not. During my stay in Ayodhya I have heard that there was some dispute with the Nirmohi Akhara. I do not know in which year the dispute arised, even after I am residing in Ayodhya continuously. Thefe was some dispute in regard to Shri Ramjanambhoomi Mandir and some clashes took place. In which year the clashes took place, I have no knowledge about it. I was in Ayodhya at the time of clash and I was 20 years old at that time. Muslims claimed that disputed site belongs to them and Nirmohi Akhara claims that it is their site. This was the reason for dispute. The clash took place in the year 1950- 51, perhaps. When clash took place, I did not try to obtain the information in this regard. At that time I was in Hanumangarhi. Hanumangarhi is at a distance of 2 furlong from the disputed site. Prior to this incidence, disputed site was not called Babri Masjid. In Hindu religion, Mandir is called, where Puja-Archana is performed.

F.I.R. dated 23.12.1949 under section 145 Cr.P.C., from the questionnaire, was shown to witness.

Question: Who lodged the report and against whom?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri Tarun Jeet Verma, in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that the witness is, in no way, concern with the report, so question in this regard cannot be asked from him.)

Answer: It is not clear from the paper that against whom the report was lodged and who lodged it.

I have no knowledge about the report lodged by Shri Ramdev Dubey, Sub-Inspector, Incharge of Police Station, Ayodhya on 23.12.49 at 19.00 regarding the incident happened at 6.00AM on the same day, in Mohalla Ramkot Janmbhoomi. The fact that "about five-six thousand people gathered there chanting religious slogans..... so many peoples have seen the incident" was shown to witness. Witness said he has no knowledge about the report lodged by Ramdev Dubey.

Question: It has been written in the report that accused Ram Dass alongwith the fifty to sixty persons armed with weapons, made forceful entry into Masjid and desecrated the Masjid by installing idols in the Masjid. What you have to say in this regard?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey on behalf of plaintiff in other original suit No. 5/89, raised an objection that the question about the

contents of the document on the record of court cannot be asked. Moreover the witness has expressed his unawareness about the document. Hence permission cannot be granted to ask such question, to harass the witness and to waste the time of court.)

Answer: I have no knowledge in this regard.

I was in Ayodhya on 23.12.1949, I have not visited the disputed site on that day. I was at a distance of two furlong from the disputed site. He himself said that I was restricted with the practice of Ashram, so I did not go there. In this regard I have heard that some altercation took place with the sadhus of Nirmohi Akharas at Ramjanambhoomi. Baba Abhiram Dass, who used to visit Ashram to see Guruji, had told about the incident to Guruji. I had also heard about it when he was narrating the things to Guruji.

I was called at the occasion of the anniversary of Ramanandacharya during Kumbh. There was a function on 26th February, 1989 at this occasion I was appointed as Sampradayacharya of the Sect. At least about four thousand sadhus-Mahatmas were gathered there at this occasion. I delivered a speech. I can speak Hindi as well as Sanskrit. I had spoken in Hindi at the said Kumb fair.

Lakhs of people are gathered at Kumbh. Many sants did not arrived there, but the sants presents in the Kumbh, were there in the function. Besides the sadhus, 10 thousand peoples gathered there. This function went on for three hours. A 'tent was fixed there.

The Akharas I have referred in the statement given by me were constructed in 15th era. It is not correct to say

that these were constructed during 15th era at Jaipur. The fact is that these Akhara were there since long because these were referred in Valmiki Ramayana too. No Akhara was constructed in Jaipur. Akharas were meant for imparting training in arms. These were called Patabana. Lath, sword, lathi, Bhala, Ballam, sticks are used in Patabana. He himself stated that Akhee means military. Hence training for use of weapons are imparted in Akhees. There are 18 Akharas in India and not 13. All Akharas come at Kumbh and stay there for a month. Training in use of weapons is not imparted during Kumbh. At the time of Shahi Jullus, sadhu playing the patbana leads other sadhus. Govt. has fixed the time period for each jullus. The period is fixed on the basis of distance. During Kumbh three Royal baths are held and jullus is taken out at these Royal bath. During the period of Kumbh i.e. for one month, services, Puja and food is provided to the visitors. Food is provided to all the visitors. There is no fixed number to whom the food is to be provided. The main Akharas, among the above mentioned 18 Akharas are Pra Haridwar, Nasik and Ujjain. At the time of Royal bath all the eighteen Akharas go together. Only Jagadguru goes alone. There are four Jagadgurus in Shri Vaisnav Sect. These Akharas were established five hundred years ago by Virjanand, disciple of Balanandacharya. The first Akhara was established in Jaipur in Rajasthan

Document No. 236/52 of other original suit No. 4/89, was shown to witness. Witness upon reading both the pages of the said report said, I have no knowledge about the report. All the three Akharas, Nirmohi, Nirvani and Digamber, were constructed by Swamiji in Jaipur, 500 years ago. I cannot say that whether these Akharas were established in Jaipur because there was no Muslim ruler in Jaipur. Ramananda was not from Jaipur. He was from

Prayag, now a days called Allahabad. Ramanandacharya never been in Jaipur. His disciple Balanand established Akhara in Jaipur. There were three Akharas and 18 parts. Principle in regard to construction of Akhara have been finalised in Jaipur. But the work of preparing laws and by-laws began later. After six months of construction of Akhara in Jaipur, laws and by—laws were prepared in Prayag, Haridwar, Ujjain and Nasik. Naga, Huddanga, Chhorra and Ateet are the type of Akhara. Four types of people live in Akhara since very beginning. Similarly the training for use of weapons is imparted in Akhara from the very beginning. The three Akharas mentioned above are mobile. And accordingly these Akharas reached Ayodhya. Peoples from Akhara goes all over India and get gifts, donation etc. He himself stated that at present, 90 lakhs of sadhus are moving about through out India. The sadhus interested in getting training for use of weapons, are imparted the same and those interested in study, they do so. He himself stated that Akhara is a trust, managed in accordance with Panchayati management. The sadhus are imparted training in accordance with their choice. R.S.S. is not a child of Akhara. R.S.S. was established by Hadgewar in Nagpur. Besides above three Akharas, the fourth one is Niralamb, Akhara in Ayodhya. There is Mahant of Niralambi Akharas. The student⁵ residing in these Akhara, keep their study on. There are a number of branches of Niralambi Akhara in Ayodhya. Besides, there are branches, out side of Ayodhya. But these are not taken in counting. Besides Khaki Akhara was also there in Ayodhya. Thirty-four persons lives in it. There are thousands of persons of Khaki Akhara, outside Ayodhya. These are spread over to Gujarat, Rajasthan and Maharashtra. This training is imparted in the Ashrams of Akhara. It gives training on the their own weapons. Niralambi Akhara is at Ramghat Mohalla and Khaki Akhara

is at Hanumangarhi intersection. Nirvani Akhara is after Digambar Akhara, Hanumangarhi and thereafter comes Nirmohi Akhara. Every Akhara have their own laws, by-laws and own site. Training is imparted in these sites. These training pertain to weapons, education and yoga. Balanandacharya was a disciple of Virjanand. Akhara means Akhandta. Akhara are from the ancient time. But Balanandacharya gave it impetus.

(Cross-examination by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate, on behalf of Mohd. Farooq Abmad defendant No. 11, concluded.)

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

I belong to Nirvani Akhara. Hanumangarhi comes under Nirvani Akhara. Hanumangarhi is the main centre of Nirmohi Akhara in Ayodhya. It is necessary for the Mahant of Nirvani Akhara to hold the weapons. Ramanandacharya never put on the weapon.

Holding weapon is also not necessary to the Sampradayacharya under Ramananda Sect. I also hold Dand. It is not a weapon It is prepared in accordance with the principle of Tatwatreya of Ramanand. It is made of Vilva, Plas and Bamboo. It indicates Brahm, life and wealth. The Dand is made of wood. Upper part is called sumeroo, which is a symbolic of Brahm. There is a sign of Tilak in the upper part of Dand, which is the main sign of Ramananda Sect.

I have been residing in Ayodhya since the time I became Sarnpradacharya. My Headquarter is at Panch Gangaghat, Kashi. At the Headquarter situated at

Panchghat, Kashi other sadhus live there. Ramanand Sect has no other Headquarter at any place in India. The name of my disciple are suffixed by the word Dass or Saran. They do not get any degree after that. At present my two disciples are present in the court. One is Ramdevacharya and second is Kaushlendra Dass. The item like club in their hand is called Nishan ki Chari. This Nisan goes with the Sampradacharya. The four Jagadguru were not there since the beginning. Four Jagadguru were from the last hundred years. They were elected at a different times. There are 52 voters in all four sects, spread over throughout the India. Chatu Sect, select the 52 voters. Chatu Sampradaya means, Ramanand, Nimbark, Ballabh and Madhva. These four together form Chatu Sampradaya. There are four representative Mahant of the four Sampradaya. The 52 persons, who have voting rights, are elected by Ramanandiya Sect Samaj. Ramanandiya Sect has 90 lakhs sadhus. These 90 lakhs sadhus together elect the 52 voters who in turn elect the Sampradacharya.- These 52 voters elect one Sampradacharya. Similarly other three Sampradaya elect their Sampradacharya. Similarly twenty thousands people in Madhwa Sampradaya, Nimbark Sampradaya and Ballabh Sampradaya elect 52 voters. And similarly forty thousands people of Nimbark Sampradaya elect 52 voters. In Ballabh Sampradaya approx. thirty thousand people elect 52 voters. Ramanandacharya of Madhva Sampradaya is Madhvacharya, at present. Achatya Shri ji is the present Acharya of Nimbark, who lives at Salemabad in Rajasthan. Madhavacharya lives at Surat in Gujrat. Similarly Kalyanraiji is a Sampradayacharya of Ballabh who lives at Surat in Gujarat. Shri Ram Bhadryacharya of Chitrakoot belongs to Ramanandiya Sampradayacharya. I blessed him with Dand. Rambhadracharyaji is an Upacharya of Ramanandiya Sampradaya. He is my Upacharya. The

objective and philosophy of these four Sects differs from each other. Ramanand Sect follows the Vāsistadwet principle of Ramanandacharya. Ballabh Sect follows the Krishna in his childhood. Nimbark Sect's God born as Jyotiswaroop on Nib, that's why it is called Nib Sampradaya. Nib means the tree of Neem. Madya Sect follows the Madhurupasana hence it is called Madya Sect. Their philosophy is Sidhadev. Ramchander is the God of Ramanand Sampradaya. Radaji is followed by Ballabh Sampradaya and Radha Krishan is followed by Madhva Sampradaya. The method of prayer is different. Nimbark Sampradaya follows the Radha. Radha is a incarnation of Laxmi. Besides above four sects, there is Ramanuj Sampradaya Ramanuj Sampradaya follows Sriman Narayana and Laxmiji. Besides above four Sects, one Ramanuj Sampradaya is there. Shriman Narayana and Laxhmi is the God of Ramanuj Sampradaya. Similarly there are five Sect in Vaishnav Sampradaya and they all are independent. Among these five, only Ramananda Sampradaya follows Shri Rama. They do not follow the philosophy of Shankarayacharya. There are four seats of Sankracharya in India but Sankaracharyas are many in number. Srigesi, Pun, Rameshwaram and Badrinath are among them. Prayag is a sub-seat, which comes under Badrinath seat. I am not recollecting the name of Shankaracharya of Srigeri seat. Nishalanandji is a Shankaracharya of Rameshwaram seat, Swaroopa Nand Sarswati is a Shankaracharya of Badrinath and Chinmayanandji is a Shankaracharya of Pun. The philosophy of all these four seats differs from the philosophy of Ramanand sect. All these Sankaracharya follows the Nirnimesh Brahrn. Ramanand Sect follows the Sagun Sakar. Sankaracharya of Kanchi is a Sankaracharya of Rameshwaram. Sankaracharya of Rameshwaram follows the Shankarji but only his

Nirnimesh. Jagannath is followed by the Sankaracharya of Pun. No meeting was held ever of four Sankaracharya's and five Sankaracharya of Vaishnav Sarnaj in regard to the birth place of Rama. I met all the Sankaracharyas 25 years before, at Runopali in Ayodhya where a large Yagna was held. I have also participated in the yagna. Sankaracharya swaroopanand and one more Sankaracharya, perhaps Niranjana Dev Teerth Sankaracharya of Sringeri are alive. The name of Shankracharya is Niranjana Dev Teerth, about whom I said that the name is not remembered to me. Other Sankaracharyas who participated in the Yagna are not alive. These Sankaracharya made speeches but there was no reference of Ramjanmbhoomi in their speeches. Swami Niranjana Devji spoken over cow-slaughter. I do not know whether any one of them, or four together went to Ramjanmbhoomi or not. These four Sankaracharya stayed in Swargdwar Mohalla and Ranopalli Mohalla, in Ayodhya. They stayed in Ayodhya for two-three days. No Shankaracharya, other than above, participated in the Yagna at Ranopali. Besides these, there are 21 self styled or political Sankaracharyas. Vasudevanand of Prayag and Chinmayanand of Sumeru Seat are one of them. These 21 Sankaracharya also follows the Adweiat principle. All four Sankaracharya, including the above 21 Sankaracharya and their Ist-dev is not different from those of other Sankaracharya. They follow their Ist-dev as a matter of practice. All these Sankaracharya believes that only Brahm is true and universe is not true. Soul is the Brahm and none one else. They all do not follow Rama. Although in practice they do. They believe in Panchdevs and thirty-three crores God/Goddess, but only for the purpose of practice prevailed. Thirty-three crores God/Goddess were referred in Ved-Puranas. These veds and purans are the same, which I referred above in my statement. There are

four Ved, four up-Ved, 18 main Purans, 18 up Purans and 18 Oap Purans. Besides, there is no Ved and Purans. Smirties are there, these are in 8 numbers. None other than the above mentioned Ved-Purans, have the reference about thirty-three God/Goddess.

The period of Aadi Sankaracharya was hundred to two hundred years before the Ramanandacharya. The books written by early Sankaracharya are available. Geeta Bhasya, Upnishad Bhasya, Brahm Sutra Bhasya and Charpatmanjari are among them. These books are in Sanskrit. I have no knowledge whether Sankaracharya had written any book in Tamil or not. I have read all the books written by Aadi Sankaracharya. No book written by Sankaracharya, referred his visit to Ayodhya. I do not know the number of disciple of early Sankaracharya. I have no knowledge, who succeeded him. I have read about the life and believe of Sankaracharya, in the book "Adarsh Charitawali" written by Bhagwati Saran. There is mention in this book that he went for darshan of Ganga Manorama in through Ayodhya. Ganga-Manorama, which is now a days is called Makhora and 'the 'real name was Makhstali, which is still there. Makhstali means Yagnasthal. It is at a distance of 14 Km. in the north of disputed site in Ayodhya. There are temples of Sitaram, Ram, Laxman, Bharat, Satrugan and Hanumanji. These temples said to be eight hundred to one thousand years old. In the books written by early Sankaracharya there are reference of Ramachanderji. He has written Vishnu Sahastra in which he described the importance of Ram. Dasrath putra Ram was referred in it but no mention of Dasrath or his Queens or birth place of Rarna. Besides, Sankaracharya written Geeta Bhasya in which he mentioned about Ramchandra. Explaining the main slok in Geeta he mentioned Rama. There is no mention about King Dasrath in Geeta Bhasya. Similarly there is no

mention of Queens of Dasrath and birth of Ramchander. In the book written by Sankaracharya there is no reference of King Dasrath and his Queens. Similarly in the book written by early Sankaracharya, there is no reference about Ramchander and his birth place.

I have been living in Ayodhya for last fifty-fifty five years. I have listening about Janm Bhoomi since I came to Ayodhya. During my stay in Ayodhya among the Sir - Sangchalaks of R.S.S. only Go visited Ayodhya 25 to 30 years ago. I do not know whether he visited the disputed place or not. He made his speech at Tulsi Chaura in Ayodhya. I am not sure whether since the inception of R.S.S. its principles are in agreement with the principles of Ramanandiya Sect or not. Their principles are quite different and they believe in nationalism means Hindutava. Hindutava is not included in the religious belief of early Sankaracharya and Ramanandacharya. I am not related to R.S.S. I have been in the conferences of R.S.S. But I differ from them. They believe in all God/Goddess but their adorable is Saffron Flag. I do not know what they mean from Saffron Flag He himself said that according to their belief, unless a head of a nation is an ascetic and a renouncer, he cannot develop the nation.

I know the organization called Vishwa Hindu Parishad. It was established approx. fifty years before. I do not know who established it. Religious belief of Vishwa Hindu Parishad is that they followed him, who is helpful to them only. Vaishnav Shaqua, Shaiv, Jam and Budhs are also its members. At present their adorable is Ramchandraji. Who was their adorable before him, I do not know. Vishwa Hindu Parishad started coming to Ayodhya for last ten-fifteen years, two to three years before the inauguration in 1989 Since than only they

started talking about Ramjanmbhoomi. They might be the devotee of Rama prior to that time but after inauguration they started taking active part. I have participated in the conferences convened by Vishwa Hindu Parishad at so many times. In 1984, whether any member of V.H.P. participated in the yatra organized by Mahant Avedanath and Day Dayal Khanna from Sitamadhi to Ayodhya, I do not know. I have no knowledge about the resolution adopted during the bath in Saryu at that time Ashok Singhal and Giriraj Kishore, Leader of V.H.P. are personally known to me. They do come to my Ashram. Besides, Praveen Togadia and Vishnu Hari Dalmia are known to me. I have heard about the declaration of V.H.P. that Ramjanambhoomi would be constructed at the disputed site but I have no other personal information. I never attended the meetings of Ramjanambhoomi Trust. I was not present in the meeting wherein it was decided to establish Ramjanambhoomi Trust. Swami Shivramacharya was the Sampradacharya of Ramanand Sect, prior to me. He was the Chairman of Ramjanambhoomi. I have not been invited to take part in the activities of Ramjai Bhoomi Trust. The Headquarter of Trust is at Karsewakpuram. After Shivaramacharya, Ramchander Paramhans became the Chairman of Ramjanambhoomi Trust. He is known to me since childhood. The present Chairman of the trust, Nritya Gopal Dassji is known to me since student life. He is not my Guru but a friend. Nritya Gopal Dass belong to Digambar Akhara. I do not know the Mahant Suresh Dass. I have no knowledge about his Akhara. Paramhans Ramchander Dass was a Mahant of Digambar Akhara, now Suresh Dassji is a Mahant in his place. I used to go to Digambar Akhara but after I was appointed Acharya, I go on invitation only. Similarly I go to Nirmohi Akhara or any other Akhara or to any Sadhu only on invitation Present Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara, the name I forget, is known to

me for last five to ten years. Mahant Bhaskar Dassji is known to me for last fifty to sixty years, from the time when he was a priest. He is an old Sadhu.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

27.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, the suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 28.7.2004.

(Han Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

27.7.2004

www.vadaprativada.in

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special
Duty,- High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 28.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 27.7.2004, cross-examination
by Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 9,
Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

Upon seeing the document No. 261 C-1/1 and 261 C-1/2, Valmiki Ramayana, witness said Valmiki Ramayana, published from Geeta Press is in two volumes and is complete and authentic. No book was written before it. This book is one crore, eighty-one lakhs sixty thousand one hundred and three years old. The original book was written on Bhoj Patra. Besides, it was also written in Valkal i.e. skin of tree. The entire book was written by Maharishi Valmiki Maharishi who was contemporary to Ramchanderji. Ramchanderji said to be born in 24th Tretayug. One crore eighty-one lakhs, sixty thousand one hundred and three years have passed away from 24th Tretayug. 25th Kalyug is going on at present. Five thousand years have been passed since 25th Kalyug. There are four Kalyug. These are Satyug, Treta, Dwapar and Kalyug. I do not remember how long the Satyug is. Similarly the period of Treta and Dwapar is not remembered to me. Kalyug is four lakhs, thirty two

thousand years long. Vidvyasji is contemporary to Maharishi Valmiki. Maharishi Valmiki and Krishn Dwepayan Vyas were contemporary to Ramchanderji, in fact earlier to the birth of Rama. These two persons have not written Vedas because Veds are divine. They have seen the Vedas. Vedas were there before Maharishi Valmiki and Vyasji were born. But secondary Vedas were not there. Vedas were born with God. Bhagwan asked Vedas, who they were. Vedas replied that, we are your palpitation and we will chant your various characters. Bhagwan means Bhagwan Ram Various Maharishies have made the darshan of Richas of Veds. This is the reason that Viniyog are written before every richas, which means, which rishi has made the darshan of which richas first. At the time when Bhagwan Ram went to heaven, Ved were there because Ved are Saswat i.e. the things who never Vanishad. Ved are there today. Ved has two forms one is in the form of Visual and other is in the form of poem. Poem form is also called Shravya form and Veds are exist today in this form. Vedas born as a human with God, stayed for 31 thousand years. Veds are four in number. So four mans were born in the form of Ved. They were not named Rigved after their birth. Ved Vyas gave name to four Ved. Ved Vyas is immortal. He still exists hut he keeps changing. Ved Vyas who was at the time of Rama, is still. He is immortal. But he is not visible. Maharishi Valmiki is also immortal. He is still alive.

Ramchanderji lived for eleven thousand years. All peoples from Ayodhya have not gone with Rama to heaven. Some people remain back. That's why Ayodhya is inhabited to-day. He himself said he offered Kingdom to Kush. Hence Kush had ruled Ayodhya after Ramchander. From the time of Ramchanderji to upto-day Ayodhya neither deserted nor desolated.

Slok No. 10 at page 830, document No. 261 C/2 of the second volume of Valmiki mayana was shown to witness, upon which witness said Lthat Uttar Kand of Valmiki Ramayana is treated interpolated. This sloks means Ayodhya remained deserted for long. It was inhabited during the time of Rishabh Dev. The above facts according my faith is not correct. This part was added later, approx. 7-8 thousand years before. I do not know who added part. King Rishabhdev was religions preceptor of Jainism. He ruled Ayodhya. When he ruled Ayodhya, I cannot say. Rishabh Dev was before Mahatma Budh. Budh and Mahabir were contemporary. King Rishabh Dev might be 6-7 thousand years before.

A part of statement given to-day "The book Valmiki ramayana, published from Geeta Press, is complete and authentic", was read out to witness. Witness said his statement is true. The statement given by him to-day that "The Uttar Kand of Valmiki Ramayana..... was added later" was readout to witness. Witness said that my statement was correct.

Question: According to you, both the part of Valmiki Ramayana are authentic. If so than the slok No. 10 written in second part, which was read out to you, is not correct, according to you.

Answer: Some people recognized the entire book as an authentic and some people recognized it upto Udh Kand.

Question: Should I presume that in accordance with the above statement you are not taking both the part of Valmiki Ramayana in full as authentic one? Hence the above statement given by you

is not correct that the book is complete and authentic.

(Upon this question, Shri R.L. Verma, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that this question is being asked again. Witness has already given its answer. In addition to this, complex question, combining two facts, is being asked. Hence it cannot be answered in one go. So such question may not be allowed.)

Answer: The above mentioned books are complete. But some people do not take the entire part as authentic. I take the part upto Udhkand as authentic one. The later part, I do not treat authentic.

Whether the contents of the part of Valmiki Ramayana, which I treat authentic. Its contents are authentic or not, I can tell only after seeing the book. He himself said a number of parts were added later on. Jams take Uttarkand as authentic one. None in Ramanandiya Sect take after math part Udh Kand as authentic one. Some facts are authentic and some are not. 26th slok at page No. 805 of the document No. 261 C-I/2 was shown to witness. Witness said its translation given in the book is correct. The fact written in this slok is correct that there are 24 thousand slok and one hundred Upakhayan in the book. The Sadhu referred in this slokas renouncer is Maharishi Valmiki. Gayatri Mantra contains 24 letters. But only 23 letters are pronounced. Similarly out of 24 thousand sloks in Valmiki Ramayana, one thousand sloks are interpolated. All 24 thousand sloks are authentic and only 23 thousand are authentic for chanting and rest one thousand sloks are treated interpolated.

Question: My question is this that this book contains 24 thousands sloks. Whether this number is including the sloks in Uttar Kand or excluding it?

Answer: This number of 24 thousand sloks is including the number of Uttar Kand.

The Ramayana was written during the lifetime of Rama. This book Valmiki Ramayana referred the birth place of Rama. This is referred in slok No. 30 at page 64 of 15th canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayan as under:

Shri Ram, as a human being had thought about Janambhoomi. This was the background for Janambhoomi. The meaning of the slok given in the book is correct but it is having an emotional content. He himself stated that Bhagwan had decided to construct Janambhoomi after giving blessing and assurance to Devtas.

Question: Whether sloks means that the situation referred in, was prior to the idea of Janambhoomi taken place?

Answer: Yes. Chintayamas means, resolution to take birth on the earth and preferred Ayodhya. This resolution was taken before birth.

Question: This slok neither refer Ayodhya nor the place specific, about which the resolution was taken to take birth there.

Answer: Manusey means, the resolution to take birth in Ayodhya, the city of constructed by Manu.

Besides this, there was a reference in other sloks about birth of Rama. It was mentioned in slok No. 31, at page No. 64 of document No. 261 C-1/1. This slok refer that Bhagwan Shri Ram taken birth in the palace of King

Dasrath in Chaturvid. It means that Bhagwan decided to take birth in four characters i.e. Ram, Laxman Bharat and Shatrughan and decided to take birth in the house of Dasrath.

It was also mentioned in slok No. 10, at page No. 69 of 18th canto of the above books. It was stated therein that Bhagwan Ramji was born to Bhagwati Kaushaliya. He was full with all divine lights and all people bowed there in reverence. It may be possible that other sloks may be there in Valmiki Ramayana, wherein birth of Rama was referred. Witness said that it was referred in Balkand also.

Question: From the word used in three sioks referred by you, which are at page No. 64 and 69 of first part of Valmiki Ramayana it does not appear from any word that specific place was earmarked, where Rama will take birth may have been mentioned

Answer: it is not correct. In all three sloks, Ramjanambhoomi was described in detail. He himself said in the first canto of Valmiki Ramayan "Ramasya Janm Sumhatviryam Tantra." Here Tantra means Ayodhyasthali

Question: Can you say at what place (page/slok) in Valmiki Ramayana the slok is, which you have readout?

Answer: On seeing the slok No. 10 at page No. 36 of document No. 261 C-1/1 the witness said that place specific was mentioned therein where Ramchander to take birth. This slok is in third canto of Valmiki Ramayana.

The part of slok, about which I said that it was appearing in first canto of Valmiki Ramayana, infact appears in slok No. 10 of third canto.

Question: There is no mention of a place about the birth of Ramchander in the slok No. 10 of third canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayan referred by you?

Answer: It is not correct to say that there is no mention of birth of Rama in this slok. The word Sarvanukoltam, figuring in the slok means, "Rama was born when Jog, Lagan, Grah, Days, Date and Place were favour.

Question: You are knowingly giving incorrect meaning of these four sloks?

Answer: It is not correct to say that the meaning of the slok is not correct. In these four sloks birth of Shri Ram, Grih Gochar and Place were described.

Question: Have you remembered any slok of Valmiki Ramayan other than above four sloks, in which there is reference in regard to the birth of Rama?

Answer: Sloks are there but I do not remember

The four sloks at page 36, 64 and 9, which I referred in my statement were regarding the birth of Rama in the palace of Maharaj Dasrath. The area of palace of Maharaja Dasrath, as referred in Valmiki Ramayana is situated within five Km. of Ayodhya. He himself said that it is under five Kaushi parikarma. Palace of Dasrath begins from the place where from parikarma starts and it is upto the point where parikarma comes to an end. At present Panchkaushi parikarma starts from many places, Rinmochan Ghat, Jhunki Ghat, Raj Ghat and Naya Ghat.

The people residing opposite to parikarma route start their parikarma from Tapsi Chavani. Parikarma comes to an end at the place where it starts. People took both in Saryu after completion of Parikarma. All Ghat, from where parikarma starts, are at the bank of Saryu. Saryu is in the north of Ayodhya. People go by the side of Sheetalamari, in the south side, on parikarma. Sheetalamari is in Ayodhya, at a distance of two to two and half Km. from disputed site. People pass by the side of ban chavani, on parikarma. People perform parikarma in a circle. What I mean to say, that palace of Dasrath falls with in the circle route of Parikarma. In which canto, sloks of Valmiki Ramayana, it is referred, I do not remember.

Question: The description of said palace of King Dasrath is nowhere in Valmiki Ramayana?

Answer: It is correct that there is no mention of Dasrath's palace in Valmiki Ramayana from the point of parikarma. I have no knowledge about any reference in Valmiki Ramayana in this regard.

Question: There is no mention about the length and width of the palace of Dasrath or about its area, in Valmiki Ramayana?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of' in other original suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that this question is being asked again. Witness' had already replied this question. Hence such question should not be allowed again.)

Answer: It is not correct to say that there is no complete description about this, Valmiki Ramayana. It is described in it.

In which sloks, in which canto, in which Kand of Valmiki Ramayana, the area, length and width of palace, was described, I do not remember I can tell you tomorrow, after going through the book. I agree with the area of Ayodhya, given in Valmiki Ramayana. The area of to-day's Ayodhya is much higher than the area of than Ayodhya.

Length and width of Ayodhya was given in slok No. 7, at page No. 41, in fifth canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana. It was said to be 12 yojan in length (one yojan is equal to 8 miles, approx.) and 3 Yojaii in width. As such the length and width of Ayodhya comes to 48 kaush and 12 kaush respectively. 48 kaush stand for 96 miles. Ayodhya of to-day is much bigger than this area. Ayodhya conies to an end at the bank of Saryu. He himself said that Ayodhya spread over upto Makhroa or Makhsthali in the north. Makhroa is in the north of Saryu. He said it was mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana. In southern side, it is spread over upto Ranopali. Makhroa is at a distance of 25 Km. from Ranopali. He further said that 80 kaushi parikarma covers the present Ayodhya. This parikarma begins from the Jamdagni Kund in Distt Gaunda where there was a Gosala (cow shed) of King Dasratha. Jamdagni Kund is at a distance of 35 Km from Ramghat, Ayodhya. Jamdagni Kund is within the modem Ayodhya. A part of Distt. Gaunda is within the present Ayodhya. 80 Kaushi parikarma begins from Jamdagni Kund and passes through many villages, the name of which I do not remember I do not know at what place the parikarma comes to an end in the southern side.

Question: It is 84 kaushi parikarma and not 80 kaushi parikanna?

Answer: It is correct.

The 80 kaushi parikarma is in fact 84 kaushi parikarma. Ayodhya is spread over in length towards east-west and in width, towards north-south. Ayodhya begins from the Ashram of Sringeri Ashram, situated in the east of disputed site. I do not remember the distance of Sringeri Rishi Ashram from the disputed site, in east. May be at the distance of 25-30 Kms. In west, Ayodhya begins from Tanda village also called Tanduwa, adjacent to Saryu. In north of Ayodhya, there is a Makhsthal, which begins from Ganga Manorama. Makhsthal is at a distance of 30 Kms. from the disputed site. In south, Ayodhya begins from Gurukul. Gurukul is at the distance of 8 Kms. from the disputed site. Makhsthal, according to my knowledge, is at a distance of more than 36 Kms. from Gurukul. Tanda or Tanduwa is at a distance of 96 miles or more from Sringeri Rishi Ashram.

The couplet, Janmbhoomi Mumpuri Suhawani, Uttar Disha Saryu Bahi Pawani next to third couplet of Uttar Kand, document No. 258 C-1/2 of Ramcharitmanas was shown to witness, upon which witness said this part of Ramcharitmanas is correct. It is written in the couplet that Saryu River flows on the north. of my Suhawani birthplace. Suhawani birthplace means, Ayodhya. According to this description, Ayodhya, in north does not come to an end at the bank of Saryu but it is spread over upto Makhsthal.

Question: What I mean to say that from the above couplet it concluded that Ayodhya is spread over upto Saryu River only and the part in the north of Saryu cannot be, treated as a part of Ayodhya?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of plaintiff in other original suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that the couplet contents the view of

one person only. Hence question cannot be asked from witness in this regard. In addition, the boundary specified in the couplet is a subject of interpretation. Hence question cannot be asked in this regard.)

Answer: It is not correct. Had it been so; Maharaja would have not performed the Yagna in the land, which does not pertain to him.

Question: It is possible that the Saryu, which is flowing in the present place, had been flowing at a distance in the north side?

Answer: There is no fixed place where Saryu flows. Every year, it changes the route. Sometime in the north, sometime shifted to the side of Ayodhya and sometime it merges with Ganga Manorama.

Question: Had Saryu shifted to north-south side ever since the time you have been living in Ayodhya.

Answer: Yes.

It never happened that original route of Saryu had been changed towards north or south: It might be possible that its main route had been Li the south-west of the present route. I do not know the present distance of Saryu from the disputed site was less in old times. It is not correct to say that the actual length and width of Ayodhya was much less than what I am stating.

There is reference in Valmiki Ramayana that palace of King Dasratha was at a distance from the palace of his Queens. Palace of Queens was also under the palace of Dasratha. He himself said it included the private residence and the other palace of other Queens and also the palace of Ramchanderji and Sita. He himself said each brother

had his own palace. The palace where the palace of Kaushaliya, Sumitra, Kaikeyi and King Dasratha are situated at present, were also at the same site during the time of Dasrath. At present Sumitra Bhawan is situated in east-south of the disputed site. The said Bhawan has since been demolished. I do not know when the Bhawan was demolished, perhaps 10- 15 years before, but I cannot say the definite time. I have heard that it was demolished during the time of Chief Ministership of Kalayan Singh, for making the land plain. I visited the Sumitra Bhawan 15-20 years before. There were a number of idols in Sumitra Bhawan. There were the idols of Shri Ram, Laxman, Bharat, Satrugan, Sumitra and Hanumanji. The Bhawan, called Kaushaliya Bhawan is in the east-north of the disputed site. Kaushaliya Bhawan is at a distance of two to two hundred and fifty feet from the disputed site. Sumitra Bhawan is at a distance of hundred to hundred and fifty feet from the dispute & site Kaikeyi Bhawan is in the north of Kaushaliya Bhawan. Kop Bhawan is in the east of Kaikeyi Bhawan. Kaikeyi Bhawan is at a distance of 50- 60 feet from Kaushaliya Bhawan. There are idols of Ram chanderji, Sitaji, Laxmanji, Bharatji, Satruganji, Kaushaliyaji and Hanumanji in Kaushaliya Bhawan. I have seen these idols last time, 15 years before. There are idols of Shri Ram, Laxman, Bharat, Satrugan, Kaikeyi and Hanumanji in Kaikeyi Bhawan. Kaushaliya Bhawan and Kaikeyi Bhavari still exist. Kop bhawan might be there even today. I have not gone since long. There was an idol of Kaikeyi in Kop Bhawan. Red colour represent to anger. So the idol was painted with Red colour. Kaushaliya Bhawan and Kaikeyi Bhawan were from the time of Dasrath. He himself said these Bhawans are at the places, where they were at the time of Dasrath.

Question: Whether the Kaushaliya Bhawan and Kaikeyi Bhawan were made of Lakhori bricks, Gumna bricks, cement and stones or from other material?

Answer: It has been changed due to reconstruction. Present reconstruction is made of solid bricks and cement.

Present construction is four-five hundred years old. The palace wherein Ramchanderji and Sitaji were said to be resided, is Kanak Bhawan at present, which was gifted to Sitaji by Queen Kaikeyi at Muhdikhai.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

28.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 29.7.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

28.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 29.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 28.7.2004, cross-examination
by Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 9,
Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

Idols of Sita-Ram, Laxmanji, Hanumanji and Ramlalla
are there in the present Kanak Bhawan. From Ramlalla I
mean, child Rama. The site of Kanak Bhawan is the same
at which it was during the time of Dasrath. Similarly the
area of Kaushaliya Bhawan. Dasrath Mahal or Barasthan
is at the east-south corner of Kanak Bhawan. Dasrath
Mahal is also a temple. There are idols of Ram, Laxman,
Sitaji and Hanurnanji inside the Dasrath Mahal and not an
idol of Dasratha. The Dasrath palace is at the same place
where it was during the time of Dasrath. This is the same
place, which I referred as Rajmahal. Palace of Dasratha
was referred in Valmiki Ramayana. It was referred in slok
No. 8,9 and 10 of fourth canto, at page No. 188 in
document No. 261 C-I/I King palace is referred in slok No.
8, slok No. 9 refers the palace of Dasrath. Similarly 10th
slok refers the Bhawan of father of Raghav. Area of palace
of Dasrathji or its length and width has not been given in
Valmiki Ramayana. Similarly the area, i.e. length and
width of others Bhawan, Kaushaliya Bhawan, Sumitra

Bhawan, Kaikeyi Bhawan has not been given in Valmiki Ramayana. Slok No. 4 at page No. 188 of the book refers the Bhawan of Ramchandra. Slok No. 29 at page No. 189 of this book refers about Ramchandra's going to the palace of Kaushaliya from his palace. In the slok, later to above slok, there is a reference about the Pujan of Dev, being performed by Kaushaliya. This Dev was a Bhagwan Rangnath. This slok also referred the puja of Rajyalaxhmi, which Kaushaliya performed for the welfare of Ramchanderji. Rajyalaxhmi means Royal throne. In slok No. 30 at page No. 190, there is a reference of doing Jap of Sriman Narayan. Sriman Narayan means, Bhagwan Rangnath. In slok No. 41, at this page, there is a reference of Bhagwan Vishnu. Kaushaliya had worshiped the Bhagwan Vishnu. She is asking the blessing of Bhagwan Vishnu, for succession to Ramchanderji. Ramchanderji is an incarnation of Mahavishnu. Vishnu and Mahavishnu are individuals. He himself said that Baikunthadhis Sriman Narayan as Bharat, Sriram Sanyee Sriman Narayana as a Laxman, Swetadhipatti Uma Sriman Narayana as Satrugan were born to serve the Rama, incarnation of Mahavishnu. It was also mentioned in Shiv Sanhita. It is referred in slok No. 114 at page No. 195, document No. 261 C-1/1, that at that time, the palace was full of men and women overjoyed with pleasures. The palace referred in the slok was the palace where Ramchandra lived before marriage. That palace was not a Rajbhawan. It was called Ramvesh or Ram Mahal. Ramvesh was referred in slok No. 14. The reference figured in fifth canto and first canto was about the Rajyabhisek. Ramchanderji was married before his Rajyabhisek. At that Sita was residing with Ramchanderji in King's palace. It is said that coronation was held after two to three month after their marriage. Ramchanderji did not go alongwith Sitaji in Kanak Bhawan at the time of

Rayabhisek. At the occasion in which connection of above facts were narrated, Ramchanderji was residing in a Kings palace. My above statement that the palace where Ramchanderji was residing before his marriage was not a King's palace is not correct. Raj Bhawan and Raj Mahal are synonym. In slok No. 15, at page No. 191 of the book, there is a reference that the palace from where Ramchanderji came out was the best palace among the Raj Mahals. There is a reference that palace of Dasrath was the best among the Raj Bhawans. Witness again said that sloks referred the palace where Rama was living. The word Prakhyat was used in the slok. Prakhyat means the famous buildings among the palace and in Ayodhya. Palace of Ramchanderji alongwith Dasratha was famous among the public.

Question: Whether in accordance with the Valmiki Ramayana. The Marg (road) on which the above Raj Bhawan situated was called Rajmarg.

Answer: The roads aside the above Bhawans, were not only the Rajmarg but also all the roads in Ayodhya were called Rajmarg, which were full of gathering at the time of Rajyabhisek.

At present, the road leading to Gorakhpur from Faizabad is called a Rajmarg. This is the main Rajmarg. Besides this, all the roads are called Rajmarg. I mean the road constructed by the Govt. are called Rajmarg. The road leading to Faizabad from Lucknow and the road by which I go to Lucknow from Faizabad is also called Rajmarg.

Slok No. 13 at page No. 42 of the book was shown to witness. Witness said there is mention of ditch around the Ayodhya, which is very difficult to cross. The facts written

in the book about the time of King Dasrath, in fifth canto are correct. The Ayodhya as mentioned in slok No. 8, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 at page No. 41 and 42 of fifth canto, matches the present geographic of Ayodhya having gardens all around and pitcher, with gold plates at Rajdwar. Pitcher at Rajdwar is of the gold Besides good Rajmargs also there. Ayodhya to-day is in the shape of fish, as it was than. Otherwise Ayodhya in the present time does not match with the Ayodhya of that time. Ayodhya was not constructed by King Dasrath. Slok No. 22 at page No. 42 was shown to witness and he was asked.

Question: Is there a mention about the Ayodhya that it was constructed by King Dasrath?

Answer: There is no such mention. But it was mentioned that people who were craftsman, the people who can shoot at the voice points, people with high caliber and philosophers, were inhabited in different small puries. The slok No. 9 at page 41 of the book was shown to witness.

Question: Whether this slok that Ayodhya was constructed / inhabited by King Dasrath?

Answer: There is a mention that King Dasrath has developed the Ayodhya. There is no mention about its construction. This slok also refers the people to whom I referred in a reply to 19 questions that Ayodhya was inhabited by the skilled peoples.

Ayodhya, first of all was constructed by Manu. This Manu is called Vewswat Manu i.e. 7th Manu. One kalp is equal to a time of one Manu. One Kalpa is equal to one thousand chaturyug. One thousand kapa is equal to a day

of Brahma. Time of one Manu is equal to a day of Brahma. On seeing the book, he brought with him, he said one chaturyug is equal to 43 lakhs 20 thousand years. Satyug is equal to 17 lakhs 28 thousand years. Treta is equal to 12 lakhs 96 thousand years, Dwaper is equal to 8 lakhs 64 thousand and Kalyug is equal to 4 lakhs, 32 thousand years.

Manu originated the universe first. But I believe that the originator of universe is not Manu but Brahmaji. Manu was created by Brahma. At present, the period of 7th Manu is going on. Bhagwan Vishnu and Mahesh were also originated by Brahmaji. There are two Mahapralaya (Destruction) in a kalpa. 28th chaturyug of the present kalp is going on at present. Present time is 28th Kalyug of this kalp. In the first and second line of the statement given by me yesterday at page 56, I have stated that at present 25th Kalyug is going on. While to-day I said it is 28th Kalyug. It is by mistake. The correct position is that 25th Kalyug is going on. 38 lakhs, 93 thousand years of present chaturyug have been passed away. Yesterday I said that Ramchanderji was born in 24th Treta. It is correct. Satyug comes first and then comes Tretayug.

Question: According to you Ramchanderji was born in 24th Treta and at present 25th Kalyug is going on. So whether Ramchanderji was born 64 lakhs 85 thousand years before.

Answer: It is not correct. I believe that Ramchanderji was born one crore, 81 lakhs, 60 thousand years ago. What is the basis of my statement, I will tell you tomorrow. He said, I would be able to reply the question, after reading Haribansh Puran.

I had said that Manu was a first human. He was 6 thousand kalpa before. One thousand chaturyuga is equal to one kalpa and one kalpa is equal to 4 Arab, 32 crores years. I believe that six kalpa had passed away and present is 7th. Thus 25 Arab 92 crores years have passed away. There is lot of difference in between the present time human and the first human. Earlier human was big in size. For how long the present size of a. man is in existence, I cannot say. Period is not known in this regard.

Document No. 261 C-1/3 of the document No. 261 C 1/1 was shown to witness. I cannot say whether this size of physique was available before one crore, 81 lakhs years or not. The size given in the picture can be hypothetical. Similarly the size shown in 261 C-1/1/8 of document No. 261 C-1/1/1 can also be hypothetical.

Question: Is it correct to say that there is no evidence in support that such human exists one lakhs years before?

Answer: It is not correct to say. Evidences are there in Veds.

There is an evidence in Rigved. I do not remember in which Richas it is. But I can reply it tomorrow after studying All Veds referred about Ramchanderji i.e. Rigved, Yazurved, Samved, Atharvved, Brahaman, Satpath, Upnishad. Brahaman, Upnishad and Satpath are the part of Veds. There is a reference about Ram incarnation in these Veds. About his birth, no particular place has been mentioned. There is a reference that he has taken birth is Suryakul. Suryakul and Suryavansh is one and the same.

Question: Whether all these four Veds were written after the time of Ramchanderji or were existed before Ram incarnation?

These Veds were not existed in writing. These were in the divine form. After Rama, when Rishies Shaw the Veds, than they have written it. Veds were written before Rama was born. Their script and language are similar to the script and languages of Veds of to-day. Veds, for the first time were written on Bhojpatra and Valkal/skin of tree. I have seen the manuscript of Vedas in Sarswati Library of Sanskrit University, Varanasi. In addition to this, manuscript written on wood and stones are there. I came to know about that Veds were written in Bhojpatra, Balkal, Kast and stones from the catalog. I have seen it when I was stydying in the said University, almost 50 years ago. These manuscripts contain, a few parts from Rigved and sloks from other Veds. This fact is not known, where the other parts of Veds are, which are not in the said Sarswati Library. He himself said some of its part was in Nalanda University but it was heard that it was destroyed in the fire. I cannot say whether the manuscript written in Bhojpatra etc. and kept in Saraswati Library were written before the birth of Bhagwan Ram.

Question: You have stated in your statement today that Veds had been written before the birth of Ramchanderji and in regard to birth of Ramchanderji you have stated that he was born one crore,; 81 lakhs; 60 thousand and 103 years before. Hence manuscript must be more than one crore, 81 lakhs, 60 thousand, 103 years old.

Answer: I have no knowledge about this. I have been told in the University that these manuscripts were very old.

I have stated in the statement given by me to-day, that original manuscript of Valmiki Ramayana was written Bhojpatra or Balkal (skin of tree). I have seen some parts of manuscript of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana in Baraha area. This area is in Distt. Gaunda. I have seen this manuscript 30- 35 years ago. He himself said he visited there in a conference of scholars. These manuscripts were in Paska temple. This temple is managed by a Mahatma who was from Ayodhya, belongs to Ramanandiya Sampradaya. But I do not know his name. I have no knowledge, about which Akhara or temple he belongs to. I have seen the first slok of Valmiki Ramayana, written in black ink on the Bhojpatra. The priest was 80 years old at that time. He told me that this is the original manuscript of Ramayana written by Maharishi Valmiki. This manuscript was written during the time of Ramchander after his birth. The Sanskrit, written in it, is similar to the Sanskrit written in document No. 261 C-1/1 of Valmiki Ramayan. The script of the manuscript was similar to the script written in document No. 261 C-1/1. The entire manuscript is not available there. The manuscript of other pan of Valmiki Ramayana was in Nalanda University, which was destroyed in the fire. The statement given by me to-day that 'Veds had been written before the birth of Ramchanderji', is correct.

I have given the statement today that "This manuscript was written after the birth of Ramachanderji" is correct. I made a statement on 28.7.2004, that "Valmiki ramayan document No. 261 C-1/1 and 261 C-1/2..... no book had been written before it," is correct.

Question: According to your statement, you had given yesterday, Valmiki Ramayana is an oldest book and no book was written before that. You have said to-day that Valmiki Ramayan was written during the time of Ramchander, after his birth and on the other hand you said to-day that Veds were written prior to his birth. Would you please tell us that according to your statement Veds are the oldest book and not the Valmiki Ramayan?

Answer: Valmiki Ramayan is a poetry and Veds are divine, which becomes visible and disappeared from time to time. Divine knowledge has no boundation.

Question: My question is concerning to the time period that when these two books were written. Please tell us which of your statement is correct, the statement given by you yesterday regarding Valmiki Ramayan or the statement given to-day regarding Veds.

Answer: Both the statements were correct.

Question: When, on the basis of manuscript written on Bhojpatra and Valkals book was formed for the first time?

Answer: I cannot reply. The same reply is applicable in the case of Valmiki Ramayan.

About Ramchanderji and his birth place, birth time of Ramji, his character and glory, was described in Rudryamal, Skand Puran, Padam Puran Brahm Puran, Purva Puran, Vaman Puran, Brahmavetarva Puran, Kalika Puran, Devi Bhagwat Puran, Ramstavraj excluding Valmiki Ramayan and Ramcharitmanas. The description about the birth of Ramchanderji was given in all the above purans. I have not read the book namely Shri Ramjanambhoomi written by Dr. Radhey Shyam Shukia. I have not read any

book written during the last 100-200 years, on the above subject. One part of Skand Purans is by the name of Ayodhya Mahatamya. I have read Ayodhya Mahatamya thoroughly. I remembered the description about Ramjanambhoomi given in this book. The description given about Ramjanmbhoomi, in Ayodhya Mahatamya of Skand Puran and Patal Khand of Padam Puran is similar. I have submitted the detail of Patal Khand of Padam Puran, in regard to Ramjanmbhoomi, in my main examinee affidavit. I fully remember the detail. I have not brought the book. The book is in Ayodhya. I can call for the book. I am still residing in Ayodhya. I have cited the extract from the first part of Rudiyamal at page 6 of my main examinee affidavit. Page 6 of his main examinee affidavit was shown to witness.

Question: Is which word and sloks of above part of Rudryamal refers about the Janmsthan and Janmbhoomi of Ramchanderji?

Answer: The slok at page No. 6, means that Saryu is in the north and south of Shri Ramjanmbhoomi.

In this slok the word Hareranthgrah stand for Ramjanmbhoomi. It is written in the slok, which comes after the above mentioned slok, that area of Ayodhya is in the shape of fish and this pun (land) pray for the incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu i.e. Rama. This place, Ayodhya, is in the west, east and south at the point from where cows crosses the Saryu and it is in the central part. In the. third slok, among the above slok, it was stated that Saryu was in the north and south of Ayodhya. Saryu is at the distance of three furlong i.e. half Km. in the north of the disputed site. There was a Jalpa drain in the south of disputed site, which now has been covered. Saryu in the south of the disputed site never has been in my knowledge. The direction of Saryu and Tamsa River was given in the third slok at page No. 6 of the affidavit. Drection of

Ramjanmbhoomi was not given. The word Hareranthgrah written in between Saryu and Tamsa in slok No. 6, refers the Ramjanambhoomi. It was not stated in the slok, that Ramjanmbhoomi is situated in between Tamsa and Saryü. It was stated in the slok that Saryu is in the south of Ramjanambhoomi and in the south of northern Chohadi and Tamsa is in the north. Tamsa River has since Vanished 1000 years, 500 years or 2000 years ago, I do not know. On the basis of above detail in Rudryamal, I am talking about the existence of Tamsa River. Rudryamal is almost 500 years old. What I mean from para 30 of my main examinee affidavit that Rudryamal is 500 years old. None other than the word "Harinantra Grih." in the third slok refers Ramjanmbhoomi. There is no reference in any part of Rudryamal, about the Ramjanmbhoomi, other than the extract, which I have submitted in my affidavit, from Rudryamal. He himself said that only its introduction is there. I have read the book namely "Ayodhya Ka Itihas" written by Lala Sitaram, residence of Ayodhya. I might have seen him. He was a scholar. Had he not been a scholar of history, he would have not written this book. He belongs to Ramanand Sampradaya. He was a religious person. He was a devotee of Rama.

I have not seen the book named "Ayodhya Ka Rakt - Ranjit Itihas."

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

29.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 30.7.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

29.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 30.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryachaiya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 29.7.2004 cross-examination
by Shri Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant
No. 9, Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

I have stated in the statement given, by me that
Manu has constructed the Ayodhya. Crores of years have
n passed away from the time seventh Manu inhabited
Ayodhya. Ayodhya was inhabited in between the time of
first and seventh Manu. But it was in a deserted form.
Ayodhya got its resurrection form during the period of
Rama. One crore, eighty one thousand one hundred five
years have been passed away from the time of
Ramchanderji. In my earlier statement I said one hundred
and three years, rather one hundred and five years. It was
based upon the calculation done two years before. I have
by mistake said yesterday that twenty-fifth Kalyug is going
on, at present. There was a mistake in calculation. The
fact is that twenty-eighth Kalyug is going on. I am stating
this on the basis of Skand Puran. Harivansh Puran also
said like this. I could not get the Harivansh Puran in
Lucknow. I have said in the statement given by me that
the mankind existed in India one lakhs year before also.
There is a reference in Rigved, about this, which is as

“Adho Ram Savatriya.” On seeing the Rigved, witness said this reference occurs in 10/3/3. In addition to this, “Chitramasya Ketavo Ram Vindan” also comes on 10/111/7. Which means that the character of Bhagwan Ramchanderji is in the nature creator. He himself said, he is known as Rakar, Makar and Akar i.e. Latvatraya.

Question: From word “beej” (creator) you referred in your statement, it appears that Rishi had seen Ramchanderji as a mankind of to-day?

Answer: Not only “beej” but his character was perceived by Rishi.

Question: Which sentence of Rigved refer the above contention?

Answer: From “Chitrayamasya Ketavo Ram Vindan.”

Question: In the reference, regarding “Beej” from Rigved, you have quoted just now - There is no comparison in between the present mankind and mankind referred in Rigved?

Answer It is not correct to say that no comparison with the present human was given. According to grammar, the “idam” which appears face to face perception. Hence the picture and “Asya” and “Ram” in Veda indicate towards mankind.

Question: According to you Veds were written crores of years before. Can the person characterized in Ved, be compared with the present human?

Answer: They may differ in size, in height, in strength etc.

The Tamsa River which was during the time of Ramchanderji has since vanished. I have read about this in a book, the name of book is not known to me. There is a river called Tons, in the Distt. Azamgarh, but it is quite

different from the Tamsa River, existed during the time of Ramchanderji. Tamsa River passes through the side of Bharat Kund, situated in Distt. Azamgarh. This Tamsa River is called Tons River, but it is not the Tons River of the time of Ramchanderji. The Tons River, passing through the sides of Bharat Kund, merges with Tamsa River. The Tamsa River, about which I said that it was vanished, was passes through the area in between the Bharat Kund and Nandi gram. Besides one more river called Tilodaki was also passes through there. This Tilodaki River was created by King Dasrath. But the Tamsa and Tilodaki, both, are now vanished. The Tamsa River, which I am referring, is not a existing Tamsa rivers, the present Tamsa river which flows from Bhadarsa and Bharat Kund. It is not a river Bharat Kund and Bhadarsa is in the south of Ayodhya. Sringverpur is at a distance of 10-15 Km. (then said at 25 Km.) in south of Ayodhya. On seeing the couplet "Nikasi Vasist dwar Bhai Thade" at page No. 276 of document No. 258 C-I/2 of Ramcharitmanas, witness said "Ramchanderji is standing at the door of Vasista, for going to forest." The door referred above, was at the place, where Vasist Kund is situated at present. The residence of Vasist was in the outer part from the palace. He himself said, that King Dasratha used to go to the residence of Vasista. Ramchanderji went to the forest, passing through the residence of Vasista. On reading the slok No. 84 at page 278 document No. 258 C-I/2 of the book mentioned above, witness said Ramchanderji stayed at the bank of Tamsa river, on the first day, while going to the forest. Upon reading the seventh couplet, next to couplet No. 84, of the above mentioned book, witness said he went to forest from there after staying at the bank of Tamsa river, in the mid night. After reading the two couplets next to couplet No. 86 at page No. 279 of the book, witness said he along with

his brother, secretary and Sita reached Sringvespur, situated at the bank of Ganga-Gomati river in Distt Sultanpur. He gets down from the chariot and bow before Ganga-Gomati. The word Ganga used in the couplet, is called Gomati river now a days. Srigheshwar is in the south of Ayodhya. Saryu is at a distance of 4 Km. from Ramghat, where I live. When I started digging foundation at Ramghat, 15 years before, I found sand upto 10 feet in depth. I means, river keeps changing the route. It might be possible that Tamsa had also changed the route. I read in a book that Tamsa has vanished. It might be incorrect. The Purans I referred in my statement were written by Krishna Dwepayan Vedvyas. There have been 28 Vyas in addition to Krishna Dwapayan. He was contemporary to Rama. Vyas was black in colour, hence he was called Krishna. Dwepayan means a place in between two island. Vyasji was residing at an island. So being black in colour and residing in an island, he was called Krishna Dwepayan. Krishna means black in colour. He further said he has written a number of books about Krishna. So he was called Krishna Dwepayan. Krishna, means Bhagwan Krishna, incarnation of Vishnu. Krishna was 5000 years before. Krishna was in Dwaperyug.

Valmiki Ramayana is a poetry and history. It cannot be called Puran. Ramayana also means the way to attain Rama. The word "Ramayana" used in Valmiki Ramayan means "Ayan" i.e house of Ramchanderji. Its second meaning is that one get knowledge (Gran) strength, salvation and love by studying Ramayana. Ujurved is also written by Krishna Dwepayan, Vedvyas.

Ramanandacharya was an Acharya of Ramananda Sect. But he was not a founder of that Sect. Sitaji was a founder of Ramanandiya Sect. She was an Acharya of this

Sect. She propagated the definition of Ram Mantra and Srimat. Bodhayan, Parashar, Vyasji and Hanumanji were the Acharya in the period in between the Sitaji and Ramanandacharya. These people had fastened the movement. I cannot say which period Bodhayan belongs to. May be after Bhagwan Budha. There is no literature about Bodhayan. Vedvyas is immortal. Hanumanji was a Devta. He himself said that he was a human and Devta, both. I do not know any person who wrote the literature of this Sect, prior to the time of Ramanandacharya. There is only a Bhasya, known as Janaki Bhasva. Literature written by Ramanandacharya is the oldest one regarding Ramananda Sect. Other literature, which is available, is of the time, later to Ramanandacharya. Ramananda has written, Bhasya on Geeta, Upnishad and Brahmsutra. So he was called Anand Bhaskar. He has not written any Bhasya on Ramayana. His book, "Vaishnav Matabyabhaskar" is about the code of conduct of Vaishnav Acharya. This book does not refer Ramchanderji but his character had been reflected in it. Among the 12 disciple of Ramanandacharya, one is Anubhawanandacharya. He was before 500 years. He was born in 1503 at Varanasi. He established military principle in his life and imparted training in Lance, arrow, spears etc. Virjanandacharya was the disciple of Anubhawanandacharya and Balanandacharya was the disciple of Virjanandacharya. Balanandacharya has established Akhara five hundred years before. The aim of Ramanandacharya at his disciple was to propagate Vedic culture and to analyze the principles of Indian Literature.

The birth of Rama has not been referred in any upnishad. "Om ha ye Ramchandra" is written in Chandogya upnishad, which means Rama was a incarnation of Mahavishnu. "Ramtamniyopshid" refers to his physique but his birth and incarnation has not been

described therein. Mahavishnu was prior to Mahabrahma because Brahma was born from the his hubtolus, which gives knowledge to Rishies. I have stated yesterday that Mahesh and Vishnu created by Brahma. The said Vishnu is other than Mahavishnu. Shrikrishna was an incarnation of Vishnu. According to my faith, Vaikunthdhees Shrimannarayan Chuterbuj Cheerabhsayee Shrimannarayana Swetadipradhithi Asthbhuji Bhumasrimannarayan is other than the Mahavishnu, Rama was his incarnation. I do not know how many incarnation of Krishna were there.

Question: Whether Narsingh and Varah were the incarnation of Vishnu?

Answer: There are three type of incarnation. Aweshwater, Prawesathar, Sarfutyavatar. Narsingh Avtar is Prawesthar. It was for Prahalad. Barahavtar is Surfutyavatar, which is for the welfare of universe.

Shri Krishna was the incarnation of Bhagwan Rama. There was no other incarnation of Rama, other than Srikrishna. He himself stated that Parsuram was said to be incarnation of Rama. Parsuram was Aweshwater of Rama, who was for a short period. Rama is called a Suryavanshi on the earth. It is said about Parsuram that he had resolve to massacre the Chatriya even then he is called the short lived incarnation of Ramchanderji. Incarnation of Rama, as Parsuram, was before the birth or after the birth of Rama, I cannot say. Bhagwan Budha was not an incarnation of Vishnu and similarly Mahabirs was not. It is not relevant to call early Shankrayacharya Chadmbodh.

An idol worship had begun during the time of Ved. The time of Ved and ancient period is almost one. These

four Sects are from the ancient period. These four sects are Shri, Shev, Shakya and Sanak. Sri Sect is called Vaishnav Sampraday. The 18 Purans referred in the statement given by me, are followed by all the four sects. These Purans contains the description of dynasties of King's. He further said that it also contains description of world. Matasya Puran contains the description of Suryavansh and Chandervansh. There might be description of Nand Vansh, Maurya yansh, Gupt Vansh and Satyavahan Vansfi in these Purans. Maurya Vansh and Gupt Vansh were there 2000 years before. They might have existed before that. I have no knowledge whether the people mentioned in Maurya Vansh and Gupt Vansh were before 2000 year or after. King of Chandervansh and five type of Vayu were described in Vayu Puran. Shri Krishna was the main in Chandervansh Kings. During the period of Mahabharat, all the Kings were called Chandervanshi King. Garur Puran also contains the description of Shri Krishnavansh, but pret Karm was described more. Bhagwat Puran contains the description of Surya Vansh and Chander Vansh. Suryavansh was described upto chapter nine and Chandervansh upto the Dasam Skand. The description of Krishn Vansh Kings figured in the last of Brahanand Puran.

There is no specific description of a particular period in Smrities. I do not remember whether Smirities are from the time of seventh Manu or after that. Narad smriti defines time period. I cannot say whether Gupt period was described in or not. Suryavanshi King Dasrath, Ramji, Ichavaku, Kakutastha were described in Veds. This description is in Rigved, Ujurved and Samved. Ichhavaku and Indra are described in Ujurved. Indra means King Indra. According to Atharved, King Parshith was a last King of Purus. But I cannot say definitely. There is no

reference of Mahabharat in these Veds. He himself said that Aryaverta was referred to in this book. Mahabharata is not a Puran. It is a history. Mahabharata was written by Ved-Vyas. Ved-Vyas is a Krishnadweyapan Vedvyas, whom I referred above. He was 28th Vedvyas Srimad Bhagwat is an enigmatical poetry. The some slok said to be spoken by Bhagwan Srikrishna. Rest slok were taken from Mahabharata. Shri Krishna is said to be the writer of Geeta. I do not know when Geeta was written. I require time to study about this.

Ganesh has written Srimadbhagwat Geeta. Ganeshji one of the five devtas. Ganeshji might had written the slok of Geeta on Bhojpatra or leafs of Pipal. I have neither seen nor heard about it. Geeta is written in Sanskrit. Geeta is also called Geetaupnishad. I have read the "Geeta Ka Arth" Bhasya written by Ramanandacharya and Shankracharya. I have studied the Geeta in Sanskrit. Ramchanderji born as Shrikrishna. Mahabharat was 5000 years before and Krisha is contemporary to Mahabharat Ramchanderji was the incarnation of Mahavishnu who was one crore 81 lakhs 60 thousand and 105 years old. Rama born as Shrikrishna, about 5000 years before. Since than Rama does not take birth again. King Dasratha was the father of Rama, the incarnation of Mahavishnu and similarly Vasudev was the father of Shrikrishna. Shrikrishna was born in the jail, which belongs to Kansh.

There is a grand palace at the site where Krishna was born. There is no description about the place where Krishna born, in Geeta. Neither the place of birth of Rama nor Ayodhya, where Rama was born, were referred in Geeta. There is a little reference in Geeta where it was referred that "Ram Sastramirtamham." In which chapter it figures, I can say only after seeing the book Geeta.

Ramanandacharya has written Bhasya. on Geeta. There also has no mention of birth place or Janmbhoomi of Rama. Among the other Bhasya and translation rendered within two-three years, Bhasya written by Ramsukh Dass is authentic.

Swami Vivekanand was a scholar of Hindu religion. Maharishi Dayanand has not written correct facts about Hindu religion. The points he written by Maharishi Dayanand about Arya Samaj is authentic but the facts written about Hindu religion by him are not authentic. Mahatma Gandhi was also a scholar of Hindu religion. He was universal but by his core of heart he was a devotee of Rama. Rama was his God. At his last moment he chanted the name of Rama. He chanted "Raghupati Raghav Raja Ram, Patit Tapawan Sita Ram at his last time. Gandhi wanted to establish Ram-Rajya in India. Gandhiji came to Ayodhya during freedom struggler but at what time, I cannot say. There was a slogan at that time "Chal Chawani Chandi Ki, Jai Bob Mahatma Gandhi Ki." I have personally not met him. I was 13-14 years old at the time of his visit to Ayodhya. Freedom struggler was going on at that time. A meeting was held at the bank of Saryu wherein other big leaders, including "Ba" i.e. wife of Gandhiji were present. But I could not heard him because of huge gathering. Gandhiji did not go to disputed Bhawan then. Dr. Rajinder Prasad was a scholar of Vaishnav Dharma. He was a learned person. He contributed a lot for the construction of Somnath temple. Once Rajinder Babu visited Ayodhya to see Swami Rampadasthji, a high class Mahatma and having knowledge of Veda, and follower of Ramananda Sect, which proves that he was related to Ramannandiya Sect. Rajinder Babu has written a number of books. He has written books on Indian history and politics. So far I knew he came to Ayodhya only once. At

that time he went to see Swami Rampadarathji at Janki Ghat, Ayodhya. He had not visited the disputed site. I do not know whether Rajinder Babu referred about Babar in his book or not. Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru was a learned man. He wrote the book on Indian history and Indian culture. I have read his book "Discovery of India". There is no reference about Ramjanmbhoomi in the book "Discovery of India". Besides I have read the book named "Fighters of freedom" written by Sarojini Naidu in English. I have partially read the book written by Rajgopalacharya on Ramayana. I have also read the book written by Priyar Sahib on Ramayana but summarily. I have not studied any other book written in English on Ramayana, which is in agreement with the principle of Ramananda Sect. I have read the books written by Karpatriji, Swami Akhandanandji and Prabhudutt Brahmchari on Ramayana: These books are authentic. The books published by Geeta Press, Gorakhpur on Ramayana are authentic but the matter has been reshifted at some places. I do not agree with the book written by Rajgopalachari on Ramayana. I have no knowledge about the book Kayasthchidendra. I have the knowledge about the books, Nirnaya Sindhu and Dharmsindhu. There are the authentic books of Hindu religion. I have heard the name of Nagendra Bhatt. I have no knowledge about Nagendra Bhatt. But I have the knowledge about Nagesh Bhatt, who is a high class writer on Hindu religion. Perhaps he belongs to 8th century. I have read his book, Laghusabdendushekhar and Paribhasendushekhar. These books are on Grammar. The word 'Ram' is referred there in but no mention about the birth place of Rama and his character. The word "Ram" was also referred in the book - Nirnayasindhu and Dharmsindhu, but no reference about the birth place and character of Rama is there in. I have read the books written by Jagadguru Ramanandacharya and

Bhadracharya. ii have also read the books named Parsthan Thantriya and Jatayu, Mains main Tapas and Sarju Lahari in addition to above books written on Ramayana.

I have not read the book "Ayodhya Ka Itihas avam Puratatwa" written by Thakur Prasad Verma and Swaraj Prakash Gupta. I have not even saw the book. Thakur Prasad Verma and Swaraj Prakash Gupta are not known to me. Witness said I do not know Justice Devki Nandan Aggarwal, who has filed a petition, which is going on with the suit in which I am giving statement.

I am familiar with the main temples and places of Ayodhya. He himself stated he did not go anywhere for last 10-15 years. I am familiar with Swargdwar, Chanderhari, Sahastradhara, Laxmanghat, Nageshwamath Mandir, Rinmochan Ghat, Rajghat, Kaushaliya Ghat, Sumitra Ghat, Brahmkund, Prahalad Ghat, Bighneshwar, Hanumangarhi, Lomas, Chakratirth, Jamwant Fort, Dantdhawan Kund, Kubertila, Neel Tila, Pindarak, Ratna Sihasan Mandir etc. Besides these, there are mosque and tombs in Ayodhya. One place is called Shish Paigambar is at Maniprabad have no knowledge about the tomb of Ibrahim Baba. I have no knowledge about Alamgiri Mosque or Aurangjeb mosque. I know Nogaji grave. I have no knowledge about Kekarewali Masjid, near Police Station. Disputed site is called Babri Masjid by Muslims. There may be some old graves in Ayodhya, upon which stones are fixed, might be 700-800 years old. Sita Koop is situated in the south at a distance of 100-200 feet from the disputed site. It is said about this koop that at the time of coronation of Rama, water from various places were poured in this koop. Its water is treated as a holy water. There is belief about this koop that peoples are benefited by taking the water from the koop. This koop is also called

the Sataiysa koop. It is said that at the time of Rajyabhisek, water from different holy places were poured in this koop. It is said that this koop is from the time of Ramchanderji. The koop was referred in Valmiki Ramayana and Ananda Ramayana but not in Ramcharitmanas. I believe that Saryu, Sita Koop and land are there from the time of Ramchanderji. In addition, people have faith on these things but there is no structure from the time of Ramchanderji.

I referred, Rajsadan and Rajdwar in the Statement given by me yesterday and I stated that pitchers of Gold are on them. I believe that the Rajsadan was built-up three hundred years ago. The present King, who lives in Rajsadan, has no relation with the family of Rama. Vikramjot which comes within the Basti Janpad and Thakurs in and around the villages called them as Raghuvanshi chatriya and they say that they are from the family of Rama. One of the Thakur, Naresh Singh, lives at Dantdhawan Kund, Ayodhya. These people are around 4000- 5000 in number. The area of Rajdwar temples is about 4000 square feet.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

30.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 2.8.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

30.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 2.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 30.7.2004 cross-examination
by Shri Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant
No. 9, Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

Jyotishpithaswar Santanandji Maharaj was the
Shankracharya of Jyotishpeeth. There is a dispute in
between the Santanandji and Swaroopanandji over the
peeth. The dispute is still pending. Because after the
demise of Santananda, Vasudevanandji is pursuing the
case. Santanandaji was in the meeting in which
Ramjanmbhoomi Trust was constituted. I do not know
whether he was a member of Trust or not. The seat of
Shankracharya at Badrinath is called the seat of
Dwarikadhis seat. It is also called Shardapeeth or
Jyotishpeeth.

Santanandji was a Shankracharya of Prayag-up-peeth.
Vasudevanandaji replaced him. Santparvar Brahmchari
Arel, was from Allahabad, is no more.

Witness on seeing the page No. 3 of the document
No. 111 C/1 in other original suit No.5/89 said that there is
a reference of Swami Purshothamacharya, Sugreev Kila,

Ayodhya at Sl.No. 1 who is a Jagatguru of Ramanujacharya Sampradaya and Budhbikshu Bhante, Shri Gyanjagatji Maharaj was referred at S1.No. 2. I have seen him. He neither belonged to Ramahand Sect nor Ramanuja Sect. He was a Budh. He is not related to Vaishnav Sect. The name of Madhvacharya Swami Vishesteerth is at Sl. No. 3 who is a Jagadguru of Madhavacharya Sampradaya situated at Udepi. I have not seen the book document No.111 C-1 before.

There is a road in the north of disputed site and then Janmsthan Mandir. This Janmsthan Mandir is about 300-400 hundred years old. I have visited inside the Mandir.

Question: In the Janmsthan Mandir, which is situated at a distance at a road in the north of disputed site, who is worshiped there?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, in other original suit No. 3/89 raised an objection that the answer about the question has already been calculated. Besides, it can be the name of any temple. Hence it is not possible to ask question in this regard.)

Answer: It is named a Janmsthan Mandir casually. It is a temple of Rama.

Question: Is it worshiped as a birth place of Rama for more than 200 years?

Answer: I have not seen it, being worshiped in this form.

Question: Do you see the above Janmsthan Mandir as a temple of other Devi-Devta?

Answer: Darshan of Rama is being done there.

Question: What is the belief of Hindu population and devotee of Rama, about above Janmsthan Mándir?

(Upon this question, learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in other original suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that question cannot be asked about the opinion of others.)

Answer: Some people might be going there for darshan. But I have no knowledge about their opinion.

I went into this Janmsthan Mandir for darshan and Puja in 1946-47, for the first time. At that time too, it was called Janmsthan Mandir. I have not seen the Grabh Grih. In Janmsthan Mandir, I took the darshan of idols of Ramas and his brothers. These idols are not kept in Grabh Grih. These are kept on a throne, like in other temples. No Grabh Grih is there in a common temple, but the idols are kept on an ordinary throne. The place where God is born is called Grabh Grih. There is no Grabh Grih in Kanak Bhawan and Hanumangarhi also. There is no Grabh Grih in other temples of Ayodhya except the Janmbhoomi Mandir. So far I know, only the temples situated in Ayodhya, Mathura and Kashi, have the Grabh Grih. Grabh Grih are in the Narsingh temple situated in Madhya Pradesh, Bodhgaya, Baraha Bhagwan Mandir in Sukarchetra. These are the 6 temples throughout India, where I have seen Grabh Grih. Besides I have not seen the Grabh Grih in any temple. The temple I referred above, is according to my faith is a birth place of Ramchanderji. The Grabh Grih in the temple of Kashi, which I referred, is a birth place of Bhagwan Shankar. Shankar Bhagwan was born in Varanasi. Incarnation and birth is one and the same. In Kashi, idol of Shankar Bhagwan was revealed.

The idol later formed the shape of human. On the basis of revelation of an idol, this place is called the birth place of Shankarji. I believe that Bhagwan Budh was born at Bodhgaya in a family of a King. In Bodhgaya an idol of Bhagwan Budh is worshipped in the Grabh Grih. Idolatry in Budhs is different from Ramanand Sect. Grabh Grih in Bodhgaya differs from the size of Grabh Grih in the temple in Mathura and Kashi. Grabh Grih of Bodhgaya is big in size. In Bodhgaya, people are not allowed to go inside, people take darshan from outside. Only priest can go there to perform Puja. In Mathura and Kashi puja is performed in the Grabh Grih. I cannot say about the size of Grabh Grih in Kashi. Upon the suggestion given by the Learned Advocate, witness said its length and width could have been 30-40 feet respectively. There are wall all around the Grabh Grih and four doors, each in a wall to four directions. Devotee enter for taking darshan from northern door and comes out from southern door. In the Grabh Grih of Kashi, there is not an idol of Shankarji but a Shivling. I have stated in my statement above that an idol of Shankar was revealed there, which I means Shivling revealed there. I cannot say when Bhagwan Shankar in the form of shivling was revealed. It may be thousand, two thousand, or lakhs of years ago or hundred or two hundred years before. Because it is related to my faith.

Question: Is it not possible to tell the time period of the subject related to your faith.

Answer: It is possible, but it is not possible in the case if time period is lengthy. I have not read about this in any book. Hence counting of time is not possible.

I have read a number of books about the temple in Kashi but none book refer the time of birth of Bhagwan Shankar.

The Grabh Grih in Narshing Mandir of Madhya Pradesh I referred above, it is said that Narsingh Bhagwan was revealed there.

Question: Is the phisque of Narsingh of Nar and Singh (Man and lion).

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri Ved Prakash on behalf of plaintiff in other original suit No. 5/89, raised an objection that idol puja is opposed in Islam (Muslim religion) and it is not allowed in Islam. Narsingh Bhagwan is a subject matter of faith. There is no point in the suit, about which the question can be regarded as a relevant. Hence such question should not be allowed.)

(Cross-examiner advocate, on the above objection said that raising the objection about the principle of Islam is not relevant. So far the question being asked is concerned, it is fully relevant to assess the correctness of the statement and in connection to the analysis of religious faith about the so called Janmsthan. This objection is baseless.)

Answer: Narsingh means Nar and Singh. Half of the body of Narsingh Bhagwan was of Nar (man) and half of Singh (Lion).

(Revelation or birth is one and same. Narsingh Bhagwan was the incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. I cannot say whether he was born before or after the birth of Rama. I studied the Narsingh Puran. A number of places were

referred about his birth place but there was no mention about the timing of his birth. He himself stated that he might have taken birth in the palace of Hiranyakashyap.

Question: Whether it was clearly specified or not in Narsingh Puran that Narsingh was born at the place referred by you as Grabh Grih in Narsingh Mandir in Madhya Pradesh?

Answer: There is no reference in Narsingh Puran about taking the birth by Narsingh Bhagwan at the said place.

I have referred the Shukar area in the statement given by me. This Shukar area is in the Distt. Gaunda. It is a temple of Baraha Bhagwan and there is his Grabh Grih in it. Baraha Bhagwan was also the incarnation of Vishnu. There is an idol of Baraha Bhagwan in the temple. I have not seen the temple of Baraha Bhagwan at other places except in Sukar area. Baraha Bhagwan was born before the birth of Ramchanderji. He has taken birth for the welfare of universe. I have not read any book in regard to his incarnation and birth place. Witness than said, he has read the book Baraha Puran. But there is no reference in the book about the time and birth place of Baraha Bhagwan. The priest of Shukar area, says that Baraha Bhagwan was born there and on the basis of his statement I said it. The Grabh Grih of Baraha Bhagwan Temple in Shukar area, is 30 feet in length and 30 feet in width. There are walls all around the Gragh Grih. People take darshan by standing in Jagmohan. Jagmohan is about 40-50 feet in length and 25-30 feet in width. The face of an idol is towards the east. The Grabh Grih of Narsingh temple situated in Madhya Pradesh, is 50 feet in length and 30 feet in width. It is surrounded by wall and there is

one door. People take darshan by standing at Jagmohan, at the outer place.

Any Bhawan is called a temple only if it has a pitcher, Pran Prathistha, Prathistha of Kalash, Pratistha of Parshad. It is not necessary to have Grabh Grih in a temple. The place where Murthi is installed is called Grabh Grih. In every temple, the place where idol is installed is called Grabh Grih. The statement given by me that "there is no Grabh Grih in every common temple, there is a throne. Grabh Grih is the place where Bhagwan is born" is correct. The statement given by me to-day that the place where idol is installed is called Grabh Grih. The place where ordinary idol is installed is called Antargrih. In Kanak Mahal, Hanumangarhi, Janmsthan and other temple of Ayodhya, excluding the disputed Bhawan wherever an idols are installed, is called Antargrih. I have read in "Bhavisya Puran" about the features and size of temples. Bhavisya Puran was written before the birth of Rama. I cannot say whether Ramanand is referred in Bhavisya Puran or not.

Document No. 107 C-1/122 at page No. 149, in Other Original Suit No. 5/89, was shown to witness.

Question: Whether the facts written in second para at page No. 149, is correct?

Answer: It was written in Bhavisya Puran that disciple of Ramananda came to Ayodhya. They were holding Tulsimala and Kanthi. It is also written therein that disciple of Ramananda have converted many Muslims in to Vaishnav. It is a fact.

Document No. 107 C-1/127 of the above suit was shown to witness. Wherein it was written that twelve Kaushoti pillars are inside and two Kaushoti pillars are at the Phatak of Masjid? Whether the said thing was written about Babri Masjid. Witness said that Masjid referred in the sentence is in fact a temple and not a Babri Masjid.

Question: If it is not a Babri Masjid than which Masjid is referred therein?

Answer: I cannot say.

Question: Whether the fact written in document No. 107 C 1/27 at the above page that "there are two writings in the inside and at the Phatak of Masjid. It appears that these things relates to Masjid" not to Babri Masjid. If not, which Masjid about?

Answer: I do not know about which Masjid these writings relates. 'Ram Panchayat' was written there.

At the western wall of the disputed Bhawan, there was a black stone, wherein "Ram Panchayat" was written in Hindi. This stones in the western wall was visible, while one performed parikarma.

Question: In accordance with your statement there is wall on the western side. Which part of disputed Bhawan or premises, fall on the other three sides?

Answer: Parikarma begins from western side. Then headed to wards north to east and comes to an end at Ramchabutra, where idols of Shri Sitaram, Laxman, Bharat, Satrugan are kept.

Upon seeing the photo document No. 154/7 in suit, Gopal Singh Visarad versus Jàhoor Ahmad witness said that western wall of the disputed Bhawan is not clearly visible. This is a picture of Janambhoomi Mandir. Northern part of the disputed Bhawan appears there. It is correct that this is the photo of western wall, taken from outer side in the west. What I have stated that this is photo of northern part of disputed Bhawan, is not correct. It was a mistake.

Question: Whether the place, from where the parikarma starts, on the western side, is appearing in the photo.

Answer: The place, from where the parikarma starts, in the west side, is not appearing in this picture.

Witness on seeing the photo document No. 154/10 of the suit, said the place, from where parikarma starts is not clear in the picture. This is a photo of Janm Bhoomi Mandir. The rare portion of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in the photo. Upon seeing the photo document No. 154/5, witness said that it is not clear that which part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in the photo. This is not picture of northern gate at outer portion, because there were pictures of Lions. The place from where the parikarma starts is not appearing in the photo.

Upon seeing the picture No. 6 document No. 201 c-I, witness said three pitchers are appearing in this picture. Ramlala was sitting below the middle pitchers. It is not clear, which part is appearing in this picture. The place from where the parikarma starts is not appearing in the picture. In the photo No. 4 of the album two pitchers are visible and rest are not visible. The place in western side is not visible in the photo, from where I had mentioned

that the parikarma, starts. In the photo No. 5 of the album there appear to be three pitchers. The place in the western side, from where parikarma starts is not appearing in the photo. There appears a tree of Neem in photo No. 8 of the album and rest is not clear. It is not clear from the picture, whether it is a wall or curtain. Photo No. 9 of the album is not clear and nothing is visible in it. Similarly the photo No. 10 is also not clear. It is not clear that whose picture is this. I cannot say how many times I have performed the parikarma. For once, twice, five-ten times or twenty or fifty times. I used to go for darshan in 1945-46 and to perform parikarma. In the photo No. 13 of the album, there appears to be pitchers. It is not clear which part of the disputed Bhawan is there in the photo. A Phatak is appearing in the photo No. 23 of the album but which side's Phatak is this, I cannot say. Photo No. 28 of the album is not clear. Which part is there in photo No. 28 is not clear. Writing appearing on the stones in photo No. 27 of the album, was at the Ramchabutra. In photo No. 11 and 12 of the album, there appears a part of disputed premises, where tins are on the store room and the place where sadhus of Nirmohi Akhara used to sit. The pitcher in the mid of disputed Bhawan is appearing in the photo No. 15 of this album and some trees are also appearing in.

Upon seeing the photo No. 106 of document No. 200 C/1 of colour album, witness said there appeared two pitchers and some trees. Which part of the disputed Bhawan is therein, it is not clear. There are two pitchers covered by trees in photo No. 7 and 8 of this album. Western part from where parikarma starts, of the disputed Bhawan is not appearing in these pictures. Trees of Pipal and Molshri are appearing in the photo No. 11 and 12 of the album and rest are invisible. A close wall is appearing

in these pictures. Close wall I mean a wall, where there is no door. The wall appearing in these pictures might be the wall in the west, aside the "Shankar Panchayat". In these picture, no place, from where the parikarma starts, is being seen. A pitcher is appearing in photo No.10 of this album and rest is not visible. I cannot say whether there is a part of disputed Bhawan in the photo. Photo No. 13 is not clear. There appears a thing, like the ear of horse, in this picture. There appear to be benches meant for selling the things in picture No. 17 and 18. There were some shops in. the east of main gate of the disputed Bhawan. Two pitchers and small tree are appearing in the picture No. 24 of the album. It is not clear from the picture, which part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in the picture. In all the pictures shown to me, there appears the pictures of outer wall and a stone on which "Ram Panchayan" is written. The place appearing in the picture was not meant for outer parikarma but for inner parikarma. There are picture of domes, on the disputed Bhawan in picture No. 130, 131 and 132. No wall appearing in these pictures. It is not understood which part was shown in the picture No. 128 and 129. A faded wall below the part of dome, is being seen in the picture. There was no "Ram Panchayat Stone" at this wall. Nothing is visible from the picture No. 148, 149 and 150. There appears to be a picture of wall below the dome. A Phatak in the eastern side of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in picture No. 169, 171, 172 and 173. Witness upon seeing the picture document No.154/12, 154/14 and 154/15 in the suit, Shri Gopal Singh Visharad versus Jahoor Ahmad and others, said that nothing is visible in these pictures. I cannot say whether these pictures are of the walls below the part of dome or not. In picture No.154/12, there appears a picture of western wall of the disputed Bhawan or not. I cannot say whether Allaha is written on this or not. Picture No. 154/14

is not a picture of wall below the dome. Raghupatti Raghav Raja Ram is written in this picture and Ram-Ram at the door. I cannot say whether Allaha is written in the painting there is or not. I cannot say whether it is a picture of wall below the dome in document No. 154/15 or not. But Sitaram-Sitaram is written there.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

2.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 3.8.2004.

www.vadaprativada.in

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

2.8.2004

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

Dated 3.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to 2.8.2004, Cross-examination by Shri
Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant No. 9,
Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.R continues.)

Upon seeing the photo document No. 154/13, in the
suit, Shri Gopal Singh versus Jahoor Ahmad and others,
witness said Ramlalla is appearing in it. Ramlalla is in a
temple in disputed Bhawan below the middle dome.
Besides, other idols are there but these are not clear. This
idol is kept in a throne and the throne is kept on the
staircase made of stones. There are three staircases
made of stones. I have seen the similar staircases on
which idols of Ramlalla was there, in 1946-47. For the last
time I have seen these idols, kept there, 20-25 years ago,
in 1986, when disputed Bhawan was opened for the public.
There was huge crowd, after it was opened to public. I
went there. After that I did not go there. The idols were
kept there at the same place, as shown in the picture. I
have seen the idols from a distance of 15 feet. I cannot
say whether the size of Bhawan, in which idols were there,
is 20-25 in width, or not. I cannot say whether the width is
5-10, 20-25 or 50-69 feet. I took darshan from at a
distance of 15 feet, by standing in courtyard. I went for

darshan for 4-6 times, after it was attached. I have seen there the throne, which is appearing in photo No. 152, 153, 154 and 155 document No. 200 C-1 of the colour album. The throne was under the middle dome and idol was on the throne. I used to go for darshan in the evening and come back from there at about 7.00 P.M. In winter, sun sets early, during this period Lalten or Lamp was kept there in the disputed Bhawan. At that time electricity connection was not there. I used to go for darshan through iron-grilled wall. There was a main Phatak in the wall and also a small gate. Sometimes I used to go by small gate when main Phatak remain closed. Both the Phataks are in the iron grill wall on the eastern side. The Phatak of the iron grill wall is appearing in the picture No. 65. This also can be called window. These phataks remains closed.

Question: There is no Phatak in the picture. Only windows - and iron bars are therein. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: These appearing like a Phatak. These may be the windows.

The wall appearing in picture No. 65 differs from the wall appearing in picture No. 64. There was only one iron grilled long wall in the disputed Bhawan. I cannot say whether the wall appearing in photo No. 64 and 65 belongs to the disputed Bhawan or not. A wall with grill is appearing in picture No. 63. I cannot say whether this wall is of the disputed Bhawan or not. Huts are appearing in picture No. 66. I have not seen these huts in the disputed Bhawan, as are appearing in picture No. 66. This may be the picture of other parts. Shankar Panchayat on a Chabutra, under a Pipal tree, in a compartment, is appearing in Picture No. 61. I cannot say whether I have seen the Shankar Panchayat before or after, it was

attached. I also do not remember when I saw it for the first time. Outer part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in picture No. 68. But I cannot say whether it is covered by tin or grass. A tree and a chajan is appearing in this picture. This might be the iron wall of the disputed Bhawan. I have seen it covered by tin, when I visited there. The western wall was covered by tins. I, by mistake said it to be western wall. In fact it is in east side. This tin was 15 feet in length and 7-8 feet in width. Chajan of tins was in the southern side of the tree appearing in picture No. 68. An another wall is appearing in picture No. 75. About wall appearing in picture No. 75, I got confused about its side. A Neem tree is appearing in picture No. 75. There was a iron phatak in the west of Kathare Wali wall. I might have entered from the gate, which is near to the tree. But I am not sure. This phatak remains closed. The phatak appearing in picture No. 75, differs from the phatak appearing in picture No. 77. It might be possible that phatak must have been open at the time when photo was taken. The phatak from where I used to enter, is not appearing in picture No. 77. There was no phatak in the disputed Bhawan like the phatak appearing in the picture No. 77. One and same tree is appearing in picture No. 76 and 75. A window is appearing in picture No. 76 and also in picture No. 77. The window appearing in picture No. 75 is towards east and window in picture No. 76 is towards north. The window appearing in picture No. 75 differs from the window appearing in picture No. 76.

A phatak and an almirah are appearing in picture No. 73. I cannot say that this phatak, belongs to disputed Bhawan or to some other place. A tin shade, which was on the storeroom of the disputed Bhawan, is appearing in this picture. A door in the north of another wall and a cell is appearing in picture No. 74. A door fixed in the north side

of the disputed Bhawan and its nearby part is appearing in picture No. 70. There is some tin shade. This tin should be the tin shade of storeroom. Picture No. 67 is not clear. A tin shade alongwith a few trees are appearing in picture No. 69. Where so many Mahatamas were standing. This tin shade is too small, so it cannot be a part of store-room. It is not clear whether this tin shade was a part of disputed Bhawan or not. I cannot say, how many times I visited the disputed Bhawan since I began to go there and upto its demolition on 6th December, 1992. May be 40-50 times. I went there for once or twice, at 12.00 noon, at Chaitra Ramnavami. Otherwise I used to visit in the morning and evening only. A part of Ramchabutra is appearing picture No. 59 and 60 of the colour album. I have seen the writings on white stones, in black ink, perhaps after the attachment of disputed Bhawan.

I have seen an idol of Ramlalla on Ram Chabutra. Besides, an idols of Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughan and Shaligram were there. All idols were in a row. Ramchabutra was 40 feet in length and 20 feet in width. Its length was in east-west side and width is in north-south side. An idol, of Rama was in the middle. There was another an idol of RamLalla on the east side. There were two idols of Rama. There are some other idols in the east of idol of Rama. But I am not able to remember whose idols were these.

Question: According to your statement in addition to an idols of Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughan, an idol of Rama was there on the Ram Chabutra. What do you mean by the idols of others. Whose idols these were?

Answer: Some other idols, I mean, an idol of Shaligram.

It is not remembered to me, on which side an idols of Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughan were, from an idol of Rama. Thrones have so many doors. An idol of Saligram was in the bottom door. The throne was made of wood and silver plated. It was two to two and half feet in length and one and half to two feet in width. I cannot say whether the throne was kept in north corner, or south, east corner. I go there for darshan only.

Question: You have, in your statement, stated that you have visited the disputed Bhawan for darshan for 40-50 times since 1946 to 1992. Even than you do not remember from which side you have taken the darshan?

Answer: I used to take darshan from southern side.

The above idols were in the southern corner. There was a cave in the southern side of Ram Chabutra. These caves were on the northern and southern side of Ram Chabutra. It is not correct to say that there was no cave in the southern side of Ram Chabutra. There was an idol of Bharatji in one cave and an idol of Kaushaliya with Rama in her lap and idol of Kag-Busundi was in the form of a crow.

Upon seeing the photo No. 66, of the document No. 200 C-1 of the colour album, witness said this is a picture of southern part of Ram Chabutra.

Question: Idols were on the north corner and not in the southern corner?

Answer: If you see the idols from south side, it will be seen in the north side and vice-versa.

Idol of Ramchanderji, with an idols of Laxman, Bharat and Shtrugan was in the standing position and on Ram Chabutra and second one was in the form of a child, moving on all four. An idol, which was in standing position, is about six inch in height and an idols of Laxman. Bharat and Shatrughan are less in height by one inch each. Idols were perhaps made of brass. Idols are covered by a cloth so nothing definite can be said. The face of Ramchanderji is made of, perhaps, eight metals. A tin shade and a hut are appearing in photo No. 56 of the colour album. I have seen the hut on Ram Chabutra. I have not seen the tin shade, white in colour.

I do not know when Ram Chabutra was constructed. Picture No. 58 of coloured album is partially visible. It is not clear, whose idol these are.

Two idols of Hanumanji are appearing in picture No. 31, document No. 201 C-1 of black and white album but third idol is not clear. I have not seen the idols appearing in picture No. 31, in the disputed Bhawan. In picture No. 37 of the album, writing on white stone in black ink, is appearing. These stones are fixed in the iron-grilled wall. I cannot say whether these stones were fixed before or after attachment. I have referred in para 45 of the affidavit, about the Chabutra, which is 3 feet in height, 20 feet in length and 17 feet in width. To I referred its length and width as 40 feet and 20 feet. The length referred at para 45 of my main examinee affidavit is not correct. The Chhatti Pujan Sthal referred in para 46 of my main examinee affidavit, is described in Valmiki Ramayana. There is no reference of Chhatti Pujan Sthal. Reference of Chhatti Mahatosav figure in Ramcharitmanas but no reference of Chhattee Pujan Sthal is there in Manas. I will tell, tomorrow if there is any reference about Chhatti. Foot

print, Belan, Chakia and Chulaha are neither referred in Valmiki Ramayana nor in Ramcharitmanas. The foot prints referred at para 46, of my affidavit, are made of stones. These are 4 in number. Chakla and Belan are made of stones, Chulaha might be of earth, because I have seen it from a distance. All these things were in a platform, measuring 8x10 feet in size and slightly at a height from ground level. It is also called Kaushaliya Pak and Sita Kitchen. Sita Kitchen means the kitchen used by Sita and Kaushaliya kitchen mean the kitchen used by Kaushaliya. It is possible that Sita also used Kaushaliya kitchen. I have stated the statement given by me that Ramji, Sitaji and Kaushaliya were residing in their respective palaces. I cannot say, being residing in their own palaces, they have separate kitchens or not. There is no reference about Sita kitchen and Kaushaliya kitchen in Ramcharitmanas. But it was written in Ramcharitmanas that "Nij Kar Grih parijarja karel, patti roop lakhi Aas Anusarai." According to this couplet, kitchen is included in their palaces. At what place the above couplet is figuring in Ramcharitmanas, I can say only after seeing the Ramcharitmanas. Chhatti Pujan is not a part of kitchen. Chhatti Pujan means the celebration held on 6th day from the date of birth. The Chhatti Pujan, referred at para 46 of my main examinee affidavit means the celebration held on 6th day from the date of birth of Rama. Chhatti Pujan is not a tonsure ceremony. Blessings are sought from Chhattee Devi. Chhatti Dcvi is called Vishnupriya. Chhatti Pujan Sthal perhaps is referred in Geetawali written by Tulsi Dass. But I do treat it an authentic. After reading poem No: 5 and 3 at page No. 28 and 29, of document No. 46 C-1/1 of Geetawali written by Goswamy Tulsi Dass, witness said that the translation given at page 30, from line 11 to line 21, is correct. In the above poem, No. 3, "Today is the chatt of Maharaja in his Manjul Bhawan." Manjul Bhawan means the sweet palace

of King Dasratha. The Chhatti Pujan Sthal referred at para 46 of my main examinee affidavit, is not, according to my belief, a Manjul Bhawan of Dasratha. The celebration referred by me at para 46 in my affidavit is the celebration referred in poem No. 3 and No. 5 in above book Geetawali.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

3.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 4.8.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

3.8.2004

www.vadaprativada.in

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 4.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to 3.8.2004, Cross-examination by Shri
Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant No. 9,
Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

According to my faith and belief Chhatte Pujan Sthal
was a part of palace of King Dasrath or a part of any other
palace and was described in detail in Ramcharitmanas
document No. 258 C-1/2 at page No. 142 in Balkand, at
couplet No. 193, that:

**“Nandimukh Sradh Kari Jatkaram Sab Kinhee, Halak Dhenu,
Baran Mani Nrip Biprahan Karih Dinihee”**

Question: It is not correct that Chhatti Pujan Sthal is
described in detail in above couplet No. 193.
The word “Chhatti” was not at all used in the
above couplet. What you have to say in this
regard?

Answer: “Nandimukh Saradh’ is an adjective of the born
child, which qualify the Chhatti in full.

Question: The meaning of the first line of the above
couplet is that King has performed the ritual of
the new born baby after performing Nandimukh
Shradh. It cannot be said that it qualify for the
“Chhatti Sanskar.” What you have to say in this
regard?

Answer: The line above that line “Anupam Balak Dekheni Jai, Roop Rasi Gun Kahi Na Sirai” qualify that Chhatti was performed alongwith Nandi Shradh Sanskar. It is based on the couplet starting from “AnupamBalak.”

Question: The meaning of the couplet No. 193, referred by you is that Guru Vashista was called upon. Who alongwith the Brahamans came to Rajdwar. He saw the boy who was unique and having all the qualities. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: The baby is kept on the food prepared at the Chhatti Pujan occasion and that food is distributed as a prasada. This is called Chhatti Pujan. In local language it is called “Balak Chhatiyana.” All these ritual were performed under the headship of Guru Vasistha. King distributed cows, clothes and money at this occasion.

Question: The question which I asked you, there is no reference in the couplet about pakwan (food) or prasada. Similarly you are not giving correct answer of the couplet No. 193. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: The details about Chhatti in the form of Jat-Karm (ritual of baby) was included in the couplet No. 193, after Guru Vasistha blessed the boy.

I do not remember whether any reference about “Chhatti” was given in Ramcharitmanas, except the above couplet. Chhatti Pujan was described in Valmiki Ramayana as “Sasti Pujan Sanpadyate.” This is in the Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana. It is not correct to say that there is no description of Chhatti Pujan in Valmiki Ramayana.

Sita kitchen and Kaushaliya kitchen are referred in Ramcharitmanas. At present it is not remembered to me that at what place this description is figuring.

There is a Naming ceremony. It figures at page No. 31, 32 and 33 of document No. 46 C-1/1 of Geetawali. There is a reference that naming ceremony of all the three brothers was held. There was a reference in couplet No. 17 at page No. 45 of Geetawali that Kaushaliya invited Shankarji to her palace in the guise of Brahaman. The Bhupati Bhawan referred in second couplet of couplet No. 29 at page No. 49 of the above book, is a palace of Dasrathji. The Nrip Bhawan Dwar referred in couplet No. 39 at page No. 72 of the book, is a palace of King Dasrath. Nrip Bhawan was also called Rajbhawan. Parsuram mentioned in second couplet of the couplet No. 38 at page No. 378 of the book, is an incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. Geetawali written by Tulsi Dass is second to Ramcharitmanas. Some people say that it was written prior to Ramcharitmanas. There is a reference of Bhagwan Rama in Vinay Patrika book written by Tulsi Dass. The aim of Vinay Patrika is to address Bhagwan Rama through letters. Vinay Patrika is in the form of letters. The life and character of Bhagwan Rama was described in this book. The book, Dohawali, written by Goswami Tulsi Dass is about Rama. The greatness of Rama and specialties of Ayodhya were described in this book. Parvati Mangal is also written by Tulsi Dass. This book also contains the reference of Rama and Mangal Geet about the marriage of Shankar Parvati. Tulsi Dass has written another book "Ramlalla Nahwahhu." It also contains the description of child Rama and various aspect of his life. In Krishna Geetawali written by Goswami Tulsi Dass, life of Shrikrishna was described. There is one more book "Varayagya Sandeepani" written by Tulsi Dass. This book, in seven volumes, also contains in brief the life of Rama.

In the book "Janaki Mangal" written by Tulsi Dass. Sitaji and Ramji and the song chanted at the time of their marriage were referred in it. Kavitawali also contains the reference about Ramchanderji. "Barwe Ramayana" also contains the details in brief of Ramcharitmanas in seven volumes. An another book "Ramagyan Parsan" is written by Tulsi Dass. Hanumanchalisa is also said to be written by Tulsi Dass. Besides, Hanumanbahuk is also written by Tulsi Dass. There may be other books written by Tulsi Dass, in addition to Hanumanchalisa, Hanumanbahuk and above mentioned 12 books. But I have no knowledge. I do not know the books written by Dr. Mata Prasad and Ramji Tiwari on Tulsi Dass. I know about the book written by Shri Vishnukant Shastri on Tulsi Dass. Shri Vishnukant Shastri has gifted this book to me. Shri Vishnukant Shastri has been a Governor of U.P. The book "Hindu Sahitya Ka Itihas" written by Ramchander Shukia on Tulsi Dass, is an authentic book.

I referred at para 12 of the affidavit that I have read a few books written by Tulsi Dass is correct. Some people say that Hanumanchalisa and Hanumañbahuk were written by Tulsi Dass and some do not. I have read the books written by Tulsi Dass, published by Nagari Pracharani Sabha. Nagari Pracharni Sabha has published 11 books written by Tulsi Dass, in addition to Ramcharitmanas. Ramcharitmanas was not published by this Sabha.

I have referred history in para 4, ancient history in para 13 and Indian ancient history in para 16 of my main examinee affidavit.

Itihas, Prachin Itihas and Prachin Bhartiya Itihas referred by me at para 4, 13 and 16 in the affidavit means Valmiki Ramayana, Mahabharat and Purans. Besides, I have also read other books. Such as Prachin itihas written by Ramchander Shukia, Hindi itihas written by Ram Bahori

Shukia. I have not read the book "Uttar Pradesh Ka Rajnaitik Itihas" published by Uttar Pradesh Hindi Sansthan. "Ayodhya Ka Itihas written by Lala Sitaram, is not a historical book. I have read this book but there are some addition and alteration. I have read the books written on the subject The Kings of Ayodhya. First para at page No. 39, document No. 107 C- 1/122, filed in other original suit No. 5/89, "**Ayodhya Ka Ithas**" was shown to witness. Witness said the writings in this para that "**Mahabharat Ka Mahasmarthak..... Brichal mara Gaya**" is correct. Writing in the later part of the sentence that "Ayodhya was destroyed in fullonly remains were there" is not correct. The writing in the second line at this page "description of Purans is available in Mahabharat" is correct but the writings in later part "Earlier history is not know. What happened in Ayodhya and who caused it" is not correct. The writings in second para of this page No. 48, "Although Ayodhya during the time of Budhs..... historical facts are found" is correct. It is not correct to say that Babar has not destroyed any temple. It is also not correct to say that there was no temple at the site, when Babri Masjid was constructed in 1528. He said that King Vikramaditya constructed the Ram temple in Samvat 1, which became famous as Janmbhoomi Temple. Babar had demolished this temple. There was no description about the area of temple, no classical proof. I believe that there were only 14 pillars in the temple. It was written in the above para that King Vikramaditya renovated Ayodhya, which means, that at that time only remains were there but Janm Bhoomi exists there and Vikramaditya reconstructed it. He said it was called Janmbhoomi Mandir. Vikramaditya has renovated the temple and not reconstructed the temple. Before Vikramaditya, Manvendra Manu constructed the temple. This Manu was not the seventh

Manu but was a son of Brahma. I have no knowledge about how many lakhs years before Manvendra Manu constructed the Mandir, might be lakhs of years before or thousands years before. During the time of Manu, buildings were constructed of stones and Surkhi Chuna. Manvendra Manu was before Mahabharata. The writings in the second para at page No. 41, that "In 1526, Babar..... nawabi was established" is doubtful. I cannot say whether Nageshwar Nath Mandir and Chanderhari Mandir were constructed during the period of Akbar or not. I also have no knowledge whether ruler of Delhi has gifted the Avadh province to Sadat Khan in the year 1721 as referred in the book. I also do not know that the fact mentioned at page No. 42, that the present temple of Nageshwar Nath Mahadev was constructed by Naval Rai Diwan of Nawab Safdarjung. I have heard about but I cannot say whether the fact mentioned at page No. 45 of this book "Nawab Asifuddolawas in the shape of Garghi" is correct or not. I also have no knowledge that during the period of Nawab Vajid Ali Shah, thirty temples were constructed in Ayodhya. The facts mentioned at page No. 45 of this book that "Now the historical facts of Ayodhya..... the following is written in the description of Ramkot" is doubtful and not based on historical facts. The Raj Prasad mentioned in this para means palace of King. The fact mentioned in this para that there were eight palaces in this fort, where King Dasrath, his Queens and sons resides, is not based on facts. This was written in Ayodhya Mahatamya but it is not based on facts. The facts written at page No. 45 and 46 of the book Ayodhya Mahatamya that "the said rules of King's palace..... protect the palace from all side." This fact is correct only upto some extent. The fact mentioned in this that Diwid, Mayand, Sugreev, Hanuman and Angad were living there, is correct. Vibhisan, Sursarma and other

Vanar were not in Ayodhya, is not correct. The mention at page No. 62 of the book that "Ayodhya Suryavanshi..... ruled" is correct. The genealogical tree of 93 rulers before Mahabharat and 30 rulers later to Mahabharat, mentioned at page No. 62 of the book, cannot be treated as an authentic genealogy of Suryavanshies. Because the genealogy given in Vishnu Puran, Raghuवंश written by Kalidas, Valmiki Ramayana and Srimad Bhagwat differs. Name of Shri Ramchander referred at Sr. No. 64 of the genealogy at page No. 64 of the book is correct. The name of Brichal is mentioned at Sl.No. 94. SL. No. is doubtful but the name of Brichal is correct. The names of rulers mentioned after Mahadharat at page No. 68 and 69 are correct but not in order. The name Shakya and Sidartha, mentioned at Sl.No. 23 and 25 respectively at page No. 69 is correct. But the fact that they were the King of Ayodhya is doubtful. I am acquainted with the history of Ayodhya who was the King at a particular time but I cannot say who was the King during that time. But I know the name of Kings. I have no knowledge how long the Kings of Gahdwal Dynasty ruled over Ayodhya. I have no knowledge about the rule of Gahdwal dynasty over Ayodhya. I have no knowledge, whether King Chander Dev, King Madan Pal, Govind Chander, King Naya Chander, Vijay Chander and Jai Chander have ever ruled in Ayoc or not. I have read the fact mentioned at page 147 of this book that Sahabuddin has attached Ayodhya in 1194 and Makhdam Shah Juran Gouri was killed in Ayodhya and his tomb was constructed in Ayodhya but I cannot prove it. I have also read that Bakhtiyar ruled in Avadh and established it as a military centre. I have also read that Kamaruddin Gayaran became the Hakim (Ruler.) in the year 1236 and 1242 but I cannot authenticate this fact. The writings in the second para at page No. 149 of the book that "Tuglaks have given

favourable look towards Ayodhya" is correct. I have read the writing at page No. 149 and 150 of this book that "Firoz Tuglak came to Ayodhya in the year 1324 for the first time and in the year 1348 for the second time..... charitable Jagirein where used to held" but I cannot authenticate the facts written therein. I have read the writings at page No. 155 of this book that "In the year 1731 (Vikrama Samvat 1788)..... was made Subedar" but I cannot authenticate it. The writing at page No. 156 of this book that "Jalashankar was the Dewan of Prime Minister of Sahadat Khan" is correct. The writing at page No. 157 of this book that "At this time Nawab Safdarjungfilling the dirty water" is correct.

www.vadaprativada.in

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

4.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, the suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 5.8.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

4.8.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special
Duty, High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 5.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 4.8.2004 cross-examination by
Shri Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant No.
9, Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

11 books referred in para 9 of my main examinee
affidavit, were written by me. Books related to
Ramchanderji - Vedon Ka Avtar Rahasya, Shri
Ramsatwaraj, Shri Ramcharitmanas Ka Vedictwa, Geeta
Bhakti Darshan, Panchmukhmangal Hanuman, Shri
Sampradayacharya Darshan are among these books. Shri
Sampradacharya Darshan is the last book written by me.
This book was published 3 years before. There are approx.
one hundred and fifty pages in this book. All these books
were published by different publishers. Some of the books
are published by me. The manuscript of the book named
Shri Sampradayacharya is mine but it was published by a
Mahatma from Gujrat. The book which was published first
was Shri Sampradaya Manthan, in seven volumes. The
history, from the birth of Rama upto going to heavens, are
described in this book. I have consulted a number of
books, such as Ved, Puran, History, Vedant, Shri
Ramcharitmanas, to write these books. Among the history
books, I have studied Valmiki Ramayana and Mahabharata.

In addition to this I have studied Anandbhasya, written by Ramanandswami and other books the name are not known to me at present before writing these books. I have stated at para 10 of the main examinee affidavit that I am an editor and founder member of Avadh Sourabh monthly magazine. This magazine is being published for last four years. From Vedic literature I means Veds. I have mentioned five subjects at para 16 in my main examinee affidavit. These are sarg (canto) Pratisarg, Vansh, Manwantar and fifth genealogy. These are five characteristic of veds. I have stated at para 21 of my main examinee affidavit that Sanatan Hindu Samaj treat Manusmriti as an authentic one. Nothing against Manusmriti is recognised. I treat the things written in Manusmriti as authentic one, even today. I used the word "Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj" in this para. It covers Arya Samaj also. Followers of Arya Samaj also follows Manusmrities. An idol is worshiped in Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj while Arya Samaj do not worshiped idols. Even than they are the part of Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj. To be a member of Sanatan Hindu Samaj is one thing and to follow the principle of veds is another thing. They, according to their faith, do not follow idol worship but description of idols is there in veds. I have, at para 22 of my main examinee affidavit, mentioned a slok from Manusmriti, which means any King, having faith in religion, cannot treat the temple its own. I have stated at para 25 of my main examinee affidavit that geographical situation of Ayodhya, Saryu, route to forest and others temples are unchanged. Regarding Tamsa River I have stated in the statement given by me, that Tamsa River might have shifted its original route. The situation described in Valmiki Ramayana, has now been changed. Earlier it was at Ramghat but now shifted at a distance of 4 Km. from its original place. I have seen Bhardwaj Ashram, situated at

Prayag. I have not gone to Rameshwaram. At para 25 of my affidavit, I have written Lanka and Rameshwaram, separately. I have also described the three mantra of Atharved and its meanings at para 26 of my affidavit, which is correct. Only mantras were referred at para 26 of the affidavit. These are about Ayodhya from Atharved. I have at para 27 of my affidavit referred, the fifteenth and sixteenth slok from second chapter of Shiv Sanhita. The meaning of fifteenth and sixteenth sloks is: Ayodhya is the city of eight wheels, nine doors and wealth. Eight wheels means Sudarshan Chakra of Vishnu. I have found only this much description about Ayodhya in Shiv Sanhita. Shiv Sanhita was written by disciple of Ved Vyas and other disciple. This Ved Vyas is the same, who had written Ved and Purans.

At para 29 of the affidavit, I have stated that according to Valmiki Ramayana, Ayodhya was the birth place of Rama. Bhagwan Rama said, the entire Ayodhya is my birth place. No specific place was identified as a birth place. At para 30 of this affidavit, I cited a reference from Rudryamal's first part and its meaning was given next, which is correct. The things written at para 31 of the affidavit are correct.

Witness was shown document No. 289 C-1/202, exhibit 3.O.S. 5-3 of Other Original Suit No. 5/89, upon which witness said on the left side in the middle of the map, Ramjanmbhoomi is written and Lomas is written on the right side and below this Sumitra Bhawan is written. In my affidavit I have not written the position at para 31 of affidavit, which is written in the map. Witness again said the position of Ramjanmbhoomi, Lomas and Sumitra Bhawan shown in the map is correct. In the map, Babri Structure is written below the Ramjanmbhoomi and

Vasisht Kund just below it, is correct. On the right side of the Ramjanmbhoomi, Hanumangarhi is written and above it VighneSh is written. It is correct. Chakratirth is written below the Vasist Kund and Neel Tila is written in the right side and Sugreev Tila is written on the right side, is correct. Swargdwar and Chander Han is written on the north side in the map, is correct. Chander Han is a temple and Swargdwar is a name of entire place. That Mohalla is called Swargdwar. Swargdwar is also written on the southern side of Chanderhani Mandir. This place is at the bank of Saryu. This place, submerges in the flood. From this place, Bhagwan Shri Rama, went for Atmajyoti. Hence it is called Swargdwar. On the left of Adinath, Nageshwar Nath Mandir is written. Below the Nageshwar Nath Mandir, Mazar Juran Shah is written. Below this Begampura is written. The position of these places are shown correct. Vibhisan Kund is below the Begampura and Pindarak is below it. On the left side, Ramkot is written. These places are correctly shown. Kaikeyi Bhawan is written below the Ramkot and Ratnmandap is written just below it. Ratnmandap means Ratna throne Mandir. Ramkot Mohalla begins from the point, where Ramkot is written. On the left side of Ramjanmbhoomi, Kaushaliya Tirth, Sumitra Tirth, Brahm Kund and Prahalad Ghat is written. Its location is correct. Ghat, means, Saryu might had been flowing from this place. He said that this Ghat still exists and is at a little distance from Saryu. Dantdhawān is written on the right of Lomas and Sugreev Kund is written on its right. It is correct. At the bottom, in the right side Ranopali is written. It is correct. Ranopali is the last Mohalla of Faizabad.

Upon seeing the document No. 289 C-1/203 witness said in the middle of the map, Lomas Rishi Ashram is written. It is correct. Location of Sumitra Bhawan is also

seen at appropriate. Location of Kuber Tila, Laxman Tekri, Sita Koop and Sakshi GopalMandir are also correct.

Document No. 289 C-1/207 was shown to witness. Upon which witness said that the front portion of the disputed structure is appearing in the photo. I have seen the same position, at the side, in the year 1986.

The rare part of Title cover of the book, exhibit No. O.O.S. 5-3, was shown to witness. Upon seeing the picture, witness said that the photo appearing in the picture might be of Ayodhya Temple. But I could not understand, which temple is shown in this picture. Two type of pitchers, one high in length and other is in round shape are appearing in this picture. There is slight difference in between the pitchers of the other temples in Ayodhya and pitchers shown in the picture. Such pitchers might be on the other temples. But I don't remember to me. I have referred Ramgulella Mandir in my main examinee affidavit. This temple is shown in document No. 289 C-1/202, as a Lomas Temple. In its support, list-A is attached. List-A is attached in support of Vighneshwar Bhagwan shown at para No. 21 of the affidavit. It is cited from Skand Puran List-A has been enclosed only in support of Vighneshwar. Vighneshwar is at a distance e approx. 100 meter from the western wall of the disputed. Bhawan. I have no knowledge about who established the Vighneshwar. This place is from the time of Ramchanderji. During the time of Ramchanderji, it was worshiped as Vighneshwar Ganesh.

There is no difference in between the practice of Nirvani Akhara and Nirmohi Akhara. The practice of Nirvani Akhara and Nirmohi Akhara are similar. I went to disputed site fpr darshan for 40-50 times from the period 1946 to 1992. Witness was shown the para 19 of his main

examinee affidavit, wherein he had stated that he used to go for darshan of Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir daily. Upon seeing it, witness said that he did not used to go daily. After attachment, I use to take darshan from the main gate fixed on the iron wall where there were two phataks.

The Phatak, from where I used to take darshan, has been shown in picture No. 37 of the black and white Album, in document No. 201 C-1. This Phatak is appearing in the picture by a side of a tree. Upon seeing the photo No. 107 of this Album, witness said I did not take the darshan from the gate appearing in this picture. The Phatak appearing in picture No. 37, is different from the Phatak appearing in picture No.107. The Phatak in the outer wall is appearing in photo No. 42 of this album, it is also called Hanumanthdwar, by some people including me. There were two Kaushoti pillars in it. One of the pillar is not appearing in the picture No. 27. This pillar is different from the pillar fixed at Hanumanthdwar. Whenever I go there for darshan, I used to give prasad to the priest, inside the iron grill wall, appointed by the receiver. His name was Baldev Dass. I cannot say whether Baldev Dass, was from. Nirmohi Akhara, and appointed by the receiver as a priest or no

I have stated in the statement given by me, that Baldev Dass was appointed by the receiver, is not correct. I have said that Baldev Dass was the priest at that time. I have not said, that he was appointed by the receiver. I have no knowledge whether Bhaskar Dassji was appointed as priest by the receiver or not. After attachment I saw Bhaskar Dass, inside of the iron grill wall. He said that priest keeps changing. After attachment, priest stay inside of the iron grill wall. But I have no knowledge whether they were the priest of Nirmohi Akhara or appointed by the

receiver or not. I, at para 42 of my main examinee affidavit stated that receiver was appointed for looking after the temple in the last of December, 1949. It is based on hearsay. I have no personal knowledge about this. I myself had written the above thing and not by my Lawyer. I have myself written the point, which I have mentioned at para 34 to 52 at page No. 13 of my affidavit. Its confirmation was based on hearsay. In my affidavit, at page 44, I have referred storeroom and Sant Niwas, covered by tins. Its wall was of the wood. Witness said that the wall was made of bricks and Chhajan was made of wood. This wall was in the southern side. On the eastern side of Sant Niwas and storeroom, there was a Chhatti Pujan Sthal and an old building of Ramjanmbhoomi. On the north side of Chhatti Pujan Sthal there was a wall of building with dome. Shankar Panchayatan was on the southern side covered by tins. Storeroom and Sant Niwas was about 15-16 feet in length and 7-8 feet in width. There was a small door in the north of Sant Niwas. No other door was there. The northern and southern wall of storeroom and Sant Niwas was made of concrete. Sant Niwas and storeroom was there before and after the attachment. There were small idols below the part of disputed Bhawan, where dome was fixed. These idols were covered by clothes. These idols were made of either from brass or eight metals. Idol of RamLalla was approx. 6 inches in height. I have mentioned at para 49 of my main examinee affidavit that structure (inner or outer part) was demolished by the crowd on 6th December, 1992. I was not present there, at that time I came to know about this from the people living in Ashram that structure was demolished at about 12 noon to 1.00 PM. I did not go there at the site since morning to evening. I stayed at my Ashram throughout the day on 6th December, 1992. The idols there remained intact because, these were covered

by solid articles from above. An idols, which were there till the morning of 6th December, 1992, remained intact. These were in the disputed Bhawan too during the time when structure was demolished. Till to-day these are there. The throne, Jhula, on which idols were kept, are still there. I have heard about it, as I have not went there for darshan after 6th December, 1992. I have heard it from the students and Sadhus of Ashram. I have heard about this from Ramdev Shastri Shashikant, Ram Dass, Ambreesh Mishra and Kamal Dass, all were the student and Sadhus. These people are still alive and residing in my Ashram.

Upon seeing the picture document No. 154/13 filed in the suit, Shri Gopal Singh Visarad versus Jahoor Ahmad and others, witness said when I visited to the disputed Bhawan for darshan, two-three years ago, for the last time, I saw the idol of RamLalla there in the same position at it is shown in the picture. And Jhula was in the same position as shown in picture No. 81 and 82 of the album, document No. 200 C-1. Similarly idol of Ramlalla was there upto 6th December, 1992 and I have heard that idol of Rama is in the same shape, even to-day. I did not visit the disputed site after demolition of structure because I am not keeping well and there are possibilities of felling down. I have stated in para 52 of the affidavit that I have been taking darshan regularly from the date I came to Ayodhya. I had never seen any Muslim reading Namaj in the disputed Bhawan I am not aware if Namaj was being read before the time I came to Ayodhya. The richa of Rigved mentioned at para 53 of the affidavit is in regard to Saryu. I have also produced its translation next to it. Word "Ram was used in the richas of Veds, which were referred at para 54 of the affidavit. Richa, referred at para 55 is about King Dasrath. It translation is also given next to it. The word "Kaushal" used in the slok of Valmiki Ramayana,

referred by me in the para 57, also mean Ayodhya. It is another name of Ayodhya No. 31 and 32 of fifteenth canto of Valmiki Ramayana, referred at para 58 of the affidavit, were about the resolution taken by Bhagwan Vishnu before the birth of Rama.

Question: There is no reference of Jai in the sloks No. 31 and 32 of the 15th canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana, referred at para No. 58 of the affidavit?

Answer: When ground for taking birth was prepared, Bhagwan Rama divided himself into four characters. He translated the resolution into action by taking birth as a son of King Dasrath. The word Madhusudan used therein is also stand for Rama.

It was referred in slok No. 31 that God Rama divided himself into four characters. All the four character are the part of Bhagwan Vishnu. These are Ram, Laxman, Bharat and Satrugan. These four are the incarnation of Mahavishnu. It is stated in the 30th slok of 15th canto that Bhagwan Vishnu decided about the place, to born. Witness said the character and image comes before action.

Question: It is not stated in the slok No. 30, where the Janmbhoomi should be. Some short of resolution might have taken. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It becomes clear from the word "Tustubu Madhusudan" appearing in 32nd slok of this resolution that in accordance, with the resolution adopted before, Devtas bows. before the Madhusudan Bhagwan Ram in the Janmbhoomi.

Question: The word Madhusudan figuring in thirty-second slok is for the Bhagwan (God) not four Janm Bhoomi. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: Resolution regarding "Janm Bhoomi" in the slok, indicates the Janmbhoomi.

The above slok means slok No. 30. I have referred two books at para 59 of the affidavit and in this regard I have stated that the Lawyer of Nirmohi Akhara told me that these two books have been filed in connection with the suit. One book is "Shri Ramanand Sampradaya Ka Itihas" and second one is "Smriti Granth." "Shri Ramanand Sampradaya Ka itihhas" is in two volumes. I have referred both the volumes as a book.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

5.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, the suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 6.8.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

5.8.2004

Before:Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey, Additional
Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty, High Court,
Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 6.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench, Lucknow
vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 5.8.2004, cross-examination
by Shri Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant
No. 9, Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

Upon seeing the document No. 200 C-1 picture No.
104 to 108 of the colour album, witness said that two
pillars, one in each picture, are appearing in these
pictures. These pillars were in the disputed Bhawan. Idol
of Hanumanji on the pillars, are appearing in picture No.
104-108. These idols have been painted with Mahabiree. I
cannot say that at what places pillars appearing in picture
No. 104, Lagayat 198 were fixed. I cannot say, what part
of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in picture No. 103
because it is not clear. The pillars appearing in picture No.
109 lagayat 114 of the album, were of the Grabh Grih of
the disputed Bhawan, but I cannot say at what places
these were fixed. Idol of Hanumanji is appearing in picture
No. 109, 110 and 114 at the places where Mahabiree is
painted.

Question: No idol is appearing in the above pictures. But
only on the basis of Mahabiree, you are saying
that idol of Hanumanji is appearing in it.

Answer: It is not correct to say that no idol is appearing at the places where Mahabiree is painted.

The pillars appearing in the picture No. 121, lagayat 126 of this album were at the disputed Bhawan. These pillars are appearing one by one. Therefore I cannot say at what places of the disputed Bhawan, these pillars were. No idol is appearing on these pillars. The pillars appearing in picture No. 139, Lagayat 144 of the album, were in the disputed Bhawan. In picture No. 140, 141 and 143 an idol of Hanumanji is appearing at the places where Mahabiree is painted. The pillars appearing in picture No. 163 lagayat 166 of the album were in the disputed Bhawan. One pillar, each in the picture are appearing in these pictures. So I cannot say at what places, these were in the disputed Bhawan. In picture No. 166, 167, 163, idol of Hanumanji is appearing at the places where Mahabiree is painted with. The pillars appearing in picture No. 176 lagayat 180 of the album were in the disputed Bhawan but I cannot say at what places these were. An idol of Hanumanji is appearing in picture No. 180, 177, 176 at the places where Mahabiree is painted With. The pillar in picture No. 181, lagayat 186 of this album, were in the disputed Bhawan but at what places, is not clear. Photo of Hanumanji is appearing in picture No. 181, 183 and 185, where Mahabiree is painted with. Pillars appearing in picture No. 187 lagayat 192 of this album, were in the disputed Bhawan but at what places these were, I cannot say. An idol of Hanumanji is appearing in the picture No. 188, 189 and 190, at the places where Mahabiree is painted with. The pillars appearing in picture No. 193, lagayat 200, were in the disputed Bhawan but only one pillar is appearing therein. Therefore I cannot say at what places these pillars were. An idol of Hanumanji is appearing in picture No. 193, 194, 195 and 196, at the

places where Mahabiree is painted with. The pillars appearing in picture No. 126 lagayat 138 of this album, were in the disputed Bhawan but at what places of the disputed Bhawan, these were, I do not know. Idol of Hanumanji is appearing at picture No. 136 and 137 at the places where Mahabiree is painted with. The pillar appearing in picture No. 127 of the album was in the disputed Bhawan but at what places, I do not know. The pillars appearing in picture No. 49 lagayat 54 were in the disputed Bhawan but only one pillar is appearing in the picture. Therefore, I cannot say at what places these were in the disputed Bhavah. An idols of Hanumanji, appearing in picture No. 50, 51, 52 and 54, are at the places where Mahabiree is painted. The pillars appearing in picture No. 115 lagayat 120, of the album, were at the disputed Bhawan, but at what places these were, I cannot say. An idol of Hanumanji in picture No. 115, 117 and 120 are at the places where Mahabiree is painted. In picture No. 40, two fishes and two lions are appearing at the door. Garurji is there in between two lions. In picture No. 79 and 80 of the album, the outer part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing. From outer part, I mean these pictures were at the Hanumanthdwar. Picture No. 87 and 88 of the album are partly visible and takhein are appearing in picture No. 88. I cannot say, which part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in these picture. A curtain and policemen are appearing in picture No. 85 and 86. Which parts of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in these picture, I do not know. I cannot say, which parts of the disputed Bhawan are appearing in picture No. 91, 92 and 93 of this album. It is not clear from the picture No. 99 and 100 of this album, which parts are appearing in these pictures. It is not correct to say that I did not visit the disputed Bhawan prior to 1950. It is also not correct to say that no idol was there in the disputed Bhawan upto 22nd December, 1949. It is

not correct to say regular Namaj was being read there in the disputed Bhawan upto 22nd December, 1949. It is not correct to say that I visited to the disputed Bhawan only two to four times only and hence I have a little knowledge about disputed Bhawan. It is also not correct that disputed Bhawan, since its construction, is being used as Babri Masjid. It is not correct to say that disputed Bhawan was never been a Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir. It is also not correct that disputed Bhawan was not constructed after demolition of Mandir. It is not correct that I have been related to Akharas and as such I am giving false statement in favour of Nirmohi Akhara.

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

(Cross-examination by Shri Mustaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff No. 7 in Other Original suit No. 4/89 aTid defendant No. 5 Mohd. Hasim in Other Original Suit No. 5/89, begins.)

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

The word "Jagadguru" and "Ramanandacharya" prefix in my name is a title. It is one title. This title was honoured to me in Prayag Kumbh held in 1999. Haryacharya is not a title. It is my name. I want to add, that I am a scholar of religion, history, literature and languages. I have the knowledge of Hindi, Sanskrit, English and Urdu. I have done M.A. in Hindi subject. I cannot say in which year, I got it from Avadh University. I am deposing in favour of Nirmohi Akhara. I cannot say against whom I am deposing. I am deposing in Ram Janm Bhoomi Suit, Nirmohi Akhara versus Muslim brothers.

Question: In your affidavit, you have written the name of parties, Nirmohi Akhara versus Priya Dutt Ram and others, as plaintiff and defendant respectively. Is defendant priya Dutt Ram is a Muslim?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89 raised an objection that it is not possible on the basis of name Priya Dutt Ram, plaintiff, to say that he is a Muslim or not. Therefore, there is no justification in asking about the name of parties, particularly when it was told that the suit was filed against Muslim community. Hence such question cannot be allowed.)

(Upon this learned cross-examiner said, India is big country and such types of names are there, that on the basis of names, it is not possible to identify, who is Hindu and who is Muslim.)

Answer: The defendant, Priya Dull Ram is not a Muslim.

I do not know Priya Dull Ram. I am right if I say that this suit has been filed against Mushms. The witness, upon seeing the suit document of Other Original Suit No. 3/8 9, said the name of Priya Dull Ram has been deleted as defendant No. 1 and it is replaced by Jamuna Prasad.

Question: In the above suit, decree has been asked for against defendant No. 1. What you have to say in this regard?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that in accordance with the judgment given by Hon'ble High Court on 24.10.1994,

such question has become redundant and there is no need to ask such question particularly when witness said that the suit has been filed against Muslim community.)

Answer: It is correct that decree has been asked for, against defendant No. 1.

It becomes clear from the suit document that Shri Umesh Chander Pandey has been referred as defendant No.10.

Question: It is clear from the suit document that Anutosh (order) has been asked for against defendant No. 1 only. What you have to say in this regard?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that question from witness cannot be asked about which he is not concerned. Hence such question should not be allowed.)

Answer: It is correct that decree (Anutosh) has been asked for against the defendant No. 1, only.

I am aware of that the suit is about they disputed Bhawan but I have heard that other peoples have also filed the suit. I have no knowledge about it.

Question: You are deposing only in this suit, what you have to say in this regard?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that such question should not be allowed, particularly when many other suits are linked with

each other and examination is being done together. In view of this such question should not be allowed.)

Answer: I am deposing only in the suit "Nirmohi Akhara versus Priya Dutt" and not in another.

I know Gopal Singh Visarad, who was living in Ayodhya. He was residing in Raiganj Mohalla and was a Hindi Teacher in Divya Kala Vidyalaya. Besides he was a poet and used to take part in meetings etc. I have heard that he has filed the suit in regard to disputed Bhawan. I have no knowledge about the suit filed by him. He had a house in Ayodhya but whether the said house exist or not, I do not know. List-A is attached with my main examinee affidavit.

Question: Can you tell, in brief, what you want to say through your affidavit?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, has raised an objection that to give brief of the affidavit is not possible when the statement of main examinee has been recorded in the affidavit and such question should not be allowed.)

Answer: On the conjecture of the people, that Ayodhya, Saryu are not there. Its chauhadi is not correct. Ramjanmbhoomi reference is not in the books. These all are not correct. It has been Ramjanmbhoomi and still exists.

I have, at para 13 of my main examinee affidavit, referred Ancient History and Ancient India History at para

16. The word I have used Ancient History, is for the Ancient History of the world.

Question: Is Ancient Word History is the subject matter of this Suit?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit raised an objection that question about the subject matter of the suit cannot be asked from witness. Hence such question should not be allowed.)

Answer: This suit is related to universal humanity. Hence I referred the world history.

The word "Swami" is figuring in my name in the affidavit. The word swami is an indicative of honour. One who holds Dand is called swami. It is not in any way related to ownership or Lord. The word Ramanandacharya is referring early Ramanandacharya. Sampradayacharya means present head of Sampradaya. I am holding both these two titles. My first guru was Rambalak Das When I hold Dand and when I was honoured with Jagadguru, Swami Shivramacharya was my second guru.

The Mahant, who sits in the 1-Tanumangarhi on the seat, is called Gaddinaseen. My Guru was Gaddinaseen. It is Urdu word. The word "Sadiq" disciple of Mahant Parmeshwar Dass was referred at the first page of the affidavit, is not correct. It should be "Sadhak." Mahant Permashwar Dass was also my Guru. Thus I had three Gurus, Balakram Dass, Permashwar Dass and Shivramacharya. I have not mentioned about my third Guru in my affidavit.

The Digember Gurukul referred at para 7 of my main examinee affidavit is situated in Katra Mohalla and not at Jalpa drain. The word Patti Sagaria is figuring at para 8 of the affidavit. There are four Patti in Hanumangarhi, Patti Sagaria, Patti Vasantia, Patti Ujjainia and Patti Haridwari. Patti means a line or group. He himself said Patties are named on the basis of four Kumbh. Ramanandiya Sect is a Sect of Hindus thought. I was a family person before entering into this sect. In Ramananda Sampradaya, some are family men, some are Virakt and some are Vanprastha. Before joining Ramanand Sampradaya. I was a family man. The Bhawan, which was demolished on 6th December, 1992, was the reconstructed Bhawan. I do not know, when it was constructed.

Question: Para 3 of the document in suit, in Other Original Suit No. 3i89 and attached map was shown to witness and he was asked whether the alphabet referred at para 3, A, B, C, D and E, F, G, K, P, N, M, L are exist in the map.

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, has raised an objection that such type of question cannot be asked for from witness. Neither it can be shown to witness nor it can be referred. Neither the witness has prepared this map nor he is a party. Hence such question cannot be asked. Two question being asked through a single question. Hence permission may not be granted.)

Answer: Alphabet A, B and D is visible. C is not visible. There are four 0 in the map. Besides, alphabet G, H. P. N are in the map. I cannot certify whether this map is of the disputed Bhawan or not?

Question: Please tell, after reading para 3 of the suit document whether fact referred at this para is subject matter of disputed Bhawan.

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89 has raised an objection that neither the subject matter can be shown to witness nor question in this regard can be asked from the witness because witness is not a party. Hence such question cannot be asked for.)

(Learned Advocate cross-examiner has raised counter objection that witness is a witness of plaintiff and question being asked, is based on the suit document filed by plaintiff. Hence showing and reading out the suit document is legal and question can be asked for.)

Answer: Smriti Bhawan of Shri Ram is referred in this para and not the disputed Bhawan.

Question: After reading the paras, next to para 3, tell us, whether disputed Bhawan is referred there anywhere?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that this question is vague, so it should not be allowed.)

Answer: It appears from these paras, that some Muslims wanted to enter into the disputed premises but could not. They have tried in 1934 but could not.

There is no reference about disputed premises at para 4 and 5 and also at para 6 and 7 and para 4A and 4B of the document.

Question: The statement given by witness to-day that It appears from these paras, that "some Muslims wanted to enter into the disputed premises but could not. They have tried in 1934 but could not" was read out to witness and he was asked

if there is no reference about the disputed premises in the documents, than on what basis you said that Muslims have tried to enter into.

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89 has raised an objection that a question is being asked from the witness, which he had already replied. So the question about the subject matter involved cannot be asked for again.)

Answer: I have not said that they entered into the disputed premises. I have said that they had tried but could not.

Muslims have tried to enter into. This was referred at the first line of para 5 of the suit document. "Said temple building" is written at para 5. He himself said it is a court language. I cannot understand it fully. "Said temple Building" I mean, they have tried to enter into Shri Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

6.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, the suit may be listed for cross examination for 9.8.2004, before Hon'ble Full bench.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

6.8.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey, Additional
Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty, High Court,
Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 16.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 13.8.2004, in Other Original
Suit No. 3/89.)

(Cross examination, furtherance to dated 6.8.2004,
by Shri Mustaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate, on behalf of
plaintiff No. 7 in Other Original Suit No. 4/89 and
defendant No. 5 in Other Original Suit No. 5/89, continues.)

After reading the full suit document, witness said that
he has read the full document. I could not understand a
part, in which court language was used. Witness said that
after understanding the meaning of para 2, the points
mentioned therein are clear to me. There is no such point,
which I cannot understand. Nothing about the suit, in
which I am deposing here, is written in the suit document.
A part of his statement made on 6.8.2004 at page No. 165
"in this para, disputed Bhawan Shri Ram
Smriti Bhawan is mentioned" was read out to witness.
Upon this the witness said, some where in the suit
document it has been mentioned that this Bhawan was
constructed in the memory of Shri Rama. On the basis of
which, I have mentioned, in the reply given by me, about
Shri Ram's Smriti Bhawan. I do not know, at what place
the Shri Ram's Smriti Bhawan, referred in suit document,
is. I also do not know about its length and width. A part of
his statement "Some Muslims tried to enter into the

disputed premises” was read out to him and he was asked, what does he mean by disputed premises. Witness said, that disputed premises means Rajanmbhoomi. The disputed site, in which I am giving statement, is a disputed premise. The outer portion of Ramjanmbhoomi cordoned by wall, is called disputed premises. The disputed premises is open, it is not cordoned by wall. There were a few shops in the eastern side of the disputed premises and a road on the eastern side of the shops. There was open space in the north of disputed site and road ahead. This road leads to Vasistha Kund from Janmsthan. There was a big platform on the southern side of the disputed premises, where Satsarg and Katha was used to held. A disputed premise was above 100 feet in length and 80 feet in width. Ramjanmbhoomi is on the western side of disputed premises. Ramjanmbhoomi is cordoned by iron grilled wall. In the west of disputed premises, there is an iron grilled wall and Nirmohi Akhara’s storeroom of tin is in the western side of iron grilled wall, where sadhus lives. I do not remember whether there was anything in the west side of the iron grill wall. It is not like that I do not want to tell the facts. I am not keeping well. My memory is good. A part of the statement given by witness on 6.8.2004, at page No. 166 was readout to him that ‘It appears from these paras that Muslims wanted to enter into the disputed premises but could not” and he was asked if it is necessary to have wall around to enter into or entry can be effected through open space. Witness said, it could be for open space.

List “A” attached with his main examinee affidavit was shown to witness. This list contains a part from Ayodhya Mahatamy. The edition of Skand Puran, from where list-A was taken, is read by me. This edition of Skand Puran is published by Kashi Vidwat Parishad. The

year, in which it was published, is written in the book. I do not remember its year of edition, because it was published much before. I do not know what edition no. it has. Vaishnav Khand is written there in the book. This book might have published 2-4 years back. The sloks given in List-A, is followed by their proposition, literal meanings, meaning in Hindi and its English translation. In my view, the sloks given therein are correct and their proposition literal meaning, Hindi and English translation is correct. The word "Pindarak" in English translation in slok No. 15, is correct. "Pindarak" . still exist in Ayodhya in between Sugreev Fort and Diwid Fort, which is in a dilapidated position now a days. This is the place of Surya, where Suryavanshi King used to do prayer. It is an open space now a days. Most of its part is under cultivation. Pindarak is at the distance of 100 meters from the disputed site. A disputed premise is in the west-south side of the Pindarak and Pindarak is in the east side of the disputed premises. I have stated in the statement given by me to-day that there were a few shops in the east of disputed premises and a road ahead. This place, Pindarak is in the east of the road referred above. Pindarak is at a distance of 100-150 meter from the road and is in the east. This road leads to Faizabad from Janmbhoomi via Kaziya. In English translation of slok No. 15, it is written as Pindarik but in the translation of slok No. 16, it is written as Pindarik, which is o clerical mistake. Upon reading the English translation of slok No. 17, List No. A, witness said the place, referred as Vighneshwar is still exist. It is in Ayodhya. Vighneshwar is in the east of Pindarak. It is at a distance approx. 100-200 meters from Pindarak. It is a worship place. Ganeshji is worshiped here. There is no temple at that place. It is an open place. There is a small place of Vighneshwar, like a temple, at a height of 10 feet from the ground level. It is in a form of temple. There is

an idol of Ganesha in it. There are fields around it and a road. This road is in the south side of Vighneshwar. This road is at a distance of 10-15 meter from Vighneshwar. This road leads to Janmbhoomi from Hanumangarhi. Vighneshwar is aside by it. This temple of Ganeshji is less than 200-400 years old. Pindarak is in the form of a stone, which was worshiped by the princes of Suryavanshi. It is an old place approx. 500-600 years old.

“Hermitage” of Vasista, referred in English translation of slok No. 20 is in the south side of Ramjanmbhoomi in Ayodhya. There is a grand temple of Vasista and a Kund. This temple of Vasista is very old, contemporary to Rama. It may be in a ruined position but now its major part is build-up. The bricks fixed in the temple are very old because these type of bricks are not produced now a days. Wall of temple is cemented but bricks of Kund are not plastered. The entire Kund is made of bricks. These bricks are in square form and big in size. I do not know whether engraving is there on the bricks or not. On one stone “daily Vasist Kund Yatra” is written. Number is not written on the stone. It is said by the Sadhus that this stone is from the time of Rama. I have not seen any number or writings on it except the writing on the stone “Vasista Kund daily yatra.” It is not correct to say that something is written in English on the stone. It is also not correct to say that a number is written on it. The Lomas Hermitage is referred in the above slok. A number over a stone is written there... There is a place called Ramgulella where Lothasji used to come and stay. There is a temple at the place of Ramgulella. Ramgulella .temple is less old than Vasisht Temple. It appears from the stone that Vasisht used to stay there, whenever he comes there. The stone fixed there is a Makrana stone, which is thousands years old. The writings on the stone is in Hindi

script. Hindi script was in vogue in India and is still in vogue. Scholar of to-day says Hindi has no script and Hindi is written in another script. It is said about Ramgulella place that Ramchanderji used to play a ball here i.e. play Gulel there. Lomas Mandir might be in the east-south side of the disputed premises. The temple of Vasisht is also towards this direction.

Three roads leads to Dorahi Kuan from Hanumangarhi. The road adjacent to Ramjanm Sthan, leads to Dorahi Kuan from Hanumangarhi. On the southern side of the road, there is Vighneshwar place. Vighneshwar place is at a distance of 20- 22 meter, approx. from this road and Pindarak is in the south of the road. Pindarak is at a distance of 40-50 meter from the road. Temple of Vasishta is in east-north side from this road. Lomas temple is in east-south direction from the road. I agree with the Hindi-English translation of the sloks mentioned at list-A. In my view nothing is wrong therein. Misprinting might be there.

A part "Mata Kaushaliya with folded hand..... people make fun" of statement given by him on 23.7.2004 at page No. 18, was readout to him. Witness said the above mentioned facts were spoken by Mata Kaushaliya.

Birth, incarnation and fame of Ramchanderji were described in Ved and Purans. Veds and Purans are contemporary. I believe that Veds are divine, which cannot be confined to a particular time. Similarly Purans are also divine. He himself said Purans are referred in Veds. Veds and Puran were there before the time of Rama. Veds were there before Rama. Rama was referred in Veds because Rama ever existent is time immemorial. Therefore,

Ramchanderji was referred in Veds. Ved and Purans are in Sanskrit. These existed in writing since eternal. Ramchander born as a son of King Dasratha and Ramlila is organized about which, is referred in Veds. Ramchanderji takes birth in every Kalpa. At present first stage of Kalyuga is going on, It was lasted 5000 years before. Ramchanderji will take birth in the last phase of Kalyuga. Kalyuga follows by Satyuga and than Tretayug. At the eve of Dwaperyuga and the last of Treta, Bhagwan Rama takes birth in Ayodhya again.

I referred "Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj" in my statement. The word sanatan means continous process. Arya Samaj, Hindus and Budhs are derivative of Sanatan Dharma. Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj spread over to whole India. It is also spread over to England, Switzerland, Paris etc. People from there comes here for pindtaran. The people living in India, all comes under Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj. The follower of all religion i.e. Hindu, Muslims, Sikh, Christians, Budhs and Jams comes under it.

There is a River Ganga in India. He himself said that five rivers are called a Ganga. One brought to earth by Maharaj Bhagirath and is at prayag. Second is Krishna Ganga, in Madhya Pradesh, third is Manorama, at Makhsthali in Ayodhya. Makhsthali is situated in Distt. Gaunda, in the north of Saryu. Fourth one is Kaveri, near Sonbhadra in Bihar and fifth one is Tiloshawar flows below Mani Prabat in Ayodhya. It exists even to-day. It flows from Tiloshwar and meet with sea. All the rivers flows to sea. This river merges at a point where Damodar and Brahmputra merge. Mani Prabat, I referred above, is in Ayodhya. Tiloshwar is in Chhatisgarh. This river merges from Tileshwar and flows to Ayodhya. He himself said there is little water in it. All these five Gangas are from the

time of Ramchanderji. It is not correct to say that there is Ganga, namely Trilokiya, in Ayodhya and I am giving false statement in this regard. Besides there were other Gangas during the time of Ramchanderji. These five Gangas were described in Ramcharitmanas Gomati, Ganga, Saiganga, Tonsganga are in addition to above five. There may be more Gangas. Tons river and above two rivers are known as Ganga even to-day. Saryu River, at some distance is called Ghaghra. He himself said that after a distance of 360 Dhanus in east and 360 Dhanus in south, it is called Ghaghra. One Dhanus is equal to 11 man hand. 11 man hand, I mean, sixteen and half feet. At Faizabad, at the distance of 360 Dhanus from Ayodhya, it is called Ghaghra. From Mastakbagh to Ramghat it is called Saryu and from there it is called Ghaghra. Some part of Mastakbagh falls in Ayodhya and some part in Faizabad. With the passage of time, the name of Mastakbagh changed to Mahtab Bagh. This place has a religious importance. Bhagwan Ramchanderji used to come here for walk. This place is also referred in Valmiki Ramayana and Ramcharitmanas. In Valmiki Ramayana it is called Mahad Vanam. By which name it is referred in Ramcharitmanas not known to me. He himself said that in Ramcharitmanas it is referred as Goptarghat. During the period of Nawab the name of Mahad ,Vanam changed to Mahatab Bagh. I came to know about this from the Tamrapatra kept in Hanumangarhi. This Tamrapatra is in Arabi language and belongs to the period of Asifudola. I do not know Arabi language but another Mahatma read it for me. It was mentioned in that Tamrapatra that land was given to Hanumangarhi. King donated 51 bigha land to Hanumangarhi after he recovered from leprosy. The King was Sirajudola. It was mentioned in the Tamrapatra that the place known by the name of Mahad Vanam is now called Mahtab Bagh. There is no reference about it, anywhere. He himself said that

Britishers caused partridges to fight with each other at this place and address them b" the name Pappu Gappu etc. It is not possible in Veds, to reduce something and to highlight something because whatever reduced 'or highlighted, it should be in Lokik Sanskrit. So by using Sanskrit in vogue it is not possible. There are some Purans, wherein reference about modern Kings is found, where it is possible to reduce and to extend the facts. The Purans where some part is added cannot be called divine. Such Purans will not be included in the list of 18 Purans. Nothing has been reduced or extended in Skand Puran. Some Variation were made in Devi Puran, Kalika Puran and Bhavisya Puran. Alallaho Puran is there also. This Puran is not covered under 18 Purans.

No addition or reduction is made in 18 Purans. I am saying this after reading them. It was written in Devi Puran that Sukdev Swami was married to 100 women. This part was added in Devi Puran. Except this, all facts given in Devi Puran are certified. Witness said that there are four more Purans, where some portions were added. Devi Puran is not included in 18 Purans. Devi Puran is also treated an honoured Puran but the added portion is not treated as honoured one. Alallaho is not a Puran. It is Upnishad. The statement given by me earlier that Alallaho is Puran, is not correct. It is an Upnishad. It is written in Tretrayopni shad that Utkastam Jagrat, Varanyabodhak. Azan of Kuran is taken from there. The word Allahu, Allahu, Allahu Akbar is taken from the above upnishad.

Document No. 109 C-1/3 of Other Original Suit No. 5/89, which is suit document in original suit No. 57/8, court of Munsif Sadar, Faizabad, was shown to witness. Upon reading the details Mandir Nizai, given in the last of the suit document, witness said the material differs from the

suit No. 3/89, in which I am giving statement. The disputed subject of both the suit differ from each other.

Question: In your statement you have used the word disputed premises and also said that this disputed premises is different from the subject of other original suit No. 3/89. You have also told about the area and Chouhadi of disputed premises. Whether the disputed property involved in this suit is in agreement with the property of the above disputed premises.

Answer: The Chouhadi of disputed premises I referred in my statement above is different from the disputed property referred in this suit. These are not in agreement.

Document No. 45 C-1/1/1 of Other Original Suit No. 3/89 was shown to witness. Witness said the person, Raghunath Dass, Baldev Dass, Sukhram Dass, Naga Charan Dass and Ram Lakhan Dass, referred in agreement, are known to me. I do not know Mahant Ramchanran Dass referred as plaintiff in the agreement. The person known to me, were from Nirmohi Akhara. They were office bearer of Nirmohi Akhara. Vide para- 1, of this agreement Mahant Raghunath Dass of Nirmohi Akhara was authorized to perform Puja etc. of Shri Ram Mandir. Raghunath Dass was declared the Mahant of all properties of Nirmohi Akhara. It was also stated in the agreement that plaintiff Ramchander Dass have no right over the property of Nirmohi Akhara. At para-2 of the agreement, temple of Nirmohi Akhara, situated at Ramghat was also referred in. In the last of this para, rights in regard to other properties, as mentioned in the list, was given to Raghunath Dass. Document No. 45 C-1/1/6 is the list of properties mentioned in the agreement. The List-A

enclosed with the document and Chouhadi of a temple, is of the temple of Nirmohi Akhara, situated at Ramghat. In my view there are number of anomalies in this Chouhi. Than said that the Chaudhi of the temple of Nirmohi Akhara at Ramghat is correct but the Mahant who erase the property of Akhara is expelled at once. Like Ranikewal Dass, who donated the land of Ramjanmbhoomi, was expelled at once. Ramkewal Dass donated the land of Ramjanmbhoomi to V.H.P. and others. When it became known to Akhara's people, they removed Ramkewal Dass from the Mahant. The details and Chaudhi given at document No. 2, cannot be said correct. The old Chaudhi has not been mentioned anywhere. Only present Chaudhi was given. The Chaudhi mentioned at Sl. No. 3 of this document is not correct. The Tulsi Dass and Chabutra Lomas on the west and Sumitra Bhawan in south, is correctly mentioned and graveyard is written in the eastern Chaudhi, which is not correct because graveyard never seen there. In document No. 45 C-1/1/5 Almarkoom Yadoom June 42 is written, which means that this agreement was written on 1st June, 1942. Upon seeing the documents No. 45 C-1/2A, of this suit, witness said outer part of the disputed premises is shown in the map. The southern part referred by me is shown here. Disputed premises is shown in the map as Chabutra. This is the same disputed premises, which I referred in the statement. A road in the north was shown in this map. This is the same road, which leads to Hanumangarhi from Dorahi Kuan and in its north there is Janmsthan Mandir. Southern part beyond the road has been shown in the map. The item shown in the southern part, in the map are correct. It appears that Ramchabutra, Shankarji Ka Sthan and Bhandar Grih, which I saw during childhood, are shown in the map. But I am not sure that the points shown in the map are correct. The map shows the things, which I have

seen. But beyond the Chabutra, shown in the map, there were field. I have mentioned a word Vanprastha in my statement, which means, people go to forest for chanting Bhajan etc. I have mentioned that humanity is related to this issue, which means brotherhood. I have stated that all people living in India are the part of Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj. None was excluded from it. The present dispute is like a small boil, it requires operation. Unless it is taken out, will spoil the atmosphere. The incident of 6th December, 1992, in Ayodhya cannot be treated as good one. It shows differences. Problem can be solved mutually. It is because politics has entered in to religion have not tried because none has asked for me. This problem can be solved either through court or by mutually accepted decision. Court is the highest authority. The decision of court should be honored by all concerned. I have referred the Ayodhya and Janmbhoomi, which were referred in Valrniki Ramayana. The reference in Valmiki Ramayana is not imaginary. It is not correct to say that I did not know about Babri Masjid before 1950. I was a child at that time. I had heard that some dispute taken place in between Hindus and Muslims and with the result the temple was attached. I have heard that some people have lost their lives and some were injured. I have heard about it. I did not went there because I was bounded with the principle of Ashram. The big temple in Ayodhya have huge properties. I cannot say that Barasthan Mandir has the huge property but once it was said that the Mahant of Barasthan had Kohinoor Diamond in his possession and the properties in various district U.P. and in four-five states. Hanumangarhi also had a huge property but after abolition of Jamindari, its property has been reduced substantially. Chavani and Ban Chavani also have the properties. Mahant of Chhottee Chavani, Nirtya Gopal Dass is at present a national hero. Janmsthan Mandir also

had the property but now it has been reduced. People have encroached upon its property. The property, which peoples used to donate to temple, became the property of temple. Ramjanmbhoomi had no distinct existence. It was a part/branch of Nirmohi Akhara. It might be possible that there was no role of local Hindus in the dispute, which took place in 1949 and in the incident of installing an idol in the disputed Bhawan. The outsider sadhus were responsible for this. I do not know whether any Hindu of Ayodhya was involved in the suit for attachment. I have heard that clash took place in the night. The first suit in connection of taking out an idol from the disputed Bhawan was filed by Gopal Singh Visharad. I cannot say that Gopal Singh Visharad was from Ayodhya or not. Then said he was from Ayodhya I treated him as the original resident of Ayodhya. But he was not. I do not know that he was residing in a rented house. I have not seen Namaj was being read for five times a day upto 22nd December, 1949. Muslims keeps Roza. This I know. It is not correct to say that Namaj was being read there during Roza. I am not aware of the fact that Priest seating on Chabutra used to distribute Ladoo to the Namazee or not. It is not correct to say that Namaj was being read there in the disputed Bhawan upto 22nd December, 1949. It is also not correct that disputed Bhawan was not called as Ramjanm Mandir by any person. A well is a part of Masjid. Where people do Vaju. But there was no well in the disputed Bhawan. And at present also there is no well. It is not correct to say that I am making false statement about Ramjanmbhoomi disputed structure.

Shri Sayyed Irfan Ahmad, Advocate, on behalf of defendant No. 26 in Other Original Suit No. 5/89, has accepted the cross-examination done by Shri Zaffaryab Geelani and Shri Mustaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate.

Shri Fazie Alam, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No. 6/1 and 6/2 in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, has accepted the cross-examination done by Shri Abdul Mannan, Shri Zaffaryab Zilani and Shri Mustaqu Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate.

Cross-examination by all defendants/parties concluded.

Witness is discharged.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

16.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

16.8.2004

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 Dutt Ram and others ... Defendants

STATEMENT OF D.W. 3/14
JAGADGURU RAMANANDACHARYA SWAMI
HARYACHARYA

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 Dutt Ram and others ...Defendants

MAIN EXAMINEE AFFIDAVIT JAGADGURU
RAMANANDACHARYA SWAMI HARYACHARYA D.W.
3/14, UNDER ORDER 18 RULE 4 CODE OF CIVIL
PROCEDURE

I, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya, aged 69 years, disciple of late Mahant Ram Balak Dass, Hanumangarhi Ayodhya and disciple of Mahant Parmeshwar Dass Haridham, Gopal Mandir, Ramgbat, Ayodhya, hereby solemnly affirm that: -

1. I am consecrated to the post of Sampradacharya of main seat of Ramananda Sect.
2. I am the 25th Ramananda Sampradacharya of Ramananda Sect.
3. I am a Vyakaranacharya (scholar of Grammar) literature, Vedantacharya (expert of Vedant philosophy) and M.A.
4. I have studied Ved-Purans, Smriti, Religion, Poetry, History and all the practice under sanatan Dharm.

5. I have studied Sanskrit language.
6. I have studied Valmiki Ramayana too.
7. I have been a Principal of Yogiraj Sanskrit Vidyalaya (School). I have been a Grammar professor in Anadi Digambar Jain Gurukul for 6 years and Head of the Department of Grammar Science in Shri Niwas Bodhayan Ramanuj Sanskrit University, Uttar Totadri Math for 18 years.
8. I came to Ayodhya in the year 1945, at the age of 10 year (approx.) and opted the Ramanandiya Sect, after becoming the disciple of Swami Ram Balak Dassji, Patti- Sagariya of Hanumangarhi and studied in Ayodhya while residing at Hanumangarhi and Kashi.
9. I have written the following Granth (books):
 - 1) Sri Sampradaya Manthan (in seven volumes) published from Ayodhya and Vijak Karm Samvat 2048.
 - 2) Sri Sampradaya Samay Teeka book.
 - 3) Vedon Main Avtar Rahasya.
 - 4) Shri Ramcharitmanas ka Vadicatwa.
 - 5) Brahm Sutra Sanskrit Teeka.
 - 6) Upnishad Irsa Vasthoya Nisad Haribhasya
 - 7) Geeta Bhakti Darshan.
 - 8) Nan Tu Narayani.
 - 9) Sri Ram Satavraj.
 - 10) Pnchmukh Mangal Hanuman.
 - 11) Sri Sampradaya Darshan.

10. I am a Founder Editor Chairman of Avadh Saurabh monthly magazine.
11. I have delivered discourses at various places, in districts and in metro cities for the propagation of Sanatan Dharma and have been debating from the student life.
12. I have studied Vedic Literature, Ved, Vedang, Purans, Upanishad, Smriti and Bhasya etc. and also studied other religious books. I have studied Valmiki Ramayana, Ramcharitmanas written by Tulsi Dass. I have read Ekadash books written by Goswami Tulsi Dass.
13. Vedic Literature has great importance in studying the ancient history.
14. Rigveda has a great importance in Vedic literature. And similarly Brahman's books also have great importance for every Veds.
15. In Atharv Veda Prithiviti was said to be king of Karauva.
16. There is a systematic description of ancient Indian history in Puranas. Five subjects were illustrated in Puranas : -
 - 1) Canto (Primordial world).
 - 2) Prati Sarg (re-generation after universal destruction.)
 - 3) Vansh (Genealogy of Gods and Rishies.)
 - 4) Manwantar (great age of Kalpa, creator of which was Manu.)
 - 5) Genealogy (History of ancient King's dynasty.)

17. Genealogy Matyasya Puran, Vishnu Puran, Brahman Puran, Bhagwat Puran etc.
18. Garur Puran also contains tables of Porav, Itchwanku and Brihdat etc. royal dynasty.
19. Smriti Manu, Bhardwaj, Yagyawalkaya, Narad, Brahaspatti, Parashar etc.
20. All Smrities contains the subject. General Varnashram Religion, duties of a King etc. Among these, Manu Smriti is the base of Vedic Sanatan Dharma.
21. Sanatan Hindu Samaj recognized Manusmriti an authenticated. Nothing against Manu Smriti is adhered. According to Manusmriti, King is also governed by Religion. No King can take the temple.
22. Dharmo Vishawasasya Jagat Prathistha. (Manu Smriti.)
23. I have studied Valmiki Ramayana in Sanskrit and Hindi Translation.
24. Maharishi Valmiki, in Valmiki Ramayana, has described the character of Ram, my adorable, my God, in a live description.
25. Valmiki Ramayana contains the description of Ayodhya and Saryu and geographical situation of all these rivers and ways through which Rama went to forest, is unchanged even to-day. Saryu River,

Nandigram, Panchwati, Rameshwaram, Ganga, Bhardwaj Ashram, Lanka etc. all are there.

26. According to Atharv Veda: -

Ayodhya is the city of God, having eight wheel nine gates, full with glory and gold, lighted by the luster of heavens. There are a number of learned Brahmgyani (one who has a deep knowledge of Brahm) in Ayodhya and full of gold. The city full of fame and invincible. Such Ayodhya is described in Vedas.

27. In 15th and 16th slok (couplet) of second chapter of Shiv Santuta, description of Ayodhya, Saryu was given as under: -

**Astchakra Navdwara Nagari Dharmisampada!
Dristvevam Gyannentreran Dhaytavya Saryusththa!!**

(Shiv Sanhita 20/15/16)

28. Ayodhya situated at the bank of Saryu and full of wealth, fame and glory. The detail of which was given in fifth slok of fifth canto, in Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana.

29. According to Valmiki Ramayana, Bhagwan Rama himself said that Ayodhya is his birth place.

30. Rudryamal is an ancient book, 500 years old and a recognized one. In accordance with the Rudryamal, Ayodhya was described as under:-

Ayodhya is situated on the Sudarshan Chakkra of Mahavishnu. It gives birth to the holy person. It is merry-making place

of Shri Sitaram. Fixing the limit of inner home of God, Shankar says to Parveti it is spread over from Sahastra Dhara, Golaghat, Laxman Fort, upto for four miles in the east, 4 miles in the west. In North and south, from Saryu to Tamsa River (near Bharat Kund). In west direction it is like a fish-head in area and in east, like a tale.

31. Lomas Rishi Ashram is in the east of the present Shri Ramjanrn Bhoomi Mandir, about which a case is subjudice. Where there is a Ramgulella Mandir, there is a stone in the name of Shri Lomasji. Bighneshwar Bhagwan is in the west side of Ram Janm Bhoomi Mandir. Which is in the west side of Vasisth Bhawan Mandir. The proof is enclosed at list 'A' of an affidavit.
32. Swami Ramanandacharya has introduced the Vasistadwet Darshan Ramanandiya Veragi Sect, approx. 700 years ago. Bhagwan Ram is the God of Ramanandiya Sect.
33. Akharas of Ramanandiya Vaishnav Sect were established by Balanandji Maharaj, 500 years before. There are a number of Nirmohi Akharas at various places in India and a number of temples are under its control.
34. Nirmohi Akhara is Religious Trust, which is managed by Panchs. This Akhara is a public Math. There is Mahant, elected by the Panchs. He works in accordance with the advise of Panchs. Mahant cannot donate the property of Akhara.

35. Famous Hanumangarhi, Kapil Muni Mandir and 12 temples of Hanumangarhi comes under the Nirvani Akhara. Similarly Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir has been under Nirmohi Akhara. Ramghat is an ancient place of Nirmohi Akhara. Ramapura, Khurdabad, Sumitra Bhawan, Sita Koop, Naka Hanumangarhi are the temples of Nirmohi Akhara.
36. Annee Akharas are the military organization of Shri Chatu Sect of Vaishnava Ramananda Vishnu Swami Nimbark and Madhavacharya.
37. Customs, traditions of Nirvani Annee, Nirmohi Annee and Digambar Annee are similar. I have been a Sadhu of Nirvani Akhara. I know all traditions, customs. The customs, tradition of Hanumangarhi are similar to Nirmohi Akhara and Digambar Akharas.
38. I alongwith with the students and Saints of Hanumangarhi used to visit Ramjanambhoomi Mandir daily for darshan from the day I came to Ayodhya.
39. I have been taking darshan of Bhagwan Rambila sitting below the middle pitcher of all the three pitchers, from the time I came to Ayodhya, and upto the date of its attachment.
40. As per my knowledge it was attached in December, 1949. Since than Darshan of Bhagwan Ramlalla is made from the outside of the Grill-door.
41. Before its attachment the Puja-Path, Utsav, Sameya of Bhagwan Ramlalla, sitting below the pitcher were being performed by the Nirmohi Akhara. There were

priest of Nirmohi Akhara. Baldev Dassji was a priest there at the time, when I visited for the first time. After sometimes, I saw his disciple Bhaskar Dass there. At present Bhaskar Dass is Mahant of Hanumangarhi. There were other assistant priest whose names are not known to me.

42. After attachment, receiver was appointed in the last days of December, 1949, for looking after the arrangements.
43. There was a Ramchabutra Mandir in the outer part on entering from eastern door. An idol of Bhagwan Ramlalla and three brothers, in their childhood, were there on the chabutra. Its Puja-Path, Utsav, Samaiya etc. were being managed by Nirmohi Akhara. I also took darshan there.
44. On entering from eastern gate, there were store room, Saint Niwas adjacent to the wall of gate, where priest, Panchs and Sadhus of Nirmohi Akharas resides.
45. The chabutra was 3 feet in height, 20 feet in length and 17 feet (approx.) in width. There was a throne made of wood on the chabutra and it was covered by chhappar from the above. There were caves doors on the two sides of chabutra. On one side an idol of Kaushaliya, with Rama in her lap, and on the other side there was an idol of Bharatji, made of stone and 2 feet in height.
46. There was also a door in the outer courtyard, which opens only during the fair. There was a chhatti Pujansthal in the outer courtyard in the south of

northern gate, where there were the foot prints of all the four brothers and Belana-Chakia and Chulaha. This place was treated as sacred place.

47. Outer part was remained under the control of Nirmohi Akhara, even after attachment but it was also attached 22 years ago, due to dispute, of Nirmohi Akhara. Receiver has been appointed for this place too. Receiver was the same person, for both the places, outer or inner part. His name, I am not recollecting.
48. Prior to 1949, when it was attached, the inner and outer part, both were under the control of Nirmohi Akhara.
49. Structure i.e. outer and inner part was demolished in December, 1992 by the gathering but Bhagwan Ramlalla, which was under the middle pitcher, is sitting as before, in the tent, which is under the control of Central Govt. I came to know from others that darshan are being allowed as before. I have not visited there for darshan after demolition.
50. There was a Shiv-darbar in the outer part under the pipal tree at the east-south corner of Ram Chabutra Mandir. It was also managed by Nirmohi Akhara.
51. Like me, all the people of India, takes darshan of Bhagwan Ramlalla sitting in the inner or outer part and other religious places, like Shiv Darbar and Chhatti Pujan Sthal etc.
52. I have been visiting the inner and outer part of Ramjanambhoomi Mandir, since the time I came to

Ayodhya, for darshan. I have never seen any Muslim reading Namaj there in the disputed Bhawan.

53. Vedic proof of Saryu River, is in 9th mantra, 64 chapter, 10th mandal of Rigved and similarly in 9th mantra, 53rd chapter, 5th mandal, which read as under:

Oh, Saryu River appears in adhisasthree form alongwith the waves for the security of our yagna being performed at the time of Patresthi yagna of Maharaja Dasrath.

54. Vedic proof of the word "Ram" is as under: -

In 10th Mandal (tenth division of Rigved)/93rd translation/4th Mantra and 10th Mandals/3rd translation/3rd Mantra of Rigved and 59th Mantra of 29th chapter of Madhyanandini part of Sukra Ayjurved, 1st Mandal/31st translation/1st Mandal of Atharved, 1 Mantra/2nd translation/15th Mandal of Samved, 7th Mantra/111 translation/10 Mandal of Rigved, 13th Mantra/8th translation/5th Mandal of Tetriya Aaryakya and in the creation of Ketao Ramvindan etc. by exposition of Ram, his roopleela (deeds) and place was described. The specific principles of Ramanandiya Sect have been reproduced in the above mantra.

55. Vedic proof in regard to Maharaja Dasrath is as under: -

Maharaja Dasrath had 40 types of colour horses who live near Kamboj, Bahlik and Sindu Rivers.

56. The detail of Ayodhyapuri, described in 6th slok of 5th canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana, is as under: -

The Ayodhya city in that district is famous all over. This city was built-up and inhabited by Maharaj Manu himself.

57. Following has been described in 5th slok of 5th canto, in Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana: -

There is a great district named Kaushal, situated at the bank of Saryu, progressing day by day and is full of delight.

58. In accordance with the Valmiki ramayana, Devtas prayed the Bhagwan Vishnu and he resolved to descend on the earth and according to his resolution he descended. It was described in 31st and 32nd slok of 15th canto of Balkand.

59. I have read the "History of Shri Ramanand Sect" 700 Jayanti Samarak Smriti book of Anand Bhaskar Jagadguru Shri Ramanandacharya and Jayanti Smarak book, written by him. Swami Hariprasadacharya, Swami Sitaramacharya and Swami Ram Swaroopacharya were in the editor group. It was published from Ahmedabad, Gujarat. The Lawyer of Nirmohi Akhara has told me that these two books have been filed in the suit. These two books are recognized in our Sect.

60. The document "Ayodhya Mahatamya" is enclosed at list No. "a" with the affidavit, is authentic.

Verification

I, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Haryacharya solemnly affirm that para 1 to 12, 28, 31, 34 to 52 and 60

based on my knowledge and para 14 to 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 53 to 59 based upon the knowledge I gain from books and para 13 on the basis of my belief, are true to the best of my knowledge. I again solemnly affirm that nothing is false or nothing has been concealed. May God help me. Solemnly affirmed at Lucknow High Court, Lucknow.

Dated 23.7.2004

Witness

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya

Swami Haryacharya

I, R.L. Verma, Advocate, know the above witness. He put his signature in my presence.

(R.L. Verma)

Advocate

23.7.2004

Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow

Nirmohi Akhara V/s Baboo Priya Dutt Ram

D.W. No. 3/89

CLASSIC PROOF OF SHRI RAM JANAMBHOOMI

ANNEXTURE. "A"

Attached with affidavit

After bathing in the water of Sarayu one should even worship Pindarak, the one who puts the evil doers into delusion and bestows the virtuous with understanding.

During Navaratri one should make a pilgrimage to him (Pindarik) at a period when Pushya Nakshatra reigns and without fail should worship Ganesh on his western side.

Not an iota of impediment remains for one who visits him (Vighneshwara). For this reawn Vighneshwara, the endower and every desired reward is venerable.

From this spot, Ishanward lies Ram Janambhoomi. This place of birth is held to be the bestower of liberation and other rewards.

From this spot, Ishanward lies Ram Janambhoomi. This place of birth is held to be the bestower of liberation and other rewards.

The man who dwell in the hermitages and asceties, who perform thousand Rajsuya Sacrifices every year and Agnihotra, those who specially visit men undergoing religious observations at the Janambhoomi and the men who serve parents and Guru, obtain that kind of reward which is obtained the moment one sees Ram Janambhoomi.

On the eastern side of Vighneshwara, on the northern side of Vashishtha's hermitage, on the western side of Lomasha (hermitage) lies situated His (Ram birth place (Janambhoomi).

Seeing which human beings beself of penaure and the act of sacred offerings, even without making pilgrimages and performing sacrificial rites get released from the cycle of birth.

By visiting the Janambhoomi one obtained results which is equal to that of giving away of one thousand Kapila cows each day.

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004.)

Other Original Suit No. 3/1989

R.S. No. 26/1959

Nirmohi Akhara ...Plaintiffs

Versus

Baboo Priya Dutt Ram and others...Defendants

Dated 23 .7.2004

**D.W. 3/14 Jagatguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryachaiya**

Main examinee affidavit - page No. 1 to 13, of Jagatguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya, aged 69 years, disciple of Late Mahant Balak Dass of Hanumangarhi, Ayodhya and Sadik disciple of Mahant Parmeshwar Dass Haridham, Gopal Mandir, Ramghat, Ayodhya was submitted and taken on record.

(Cross-examination by Km. Ranjana Agnihotri, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No. 20, Akhil Bhartiya Shri Ramjanambhoomi reconstruction Committee in Other Original Suit No. 4/89, begins.)

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

I became the Sampradhacharya of main seat of Ramananda Sect during last Kumbh in 1985-86. I am 25th Ramananda Sampradhacharya of Ramananda Sect. First

Ramanandacharya was 700 years ago. Main seat is situated at Panchagangaghat Varanasi. Sampradayacharya of main seat can reside at the places other than Varanasi. I am a Vyankaranacharya. I have written a number of books on Grammar. Some books are in Hindi and some are in Sanskrit. I have written the book for the ordinary man. Besides I have written the books on other subject also. The book on the subject Grammar, written by me in Hindi are - Vyakaran Rahasya, Vedon main Avtar Rahasya. I could not brought the book with me. Swami Adiramanandacharya has 12 disciples. Their names were - Sursuranandacharya, Bhawanandacharya, Peepaji, Girjanandacharya. The names of others are not remembered to me. Narharyanandacharya was also among his disciple. This is the same Narharyanandacharya, who was referred by Goswami Tulsi Dass in 1 st line of fifth soratha in **Balkand of Ramcharitmanas**. This Soratha is as under:

Bandrau Guru Nai Kanj Kripa Sindu Narrop Hari
Mahamoh Tam Punj Bachan Ratri Kar Nikari

From the word Narhari "Nar Roop Han", Goswamiji means Narharyanandaji. Narharyananda was a Guru Goswami Tulsi Dass. So he praises him. My main study was confined to Sanskrit. I have started studying Sanskrit at the age of 15 years. Before the age of 15 years I was in my native place. I have studied in a Primary School. I was born in village Bandhuwa under Sidharth Nagar, Basti Division. We have concentrated on Valmiki Rainayana. Hence studied it first. I was reading and chanting manas before attaining the age of 15 years.

Ramcharitmanas was written four hundred years ago. I have heard poem, which means.

I published Shri Ramcharitmanas in Ayodhya city on ninth date, Tuesday, in the month of Chaitra. This book was published in 1621. Besides, Ramcharitmanas, I have read the other books written by Tulsi Dass, such as Geetawali, Kavitaawali, Vinay patrika, Vairagyasandipani, Barwe Ramayana, Ramlalla Nahchhu, Parveti Mangal, Ramagya Prasan, Hanuma Bahook, Hanuman Chaleesa etc.

The aim and objective of Ramananda Sect is to propagate the Vasistadwet philosophy to preach, to make religious discourses, creation etc. Bhagwan Rama was the God of Ramanandacharya. As an Acharya, he blessed Sita with Ram-mantra. Bhagwan Sitaram was the god of other followers of Ramanandiya Sect. Ramanandiya Sect follows an idol prayer. Janmsthal is also worshiped. Five type of idols are recognized in Ramananda Sect. Among them there are metal's, woods, earth, chih, earth and letters idol. In Vasistadwet philosophy, in addition to an idol, Janmsthan is worshiped. Janmsthali is worshiped at a number of places in India. The birth places of Bhagwan are Ramjanmbhoomi, Mathura and Kashi. In Mathura, birth place of Bhagwan Shri Krishna is worshiped. In Kashi, Bhagwan Shiva is worshiped.

In my main examinee affidavit it was said that I deliver discourses and religious narratives. I mainly deliver the story of Rama. I have studied the Ramcharitmanas in depth. There is a couplet No. 190 in Balkand of Ramcharitmanas, which means as under:

During the time of birth of Bhagwan Rama, the circumstances turned into favour. Everybody was with full of joy because the birth of Rama itself was an indication of joy.

The holy month of Chaitra, Shukla Paksha and Abhijeet Nakshtra are the best occasion for the devotion to Rama. The mid of the day, not so hot and not so cool, is the time for pleasure for the people. Second line of couplet No. 191 of Ramcharitmanas say:- The God, which gives pleasure and wealth and health, was born. The Chhand, next to this couplet says that Shri Rama, good for Kaushalya, kind hearted, compassionate towards poor was born. Kaushalya and sadhus became were overwhelmed with joys on seeing the child Rama. He was so handsome, having beautiful eyes, light blue colour. He was the enemy of Khar demon. Mata Kaushalya said to him that I am blessed with. Are you a Matateet, guranteet, Gyanameem, Haman. Ved Purans says that you are treasurer of pleasure, kind, full with qualities. Ved and Saint praises you. You are born for my welfare and to bless the people with love and brotherhood. You are the source of light. You are the creator of world. You are full with the knowledge. You have blessed me, by taking birth. Upon this Rama gave the knowledge to his mother Kaushalya and gave a smile. Mata Kaushalya again said that she is over whelmed with joy and pray to him that she want to see him as a child. Upon her request Rama started crying.

Slok No. 8, 9 and 10 of eighteen cantos at page No. 69, of The document No. 261 C/1 of Valmiki Ramayana was shown to witness and he was asked about the meaning. Witness said as under:

6 seasons i.e. 12 month have passed from the day of completion of yagna. On the 9th date of the month of Chaitra, in Aditi Nakshtra, when all God at their best, Kaushalya gave birth to Rama. At that time, Surya, Mangal, Sanni, Guru and Sukra, all the five planets were

in their best places and Chandrma alongwith Brihaspatti were in the lagna. Maharishi Valmiki written the birth place of Bhagwan Rama. Slok No.10 refer the place where people bow with respect. People bow before here being the birth place of Lord Rama. Valmiki Ramayana is a historical book. This proves that Rama was born in Ayodhya. He himself stated that God Rama born 'in twenty-fourth Tretayug. The time period of birth of Rama and composition time of Valmiki Ramayana is the same. Valmiki has described the deeds of Bhagwan Rama.

Puran and Vedas are divine. Valmiki Ramayana is very important to study the history of India. Because it is a primordial book. There was no book before that. Krishndwepayan, Vyasji and Balmiki were the author of Purana.

Sloks No. 8,9,10 and 11 of first canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana were shown to witness through document No. 261 C-1/1. Witness read the sloks and said, these means: The Rama, born in Ichvaku family is a learned, Sagacious, spokesman and destroyer of enemies. He is strongman. His chest is large and bow is big. His arms are lengthy alluring forehead. His physique is well built. His colour was glossy,, eyes are big and chest was bossy. He was renowned.

In para 20 of my main examinee affidavit, I referred about the stages of life described in Ramcharitmanas, which is as under:

“Varnamasthsanghanam” is written in the first slok of Balkand of Ramcharitmanas. The word “Vam” figuring in the slok mean the colour and the second meaning is “Caste system”. In Uttarkand of Ramcharitmanas, next to the

couplet No. 97(b), "Varn Dharm Nahin Asharmchari", word Ashram means, caste system.

I came to Ayodhya at the age of 10-11 years. I have studied in Ayodhya. There are three Akharas of Ramanandiya Sect in Ayodhya. Both the three Akharas are Annee Akharas. Annee stand for the military. Every Akhara is governed by Panchyati system. He himself said Mahant of Akhara is elected. All the three Akharas i.e. Nirmohi, Nirvani and Digambar Akharas are equal. No head Akhara is there. All the three Akharas have one system of working. Three times pooja, early morning, mid of day and at evening, is must in the temples of Akharas. Pooja at three times is performed in the temple of Ramanandiya Sect.

Vyasji has written Rigveda only. Its 1137 branches were not written by Vyasji. These were written by his disciples and disciples of others. There are four parts of Vedas - Bhasya, Sanhita, Brahaman and Upnishad. Each Vedas have separate Brahamn. Their name is - Aranyakya, Maitreya, Satpath Brahaman and Angira. These four are also Vedas. I have been visiting the birth place of Bhagwan Rama for darshan since 1946-47. I was 12-13 years old at that time. He himself said that he used to go for darshan alongwith the students. I went for darshan, for the first time, with my Guru. It is believed that one gets salvation by taking darshan of that place. With this faith and belief, followers of Sanatan Dharma goes for darshan. I went for darshan at hundred times at the occasion of Chaitra Ramnavami, Sarad Ramnavami, Swanjhulnotsav. There used to be heavy crowd at these occasions but one could get darshan easily. At Ramnavami heavy crowd reaches there, not less than three to four lakhs people.

There remains heavy crowd at Sarad Navratra but less than the Chaitra Ramnavami. Devotees from all parts of the country visit there. There are heavy crowd at Sawan Jhula also. At this occasion lakhs of people from every district comes there.

I have performed 14 Kaushi and Panchkaushi parikarma. I have performed parikarma of Ramjanambhoomi at so many times. Jankaura, Gosala Mandir, Gurukul and a number of villages comes under 14 kaushi parikarma. Sheetal Amrai also comes under it. I have performed 84 kaushi parikarma of Ayodhya. So many areas falls under this parikarma. Jamdagni Ashram, situated in Gaunda district falls on the way of parikarma.

I have taken bath in Saryu at the time of Chaitra Ramnavami, Kartik Poornima and Jhulyotsav in the month of Sawan. During the month of Kartik, I took bath in Saryu on everyday, had I been there in Ayodhya. After taking bath I used to go for darshan. First of all I used to go to Hanumangarhi, then Ramjanmbhoomi and after that to Kanak Bhawan. Other devotees also takes darshan in the same cycle.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya

Swami Haryacharya

23.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this the suit may be listed for cross examination for 26.7.2004.

(Han Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

23.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 26.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 23.7.2004, cross-examination
by Km. Ranjana Agnihotri, Advocate, on behalf of
defendant No. 20, Akhil Bhartiya Shri Ramjanambhoomi
reconstruction Committee in Other Original Suit No. 4/89,
continues.)

I brought the books with me, which I referred in the
statement given by me on the last date. These books are:
Vedon Ka Avtar Rahasya, Shri Sampradaya Samaya,
Hanumanth Kavach Haribhas, Manas Ka Vedictatwa, Nan
tu Narayani, Brahmsutra Haribhasya, Shriram Asthava Raj,
Geetabhakti Darshan, Ishavsiyounpnishad Haribhas, Shri
Sampradayacharya Darshan and Shri Sampradaya Mantha
I have referred various Purans in para 17 of my main
examinee affidavit, in which systematic description of
Indian ancient history was described. Shri Bhagwat Puran
is also a Puran. The Learned Advocate shown the Vishnu
Puran to witness. The witness on seeing the slok No. 13
and 14 of second chapter said there is description of India
in it. Similarly upon seeing the first, second and twenty-
fourth slok, before the second part of third chapter. The
witness said there is description of India and about its
borders, in detail. India described in this Puran, is the

India of to-day. Ayodhya described in Shrimad Bhagwat is the Ayodhya of to-day. Saryu described in it, is the same Saryu of to-day. I used to go to three domes Bhawan for darshan, earlier. I have also taken the darshan of Shri Ramjalla. I took darshan because I believe that one could get salvation by doing the darshan.

(Cross-examination by Km. Ranjana Agnihotri, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 20 Akhil Bhartiya Shri Ramjanambhoomi reconstruction committee in other original suit No. 4/89, concluded.)

(Cross-examination by Shri Beereshwar Diwedi, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 17 Shri Ramesh

Chander Tripathi in suit No. 4/89 and defendant No. 22, Shri Umesh Chander Pandey in suit No. 4/89 begins.)

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

Rudryamal is an ancient book. It was written at least five hundred years ago. I do not know the name of writer of Rudryamal; I got a chance to study the book Rudryamal. This book also contains the name of books written earlier about Ayodhya. The books referred in Rudryamal and the book wherein there is reference about Ayodhya, I do not remember their name. Atharved was written much earlier than the Rudryamal. There are references in Rudryamal taken from Atharved, which contains the references about Ayodhya. Brahmpuran and Skandpuran were referred in Rudryamal.

700 anniversary years of first ever Ramanandacharya will be celebrated this year. First ever Ramanandacharya was not a founder of Ramanandiya

Sect, he was the man who gave motion to this Sect. Ramanandiya Sect is very old. It was named after the name of Ramanand. Ramanandji was 700 years before.

Skand Puran was written in Vedic period. Valmikiji has discussed the Purana during the time of Bhagwan Ram. These were also mentioned, in Vedas. There was description about Ayodhya Mahatamya in Skand Puran. While describing Ayodhya Mahatamya, birth place of Shri Ramchanderji was also mentioned. The description of Ayodhya in Ayodhya Mahatamya was prior to the time of Ramananda. Mandir is called for the place where God resides. The place of residence of human being is not called Mandir. Goswami Tulsi Dass while referring Dassanan Mandir in Ramcharitmanas said:

There were temples in Lanka, called "Dassanan Mandir". Dassanan was devotee of Bhagwan Shankar. Lanka had a number of temples. There was a temple of Nikumbla Devi. Meghnath was a devotee of Nikumbla Devi. Besides, Mandir of Shankar Bhagwan was there. In the outer part, there was a temple of Sayar. On entering into Lanka, Hanuman met sayar first. Warriors lived in the temples. There were temples of warriors also. Bhawan, Mandir and Mahal are synonym of Mandirs were named after the name of specific God.

The person appointed for rendering service etc. to the God, is called Priest. In my main examinee affidavit, I referred "Annee" which means military. All Akharas were equal in status. Some Annee works under a specific head, who work to render help during Kumbh he remain head of Annee for the rest of time but it main work is to render help during Kumb. There were heads of Annees from Nirmohi, Nirvani Akharas. Akhara also stand for Religious

armament. Military power was necessitated in Hindu Religion because invaders used to come.

I have referred "Shiv Sanhita" at para 27 of my main examinee affidavit. The author of Shiv Sanhita was the disciple of Vyasji. It was written during the time of Vedic period. I regard the time of Ved eleven thousand years before. Some says, it was five thousand years before. Vedang, in which there are six darshan came after Purans and Vedang were written after Purans. Last part of Ved is called Vedang. Ved and Vedang are contemporary. Upnishad is formed from the word "Up-Ni-shad". It is not correct to say that the knowledge earned by Rishies from Ved is called Upnishad. Ved is spiritual knowledge and Rishies are its composers. Atharv Ved is not. a last Ved. In this order, it is at the fourth number. I referred in para 16 of my main examinee affidavit that there are five subjects in Purans. These subjects were detailed next to that para, in the form of canto. Genealogy is one of the subjects of Puran. There are various Purans, which are worthy of being mentioned. The details in this connection was given in para 17 of my main examinee affidavit. All Purans were not referred in this para. Hence the word "first ever" was mentioned after Bhagwat Puran. There is description of family of Dasratha in this genealogy. Garur Puran contains the detail of Ichwaku family. The conclusion can be drawn from my main examinee affidavit that their books described the family history of Bhagwan Ram and his ancestors. Skand Puran is also one of them. There is a Vaishnav part in Skand Puran. It contains the entire description, of Ayodhya. Geographical situation of Ayodhya and its important religious places were described in it. This chapter is called Ayodhya Mahatamya. Geography of Ramjanmbhoomi was described in it. No book negated the geographical situation of Ramjanmsthal.

I referred in my main examinee affidavit that I have studied the books written by Goswami Tulsi Dass. Tulsi Dass, in Ramcharitmanas, said that Bhagwan Vishnu took the birth by the name of Rama. He said:

**“Jehe Din Ramjanm Shruti gawahi,
Tirath Sakal tahan chali Avanthi,**

I referred Vasistadwet in my main examinee affidavit. I define it. Maya, Jeev, Brahm, the three substances, have been accepted as twatraya (Brahm). It means, there are, life and universe, where the God is. This principle of Vasistadwet has been accepted by Vaishnav Sect. According to this principle, the soul and God is one. Bhokta, Bhogya and its Pravek, both the three is God. This is the principle of Vasistadwet which is different from Dwet and adwet. Follower of Ramanand Sect follows the principle of Vasistadwet. In addition to north India, Visistadwet is followed by large number of population in south India. There are persons in Hindu religion who follows Adwet principle. Its followers are called Shev. The followers of dwet principle are Nimbark and follows Madwa Sect. Visistadwet principle was there before Ramanand Sect. Rigved is the first ved among the four vedas. It also contains the description of King Dasratha. I have read the para 59 at page 12, of my main examinee affidavit. I have read the book “Shri Ramanand Sampraday ka Itihas” and “Shri Ramanand Jayanti Smarak Granth” three days before. These two books contain three-four hundred pages, each.

Witness, upon seeing para 60 of my main examinee affidavit and list “a” referred therein, said, a part is in Sanskrit, a part is in Hindi and a part is in English, in the list “a”. I authenticate its correctness. It was referred in list

"a" that there is a birth place of Rama, as mentioned in Skand Puran.

(Cross-examination by Shri Beereshwar Diwedi, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No. 17 in suit No. 4/89, Shri Ramesh Chander Tripathi and defendant No. 22 in suit No. 4/89, Shri Urnesh Chander Pandey, concluded.)

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

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

There are 24 incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. Among these are Parsuram, Vaman, Shri Ram, Shri Krishna, Hans, Kalki, Narsingh etc. Matsaya and Barah are also the incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. Slok No. 117 at page 596 of Udh Kand, document No. 261 C-1/2 of Valmiki Ramayana was shown to witness. Witness on reading it said he knows the meaning of this. The subject matter of Valmiki Ramayana is not history. He himself said in Shastras, it is called fifth Ved. Slok No. 123 of Udh Kand was read out to witness, upon this he said he knows what it means. It comes out from it that Valmiki Ramayan is Sahinta. Upon reading the slok No. 25 at page No. 805 of Uttarkand of this book, witness said it means that Maharishi Valmiki is the author of Ramayana. Slok No. 12 at page No. 808 of the book was shown to the witness, upon which witness said that there is a reference that Sita followed Valmiki. Upon seeing the slok No. 15 and 16, at page 808 of this Kand, witness said that in these sloks Valmiki referred about Sitaji to Rama. Upon slok No. 16 and 17, at page No. 723 and 724 of this book witness said, this slok means:- Bhagwati Sita is pure and virtuous wife. Maharishi Valmiki, friend of Dasratha resides here. You too please reside here with him i.e. Valmiki was

contemporary to Bhagwan Rama. The same Valmiki is the writer of Valmiki Ramayana. Sanatan means "Saswat". i.e. continuous and where there is no interval.

(Cross-examination by Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff in other or suit No. 5/89, concluded.)

(Shri Madan Mohan Pandey, on behalf of defendant No. 2/1, Mahant Suresh Dass, in others original suit No. 4/89, has accepted the cross-examination, conducted by Shri Veerswar Diwedi and Ajay Kumar Pandey.)

Learned Advocate Shri K.G. Mishra and D.P. Gupta on behalf of plaintiff in others original suit No. 1/89 said they have not to conduct the cross-examination from the witness.)

(None on behalf of defendants except the advocate on behalf of defendant in others original suit No. 4/89 and defendant No. 4,5,6 and 26 in others original suit No. 5/89, was present for conducting cross-examination. Hence the cross-examination by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 11 of this suit begins.)

xxx xxx xxx xxx

I am 69 years old. I have done my schooling in Janmbhoomi, Ayodhya and Kashi. I was born in Distt. Basti, which at present is under the Distt. Siddarth Nagar. My house is at a distance of 90 kilometer from the Siddarth Nagar headquarter. I have studied at my home town upto the age of 11 years. I used to go to study in Primary School. I got my primary education from Primary School. This school is at a distance of half Kilometer from my house. Its name is Primary School, Majhuwa. This school is at a distance of half Km. from my village. Only one village called Pispohar falls on the way. My father was overseer. My father died in the year 1965, at the age of 55 years. He left the service and came to India from Nepal because he was not keeping well. My father was

overseeing the work of construction of road at Surkhet in Nepal. He stayed there for eight years. I was with my father in the town. I have been with my father in Nepal for two years at the age of 8-9 years, where I have studied 'Varnmala' book. I have studied in the school, meant for children, where 10-20 children study. One of my villagers was in Nepal and I came back to my native place with him. My father was working at that place which was at a distance of 250 Km. from the place called Rupehidiha at India-Nepal Border, it was a hilly area. The place where my father lived was a big town but what was its population, I have no knowledge about it. I could not remember how much we had to travel through hilly area to reach the town where my father was residing. My father was living in a rented room. His work was to measure the road along with his 2-4 associates. He himself said, he also used to prepare the map in regard to the land to be occupied for constn of Road. Where there is a house and at which place the bridge is to be constructed. My father sometime took me to his work place and sometime left me back with a midwife. In Nepal no signboard were there to indicate the distance. People make an estimate about distance. The town where we lived was at a great height and even vehicles used to get tired while reaching there. I lived in Nepalganj. Roads were there at that time too but were not concrete road. Since there was no bus service available, so I used to go by an old jeep. Most of the people come to Nepalganj for marketing, on foot. I cannot say, at what distance the Nepalganj is, from my place because I was 10-11 years old at that time. I do not know how far my native place is from Nepalganj, the India-Nepal border.

Question: Whether the distance from your village to above Indo-Nepal Border was 10-12 miles?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri Ved Prakash, on behalf of plaintiff in others original suit No.

5/8 9, has raised an objection hat the question asked for was not related to any point of suit and it is simply a wastage of court's time. The question is being asked as to harass the honourable witness. Such question cannot be allowed.)

Answer: It is not correct that the said border is at much distance from my village.

There is a railway station called Gaisari station near my village. If the train started in the evening, it reached there at 8 A.M. on the next day. My father, keeping my interest in learning Sanskrit, got me enrolled in the school run by the than seated Mahant, Shri Swami Rambalak Dass of Hanumangarhi, Manager of Sanskrit Vidyalaya, five years after I came to Ayodhya. Before this I practised wrestling for five years. I started studding Sanskrit at the age of 16 years. Prior to this I was in an Ashram. I have studied in the said school for 13 years. I have studied in Ayodhya for 12-13 years. He himself said that he got the final degree from Kashi. I have studied upto the age of 25-26 years. I have continued my education even after. I have passed Vedantacharya, Sahityacharya and M.A. I have completed first two parts of Acharya from Raj Gopal Sanskrit University, Ayodhya and last part from Gaay Ghat Varanasi. I was 27 years old at that time. I was, thereafter, appointed as a Grammar Teacher in Jam Gurukul School, Ayodhya at the age of 28-29 years at an adhoc pay of Rs. 29/- only. I have done teaching work there for five years. Than I was appointed a Principal in Yogiraj Sanskrit Vidyalaya, Ayodhya, and I have worked there for two years. This Vidyalaya still exists. I left the job because the Managers of that Vidyalaya were corrupt. They used to give me less money and obtained my signature at high amount. I was the Principal of that school upto 1956-57. After that I have joined Shri Niwas Bodhayan Sanskrit University as a Head of Department of Grammar, I worked

there for 18 years, at the pay of Rs. 10 thousand. 15- 16 years have been passed away since I left the school. Thereafter, the followers of Ramananda Sect have requested me to join them as a Sampradacharya. In 1989, I joined as a Sampradacharya of Ramanand Sect at fourth Sampradaya Khalsa Camp, at the time of anniversary of Swami Ramanandacharya, on 26th or 27th January in a function. In the function Sita Ram Saran Maharaj, Manas Markand, Shri Prem Dassji Maharaj, Mahant Nirtya Gopal Dassji, Mahant of Chhavani, Mahant and Swami Shri Gyan Dassji Maharaj ji have delivered the speeches on the creation of Shri Ramananda Swami. Approx. four thousand people have attended the one day's meet. Dand was offered to me before the photo of my earlier guru, Acharya Shivramacharya. It was resolved that all the followers of Sistadev principle, the Vaishnav will propogate the principle and will create awareness wherever this principle is being eroded.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya
26.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer who typed it in the open court. Suit may be listed for cross-examination for 27.7.2004.

(Han Shankar Dubey)
Commissioner
26.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 27.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 26.7.2004 cross-examination
by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of defendant
No. 11, continues.)

I have been living in Ayodhya for last 50 years. I am
not aware whether Babri Masjid was built in 1528 or not.
During my stay in Ayodhya I have heard that there was
some dispute with the Nirmohi Akhara. I do not know in
which year the dispute arised, even after I am residing in
Ayodhya continuously. Thefe was some dispute in regard
to Shri Ramjanambhoomi Mandir and some clashes took
place. In which year the clashes took place, I have no
knowledge about it. I was in Ayodhya at the time of clash
and I was 20 years old at that time. Muslims claimed that
disputed site belongs to them and Nirmohi Akhara claims
that it is their site. This was the reason for dispute. The
clash took place in the year 1950- 51, perhaps. When
clash took place, I did not try to obtain the information in
this regard. At that time I was in Hanumangarhi.
Hanumangarhi is at a distance of 2 furlong from the
disputed site. Prior to this incidence, disputed site was not
called Babri Masjid. In Hindu religion, Mandir is called,
where Puja-Archana is performed.

F.I.R. dated 23.12.1949 under section 145 Cr.P.C., from the questionnaire, was shown to witness.

Question: Who lodged the report and against whom?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri Tarun Jeet Verma, in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that the witness is, in no way, concern with the report, so question in this regard cannot be asked from him.)

Answer: It is not clear from the paper that against whom the report was lodged and who lodged it.

I have no knowledge about the report lodged by Shri Ramdev Dubey, Sub-Inspector, Incharge of Police Station, Ayodhya on 23.12.49 at 19.00 regarding the incident happened at 6.OOAM on the same day, in Mohalla Ramkot Janmbhoomi. The fact that "about five-six thousand people gathered there chanting religious slogans..... so many peoples have seen the incident" was shown to witness. Witness said he has no knowledge about the report lodged by Ramdev Dubey.

Question: It has been written in the report that accused Ram Dass alongwith the fifty to sixty persons armed with weapons, made forceful entry into Masjid and desecrated the Masjid by installing idols in the Masjid. What you have to say in this regard?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey on behalf of plaintiff in other original suit No. 5/89, raised an objection that the question about the

contents of the document on the record of court cannot be asked. Moreover the witness has expressed his unawareness about the document. Hence permission cannot be granted to ask such question, to harass the witness and to waste the time of court.)

Answer; I have no knowledge in this regard.

I was in Ayodhya on 23.12.1949, I have not visited the disputed site on that day. I was at a distance of two furlong from the disputed site. He himself said that I was restricted with the practice of Ashram, so I did not go there. In this regard I have heard that some altercation took place with the sadhus of Nirmohi Akharas at Ramjanambhoomi. Baba Abhiram Dass, who used to visit Ashram to see Guruji, had told about the incident to Guruji. I had also heard about it when he was narrating the things to Guruji.

I was called at the occasion of the anniversary of Ramanandacharya during Kumbh. There was a function on 26th February, 1989 at this occasion I was appointed as Sampradayacharya of the Sect. At least about four thousand sadhus-Mahatmas were gathered there at this occasion. I delivered a speech. I can speak Hindi as well as Sanskrit. I had spoken in Hindi at the said Kumb fair.

Lakhs of people are gathered at Kumbh. Many sants did not arrived there, but the sants presents in the Kumbh, were there in the function. Besides the sadhus, 10 thousand peoples gathered there. This function went on for three hours. A tent was fixed there.

The Akharas I have referred in the statement given by me were constructed in 15th era. It is not correct to say

that these were constructed during 15th era at Jaipur. The fact is that these Akhara were there since long because these were referred in Valmiki Ramayana too. No Akhara was constructed in Jaipur. Akharas were meant for imparting training in arms. These were called Patabana. Latoo, sword, lathi, Bhala, Ballam, sticks are used in Patabana. He himself stated that Annee means military. Hence training for use of weapons are imparted in Annees. There are 18 Akharas in India and not 13. All Akharas comes at Kumbh and stay there for a month. Training in use of weapons is not imparted during Kumbh. At the time of Shahi Julius, sadhu playing the patbana leads other sadhus. Govt. has fixed the time period for each jullus. The period is fixed on the basis of distance. During Kumbh three Royal baths are held and jullus is taken out at these Royal bath. During the period of Kumbh i.e. for one month, services, Puja and food is provided to the visitors. Food is provided to all the visitors. There is no fixed number to whom the food is to be provided. The main Akharas, among the above mentioned 18 Akharas are Pra Haridwar, Nasik and Ujjain. At the time of Royal bath all the eighteen Akharas goes together. Only Jagadguru goes alone. There are four Jagadgurus in Shri Vaisnav Sect. These Akharas were established five hundred years also by Virjanand, disciple of Balanandacharya. The first Akhara was established in Jaipur in Rajasthan

Document No. 236/52 of other original suit, No. 4/89, was shown to witness. Witness upon reading both the pages of the said report said, I have no knowledge about the report. All the three Akharas, Nirmohi, Nirvani and Digamber, were constructed by Swamiji in Jaipur, 500 years ago. I cannot say that whether these Akharas were established in Jaipur because there was no Muslim ruler in Jaipur. Ramananda was not from Jaipur. He was from

Prayag, now a days called Allahabad. Ramanandacharya never been in Jaipur. His disciple Balanand established Akhara in Jaipur. There were three Akharas and 18 parts. Principle in regard to construction of Akhara have been finalised in Jaipur. But the work of preparing laws and by-laws began later. After six months of construction of Akhara in Jaipur, laws and by—laws were prepared in Prayag, Haridwar, Ujjain and Nasik. Naga, Huddanga, Chhorra and Ateet are the type of Akhara. Four types of people live in Akhara since very beginning. Similarly the training for use of weapons is imparted in Akhara from the very beginning. The three Akharas mentioned above are mobile. And accordingly these Akharas reached Ayodhya. Peoples from Akhara goes all over India and get gifts, donation etc. He himself stated that at present, 90 lakhs of sadhus are moving about through out India. The sadhus interested in getting training for use of weapons, are imparted the same and those interested in study, they do so. He himself stated that Akhara is a trust, managed in accordance with Panchayati management. The sadhus are imparted training in accordance with their choice. R.S.S. is not a child of Akhara. R.S.S. was established by Hadgewart in Nagpur. Besides above three Akharas, the fourth one is Niralambi Akhara in Ayodhya. There is Mahant of Niralambi Akharas. The student5 residing in these Akhara, keep their study on. There are a number of branches of Niralambi Akhara in Ayodhya. Besides, there are branches, out side of Ayodhya. But these are not taken in counting. Besides Khaki Akhara was also there in Ayodhya. Thirty-forty persons lives in it. There are thousands of persons of Khaki Akhara, outside Ayodhya. These are spread over to Gujarat, Rajasthan and Maharashtra. This training is imparted in the Ashrams of Akhara. It gives training on the their own weapons. Niralambi Akhara is at Ramghat Mohalla and Khaki Akhara

is at Hanumangarhi intersection. Nirvani Akhara is after Digambar Akhara, Hanumangarhi and thereafter comes Nirmohi Akhara. Every Akhara have their own laws, by-laws and own site. Training is imparted in these sites. These training pertain to weapons, education and yoga. Balanandacharya was a disciple of Virjanand. Akhara means Akhandta. Akhara are from the ancient time. But Balanandacharya gave it impetus.

(Cross-examination by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate, on behalf of Mohd. Farooq Abmad defendant No. 11, concluded.)

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

I belong to Nirvani Akhara. Hanumangarhi comes under Nirvani Akhara. Hanumangarhi is the main centre of Nirmohi Akhara in Ayodhya. It is necessary for the Mahant of Nirvani Akhara to hold the weapons. Ramanandacharya never put on the weapon.

Holding weapon is also not necessary to the Sampradayacharya under Ramananda Sect. I also hold Dand. It is not a weapon. It is prepared in accordance with the principle of Tatwatreyaya of Ramanand. It is made of Vilva, Plas and Bamboo. It indicates Brahm, life and wealth. The Dand is made of wood. Upper part is called sumeroo, which is a symbolic of Brahm. There is a sign of Tilak in the upper part of Dand, which is the main sign of Ramananda Sect.

I have been residing in Ayodhya since the time I became Sampradacharya. My Headquarter is at Panch Gangaghat, Kashi. At the Headquarter situated at

Panchghat, Kashi other sadhus live there. Ramanand Sect has no other Headquarter at any place in India. The name of my disciple are suffixed by the word Dass or Saran. They do not get any degree after that. At present my two disciples are present in the court. One is Ramdevacharya and second is Kaushlendra Dass. The item like club in their hand is called Nishan ki Chari. This Nisan goes with the Sampradacharya. The four Jagadguru were not there since the beginning. Four Jagadguru were from the last hundred years. They were elected at a different times. There are 52 voters in all four sects, spread over throughout the India. Chatu Sect, select the 52 voters. Chatu Sampradaya means, Ramanand, Nimbark, Ballabh and Madhva. These four together form Chatu Sampradaya. There are four representative Mahant of the four Sampradaya. The 52 persons, who have voting rights, are elected by Ramanandiya Sect Samaj. Ramanandiya Sect has 90 lakhs sadhus. These 90 lakhs sadhus together elect the 52 voters who in turn elect the Sampradacharya. These 52 voters elect one Sampradacharya. Similarly other three Sampradaya elect their Sampradacharya. Similarly twenty thousands people in Madhwa Sampradaya, Nimbark Sampradaya and Ballabh Sampradaya elect 52 voters. And similarly forty thousands people of Nimbark Sampradaya elect 52 voters. In Ballabh Sampradaya approx. thirty thousand people elect 52 voters. Ramanandacharya of Madhva Sampradaya is Madhvacharya, at present. Achatya Shri ji is the present Acharya of Nimbark, who lives at Salemabad in Rajasthan. Madhavacharya lives at Surat in Gujrat. Similarly Kalyanraiji is a Sampradayacharya of Ballabh who lives at Surat in Gujarat. Shri Ram Bhadryacharya of Chitrakoot belongs to Ramanandiya Sampradayacharya. I blessed him with Dand. Rambhadracharyaji is an Upacharya of Ramanandiya Sampradaya. He is my Upacharya. The

objective and philosophy of these four Sects differs from each other. Ramanand Sect follows the Vāsistadwet principle of Ramanandacharya. Ballabh Sect follows the Krishna in his childhood. Nimbark Sect's God born as Jyotishwaroop on Nib, that's why it is called Nib Sampradaya. Nib means the tree of Neem. Madya Sect follows the Madhurupasana hence it is called Madya Sect. Their philosophy is Sidhadev. Ramchander is the God of Ramanand Sampradaya. Radaji is followed by Ballabh Sampradaya and Radha Krishan is followed by Madhva Sampradaya. The method of prayer is different. Nimbark Sampradaya follows the Radha. Radha is a incarnation of Laxmi. Besides above four sects, there is Ramanuj Sampradaya Ramanuj Sampradaya follows Sriman Narayana and Laxmiji. Besides above four Sects, one Ramanuj Sampradaya is there. Shriman Narayana and Laxhmi is the God of Ramanuj Sampradaya. Similarly there are five Sect in Vaishnav Sampradaya and they all are independent. Among these five, only Ramananda Sampradaya follows Shri Rama. They do not follow the philosophy of Shankarayacharya. There are four seats of Sankaracharya in India but Sankaracharyas are many in number. Srigesi, Pun, Rameshwaram and Badrinath are among them. Prayag is a sub-seat, which comes under Badrinath seat. I am not recollecting the name of Shankaracharya of Srigeri seat. Nishalanandji is a Shankaracharya of Rameshwaram seat, Swaroopa Nand Sarswati is a Shankaracharya of Badrinath and Chinmayanandji is a Shankaracharya of Pun. The philosophy of all these four seats differs from the philosophy of Ramanand sect. All these Sankaracharya follows the Nirnimesh Brahm. Ramanand Sect follows the Sagun Sakar. Sankaracharya of Kanchi is a Sankaracharya of Rameshwaram. Sankaracharya of Rameshwaram follows the Shankarji but only his

Nirnimesh. Jagannath is followed by the Sankaracharya of Pun. No meeting was held ever of four Sankaracharya's and five Sankaracharya of Vaishnav Sarnaj in regard to the birth place of Rama. I met all the Sankaracharyas 25 years before, at Runopali in Ayodhya where a large Yagna was held. I have also participated in the yagna. Sankaracharya swaroopanand and one more Sankaracharya, perhaps Niranjana Dev Teerth Sankaracharya of Sringeri are alive. The name of Shankracharya is Niranjana Dev Teerth, about whom I said that the name is not remembered to me. Other Sankaracharyas who participated in the Yagna are not alive. These Sankaracharya made speeches but there was no reference of Ramjanmbhoomi in their speeches. Swami Niranjana Devji spoken over cow-slaughter. I do not know whether any one of them, or four together went to Ramjanmbhoomi or not. These four Sankaracharya stayed in Swargdwar Mohalla and Ranopalli Mohalla, in Ayodhya. They stayed in Ayodhya for two-three days. No Shankaracharya, other than above, participated in the Yagna at Ranopali. Besides these, there are 21 self styled or political Sankaracharyas. Vasudevanand of Prayag and Chinmayanand of Sumeru Seat are one of them. These 21 Sankaracharya also follows the Adweiat principle. All four Sankaracharya, including the above 21 Sankaracharya and their Ist-dev is not different from those of other Sankaracharya. They follow their Ist-dev as a matter of practice. All these Sankaracharya believes that only Brahm is true and universe is not true. Soul is the Brahm and none one else. They all do not follow Rarna. Although in practice they do. They believe in Panchdeves and thirty-three crores God/Goddess, but only for the purpose of practice prevailed. Thirty-three crores God/Goddess were referred in Ved-Puranas. These veds and purans are the same, which I referred above in my statement. There are

four Ved, four up-Ved, 18 main Purans, 18 up Purans and 18 Oap. Purans. Besides, there is no Ved and Purans. Smirties are there, these are in 8 numbers. None other than the above mentioned Ved-Purans, have the reference about thirty-three God/Goddess.

The period of Aadi Sankaracharya was hundred to two hundred years before the Ramanandacharya. The books written by early Sankaracharya are available. Geeta Bhasya, Upnishad Bhasya, Brahm Sutra Bhasya and Charpatmanjari are among them. These books are in Sanskrit. I have no knowledge whether Sankaracharya had written any book in Tamil or not. I have read all the books written by Aadi Sankaracharya. No book written by Sankaracharya, referred his visit to Ayodhya. I do not know the number of disciple of early Sankaracharya. I have no knowledge, who succeeded him. I have read about the life and believe of Sankaracharya, in the book "Adarsh Charitawali" written by Bhagwati Saran. There is mention in this book that he went for darshan of Ganga Manorama in through Ayodhya. Ganga-Manorama, which is now a days is called Makhora and the real name was Makhstali, which is still there. Makhstali means Yagnasthal. It is at a distance of 14 Km. in the north of disputed site in Ayodhya. There are temples of Sitaram, Ram, Laxman, Bharat, Satrugan and Hanumanji. These temples said to be eight hundred to one thousand years old. In the books written by early Sankaracharya there are reference of Ramachanderji. He has written Vishnu Sahastra in which he described the importance of Ram. Dasrath putra Ram was referred in it but no mention of Dasrath or his Queens or birth place of Rama. Besides, Sankaracharya written Geeta Bhasya in which he mentioned about Ramchandra. Explaining the main slok in Geeta he mentioned Rama. There is no mention about King Dasrath in Geeta Bhasya. Similarly there is no

mention of Queens of Dasrath and birth of Ramchander. In the book written by Sankaracharya there is no reference of King Dasrath and his Queens. Similarly in the book written by early Sankaracharya, there is no reference about Ramchander and his birth place.

I have been living in Ayodhya for last fifty-fifty five years. I have listening about Janm Bhoomi since I came to Ayodhya. During my stay in Ayodhya among the Sir - Sangchalaks of R.S.S. only Go visited Ayodhya 25 to 30 years ago. I do not know whether he visited the disputed place or not. He made his speech at Tulsi Chaura in Ayodhya. I am not sure whether since the inception of R.S.S. its principles are in agreement with the principles of Ramanandiya Sect or not. Their principles are quite different and they believe in nationalism means Hindutava. Hindutava is not included in the religious belief of early Sankaracharya and Ramanandacharya. I am not related to R.S.S. I have been in the conferences of R.S.S. But I differ from them. They believe in all God/Goddess but their adorable is Saffron Flag. I do not know what they mean from Saffron Flag He himself said that according to their belief, unless a head of a nation is an ascetic and a renouncer, he cannot develop the nation.

I know the organization called Vishwa Hindu Parishad. It was established approx. fifty years before. I do not know who established it. Religious belief of Vishwa Hindu Parishad is that they followed him, who is helpful to them only. Vaishnav Shaqua, Shaiv, Jam and Budhs are also its members. At present their adorable is Ramchandraj. Who was their adorable before him, I do not know. Vishwa Hindu Parishad started coming to Ayodhya for last ten-fifteen years, two to three years before the inauguration in 1989 Since than only they

started talking about Ramjanmbhoomi. They might be the devotee of Rama prior to that time but after inauguration they started taking active part. I have participated in the conferences convened by Vishwa Hindu Parishad at so many times. In 1984, whether any member of V.H.P. participated in the yatra organized by Mahant Avedanath and Day Dayal Khanna from Sitamadhi to Ayodhya, I do not know. I have no knowledge about the resolution adopted during the bath in Saryu at that time Ashok Singhal and Giriraj Kishore, Leader of V.H.P. are personally known to me. They do come to my Ashram. Besides, Praveen Togadia and Vishnu Hari Dalmia are known to me. I have heard about the declaration of V.H.P. that Ramjanambhoomi would be constructed at the disputed site but I have no other personal information. I never attended the meetings of Ramjanambhoomi Trust. I was not present in the meeting wherein it was decided to establish Ramjanambhoomi Trust. Swami Shivramacharya was the Sampradacharya of Ramanand Sect, prior to me. He was the Chairman of Ramjanmbhoomi. I have not been invited to take part in the activities of Ramjai Bhoomi Trust. The Headquarter of Trust is at Karsewakpuram. After Shivaramacharya, Ramchander Paramhans became the Chairman of Ramjanambhoomi Trust. He is known to me since childhood. The present Chairman of the trust, Nritya Gopal Dassji is known to me since student life. He is not my Guru but a friend. Nritya Gopal Dass belong to Digambar Akhara. I do not know the Mahant Suresh Dass. I have no knowledge about his Akhara. Paramhans Ramchander Dass was a Mahant of Digambar Akhara, now Suresh Dassji is a Mahant in his place. I used to go to Digambar Akhara but after I was appointed Acharya, I go on invitation only. Similarly I go to Nirmohi Akhara or any other Akhara or to any Sadhu only on invitation Present Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara, the name I forget, is known to

me for last five to ten years. Mahant Bhaskar Dassji is known to me for last fifty to sixty years, from the time when he was a priest. He is an old Sadhu.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

27.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, the suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 28.7.2004.

(Han Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

27.7.2004

www.vadaprativada.in

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special
Duty,- High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 28.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 27.7.2004, cross-examination
by Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 9,
Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

Upon seeing the document No. 261 C-1/1 and 261 C-1/2, Valmiki Ramayana, witness said Valmiki Ramayana, published from Geeta Press is in two volumes and is complete and authentic. No book was written before it. This book is one crore, eighty-one lakhs sixty thousand one hundred and three years old. The original book was written on Bhoj Patra. Besides, it was also written in Valkal i.e. skin of tree. The entire book was written by Maharishi Valmiki Maharishi who was contemporary to Ramchanderji. Ramchanderji said to be born in 24th Tretayug. One crore eighty-one lakhs, sixty thousand one hundred and three years have passed away from 24th Tretayug. 25th Kalyug is going on at present. Five thousand years have been passed since 25th Kalyug. There are four Kalyug. These are Satyug, Treta, Dwapar and Kalyug. I do not remember how long the Satyug is. Similarly the period of Treta and Dwapar is not remembered to me. Kalyug is four lakhs, thirty two

thousand years long. Vidvyasji is contemporary to Maharishi Valmiki. Maharishi Valmiki and Krishn Dwepayan Vyas were contemporary to Ramchanderji, in fact earlier to the birth of Rama. These two persons have not written Vedas because Veds are divine. They have seen the Vedas. Vedas were there before Maharishi Valmiki and Vyasji were born. But secondary Vedas were not there. Vedas were born with God. Bhagwan asked Vedas, who they were. Vedas replied that, we are your palpitation and we will chant your various characters. Bhagwan means Bhagwan Ram Various Maharishies have made the darshan of Richas of Veds. This is the reason that Viniyog are written before every richas, which means, which rishi has made the darshan of which richas first. At the time when Bhagwan Ram went to heaven, Ved were there because Ved are Saswat i.e. the things who never Vanishad. Ved are there today. Ved has two forms one is in the form of Visual and other is in the form of poem. Poem form is also called Shravya form and Veds are exist today in this form. Vedas born as a human with God, stayed for 31 thousand years. Veds are four in number. So four mans were born in the form of Ved. They were not named Rigved after their birth. Ved Vyas gave name to four Ved. Ved Vyas is immortal. He still exists hut he keeps changing. Ved Vyas who was at the time of Rama, is still. He is immortal. But he is not visible. Maharishi Valmiki is also immortal. He is still alive.

Ramchanderji lived for eleven thousand years. All peoples from Ayodhya have not gone with Rama to heaven. Some people remain back. That's why Ayodhya is inhabited to-day. He himself said he offered Kingdom to Kush. Hence Kush had ruled Ayodhya after Ramchander. From the time of Ramchanderji to upto-day Ayodhya neither deserted nor desolated.

Slok No. 10 at page 830, document No. 261 C/2 of the second volume of Valmiki mayana was shown to witness, upon which witness said Lthat Uttar Kand of Valmiki Ramayana is treated interpolated. This sloks means Ayodhya remained deserted for long. It was inhabited during the time of Rishabh Dev. The above facts according my faith is not correct. This part was added later, approx. 7-8 thousand years before. I do not know who added part. King Rishabhdev was religions preceptor of Jainism. He ruled Ayodhya. When he ruled Ayodhya, I cannot say. Rishabh Dev was before Mahatma Budh. Budh and Mahabir were contemporary. King Rishabh Dev might be 6-7 thousand years before.

A part of statement given to-day "The book Valmiki ramayana, published from Geeta Press, is complete and authentic", was read out to witness. Witness said his statement is true. The statement given by him to-day that "The Uttar Kand of Valmiki Ramayana..... was added later" was readout to witness. Witness said that my statement was correct.

Question: According to you, both the part of Valmiki Ramayana are authentic. If so than the slok No. 10 written in second part, which was read out to you, is not correct, according to you.

Answer: Some people recognized the entire book as an authentic and some people recognized it upto Udh Kand.

Question: Should I presume that in accordance with the above statement you are not taking both the part of Valmiki Ramayana in full as authentic : one? Hence the above statement given by you

is not correct that the book is complete and authentic.

(Upon this question, Shri R.L. Verma, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that this question is being asked again. Witness has already given its answer. In addition to this, complex question, combining two facts, is being asked. Hence it cannot be answered in one go. So such question may not be allowed.)

Answer: The above mentioned books are complete. But some people do not take the entire part as authentic. I take the part upto Udhkand as authentic one. The later part, I do not treat authentic.

Whether the contents of the part of Valmiki Ramayana, which I treat authentic. Its contents are authentic or not, I can tell only after seeing the book. He himself said a number of parts were added later on. Jams take Uttarkand as authentic one. None in Ramanandiya Sect take after math part Udh Kand as authentic one. Some facts are authentic and some are not. 26th slok at page No. 805 of the document No. 261 C-I/2 was shown to witness. Witness said its translation given in the book is correct. The fact written in this slok is correct that there are 24 thousand slok and one hundred Upakhayan in the book. The Sadhu referred in this slokas renouncer is Maharishi Valmiki. Gayatri Mantra contains 24 letters. But only 23 letters are pronounced. Similarly out of 24 thousand sloks in Valmiki Ramayana, one thousand sloks are interpolated. All 24 thousand sloks are authentic and only 23 thousand are authentic for chanting and rest one thousand sloks are treated interpolated.

Question: My question is this that this book contains 24 thousands sloks. Whether this number is including the sloks in Uttar Kand or excluding it?

Answer: This number of 24 thousand sloks is including the number of Uttar Kand.

The Ramayana was written during the lifetime of Rama. This book Valmiki Ramayana referred the birth place of Rama. This is referred in slok No. 30 at page 64 of 15th canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayan as under:

Shri Ram, as a human being had thought about Janambhoomi. This was the background for Janambhoomi. The meaning of the slok given in the book is correct but it is having an emotional content. He himself stated that Bhagwan had decided to construct Janambhoomi after giving blessing and assurance to Devtas

Question: Whether sloks means that the situation referred in, was prior to the idea of Janambhoomi taken place?

Answer: Yes. Chintayamas means, resolution to take birth on the earth and preferred Ayodhya. This resolution was taken before birth.

Question: This slok neither refer Ayodhya nor the place specific, about which the resolution was taken to take birth there.

Answer: Manusey means, the resolution to take birth in Ayodhya, the city of constructed by Manu.

Besides this, there was a reference in other sloks about birth of Rama. It was mentioned in slok No. 31, at page No. 64 of document No. 261 C-1/1. This slok refer that Bhagwan Shri Ram taken birth in the palace of King

Dasrath in Chaturvid. It means that Bhagwan decided to take birth in four characters i.e. Ram, Laxman Bharat and Shatrughan and decided to take birth in the house of Dasrath.

It was also mentioned in slok No. 10, at page No. 69 of 18th canto of the above books. It was stated therein that Bhagwan Ramji was born to Bhagwati Kaushaliya. He was full with all divine lights and all people bowed there in reverence. It may be possible that other sloks may be there in Valmiki Ramayana, wherein birth of Rama was referred. Witness said that it was referred in Balkand also.

Question: From the word used in three sioks referred by you, which are at page No. 64 and 69 of first part of Valmiki Ramayana it does not appear from any word that specific place was earmarked, where Rama will take birth may have been mentioned

Answer: it is not correct. In all three sloks, Ramjanambhoomi was described in detail. He himself said in the first canto of Valmiki Ramayan "Ramasya Janm Sumhatviryam Tantra." Here Tantra means Ayodhyasthalli

Question: Can you say at what place (page/slok) in Valmiki Ramayana the slok is, which you have readout?

Answer: On seeing the slok No. 10 at page No. 36 of document No. 261 C-1/1 the witness said that place specific was mentioned therein where Ramchander to take birth. This slok is in third canto of Valmiki Ramayana.

The part of slok, about which I said that it was appearing in first canto of Valmiki Ramayana, infact appears in slok No. 10 of third canto.

Question: There is no mention of a place about the birth of Ramchander in the slok No. 10 of third canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayan referred by you?

Answer: It is not correct to say that there is no mention of birth of Rama in this slok. The word Sarvanukoltam, figuring in the slok means, "Rama was born when Jog, Lagan, Grah, Days, Date and Place were favour.

Question: You are knowingly giving incorrect meaning of these four sloks?

Answer: It is not correct to say that the meaning of the slok is not correct. In these four sloks birth of Shri Ram, Grih Gochar and Place were described.

Question: Have you remembered any slok of Valmiki Ramayan other than above four sloks, in which there is reference in regard to the birth of Rama?

Answer: Sloks are there but I do not remember

The four sloks at page 36, 64 and 9, which I referred in my statement were regarding the birth of Rama in the palace of Maharaj Dasrath. The area of palace of Maharaja Dasrath, as referred in Valmiki Ramayana is situated within five Km. of Ayodhya. He himself said that it is under five Kaushi parikarma. Palace of Dasrath begins from the place where from parikarma starts and it is upto the point where parikarma comes to an end. At present Panchkaushi parikarma starts from many places, Rinmochan Ghat, Jhunki Ghat, Raj Ghat and Naya Ghat.

The people residing opposite to parikarma route start their parikarma from Tapsi Chavani. Parikarma comes to an end at the place where it starts. People took both in Saryu after completion of Parikarma. All Ghat, from where parikarma starts, are at the bank of Saryu. Saryu is in the north of Ayodhya. People go by the side of Sheetalamari, in the south side, on parikarma. Sheetalamari is in Ayodhya, at a distance of two to two and half Km. from disputed site. People pass by the side of ban chavani, on parikarma. People perform parikarma in a circle. What I mean to say, that palace of Dasrath falls with in the circle route of Parikarma. In which canto, sloks of Valmiki Ramayana, it is referred, I do not remember.

Question: The description of said palace of King Dasrath is nowhere in Valmiki Ramayana?

Answer: It is correct that there is no mention of Dasrath's palace in Valmiki Ramayana from the point of parikarma. I have no knowledge about any reference in Valmiki Ramayana in this regard.

Question: There is no mention about the length and width of the palace of Dasrath or about its area, in Valmiki Ramayana?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of' in other original suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that this question is being asked again. Witness' had already replied this question. Hence such question should not be allowed again.)

Answer: It is not correct to say that there is no complete description about this, Valmiki Ramayana. It is described in it.

In which sloks, in which canto, in which Kand of Valmiki Ramayana, the area, length and width of palace, was described, I do not remember I can tell you tomorrow, after going through the book. I agree with the area of Ayodhya, given in Valmiki Ramayana. The area of to-day's Ayodhya is much higher than the area of than Ayodhya.

Length and width of Ayodhya was given in slok No. 7, at page No. 41, in fifth canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana. It was said to be 12 yojan in length (one yojan is equal to 8 miles, approx.) and 3 Yojaii in width. As such the length and width of Ayodhya comes to 48 kaush and 12 kaush respectively. 48 kaush stand for 96 miles. Ayodhya of to-day is much bigger than this area. Ayodhya conies to an end at the bank of Saryu. He himself said that Ayodhya spread over upto Makhrora or Makhsthal in the north. Makhora is in the north of Saryu. He said it was mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana. In southern side, it is spread over upto Ranopali. Makhora is at a distance of 25 Km. from Ranopali. He further said that 80 kaushi parikarma covers the present Ayodhya. This parikarma begins from the Jamdagni Kund in Distt Gaunda where there was a Gosala (cow shed) of King Dasratha. Jamdagni Kund is at a distance of 35 Km from Ramghat, Ayodhya. Jamdagni Kund is within the modem Ayodhya. A part of Distt. Gaunda is within the present Ayodhya. 80 Kaushi parikarma begins from Jamdagni Kund and passes through many villages, the name of which I do not remember I do not know at what place the parikarma comes to an end in the southern side.

Question: It is 84 kaushi parikarma and not 80 kaushi parikanna?

Answer: It is correct.

The 80 kaushi parikarma is in fact 84 kaushi parikarma. Ayodhya is spread over in length towards east-west and in width, towards north-south. Ayodhya begins from the Ashram of Sringi Ashram, situated in the east of disputed site. I do not remember the distance of Sringi Rishi Ashram from the disputed site, in east. May be at the distance of 25-30 Kms. In west, Ayodhya begins from Tanda village also called Tanduwa, adjacent to Saryu. In north of Ayodhya, there is a Makhsthali, which begins from Ganga Manorama. Makhsthali is at a distance of 30 Kms. from the disputed site. In south, Ayodhya begins from Gurukul. Gurukul is at the distance of 8 Kms. from the dispute site. Makhsthali, according to my knowledge, is at a distance of more than 36 Kms. from Gurukul. Tanda or Tanduwa is at a distance of 96 miles or more from Sringi Rishi Ashram.

The couplet, Janmbhoomi Mumpuri Suhawani, Uttar Disha Saryu Bahi Pawani next to third couplet of Uttar Kand, document No. 258 C-1/2 of Ramcharitmanas was shown to witness, upon which witness said this part of Ramcharitmanas is correct. It is written in the couplet that Saryu River flows on the north. of my Suhawani birthplace. Suhawani birthplace means, Ayodhya. According to this description, Ayodhya, in north does not come to an end at the bank of Saryu but it is spread over upto Makhsthali.

Question: What I mean to say that from the above couplet it concluded that Ayodhya is spread over upto Saryu River only and the part in the north of Saryu cannot be, treated as a part of Ayodhya?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of plaintiff in other original suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that the couplet contents the view of

one person only. Hence question cannot be asked from witness in this regard. In addition, the boundary specified in the couplet is a subject of interpretation. Hence question cannot be asked in this regard.)

Answer: It is not correct. Had it been so; Maharaja would have not performed the Yagna in the land, which does not pertain to him.

Question: It is possible that the Saryu, which is flowing in the present place, had been flowing at a distance in the north side?

Answer: There is no fixed place where Saryu flows. Every year, it changes the route. Sometime in the north, sometime shifted to the side of Ayodhya and sometime it merges with Ganga Manorama.

Question: Had Saryu shifted to north-south side ever since the time you have been living in Ayodhya.

Answer: Yes.

It never happened that original route of Saryu had been changed towards north or south: It might be possible that its main route had been Li the south-west of the present route. I do not know the present distance of Saryu from the disputed site was less in old times. It is not correct to say that the actual length and width of Ayodhya was much less than what I am stating.

There is reference in Valmiki Ramayana that palace of King Dasratha was at a distance from the palace of his Queens. Palace of Queens was also under the palace of Dasratha. He himself said it included the private residence and the other palace of other Queens and also the palace of Ramchanderji and Sita. He himself said each brother

had his own palace. The palace where the palace of Kaushaliya, Sumitra, Kaikeyi and King Dasratha are situated at present, were also at the same site during the time of Dasrath. At present Sumitra Bhawan is situated in east-south of the disputed site. The said Bhawan has since been demolished. I do not know when the Bhawan was demolished, perhaps 10- 15 years before, but I cannot say the definite time. I have heard that it was demolished during the time of Chief Ministership of Kalayan Singh, for making the land plain. I visited the Sumitra Bhawan 15-20 years before. There were a number of idols in Sumitra Bhawan. There were the idols of Shri Ram, Laxman, Bharat, Satrugan, Sumitra and Hanumanji. The Bhawan, called Kaushaliya Bhawan is in the east-north of the disputed site. Kaushaliya Bhawan is at a distance of two to two hundred and fifty feet from the disputed site. Sumitra Bhawan is at a distance of hundred to hundred and fifty feet from the dispute & site Kaikeyi Bhawan is in the north of Kaushaliya Bhawan. Kop Bhawan is in the east of Kaikeyi Bhawan. Kaikeyi Bhawan is at a distance of 50- 60 feet from Kaushaliya Bhawan. There are idols of Ram chanderji, Sitaji, Laxmanji, Bharatji, Satruganji, Kaushaliyaji and Hanumanji in Kaushaliya Bhawan. I have seen these idols last time, 15 years before. There are idols of Shri Ram, Laxman, Bharat, Satrugan, Kaikeyi and Hanumanji in Kaikeyi Bhawan. Kaushaliya Bhawan and Kaikeyi Bhavari still exist. Kop bhawan might be there even today. I have not gone since long. There was an idol of Kaikeyi in Kop Bhawan. Red colour represent to anger. So the idol was painted with Red colour. Kaushaliya Bhawan and Kaikeyi Bhawan were from the time of Dasrath. He himself said these Bhawans are at the places, where they were at the time of Dasrath.

Question: Whether the Kaushaliya Bhawan and Kaikeyi Bhawan were made of Lakhori bricks, Gumna bricks, cement and stones or from other material?

Answer: It has been changed due to reconstruction. Present reconstruction is made of solid bricks and cement.

Present construction is four-five hundred years old. The palace wherein Ramchanderji and Sitaji were said to be resided, is Kanak Bhawan at present, which was gifted to Sitaji by Queen Kaikeyi at Muhdikhai.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

28.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 29.7.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

28.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 29.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 28.7.2004, cross-examination
by Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 9,
Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

Idols of Sita-Ram, Laxmanji, Hanumanji and Ramlalla
are there in the present Kanak Bhawan. From Ramlalla I
mean, child Rama. The site of Kanak Bhawan is the same
at which it was during the time of Dasrath. Similarly the
area of Kaushaliya Bhawan. Dasrath Mahal or Barasthan
is at the east-south corner of Kanak Bhawan. Dasrath
Mahal is also a temple. There are idols of Ram, Laxman,
Sitaji and Hanurnanji inside the Dasrath Mahal and not an
idol of Dasratha. The Dasrath palace is at the same place
where it was during the time of Dasrath. This is the same
place, which I referred as Rajmahal. Palace of Dasratha
was referred in Valmiki Ramayana. It was referred in slok
No. 8, 9 and 10 of fourth canto, at page No. 188 in
document No. 261 C-I/I King palace is referred in slok No.
8, slok No. 9 refers the palace of Dasrath. Similarly 10th
slok refers the Bhawan of father of Raghav. Area of palace
of Dasrathji or its length and width has not been given in
Valmiki Ramayana. Similarly the area, i.e. length and
width of others Bhawan, Kaushaliya Bhawan, Sumitra

Bhawan, Kaikeyi Bhawan has not been given in Valmiki Ramayana. Slok No. 4 at page No. 188 of the book refers the Bhawan of Ramchandra. Slok No. 29 at page No. 189 of this book refers about Ramchandra's going to the palace of Kaushaliya from his palace. In the slok, later to above slok, there is a reference about the Pujan of Dev, being performed by Kaushaliya. This Dev was a Bhagwan Rangnath. This slok also referred the puja of Rajyalaxhmi, which Kaushaliya performed for the welfare of Ramchanderji. Rajyalaxhmi means Royal throne. In slok No. 30 at page No. 190, there is a reference of doing Jap of Sriman Narayan. Sriman Narayan means, Bhagwan Rangnath. In slok No. 41, at this page, there is a reference of Bhagwan Vishnu. Kaushaliya had worshiped the Bhagwan Vishnu. She is asking the blessing of Bhagwan Vishnu, for succession to Ramchanderji. Ramchanderji is an incarnation of Mahavishnu. Vishnu and Mahavishnu are individuals. He himself said that Baikunthadhis Sriman Narayan as Bharat, Sriram Sanyee Sriman Narayana as a Laxman, Swetadhipatti Uma Sriman Narayana as Satrugan were born to serve the Rama, incarnation of Mahavishnu. It was also mentioned in Shiv Sanhita. It is referred in slok No. 114 at page No. 195, document No. 261 C-1/1, that at that time, the palace was full of men and women overjoyed with pleasures. The palace referred in the slok was the palace where Ramchandra lived before marriage. That palace was not a Rajbhawan. It was called Ramvesh or Ram Mahal. Ramvesh was referred in slok No. 14. The reference figured in fifth canto and first canto was about the Rajyabhisek. Ramchanderji was married before his Rajyabhisek. At that Sita was residing with Ramchanderji in King's palace. It is said that coronation was held after two to three month after their marriage. Ramchanderji did not go alongwith Sitaji in Kanak Bhawan at the time of

Rayabhisek. At the occasion in which connection of above facts were narrated, Ramchanderji was residing in a Kings palace. My above statement that the palace where Ramchanderji was residing before his marriage was not a King's palace is not correct. Raj Bhawan and Raj Mahal are synonym. In slok No. 15, at page No. 191 of the book, there is a reference that the palace from where Ramchanderji came out was the best palace among the Raj Mahals. There is a reference that palace of Dasrath was the best among the Raj Bhawans. Witness again said that sloks referred the palace where Rama was living. The word Prakhyat was used in the slok. Prakhyat means the famous buildings among the palace and in Ayodhya. Palace of Ramchanderji alongwith Dasratha was famous among the public.

Question: Whether in accordance with the Valmiki Ramayana. The Marg (road) on which the above Raj Bhawan situated was called Rajmarg.

Answer: The roads aside the above Bhawans, were not only the Rajmarg but also all the roads in Ayodhya were called Rajmarg, which were full of gathering at the time of Rajyabhisek.

At present, the road leading to Gorakhpur from Faizabad is called a Rajmarg. This is the main Rajmarg. Besides this, all the roads are called Rajmarg. I mean the road constructed by the Govt. are called Rajmarg. The road leading to Faizabad from Lucknow and the road by which I go to Lucknow from Faizabad is also called Rajmarg.

Slok No. 13 at page No. 42 of the book was shown to witness. Witness said there is mention of ditch around the Ayodhya, which is very difficult to cross. The facts written

in the book about the time of King Dasrath, in fifth canto are correct. The Ayodhya as mentioned in slok No. 8, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 at page No. 41 and 42 of fifth canto, matches the present geographic of Ayodhya having gardens all around and pitcher, with gold plates at Rajdwar. Pitcher at Rajdwar is of the gold Besides good Rajmargs also there. Ayodhya to-day is in the shape of fish, as it was than. Otherwise Ayodhya in the present time does not match with the Ayodhya of that time. Ayodhya was not constructed by King Dasrath. Slok No. 22 at page No. 42 was shown to witness and he was asked.

Question: Is there a mention about the Ayodhya that it was constructed by King Dasrath?

Answer: There is no such mention. But it was mentioned that people who were craftsman, the people who can shoot at the voice points, people with high caliber and philosophers, were inhabited in different small puries. The slok No. 9 at page 41 of the book was shown to witness.

Question: Whether this slok that Ayodhya was constructed / inhabited by King Dasrath?

Answer: There is a mention that King Dasrath has developed the Ayodhya. There is no mention about its construction. This slok also refers the people to whom I referred in a reply to 19 questions that Ayodhya was inhabited by the skilled peoples.

Ayodhya, first of all was constructed by Manu. This Manu is called Vewswat Manu i.e. 7th Manu. One kalp is equal to a time of one Manu. One Kalpa is equal to one thousand chaturyug. One thousand kapa is equal to a day

of Brahma. Time of one Manu is equal to a day of Brahma. On seeing the book, he brought with him, he said one chaturyug is equal to 43 lakhs 20 thousand years. Satyug is equal to 17 lakhs 28 thousand years. Treta is equal to 12 lakhs 96 thousand years, Dwaper is equal to 8 lakhs 64 thousand and Kalyug is equal to 4 lakhs, 32 thousand years.

Manu originated the universe first. But I believe that the originator of universe is not Manu but Brahmaji. Manu was created by Brahma. At present, the period of 7th Manu is going on. Bhagwan Vishnu and Mahesh were also originated by Brahmaji. There are two Mahapralaya (Destruction) in a kalpa. 28th chaturyug of the present kalp is going on at present. Present time is 28th Kalyug of this kalp. In the first and second line of the statement given by me yesterday at page 56, I have stated that at present 25th Kalyug is going on. While to-day I said it is 28th Kalyug. It is by mistake. The correct position is that 25th Kalyug is going on. 38 lakhs, 93 thousand years of present chaturyug have been passed away. Yesterday I said that Ramchanderji was born in 24th Treta. It is correct. Satyug comes first and then comes Tretayug.

Question: According to you Ramchanderji was born in 24th Treta and at present 25th Kalyug is going on. So whether Ramchanderji was born 64 lakhs 85 thousand years before.

Answer: It is not correct. I believe that Ramchanderji was born one crore, 81 lakhs, 60 thousand years ago. What is the basis of my statement, I will tell you tomorrow. He said, I would be able to reply the question, after reading Haribansh Puran.

I had said that Manu was a first human. He was 6 thousand kalpa before. One thousand chaturyuga is equal to one kalpa and one kalpa is equal to 4 Arab, 32 crores years. I believe that six kalpa had passed away and present is 7th. Thus 25 Arab 92 crores years have passed away. There is lot of difference in between the present time human and the first human. Earlier human was big in size. For how long the present size of a man is in existence, I cannot say. Period is not known in this regard.

Document No. 261 C-1/3 of the document No. 261 C 1/1 was shown to witness. I cannot say whether this size of physique was available before one crore, 81 lakhs years or not. The size given in the picture can be hypothetical. Similarly the size shown in 261 C-1/1/8 of document No. 261 C-1/1/1 can also be hypothetical.

Question: Is it correct to say that there is no evidence in support that such human exists one lakhs years before?

Answer: It is not correct to say. Evidences are there in Veds.

There is an evidence in Rigved. I do not remember in which Richas it is. But I can reply it tomorrow after studying All Veds referred about Ramchanderji i.e. Rigved, Yazurved, Samved, Atharvved, Brahaman, Satpath, Upnishad. Brahaman, Upnishad and Satpath are the part of Veds. There is a reference about Ram incarnation in these Veds. About his birth, no particular place has been mentioned. There is a reference that he has taken birth is Suryakul. Suryakul and Suryavansh is one and the same.

Question: Whether all these four Veds were written after the time of Ramchanderji or were existed before Ram incarnation?

These Veds were not existed in writing. These were in the divine form. After Rama, when Rishies Shaw the Veds, than they have written it. Veds were written before Rama was born. Their script and language are similar to the script and languages of Veds of to-day. Veds, for the first time were written on Bhojpatra and Valkal/skin of tree. I have seen the manuscript of Vedas in Sarswati Library of Sanskrit University, Varanasi. In addition to this, manuscript written on wood and stones are there. I came to know about that Veds were written in Bhojpatra, Balkal, Kast and stones from the catalog. I have seen it when I was stydying in the said University, almost 50 years ago. These manuscripts contain, a few parts from Rigved and sloks from other Veds. This fact is not known, where the other parts of Veds are, which are not in the said Sarswati Library. He himself said some of its part was in Nalanda University but it was heard that it was destroyed in the fire. I cannot say whether the manuscript written in Bhojpatra etc. and kept in Saraswati Library were written before the birth of Bhagwan Ram.

Question: You have stated in your statement today that Veds had been written before the birth of Ramchanderji and in regard to birth of Ramchanderji you have stated that he was born one crore,; 81 lakhs; 60 thousand and 103 years before. Hence manuscript must be more than one crore, 81 lakhs, 60 thousand, 103 years old.

Answer: I have no knowledge about this. I have been told in the University that these manuscripts were very old.

I have stated in the statement given by me to-day, that original manuscript of Valmiki Ramayana was written Bhojpatra or Balkal (skin of tree). I have seen some parts of manuscript of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana in Baraha area. This area is in Distt. Gaunda. I have seen this manuscript 30- 35 years ago. He himself said he visited there in a conference of scholars. These manuscripts were in Paska temple. This temple is managed by a Mahatma who was from Ayodhya, belongs to Ramanandiya Sampradaya. But I do not know his name. I have no knowledge, about which Akhara or temple he belongs to. I have seen the first slok of Valmiki Ramayana, written in black ink on the Bhojpatra. The priest was 80 years old at that time. He told me that this is the original manuscript of Ramayana written by Maharishi Valmiki. This manuscript was written during the time of Ramchander after his birth. The Sanskrit, written in it, is similar to the Sanskrit written in document No. 261 C-1/1 of Valmiki Ramayan. The script of the manuscript was similar to the script written in document No. 261 C-1/1. The entire manuscript is not available there. The manuscript of other pan of Valmiki Ramayana was in Nalanda University, which was destroyed in the fire. The statement given by me to-day that 'Veds had been written before the birth of Ramchanderji', is correct.

I have given the statement today that "This manuscript was written after the birth of Ramachanderji" is correct. I made a statement on 28.7.2004, that "Valmiki ramayan document No. 261 C-1/1 and 261 C-1/2..... no book had been written before it," is correct.

Question: According to your statement, you had given yesterday, Valmiki Ramayana is an oldest book and no book was written before that. You have said to-day that Valmiki Ramayan was written during the time of Ramchander, after his birth and on the other hand you said to-day that Veds were written prior to his birth. Would you please tell us that according to your statement Veds are the oldest book and not the Valmiki Ramayan?

Answer: Valmiki Ramayan is a poetry and Veds are divine, which becomes visible and disappeared from time to time. Divine knowledge has no boundation.

Question: My question is concerning to the time period that when these two books were written. Please tell us which of your statement is correct, the statement given by you yesterday regarding Valmiki Ramayan or the statement given to-day regarding Veds.

Answer: Both the statements were correct.

Question: When, on the basis of manuscript written on Bhojpatra and Valkals book was formed for the first time?

Answer: I cannot reply. The same reply is applicable in the case of Valmiki Ramayan.

About Ramchanderji and his birth place, birth time of Ramji, his character and glory, was described in Rudryamal, Skand Puran, Padam Puran, Brahm Puran, Purva Puran, Vaman Puran, Brahmavetarva Puran, Kalika Puran, Devi Bhagwat Puran, Ramstavraj excluding Valmiki

Ramayan and Ramcharitmanas. The description about the birth of Ramchanderji was given in all the above purans. I have not read the book namely Shri Ramjanambhoomi written by Dr. Radhey Shyam Shukia. I have not read any book written during the last 100-200 years, on the above subject. One part of Skand Purans is by the name of Ayodhya Mahatamya. I have read Ayodhya Mahatamya thoroughly. I remembered the description about Ramjanambhoomi given in this book. The description given about Ramjanambhoomi, in Ayodhya Mahatamya of Skand Puran and Patal Khand of Padam Puran is similar. I have submitted the detail of Patal Khand of Padam Puran, in regard to Ramjanambhoomi, in my main examinee affidavit. I fully remember the detail. I have not brought the book. The book is in Ayodhya. I can call for the book. I am still residing in Ayodhya. I have cited the extract from the first part of Rudiyamal at page 6 of my main examinee affidavit. Page 6 of his main examinee affidavit was shown to witness.

Question: Is which word and sloks of above part of Rudryamal refers about the Janmsthan and Janmbhoomi of Ramchanderji?

Answer: The slok at page No. 6, means that Saryu is in the north and south of Shri Ramjanmbhoomi.

In this slok the word Hareranthgrah stand for Ramjanmbhoomi. It is written in the slok, which comes after the above mentioned slok, that area of Ayodhya is in the shape of fish and this pun (land) pray for the incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu i.e. Rama. This place, Ayodhya, is in the west, east and south at the point from where cows crosses the Saryu and it is in the central part. In the third slok, among the above slok, it was stated that Saryu was in the north and south of Ayodhya. Saryu is at the distance of three furlong i.e. half Km. in the north of

the disputed site. There was a Jalpa drain in the south of disputed site, which now has been covered. Saryu in the south of the disputed site never has been in my knowledge. The direction of Saryu and Tamsa River was given in the third slok at page No. 6 of the affidavit. Drection of Ramjanmbhoomi was not given. The word Hareranthgrah written in between Saryu and Tamsa in slok No. 6, refers the Ramjanambhoomi. It was not stated in the slok, that Ramjanmbhoomi is situated in between Tamsa and Saryü. It was stated in the slok that Saryu is in the south of Ramjanambhoomi and in the south of northern Chohadi and Tamsa is in the north. Tamsa River has since Vanished 1000 years, 500 years or 2000 years ago, I do not know. On the basis of above detail in Rudryamal, I am talking about the existence of Tamsa River. Rudryamal is almost 500 years old. What I mean from para 30 of my main examinee affidavit that Rudryamal is 500 years old. None other than the word "Harinantra Grih." in the third slok refers Ramjanmbhoomi. There is no reference in any part of Rudryarnal, about the Ramjanmbhoomi, other than the extract, which I have submitted in my affidavit, from Rudryamal. He himself said that only its introduction is there. I have read the book namely "Ayodhya Ka Itihas" written by Lala Sitaram, residence of Ayodhya. I might have seen him. He was a scholar. Had he not been a scholar of history, he would have not written this book. He belongs to Ramanand Sampradaya. He was a religious person. He was a devotee of Rama.

I have not seen the book named "Ayodhya Ka Rakt - Ranjit Itihas.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

29.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 30.7.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

29.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 30.7.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryachaiya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 29.7.2004 cross-examination
by Shri Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant
No. 9, Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

I have stated in the statement given, by me that
Manu has constructed the Ayodhya. Crores of years have
n passed away from the time seventh Manu inhabited
Ayodhya. Ayodhya was inhabited in between the time of
first and seventh Manu. But it was in a deserted form.
Ayodhya got its resurrection form during the period of
Rama. One crore, eighty one thousand one hundred five
years have been passed away from the time of
Ramchanderji. In my earlier statement I said one hundred

and three years, rather one hundred and five years. It was based upon the calculation done two years before. I have by mistake said yesterday that twenty-fifth Kalyug is going on, at present. There was a mistake in calculation. The fact is that twenty-eighth Kalyug is going on. I am stating this on the basis of Skand Puran. Harivansh Puran also said like this. I could not get the Harivansh Puran in Lucknow. I have said in the statement given by me that the mankind existed in India one lakhs year before also. There is a reference in Rigved, about this, which is as "Adho Ram Savatriya." On seeing the Rigved, witness said this reference occurs in 10/3/3. In addition to this, "Chitramasya Ketavo Ram Vindan" also comes on 10/111/7. Which means that the character of Bhagwan Ramchanderji is in the nature creator. He himself said, he is known as Rakar, Makar and Akar i.e. Latvatraya.

Question: From word "beej" (creator) you referred in your statement, it appears that Rishi had seen Ramchanderji as a mankind of to-day?

Answer: Not only "beej" but his character was perceived by Rishi.

Question: Which sentence of Rigved refer the above contention?

Answer: From "Chitrayamasya Ketavo Ram Vindan."

Question: In the reference, regarding "Beej" from Rigved, you have quoted just now - There is no comparison in between the present mankind and mankind referred in Rigved?

Answer: It is not correct to say that no comparison with the present human was given. According to grammar, the "idam" which appears face to fac

perception. Hence the picture and "Asya" and "Ram" in Veda indicate towards mankind.

Question: According to you Veds were written crores of years before. Can the person characterized in Ved, be compared with the present human?

Answer: They may differ in size, in height, in strength etc.

The Tamsa River which was during the time of Ramchanderji has since vanished. I have read about this in a book, the name of book is not known to me. There is a river called Tons, in the Distt. Azamgarh, but it is quite different from the Tamsa River, existed during the time of Ramchanderji. Tamsa River passes through the side of Bharat Kund, situated in Distt. Azamgarh. This Tamsa River is called Tons River, but it is not the Tons River of the time of Ramchanderji. The Tons River, passing through the sides of Bharat Kund, merges with Tamsa River. The Tamsa River, about which I said that it was vanished, was passes through the area in between the Bharat Kund and Nandi gram. Besides one more river called Tilodaki was also passes through there. This Tilodaki River was created by King Dasrath. But the Tamsa and Tilodaki, both, are now vanished. The Tamsa River, which I am referring, is not a existing Tamsa rivers, the present Tamsa river which flows from Bhadarsa and Bharat Kund. It is not a river Bharat Kund and Bhadarsa is in the south of Ayodhya. Sringeripur is at a distance of 10-15 Km. (then said at 25 Km.) in south of Ayodhya. On seeing the couplet "Nikasi Vasist dwar Bhai Thade" at page No. 276 of document No. 258 C-I/2 of Ramcharitmanas, witness said "Ramchanderji is standing at the door of Vasista, for going to forest." The door referred above, was at the place, where Vasist Kund is situated at present. The residence of Vasist was in the outer part from the palace. He himself said, that King

Dasratha used to go to the residence of Vasista. Ramchanderji went to the forest, passing through the residence of Vasista. On reading the slok No. 84 at page 278 document No. 258 C-I/2 of the book mentioned above, witness said Ramchanderji stayed at the bank of Tamsa river, on the first day, while going to the forest. Upon reading the seventh couplet, next to couplet No. 84, of the above mentioned book, witness said he went to forest from there after staying at the bank of Tamsa river, in the mid night. After reading the two couplets next to couplet No. 86 at page No. 279 of the book, witness said he along with his brother, secretary and Sita reached Sringvespur, situated at the bank of Ganga-Gomati river in Distt Sultanpur. He gets down from the chariot and bow before Ganga-Gomati. The word Ganga used in the couplet, is called Gomati river now a days. Srigheshwar is in the south of Ayodhya. Saryu is at a distance of 4 Km. from Ramghat, where I live. When I started digging foundation at Ramghat, 15 years before, I found sand upto 10 feet in depth. I means, river keeps changing the route. It might be possible that Tamsa had also changed the route. I read in a book that Tamsa has vanished. It might be incorrect. The Purans I referred in my statement were written by Krishna Dwepayan Vedvyas. There have been 28 Vyas in addition to Krishna Dwapayan. He was contemporary to Rama. Vyas was black in colour, hence he was called Krishna. Dwepayan means a place in between two island. Vyasji was residing at an island. So being black in colour and residing in an island, he was called Krishna Dwepayan. Krishna means black in colour. He further said he has written a number of books about Krishna. So he was called Krishna Dwepayan. Krishna, means Bhagwan Krishna, incarnation of Vishnu. Krishna was 5000 years before. Krishna was in Dwaperyug.

Valmiki Ramayana is a poetry and history. It cannot be called Puran. Ramayana also means the way to attain Rama. The word "Ramayana" used in Valmiki Ramayan means "Ayan" i.e house of Ramchanderji. Its second meaning is that one get knowledge (Gran) strength, salvation and love by studying Ramayana. Ujurved is also written by Krishna Dwepayan, Vedvyas.

Ramanandacharya was an Acharya of Ramananda Sect. But he was not a founder of that Sect. Sitaji was a founder of Ramanandiya Sect. She was an Acharya of this Sect. She propagated the definition of Ram Mantra and Srimat. Bodhayan, Parashar, Vyasji and Hanumanji were the Acharya in the period in between the Sitaji and Ramanandacharya. These people had fastened the movement. I cannot say which period Bodhayan belongs to. May be after Bhagwan Budha. There is no literature about Bodhayan. Vedvyas is immortal. Hanumanji was a Devta. He himself said that he was a human and Devta, both. I do not know any person who wrote the literature of this Sect, prior to the time of Ramanandacharya. There is only a Bhasya, known as Janaki Bhasva. Literature written by Ramanandacharya is the oldest one regarding Ramananda Sect. Other literature, which is available, is of the time, later to Ramanandacharya. Ramananda has written, Bhasya on Geeta, Upnishad and Brahmsutra. So he was called Anand Bhaskar. He has not written any Bhasya on Ramayana. His book, "Vaishnav Matabyabhaskar" is about the code of conduct of Vaishnav Acharya. This book does not refer Ramchanderji but his character had been reflected in it. Among the 12 disciple of Ramanandacharya, one is Anubhawanandacharya. He was before 500 years. He was born in 1503 at Varanasi. He established military principle in his life and imparted training in Lance, arrow, spears etc. Virjanandacharya was the disciple of

Anubhawanandacharya and Balanandacharya was the disciple of Virjanandacharya. Balanandacharya has established Akhara five hundred years before. The aim of Ramanandacharya at his disciple was to propagate Vedic culture and to analyze the principles of Indian Literature.

The birth of Rama has not been referred in any upnishad. "Om ha ye Ramchandra" is written in Chandogya upnishad, which means Rama was a incarnation of Mahavishnu. "Ramtamniyopshid" refers to his physique but his birth and incarnation has not been described therein. Mahavishnu was prior to Mahabrahma because Brahma was born from the his hubtolus, which gives knowledge to Rishies. I have stated yesterday that Mahesh and Vishnu created by Brahma. The said Vishnu is other than Mahavishnu. Shrikrishna was an incarnation of Vishnu. According to my faith, Vaikunthdhees Shrimannarayan Chuterbuj Cheerabhsayee Shrimannarayana Swetadipradhithi Asthbhuji Bhumasrimannarayan is other than the Mahavishnu, Rama was his incarnation. I do not know how many incarnation of Krishna were there.

Question: Whether Narsingh and Varah were the incarnation of Vishnu?

Answer: There are three type of incarnation. Aweshwatar, Prawesathar, Sarfutyavatar. Narsingh Avtar is Prawesthar. It was for Prahalad. Barahavtar is Surfutyavatar, which is for the welfare of universe.

Shri Krishna was the incarnation of Bhagwan Rama. There was no other incarnation of Rama, other than Srikrishna. He himself stated that Parsuram was said to be incarnation of Rama. Parsuram was Aweshwater of Rama,

who was for a short period. Rama is called a Suryavanshi on the earth. It is said about Parsuram that he had resolve to massacre the Chatriya even then he is called the short lived incarnation of Ramchanderji. Incarnation of Rama, as Parsuram, was before the birth or after the birth of Rama, I cannot say, Bhagwan Budha was not an incarnation of Vishnu and similarly Mahabirs was not. It is not relevant to call early Shankrayacharya Chadmbodh.

An idol worship had begun during the time of Ved. The time of Ved and ancient period is almost one. These four Sects are from the ancient period. These four sects are Shri, Shev, Shakya and Sanak. Sri Sect is called Vaishnav Sampraday. The 18 Purans referred in the statement given by me, are followed by all the four sects. These Purans contains the description of dynasties of King's. He further said that it also contains description of world. Matsya Puran contains the description of Suryavansh and Chandervansh. There might be description of Nand Vansh, Maurya yansh, Gupt Vansh and Satyavahan Vansfi in these Purans. Maurya Vansh and Gupt Vansh were there 2000 years before. They might have existed before that. I have no knowledge whether the people mentioned in Maurya Vansh and Gupt Vansh were before 2000 year or after. King of Chandervansh and five type of Vayu were described in Vayu Puran. Shri Krishna was the main in Chandervansh Kings. During the period of Mahabharat, all the Kings were called Chandervanshi King. Garur Puran also contains the description of Shri Krishanvansh, but pret Karm was described more. Bhagwat Puran contains the description of Surya Vansh and Chander Vansh. Suryavansh was described upto chapter nine and Chandervansh upto the Dasam Skand. The description of Krishn Vansh Kings figured in the last of Brahanand Puran.

There is no specific description of a particular period in Smrities. I do not remember whether Smrities are from the time of seventh Manu or after that. Narad smriti defines time period. I cannot say whether Gupt period was described in or not. Suryavanshi King Dasrath, Ramji, Ichavaku, Kakutastha were described in Veds. This description is in Rigved, Ujurved and Samved. Ichhavaku and Indra are described in Ujurved. Indra means King Indra. According to Atharved, King Parshith was a last King of Purus. But I cannot say definitely. There is no reference of Mahabharat in these Veds. He himself said that Aryaverta was referred to in this book. Mahabharata is not a Puran. It is a history. Mahabharata was written by Ved-Vyas. Ved-Vyas is a Krishnadweyapan Vedvyas, whom I referred above. He was 28th Vedvyas Srimad Bhagwat is an enigmatical poetry. The some slok said to be spoken by Bhagwan Srikrishna. Rest slok were taken from Mahabharata. Shri Krishna is said to be the writer of Geeta. I do not know when Geeta was written. I require time to study about this.

Ganesh has written Srimadbhagwat Geeta. Ganeshji one of the five devtas. Ganeshji might had written the slok of Geeta on Bhojpatra or leafs of Pipal. I have neither seen nor heard about it. Geeta is written in Sanskrit. Geeta is also called Geetaupnishad. I have read the "Geeta Ka Arth" Bhasya written by Ramanandacharya and Shankracharya. I have studied the Geeta in Sanskrit. Ramchanderji born as Shrikrishna. Mahabharat was 5000 years before and Krisha is contemporary to Mahabharat Ramchanderji was the incarnation of Mahavishnu who was one crore 81 lakhs 60 thousand and 105 years old. Rama born as Shrikrishna, about 5000 years before. Since than Rama does not take birth again. King Dasratha was the father of Rama, the incarnation of Mahavishnu and

similarly Vasudev was the father of Shrikrishna. Shrikrishna was born in the jail, which belongs to Kansh.

There is a grand palace at the site where Krishna was born. There is no description about the place where Krishna born, in Geeta. Neither the place of birth of Rama nor Ayodhya, where Rama was born, were referred in Geeta. There is a little reference in Geeta where it was referred that "Ram Sastramirtamham." In which chapter it figures, I can say only after seeing the book Geeta. Ramanandacharya has written Bhasya. on Geeta. There also has no mention of birth place or Janmbhoomi of Rama. Among the other Bhasya and translation rendered within two-three years, Bhasya written by Ramsukh Dass is authentic.

Swami Vivekanand was a scholar of Hindu religion. Maharishi Dayanand has not written correct facts about Hindu religion. The points he written by Maharishi Dayanand about Arya Samaj is authentic but the facts written about Hindu religion by him are not authentic. Mahatma Gandhi was also a scholar of Hindu religion. He was universal but by his core of heart he was a devotee of Rama. Rama was his God. At his last moment he chanted the name of Rama. He chanted "Raghupati Raghav Raja Ram, Patit Tapawan Sita Ram at his last time. Gandhi wanted to establish Ram-Rajya in India. Gandhiji came to Ayodhya during freedom struggler but at what time, I cannot say. There was a slogan at that time "Chal Chawani Chandi Ki, Jai Bob Mahatma Gandhi Ki." I have personally not met him. I was 13-14 years old at the time of his visit to Ayodhya. Freedom struggler was going on at that time. A meeting was held at the bank of Saryu wherein other big leaders, including "Ba" i.e. wife of Gandhiji were present. But I could not heard him because of huge gathering. Gandhiji did not go to disputed Bhawan then. Dr. Rajinder Prasad was a scholar of Vaishnav

Dharma. He was a learned person. He contributed a lot for the construction of Somnath temple. Once Rajinder Babu visited Ayodhya to see Swami Rampadasthji, a high class Mahatma and having knowledge of Veda, and follower of Ramananda Sect, which proves that he was related to Ramannandiya Sect. Rajinder Babu has written a number of books. He has written books on Indian history and politics. So far I knew he came to Ayodhya only once. At that time he went to see Swami Rampadarathji at Janki Ghat, Ayodhya. He had not visited the disputed site. I do not know whether Rajinder Babu referred about Babar in his book or not. Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru was a learned man. He wrote the book on Indian history and Indian culture. I have read his book "Discovery of India". There is no reference about Ramjanmbhoomi in the book "Discovery of India". Besides I have read the book named "Fighters of freedom" written by Sarojini Naidu in English. I have partially read the book written by Rajgopalacharya on Ramayana. I have also read the book written by Priyar Sahib on Ramayana but summarily. I have not studied any other book written in English on Ramayana, which is in agreement with the principle of Ramananda Sect. I have read the books written by Karpatriji, Swami Akhandanandji and Prabhudutt Brahmchari on Ramayana: These books are authentic. The books published by Geeta Press, Gorakhpur on Ramayana are authentic but the matter has been reshiffted at some places. I do not agree with the book written by Rajgopalachari on Ramayana. I have no knowledge about the book Kayasthchidendra. I have the knowledge about the books, Nirnaya Sindhu and Dharmasindhu. There are the authentic books of Hindu religion. I have heard the name of Nagendra Bhatt. I have no knowledge about Nagendra Bhatt. But I have the knowledge about Nagesh Bhatt, who is a high class writer on Hindu religion. Perhaps he belongs to 8th century. I

have read his book, Laghusabdendushekhara and Paribhasendushekhara. These books are on Grammar. The word 'Ram' is referred there in but no mention about the birth place of Rama and his character. The word "Ram" was also referred in the book - Nirnayasindhu and Dharmasindhu, but no reference about the birth place and character of Rama is there in. I have read the books written by Jagadguru Ramanandacharya and Bhadracharya. I have also read the books named Parashan, Thantriya and Jatayu, Mains main Tapas and Sarju Lahari in addition to above books written on Ramayana.

I have not read the book "Ayodhya Ka Itihas avam Puratatwa" written by Thakur Prasad Verma and Swaraj Prakash Gupta. I have not even saw the book. Thakur Prasad Verma and Swaraj Prakash Gupta are not known to me. Witness said I do not know Justice Devki Nandan Aggarwal, who has filed a petition, which is going on with the suit in which I am giving statement.

I am familiar with the main temples and places of Ayodhya. He himself stated he did not go anywhere for last 10-15 years. I am familiar with Swargdwar, Chanderhari, Sahastradhara, Laxmanghat, Nageshwamath Mandir, Rinmochan Ghat, Rajghat, Kaushaliya Ghat, Sumitra Ghat, Brahmikund, Prahalad Ghat, Bighneshwar, Hanumangarhi, Lomas, Chakratirth, Jamwant Fort, Dantdhawan Kund, Kubertila, Neel Tila, Pindarak, Ratna Sihasan Mandir etc. Besides these, there are mosque and tombs in Ayodhya. One place is called Shish Paigambar is at Maniprabad have no knowledge about the tomb of Ibrahim Baba. I have no knowledge about Alamgiri Mosque or Aurangzeb mosque. I know Nogaji grave. I have no knowledge about Kekarewali Masjid, near Police Station. Disputed site is called Babri Masjid by Muslims. There may be some old graves in Ayodhya, upon which stones

are fixed, might be 700-800 years old. Sita Koop is situated in the south at a distance of 100-200 feet from the disputed site. It is said about this koop that at the time of coronation of Rama, water from various places were poured in this koop. Its water is treated as a holy water. There is belief about this koop that peoples are benefited by taking the water from the koop. This koop is also called the Sataiyasa koop. It is said that at the time of Rajyabhisek, water from different holy places were poured in this koop. It is said that this koop is from the time of Ramchanderji. The koop was referred in Valmiki Ramayana and Ananda Ramayana but not in Ramcharitmanas. I believe that Saryu, Sita Koop and land are there from the time of Ramchanderji. In addition, people have faith on these things but there is no structure from the time of Ramchanderji.

I referred, Rajsadan and Rajdwar in the Statement given by me yesterday and I stated that pitchers of Gold are on them. I believe that the Rajsadan was built-up three hundred years ago. The present King, who lives in Rajsadan, has no relation with the family of Rama. Vikramjot which comes within the Basti Janpad and Thakurs in and around the villages called them as Raghuvanshi chatriya and they say that they are from the family of Rama. One of the Thakur, Naresh Singh, lives at Dantdhawan Kund, Ayodhya. These people are around 4000- 5000 in number. The area of Rajdwar temples is about 4000 square feet.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

30.7.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 2.8.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

30.7.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty, High
Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 2.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 30.7.2004 cross-examination
by Shri Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant
No. 9, Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

Jyotishpithaswar Santanandji Maharaj was the
Shankracharya of Jyotishpeeth. There is a dispute in
between the Santanandji and Swaroopanandji over the
peeth. The dispute is still pending. Because after the
demise of Santananda, Vasudevanandji is pursuing the
case. Santanandaji was in the meeting in which
Ramjanmbhoomi Trust was constituted. I do not know
whether he was a member of Trust or not. The seat of
Shankracharya at Badrinath is called the seat of
Dwarikadhis seat. It is also called Shardapeeth or
Jyotishpeeth.

Santanandji was a Shankracharya of Prayag-up-peeth.
Vasudevanandaji replaced him. Santparvar Brahmchari
Arel, was from Allahabad, is no more.

Witness on seeing the page No. 3 of the document
No. 111 C/1 in other original suit No.5/89 said that there is
a reference of Swami Purshothamacharya, Sugreev Kila,
Ayodhya at Sl.No. 1 who is a Jagatguru of

Ramanujacharya Sampradaya and Budhbikshu Bhante, Shri Gyanjagatji Maharaj was referred at S1.No. 2. I have seen him. He neither belonged to Ramahand Sect nor Ramanuja Sect. He was a Budh. He is not related to Vaishnav Sect. The name of Madhvacharya Swami Vishesteerth is at Sl. No. 3 who is a Jagadguru of Madhavacharya Sampradaya situated at Udepi. I have not seen the book document No.111 C-1 before.

There is a road in the north of disputed site and then Janmsthan Mandir. This Janmsthan Mandir is about 300-400 hundred years old. I have visited inside the Mandir.

Question: In the Janmsthan Mandir, which is situated at a distance at a road in the north of disputed site, who is worshiped there?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, in other original suit No. 3/89 raised an objection that the answer about the question has already been calculated. Besides, it can be the name of any temple. Hence it is not possible to ask question in this regard.)

Answer: It is named a Janmsthan Mandir casually. It is a temple of Rama.

Question: Is it worshiped as a birth place of Rama for more than 200 years?

Answer: I have not seen it, being worshiped in this form.

Question: Do you see the above Janmsthan Mandir as a temple of other Devi-Devta?

Answer: Darshan of Rama is being done there.

Question: What is the belief of Hindu population and devotee of Rama, about above Janmsthan Mandir?

(Upon this question, learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in other original suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that question cannot be asked about the opinion of others.)

Answer: Some people might be going there for darshan. But I have no knowledge about their opinion.

I went into this Janmsthan Mandir for darshan and Puja in 1946-47, for the first time. At that time too, it was called Janmsthan Mandir. I have not seen the Grabh Grih. In Janmsthan Mandir, I took the darshan of idols of Ramas and his brothers. These idols are not kept in Grabh Grih. These are kept on a throne, like in other temples. No Grabh Grih is there in a common temple, but the idols are kept on an ordinary throne. The place where God is born is called Grabh Grih. There is no Grabh Grih in Kanak Bhawan and Hanumangarhi also. There is no Grabh Grih in other temples of Ayodhya except the Janmbhoomi Mandir. So far I know, only the temples situated in Ayodhya, Mathura and Kashi, have the Grabh Grih. Grabh Grih are in the Narsingh temple situated in Madhya Pradesh, Bodhgaya, Baraha Bhagwan Mandir in Sukarchetra. These are the 6 temples throughout India, where I have seen Grabh Grih. Besides I have not seen the Grabh Grih in any temple. The temple I referred above, is according to my faith is a birth place of Ramchanderji. The Grabh Grih in the temple of Kashi, which I referred, is a birth place of Bhagwan Shankar. Shankar Bhagwan was born in Varanasi. Incarnation and birth is one and the same. In Kashi, idol of Shankar Bhagwan was revealed.

The idol later formed the shape of human. On the basis of revelation of an idol, this place is called the birth place of Shankarji. I believe that Bhagwan Budh was born at Bodhgaya in a family of a King. in Bodhgaya an idol of Bhagwan Budh is worshipped in the Grabh Grih. Idolatry in Budh's is different from Ramanand Sect. Grabh Grih in Bodhgaya differs from the size of Grabh Grih in the temple in Mathura and Kashi. Grabh Grih of Bodhgaya is big in size. In Bodhgaya, people are not allowed to go inside, people take darshan from outside. Only priest can go there to perform Puja. In Mathura and Kashi puja is performed in the Grabh Grih. I cannot say about the size of Grabh Grih in Kashi. Upon the suggestion given by the Learned Advocate, witness said its length and width could have been 30-40 feet respectively. There are wall all around the Grabh Grih and four doors, each in a wall to four directions. Devotee enter for taking darshan from northern door and comes out from southern door. In the Grabh Grih of Kashi, there is not an idol of Shankarji but a Shivling. I have stated in my statement above that an idol of Shankar was revealed there, which I means Shivling revealed there. I cannot say when Bhagwan Shankar in the form of shivling was revealed. It may be thousand, two thousand, or lakhs of years ago or hundred or two hundred years before. Because it is related to my faith.

Question: Is it not possible to tell the time period of the subject related to your faith.

Answer: It is possible, but it is not possible in the case if time period is lengthy. I have not read about this in any book. Hence counting of time is not possible.

I have read a number of books about the temple in Kashi but none book refer the time of birth of Bhagwan Shankar.

The Grabh Grih in Narshing Mandir of Madhya Pradesh I referred above, it is said that Narsingh Bhagwan was revealed there.

Question: Is the phisque of Narsingh of Nar and Singh (Man and lion).

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri Ved Prakash on behalf of plaintiff in other original suit No. 5/89, raised an objection that idol puja is opposed in Islam (Muslim religion) and it is not allowed in Islam. Narsingh Bhagwan is a subject matter of faith. There is no point in the suit, about which the question can be regarded as a relevant. Hence such question should not be allowed.)

(Cross-examiner advocate, on the above objection said that raising the objection about the principle of Islam is not relevant. So far the question being asked is concerned, it is fully relevant to assess the correctness of the statement and in connection to the analysis of religious faith about the so called Janmsthan. This objection is baseless.)

Answer: Narsingh means Nar and Singh. Half of the body of Narsingh Bhagwan was of Nar (man) and half of Singh (Lion).

(Revelation or birth is one and same. Narsingh Bhagwan was the incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. I cannot say whether he was born before or after the birth of Rama. I studied the Narsingh Puran. A number of places were

referred about his birth place but there was no mention about the timing of his birth. He himself stated that he might have taken birth in the palace of Hiranyakashyap.

Question: Whether it was clearly specified or not in Narsingh Puran that Narsingh was born at the place referred by you as Grabh Grih in Narsingh Mandir in Madhya Pradesh?

Answer: There is no reference in Narsingh Puran about taking the birth by Narsingh Bhagwan at the said place.

I have referred the Shukar area in the statement given by me. This Shukar area is in the Distt. Gaunda. It is a temple of Baraha Bhagwan and there is his Grabh Grih in it. Baraha Bhagwan was also the incarnation of Vishnu. There is an idol of Baraha Bhagwan in the temple. I have not seen the temple of Baraha Bhagwan at other places except in Sukar area. Baraha Bhagwan was born before the birth of Ramchanderji. He has taken birth for the welfare of universe. I have not read any book in regard to his incarnation and birth place. Witness than said, he has read the book Baraha Puran. But there is no reference in the book about the time and birth place of Baraha Bhagwan. The priest of Shukar area, says that Baraha Bhagwan was born there and on the basis of his statement I said it. The Grabh Grih of Baraha Bhagwan Temple in Shukar area, is 30 feet in length and 30 feet in width. There are walls all around the Gragh Grih. People take darshan by standing in Jagmohan. Jagmohan is about 40-50 feet in length and 25-30 feet in width. The face of an idol is towards the east. The Grabh Grih of Narsingh temple situated in Madhya Pradesh, is 50 feet in length and 30 feet in width. It is surrounded by wall and there is

one door. People take darshan by standing at Jagmohan, at the outer place.

Any Bhawan is called a temple only if it has a pitcher, Pran Prathistha, Prathistha of Kalash, Pratistha of Parsnad. It is not necessary to have Grabh Grih in a temple. The place where Murthi is installed is called Grabh Grih. In every temple, the place where idol is installed is called Grabh Grih. The statement given by me that "there is no Grabh Grih in every common temple, there is a throne. Grabh Grih is the place where Bhagwan is born" is correct. The statement given by me to-day that the place where idol is installed is called Grabh Grih. The place where ordinary idol is installed is called Antargrih. In Kanak Mahal, Hanumangarhi, Janmsthan and other temple of Ayodhya, excluding the disputed Bhawan wherever an idols are installed, is called Antargrih. I have read in "Bhavisya Puran" about the features and size of temples. Bhavisya Puran was written before the birth of Rama. I cannot say whether Ramanand is referred in Bhavisya Puran or not.

Document No. 107 C-1/122 at page No. 149, in Other Original Suit No. 5/89, was shown to witness.

Question: Whether the facts written in second para at page No. 149, is correct?

Answer: It was written in Bhavisya Puran that disciple of Ramananda came to Ayodhya. They were holding Tulsimala and Kanthi. It is also written therein that disciple of Ramananda have converted many Muslims in to Vaishnav. It is a fact.

Document No. 107 C-1/127 of the above suit was shown to witness. Wherein it was written that twelve Kaushoti pillars are inside and two Kaushoti pillars are at the Phatak of Masjid? Whether the said thing was written about Babri Masjid. Witness said that Masjid referred in the sentence is in fact a temple and not a Babri Masjid.

Question: If it is not a Babri Masjid than which Masjid is referred therein?

Answer: I cannot say.

Question: Whether the fact written in document No. 107 C 1/27 at the above page that "there are two writings in the inside and at the Phatak of Masjid. It appears that these things relates to Masjid" not to Babri Masjid. If not, which Masjid about?

Answer: I do not know about which Masjid these writings relates. 'Ram Panchayat' was written there.

At the western wall of the disputed Bhawan, there was a black stone, wherein "Ram Panchayat" was written in Hindi. This stones in the western wall was visible, while one performed parikarma.

Question: In accordance with your statement there is wall on the western side. Which part of disputed Bhawan or premises, fall on the other three sides?

Answer: Parikarma begins from western side. Then headed to wards north to east and comes to an end at Ramchabutra, where idols of Shri Sitaram, Laxman, Bharat, Satrugan are kept.

Upon seeing the photo document No. 154/7 in suit, Gopal Singh Visarad versus Jàhoor Ahmad witness said that western wall of the disputed Bhawan is not clearly visible. This is a picture of Janambhoomi Mandir. Northern part of the disputed Bhawan appears there. It is correct that this is the photo of western wall, taken from outer side in the west. What I have stated that this is photo of northern part of disputed Bhawan, is not correct. It was a mistake.

Question: Whether the place, from where the parikarma starts, on the western side, is appearing in the photo.

Answer: The place, from where the parikarma starts, in the west side, is not appearing in this picture.

Witness on seeing the photo document No. 154/10 of the suit, said the place, from where parikarma starts is not clear in the picture. This is a photo of Janm Bhoomi Mandir. The rare portion of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in the photo. Upon seeing the photo document No. 154/5, witness said that it is not clear that which part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in the photo. This is not picture of northern gate at outer portion, because there were pictures of Lions. The place from where the parikarma starts is not appearing in the photo.

Upon seeing the picture No. 6 document No. 201 c-I, witness said three pitchers are appearing in this picture. Ramlala was sitting below the middle pitchers. It is not clear, which part is appearing in this picture. The place from where the parikarma starts is not appearing in the picture. In the photo No. 4 of the album two pitchers are visible and rest are not visible. The place in western side is not visible in the photo, from where I had mentioned

that the parikarma, starts. In the photo No. 5 of the album there appear to be three pitchers. The place in the western side, from where parikarma starts is not appearing in the photo. There appears a tree of Neem in photo No. 8 of the album and rest is not clear. It is not clear from the picture, whether it is a wall or curtain. Photo No. 9 of the album is not clear and nothing is visible in it. Similarly the photo No. 10 is also not clear. It is not clear that whose picture is this. I cannot say how many times I have performed the parikarma. For once, twice, five-ten times or twenty or fifty times. I used to go for darshan in 1945-46 and to perform parikarma. In the photo No. 13 of the album, there appears to be pitchers. It is not clear which part of the disputed Bhawan is there in the photo. A Phatak is appearing in the photo No. 23 of the album but which side's Phatak is this, I cannot say. Photo No. 28 of the album is not clear. Which part is there in photo No. 28 is not clear. Writing appearing on the stones in photo No. 27 of the album, was at the Ramchabutra. In photo No. 11 and 12 of the album, there appears a part of disputed premises, where tins are on the store room and the place where sadhus of Nirmohi Akhara used to sit. The pitcher in the mid of disputed Bhawan is appearing in the photo No. 15 of this album and some trees are also appearing in.

Upon seeing the photo No. 106 of document No. 200 C/1 of colour album, witness said there appeared two pitchers and some trees. Which part of the disputed Bhawan is therein, it is not clear. There are two pitchers covered by trees in photo No. 7 and 8 of this album. Western part from where parikarma starts, of the disputed Bhawan is not appearing in these pictures. Trees of Pipal and Molshri are appearing in the photo No. 11 and 12 of the album and rest are invisible. A close wall is appearing

in these pictures. Close wall I mean a wall, where there is no door. The wall appearing in these pictures might be the wall in the west, aside the "Shankar Panchayat". In these picture, no place, from where the parikarma starts, is being seen. A pitcher is appearing in photo No.10 of this album and rest is not visible. I cannot say whether there is a part of disputed Bhawan in the photo. Photo No. 13 is not clear. There appears a thing, like the ear of horse, in this picture. There appear to be benches meant for selling the things in picture No. 17 and 18. There were some shops in. the east of main gate of the disputed Bhawan. Two pitchers and small tree are appearing in the picture No. 24 of the album. It is not clear from the picture, which part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in the picture. In all the pictures shown to me, there appears the pictures of outer wall and a stone on which "Ram Panchayan" is written. The place appearing in the picture was not meant for outer parikarma but for inner parikarma. There are picture of domes, on the disputed Bhawan in picture No. 130, 131 and 132. No wall appearing in these pictures. It is not understood which part was shown in the picture No. 128 and 129. A faded wall below the part of dome, is being seen in the picture. There was no "Ram Panchayat Stone" at this wall. Nothing is visible from the picture No. 148, 149 and 150. There appears to be a picture of wall below the dome. A Phatak in the eastern side of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in picture No. 169, 171, 172 and 173. Witness upon seeing the picture document No.154/12, 154/14 and 154/15 in the suit, Shri Gopal Singh Visharad versus Jahoor Ahmad and others, said that nothing is visible in these pictures. I cannot say whether these pictures are of the walls below the part of dome or not. In picture No.154/12, there appears a picture of western wall of the disputed Bhawan or not. I cannot say whether Allaha is written on this or not. Picture No. 154/14

is not a picture of wall below the dome. Raghupatti Raghav Raja Ram is written in this picture and Ram-Ram at the door. I cannot say whether Allaha is written in the painting there is or not. I cannot say whether It is a picture of wall below the dome in document No. 154/15 or not. But Sitaram-Sitaram is written there.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

2.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 3.8.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

2.8.2004

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

Dated 3.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to 2.8.2004, Cross-examination by Shri
Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant No. 9,
Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.R continues.)

Upon seeing the photo document No. 154/13, in the
suit, Shri Gopal Singh versus Jahoor Ahmad and others,
witness said Ramlalla is appearing in it. Ramlalla is in a
temple in disputed Bhawan below the middle dome.
Besides, other idols are there but these are not clear. This
idol is kept in a throne and the throne is kept on the
staircase made of stones. There are three staircases
made of stones. I have seen the similar staircases on
which idols of Ramlalla was there, in 1946-47. For the last
time I have seen these idols, kept there, 20-25 years ago,
in 1986, when disputed Bhawan was opened for the public.
There was huge crowd, after it was opened to public. I
went there. After that I did not go there. The idols were
kept there at the same place, as shown in the picture. I
have seen the idols from a distance of 15 feet. I cannot
say whether the size of Bhawan, in which idols were there,
is 20-25 in width, or not. I cannot say whether the width is
5-10, 20-25 or 50-69 feet. I took darshan from at a
distance of 15 feet, by standing in courtyard. I went for

darshan for 4-6 times, after it was attached. I have seen there the throne, which is appearing in photo No. 152, 153, 154 and 155 document No. 200 C-1 of the colour album. The throne was under the middle dome and idol was on the throne. I used to go for darshan in the evening and come back from there at about 7.00 P.M. In winter, sun sets early, during this period Lalten or Lamp was kept there in the disputed Bhawan. At that time 'electricity connection was not there. I used to go for darshan through iron-grilled wall. There was a main Phatak in the wall and also a small gate. Sometimes I used to go by small gate when main Phatak remain closed. Both the Phataks are in the iron grill wall on the eastern side. The Phatak of the iron grill wall is appearing in the picture No. 65. This also can be called window. These phataks remains closed.

Question: There is no Phatak in the picture. Only windows - and iron bars are therein. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: These appearing like a Phatak. These may be the windows.

The wall appearing in picture No. 65 differs from the wall appearing in picture No. 64. There was only one iron grilled long wall in the disputed Bhawan. I cannot say whether the wall appearing in photo No. 64 and 65 belongs to the disputed Bhawan or not. A wall with grill is appearing in picture No. 63. I cannot say whether this wall is of the disputed Bhawan or not. Huts are appearing in picture No. 66. I have not seen these huts in the disputed Bhawan, as are appearing in picture No. 66. This may be the picture of other parts. Shankar Panchayat on a Chabutra, under a Pipal tree, in a compartment, is appearing in Picture No. 61. I cannot say whether I have seen the Shankar Panchayat before or after, it was

attached. I also do not remember when I saw it for the first time. Outer part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in picture No. 68. But I cannot say whether it is covered by tin or grass. A tree and a chajan is appearing in this picture. This might be the iron wall of the disputed Bhawan. I have seen it covered by tin, when I visited there. The western wall was covered by tins. I, by mistake said it to be western wall. In fact it is in east side. This tin was 15 feet in length and 7-8 feet in width. Chajan of tins was in the southern side of the tree appearing in picture No. 68. An another wall is appearing in picture No. 75. About wall appearing in picture No. 75, I got confused about its side. A Neem tree is appearing in picture No. 75. There was a iron phatak in the west of Kathare Wali wall. I might have entered from the gate, which is near to the tree. But I am not sure. This phatak remains closed. The phatak appearing in picture No. 75, differs from the phatak appearing in picture No. 77. It might be possible that phatak must have been open at the time when photo was taken. The phatak from where I used to enter, is not appearing in picture No. 77. There was no phatak in the disputed Bhawan like the phatak appearing in the picture No. 77. One and same tree is appearing in picture No. 76 and 75. A window is appearing in picture No. 76 and also in picture No. 77. The window appearing in picture No. 75 is towards east and window in picture No. 76 is towards north. The window appearing in picture No. 75 differs from the window appearing in picture No. 76.

A phatak and an almirah are appearing in picture No. 73. I cannot say that this phatak, belongs to disputed Bhawan or to some other place. A tin shade, which was on the storeroom of the disputed Bhawan, is appearing in this picture. A door in the north of another wall and a cell is appearing in picture No. 74. A door fixed in the north side

of the disputed Bhawan and its nearby part is appearing in picture No. 70. There is some tin shade. This tin should be the tin shade of storeroom. Picture No. 67 is not clear. A tin shade alongwith a few trees are appearing in picture No. 69. Where so many Mahatamas were standing. This tin shade is too small, so it cannot be a part of store-room. It is not clear whether this tin shade was a part of disputed Bhawan or not. I cannot say, how many times I visited the disputed Bhawan since I began to go there and upto its demolition on 6th December, 1992. May be 40-50 times. I went there for once or twice, at 12.00 noon, at Chaitra Ramnavami. Otherwise I used to visit in the morning and evening only. A part of Ramchabutra is appearing picture No. 59 and 60 of the colour album. I have seen the writings on white stones, in black ink, perhaps after the attachment of disputed Bhawan.

I have seen an idol of Ramlalla on Ram Chabutra. Besides, an idols of Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughan and Shaligram were there. All idols were in a row. Ramchabutra was 40 feet in length and 20 feet in width. Its length was in east-west side and width is in north-south side. An idol, of Rama was in the middle. There was another an idol of RamLalla on the east side. There were two idols of Rama. There are some other idols in the east of idol of Rama. But I am not able to remember whose idols were these.

Question: According to your statement in addition to an idols of Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughan, an idol of Rama was there on the Ram Chabutra. What do you mean by the idols of others. Whose idols these were?

Answer: Some other idols, I mean, an idol of Shaligram.

It is not remembered to me, on which side an idols of Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughan were, from an idol of Rama. Thrones have so many doors. An idol of Saligram was in the bottom door. The throne was made of wood and silver plated. It was two to two and half feet in length and one and half to two feet in width. I cannot say whether the throne was kept in north corner, or south, east corner. I go there for darshan only.

Question: You have, in your statement, stated that you have visited the disputed Bhawan for darshan for 40-50 times since 1946 to 1992. Even than you do not remember from which side you have taken the darshan?

Answer: I used to take darshan from southern side.

The above idols were in the southern corner. There was a cave in the southern side of Ram Chabutra. These caves were on the northern and southern side of Ram Chabutra. It is not correct to say that there was no cave in the southern side of Ram Chabutra. There was an idol of Bharatji in one cave and an idol of Kaushaliya with Rama in her lap and idol of Kag-Busundi was in the form of a crow.

Upon seeing the photo No. 66, of the document No. 200 C-1 of the colour album, witness said this is a picture of southern part of Ram Chabutra.

Question: Idols were on the north corner and not in the southern corner?

Answer: If you see the idols from south side, it will be seen in the north side and vice-versa.

Idol of Ramchanderji, with an idols of Laxman, Bharat and Shtrughan was in the standing position and on Ram Chabutra and second one was in the form of a child, moving on all four. An idol, which was in standing position, is about six inch in height and an idols of Laxman. Bharat and Shatrughan are less in height by one inch each. Idols were perhaps made of brass. Idols are covered by a cloth so nothing definite can be said. The face of Ramchanderji is made of, perhaps, eight metals. A tin shade and a hut are appearing in photo No. 56 of the colour album. I have seen the hut on Ram Chabutra. I have not seen the tin shade, white in colour.

I do not know when Ram Chabutra was constructed. Picture No. 58 of coloured album is partially visible. It is not clear, whose idol these are.

Two idols of Hanumanji are appearing in picture No. 31, document No. 201 C-1 of black and white album but third idol is not clear. I have not seen the idols appearing in picture No. 31, in the disputed Bhawan. In picture No. 37 of the album, writing on white stone in black ink, is appearing. These stones are fixed in the iron-grilled wall. I cannot say whether these stones were fixed before or after attachment. I have referred in para 45 of the affidavit, about the Chabutra, which is 3 feet in height, 20 feet in length and 17 feet in width. To I referred its length and width as 40 feet and 20 feet. The length referred at para 45 of my main examinee affidavit is not correct. The Chhatti Pujan Sthal referred in para 46 of my main examinee affidavit, is described in Valmiki Ramayana. There is no reference of Chhatti Pujan Sthal. Reference of Chhatti Mahatosav figure in Ramcharitmanas but no reference of Chhattee Pujan Sthal is there in Manas. I will tell, tomorrow if there is any reference about Chhatti. Foot

print, Belan, Chakia and Chulaha are neither referred in Valmiki Ramayana nor in Ramcharitmanas. The foot prints referred at para 46, of my affidavit, are made of stones. These are 4 in number. Chakla and Belan are made of stones, Chulaha might be of earth, because I have seen it from a distance. All these things were in a platform, measuring 8x10 feet in size and slightly at a height from ground level. It is also called Kaushaliya Pak and Sita Kitchen. Sita Kitchen means the kitchen used by Sita and Kaushaliya kitchen mean the kitchen used by Kaushaliya. It is possible that Sita also used Kaushaliya kitchen. I have stated the statement given by me that Ramji, Sitaji and Kaushaliya were residing in their respective palaces. I cannot say, being residing in their own palaces, they have separate kitchens or not. There is no reference about Sita kitchen and Kaushaliya kitchen in Ramcharitmanas. But it was written in Ramcharitmanas that "Nij Kar Grih parijarja karel, patti roop lakhi Aas Anusarai." According to this couplet, kitchen is included in their palaces. At what place the above couplet is figuring in Ramcharitmanas, I can say only after seeing the Ramcharitmanas. Chhatti Pujan is not a part of kitchen. Chhatti Pujan means the celebration held on 6th day from the date of birth. The Chhatti Pujan, referred at para 46 of my main examinee affidavit means the celebration held on 6th day from the date of birth of Rama. Chhatti Pujan is not a tonsure ceremony. Blessings are sought from Chhattee Devi. Chhatti Devi is called Vishnupriya. Chhatti Pujan Sthal perhaps is referred in Geetawali written by Tulsi Dass. But I do treat it as authentic. After reading poem No: 5 and 3 at page No. 28 and 29, of document No. 46 C-1/1 of Geetawali written by Goswamy Tulsi Dass, witness said that the translation given at page 30, from line 11 to line 21, is correct. In the above poem, No. 3, "Today is the chhat of Maharaja in his Manjul Bhawan." Manjul Bhawan means the sweet palace

of King Dasratha. The Chhatti Pujan Sthal referred at para 46 of my main examinee affidavit, is not, according to my belief, a Manjul Bhawan of Dasratha. The celebration referred by me at para 46 in my affidavit is the celebration referred in poem No. 3 and No. 5 in above book Geetawali.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

3.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in, the open court. Suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 4.8.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

3.8.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty,
High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 4.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to 3.8.2004, Cross-examination by Shri
Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant No. 9,
Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

According to my faith and belief Chhatte Pujan Sthal
was a part of palace of King Dasrath or a part of any other
palace and was described in detail in Ramcharitmanas
document No. 258 C-1/2 at page No. 142 in Balkand, at
couplet No. 193, that:

**“Nandimukh Sradh Kari Jatkaram Sab Kinhee, Halak Dhenu,
Baran Mani Nrip Biprahan Karih Dinihee”**

Question: It is not correct that Chhatti Pujan Sthal is
described in detail in above couplet No. 193.
The word “Chhatti” was not at all used in the
above couplet. What you have to say in this
regard?

Answer: “Nandimukh Saradh’ is an adjective of the born
child, which qualify the Chhatti in full.

Question: The meaning of the first line of the above
couplet is that King has performed the ritual of

the new born baby after performing Nandimukh Shradh. It cannot be said that it qualify for the "Chhatti Sanskar." What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: The line above that line "Anupam Balak Dekheni Jai, Roop Rasi Gun Kahi Na Sirai" qualify that Chhatti was performed alongwith Nandi Shradh Sanskar. It is based on the couplet starting from "AnupamBalak."

Question: The meaning of the couplet No. 193, referred by you is that Guru Vashista was called upon. Who alongwith the Brahamans came to Rajdwar. He saw the boy who was unique and having all the qualities. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: The baby is kept on the food prepared at the Chhatti Puja occasion and that food is distributed as a prasada. This is called Chhatti Puja. In local language it is called "Balak Chhatiyana." All these ritual were performed under the headship of Guru Vasistha. King distributed cows, clothes and money at this occasion.

Question: The question which I asked you, there is no reference in the couplet about pakwan (food) or prasada. Similarly you are not giving correct answer of the couplet No. 193. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: The details about Chhatti in the form of Jat-Karm (ritual of baby) was included in the couplet No. 193, after Guru Vasistha blessed the boy.

I do not remember whether any reference about "Chhatti" was given in Ramcharitmanas, except the above

couplet. Chhatti Pujan was described in Valmiki Ramayana as "Sasti Pujan Sanpadyate." This is in the Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana. It is not correct to say that there is no description of Chhatti Pujan in Valmiki Ramayana.

Sita kitchen and Kaushaliya kitchen are referred in Ramcharitmanas. At present it is not remembered to me that at what place this description is figuring.

There is a Naming ceremony. It figures at page No. 31, 32 and 33 of document No. 46 C-1/1 of Geetawali. There is a reference that naming ceremony of all the three brothers was held. There was a reference in couplet No. 17 at page No. 45 of Geetawali that Kaushaliya invited Shankarji to her palace in the guise of Brahman. The Bhupati Bhawan referred in second couplet of couplet No. 29 at page No. 49 of the above book, is a palace of Dasrathji. The Nrip Bhawan Dwar referred in couplet No. 39 at page No. 72 of the book, is a palace of King Dasrath. Nrip Bhawan was also called Rajbhawan. Parsuram mentioned in second couplet of the couplet No. 38 at page No. 378 of the book, is an incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. Geetawali written by Tulsi Dass is second to Ramcharitmanas. Some people say that it was written prior to Ramcharitmanas. There is a reference of Bhagwan Rama in Vinay Patrika book written by Tulsi Dass. The aim of Vinay Patrika is to address Bhagwan Rama through letters. Vinay Patrika is in the form of letters. The life and character of Bhagwan Rama was described in this book. The book, Dohawali, written by Goswami Tulsi Dass is about Rama. The greatness of Rama and specialties of Ayodhya were described in this book. Parvati Mangal is also written by Tulsi Dass. This book also contains the reference of Rama and Mangal Geet about the marriage of Shankar Parvati. Tulsi Dass has written another book

"Ramlalla Nahwahhu." It also contains the description of child Rama and various aspect of his life. In Krishna Geetawali written by Goswami Tulsi Dass, life of Shrikrishna was described. There is one more book "Varayagya Sandeepani" written by Tulsi Dass. This book, in seven volumes, also contains in brief the life of Rama. In the book "Janaki Mangal" written by Tulsi Dass. Sitaji and Ramji and the song chanted at the time of their marriage were referred in it. Kavitawali also contains the reference about Ramchanderji. "Barwe Ramayana" also contains the details in brief of Ramcharitmanas in seven volumes. An another book "Ramagyan Parsan" is written by Tulsi Dass. Hanumanchalisa is also said to be written by Tulsi Dass. Besides, Hanumanbahuk is also written by Tulsi Dass. There may be other books written by Tulsi Dass, in addition to Hanumanchalisa, Hanumanbahuk and above mentioned 12 books. But I have no knowledge. I do not know the books written by Dr. Mata Prasad and Ramji Tiwari on Tulsi Dass. I know about the book written by Shri Vishnukant Shastri on Tulsi Dass. Shri Vishnukant Shastri has gifted this book to me. Shri Vishnukant Shastri has been a Governor of U.P. The book "Hindu Sahitya Ka Itihas" written by Ramchander Shukia on Tulsi Dass, is an authentic book.

I referred at para 12 of the affidavit that I have read a few books written by Tulsi Dass is correct. Some people say that Hanumanchalisa and Hanumañbahuk were written by Tulsi Dass and some do not. I have read the books written by Tulsi Dass, published by Nagari Pracharani Sabha. Nagari Pracharni Sabha has published 11 books written by Tulsi Dass, in addition to Ramcharitmanas. Ramcharitmanas was not published by this Sabha.

I have referred history in para 4, ancient history in para 13 and Indian ancient history in para 16 of my main examinee affidavit.

Itihas, Prachin Itihas and Prachin Bhartiya Itihas referred by me at para 4, 13 and 16 in the affidavit means Valmiki Ramayana, Mahabharat and Purans. Besides, I have also read other books. Such as Prachin itihās written by Ramchander Shukia, Hindi itihās written by Ram Bahori Shukia. I have not read the book "Uttar Pradesh Ka Rajnaitik Itihas" published by Uttar Pradesh Hindi Sansthan. "Ayodhya Ka Itihas written by Lala Sitaram, is not a historical book. I have read this book but there are some addition and alteration. I have read the books written on the subject The Kings of Ayodhya. First para at page No. 39, document No. 107 C- 1/122, filed in other original suit No. 5/89, "**Ayodhya Ka Itihas**" was shown to witness. Witness said the writings in this para that "**Mahabharat Ka Mahasmarthak..... Brichal mara Gaya**" is correct. Writing in the later part of the sentence that "Ayodhya was destroyed in fullonly remains were there" is not correct. The writing in the second line at this page "description of Purans is available in Mahabharat" is correct but the writings in later part "Earlier history is not know. What happened in Ayodhya and who caused it" is not correct. The writings in second para of this page No. 48, "Although Ayodhya during the time of Budhs..... historical facts are found" is correct. It is not correct to say that Babar has not destroyed any temple. It is also not correct to say that there was no temple at the site, when Babri Masjid was constructed in 1528. He said that King Vikramaditya constructed the Ram temple in Samvat 1, which became famous as Janmbhoomi Temple. Babar had demolished this temple. There was no description about

the area of temple, no classical proof. I believe that there were only 14 pillars in the temple. It was written in the above para that King Vikramaditya renovated Ayodhya, which means, that at that time only remains were there but Janm Bhoomi exists there and Vikramaditya reconstructed it. He said it was called Janmbhoomi Mandir. Vikramaditya has renovated the temple and not reconstructed the temple. Before Vikramaditya, Manvendra Manu constructed the temple. This Manu was not the seventh Manu but was a son of Brahma. I have no knowledge about how many lakhs years before Manvendra Manu constructed the Mandir, might be lakhs of years before or thousands years before. During the time of Manu, buildings were constructed of stones and Surkhi Chuna. Manvendra Manu was before Mahabharata. The writings in the second para at page No. 41, that "In 1526, Babar..... nawabi was established" is doubtful. I cannot say whether Nageshwar Nath Mandir and Chanderhari Mandir were constructed during the period of Akbar or not. I also have no knowledge whether ruler of Delhi has gifted the Avadh province to Sadat Khan in the year 1721 as referred in the book. I also do not know that the fact mentioned at page No. 42, that the present temple of Nageshwar Nath Mahadev was constructed by Naval Rai Diwan of Nawab Safdarjung. I have heard about but I cannot say whether the fact mentioned at page No. 45 of this book "Nawab Asifuddolawas in the shape of Garghi" is correct or not. I also have no knowledge that during the period of Nawab Vajid Ali Shah, thirty temples were constructed in Ayodhya. The facts mentioned at page No. 45 of this book that "Now the historical facts of Ayodhya..... the following is written in the description of Ramkot" is doubtful and not based on historical facts. The Raj Prasad mentioned in this para means palace of King. The fact mentioned in this para that

there were eight palaces in this fort, where King Dasrath, his Queens and sons resides, is not based on facts. This was written in Ayodhya Mahatamya but it is not based on facts. The facts written at page No. 45 and 46 of the book Ayodhya Mahatamya that "the said rules of King's palace..... protect the palace from all side." This fact is correct only upto some extent. The fact mentioned in this that, Diwid, Mayand, Sugreev, Hanuman and Angad were living there, is correct. Vibhisan, Sursarma and other Vanar were not in Ayodhya, is not correct. The mention at page No. 62 of the book that "Ayodhya Suryavanshi..... ruled" is correct. The genealogical tree of 93 rulers before Mahabharat and 30 rulers later to Mahabharat, mentioned at page No. 62 of the book, cannot be treated as an authentic genealogy of Suryavanshies. Because the genealogy given in Vishnu Puran, Raghuvansh written by Kalidas, Valmiki Ramayana and Srimad Bhagwat differs. Name of Shri Ramchander referred at Sr. No. 64 of the genealogy at page No. 64 of the book is correct. The name of Brichal is mentioned at Sl.No. 94. SL. No. is doubtful but the name of Brichal is correct. The names of rulers mentioned after Mahadharat at page No. 68 and 69 are correct but not in order. The name Shakya and Sidartha, mentioned at Sl.No. 23 and 25 respectively at page No. 69 is correct. But the fact that they were the King of Ayodhya is doubtful. I am acquainted with the history of Ayodhya who was the King at a particular time but I cannot say who was the King during that time. But I know the name of Kings. I have no knowledge how long the Kings of Gahdwal Dynasty ruled over Ayodhya. I have no knowledge about the rule of Gahdwal dynasty over Ayodhya. I have no knowledge, whether King Chander Dev, King Madan Pal, Govind Chander, King Nayu Chander, Vijay Chander and Jai Chander have ever ruled in Ayoc or not. I have read the

fact mentioned at page 147 of this book that Sahabuddin has attached Ayodhya in 1194 and Makhdam Shah Juran Gouri was killed in Ayodhya and his tomb was constructed in Ayodhya but I cannot prove it. I have also read that Bakhtiyar ruled in Avadh and established it as a military centre. I have also read that Kamarudd'in Gayaran became the Hakim (Ruler.) in the year 1236 and 1242 but I cannot authenticate this fact. The writings in the second para at page No. 149 of the book that "Tuglaks have given favourable look towards Ayodhya" is correct. I have read the writing at page No. 149 and 150 of this book that "Firoz Tuglak came to Ayodhya in the year 1324 for the first time and in the year 1348 for the second time..... charitable Jagirein where used to held" but I cannot authenticate the facts written therein. I have read the writings at page No. 155 of this book that "In the year 1731 (Vikrama Samvat 1788)..... was made Subedar" but I cannot authenticate it. The writing at page No. 156 of this book that "Jalashankar was the Dewan of Prime Minister of Sahadat Khan" is correct. The writing at page No. 157 of this book that "At this time Nawab Safdarjungfilling the dirty water" is correct.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

4.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, the suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 5.8.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

4.8.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey,
Additional Distt. Judge/Officer on Special
Duty, High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 5.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit
No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 4.8.2004 cross-examination by
Shri Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant No.
9, Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

11 books referred in para 9 of my main examinee
affidavit, were written by me. Books related to
Ramchanderji - Vedon Ka Avtar Rahasya, Shri
Ramsatwaraj, Shri Ramcharitmanas Ka Vedictwa, Geeta
Bhakti Darshan, Panchmukhmangal Hanuman, Shri
Sampradayacharya Darshan are among these books. Shri
Sampradacharya Darshan is the last book written by me.
This book was published 3 years before. There are approx.
one hundred and fifty pages in this book. All these books
were published by different publishers. Some of the books
are published by me. The manuscript of the book named
Shri Sampradayacharya is mine but it was published by a
Mahatma from Gujrat. The book which was published first
was Shri Sampradaya Manthan, in seven volumes. The
history, from the birth of Rama upto going to heavens, are
described in this book. I have consulted a number of
books, such as Ved, Puran, History, Vedant, Shri
Ramcharitmanas, to write these books. Among the history
books, I have studied Valmiki Ramayana and Mahabharata.

In addition to this I have studied Anandbhasya, written by Ramanandswami and other books the name are not known to me at present before writing these books. I have stated at para 10 of the main examinee affidavit that I am an editor and founder member of Avadh Sourabh monthly magazine. This magazine is being published for last four years. From Vedic literature I means Veds. I have mentioned five subjects at para 16 in my main examinee affidavit. These are sarg (canto) Pratisarg, Vansh, Manwantar and fifth genealogy. These are five characteristic of veds. I have stated at para 21 of my main examinee affidavit that Sanatan Hindu Samaj treat Manusmriti as an authentic one. Nothing against Manusmriti is recognised. I treat the things written in Manusmriti as authentic one, even today. I used the word "Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj" in this para. It covers Arya Samaj also. Followers of Arya Samaj also follows Manusmrities. An idol is worshiped in Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj while Arya Samaj do not worshiped idols. Even than they are the part of Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj. To be a member of Sanatan Hindu Samaj is one thing and to follow the principle of veds is another thing. They, according to their faith, do not follow idol worship but description of idols is there in veds. I have, at para 22 of my main examinee affidavit, mentioned a slok from Manusmriti, which means any King, having faith in religion, cannot treat the temple its own. I have stated at para 25 of my main examinee affidavit that geographical situation of Ayodhya, Saryu, route to forest and others temples are unchanged. Regarding Tamsa River I have stated in the statement given by me, that Tamsa River might have shifted its original route. The situation described in Valmiki Ramayana, has now been changed. Earlier it was at Ramghat but now shifted at a distance of 4 Km. from its original place. I have seen Bhardwaj Ashram, situated at

Prayag. I have not gone to Rameshwaram. At para 25 of my affidavit, I have written Lanka and Rameshwaram, separately. I have also described the three mantra of Atharved and its meanings at para 26 of my affidavit, which is correct. Only mantras were referred at para 26 of the affidavit. These are about Ayodhya from Atharved. I have at para 27 of my affidavit referred, the fifteenth and sixteenth slok from second chapter of Shiv Sanhita. The meaning of fifteenth and sixteenth sloks is: Ayodhya is the city of eight wheels, nine doors and wealth. Eight wheels means Sudarshan Chakra of Vishnu. I have found only this much description about Ayodhya in Shiv Sanhita. Shiv Sanhita was written by disciple of Ved Vyas and other disciple. This Ved Vyas is the same, who had written Ved and Purans.

At para 29 of the affidavit, I have stated that according to Valmiki Ramayana, Ayodhya was the birth place of Rama. Bhagwan Rama said, the entire Ayodhya is my birth place. No specific place was identified as a birth place. At para 30 of this affidavit, I cited a reference from Rudryamal's first part and its meaning was given next, which is correct. The things written at para 31 of the affidavit are correct.

Witness was shown document No. 289 C-1/202, exhibit 3.O.S. 5-3 of Other Original Suit No. 5/89, upon which witness said on the left side in the middle of the map, Ramjanmbhoomi is written and Lomas is written on the right side and below this Sumitra Bhawan is written. In my affidavit I have not written the position at para 31 of affidavit, which is written in the map. Witness again said the position of Ramjanmbhoomi, Lomas and Sumitra Bhawan shown in the map is correct. In the map, Babri Structure is written below the Ramjanmbhoomi and

Vasisht Kund just below it, is correct. On the right side of the Ramjanmbhoomi, Hanumangarhi is written and above it VighneSh is written. It is correct. Chakratirth is written below the Vasist Kund and Neel Tila is written in the right side and Sugreev Tila is written on the right side, is correct. Swargdwar and Chander Han is written on the north side in the map, is correct. Chander Han is a temple and Swargdwar is a name of entire place. That Mohalla is called Swargdwar. Swargdwar is also written on the southern side of Chanderhani Mandir. This place is at the bank of Saryu. This place, submerges in the flood. From this place, Bhagwan Shri Rama, went for Atmajyoti. Hence it is called Swargdwar. On the left of Adinath, Nageshwar Nath Mandir is written. Below the Nageshwar Nath Mandir, Mazar Juran Shah is written. Below this Begampura is written. The position of these places are shown correct. Vibhisan Kund is below the Begampura and Pindarak is below it. On the left side, Ramkot is written. These places are correctly shown. Kaikeyi Bhawan is written below the Ramkot and Ratnmandap is written just below it. Ratnmandap means Ratna throne Mandir. Ramkot Mohalla begins from the point, where Ramkot is written. On the left side of Ramjanmbhoomi, Kaushaliya Tirth, Sumitra Tirth, Brahm Kund and Prahalad Ghat is written. Its location is correct. Ghat, means, Saryu might had been flowing from this place. He said that this Ghat still exists and is at a little distance from Saryu. Dantdhawān is written on the right of Lomas and Sugreev Kund is written on its right. It is correct. At the bottom, in the right side Ranopali is written. It is correct. Ranopali is the last Mohalla of Faizabad.

Upon seeing the document No. 289 C-1/203 witness said in the middle of the map, Lomas Rishi Ashram is written. It is correct. Location of Sumitra Bhawan is also

seen at appropriate. Location of Kuber Tila, Laxman Tekri, Sita Koop and Sakshi GopalMandir are also correct.

Document No. 289 C-1/207 was shown to witness. Upon which witness said that the front portion of the disputed structure is appearing in the photo. I have seen the same position, at the side, in the year 1986.

The rare part of Title cover of the book, exhibit No. O.O.S. 5-3, was shown to witness. Upon seeing the picture, witness said that the photo appearing in the picture might be of Ayodhya Temple. But I could not understand, which temple is shown in this picture. Two type of pitchers, one high in length and other is in round shape are appearing in this picture. There is slight difference in between the pitchers of the other temples in Ayodhya and pitchers shown in the picture. Such pitchers might be on the other temples. But I don't remember to me. I have referred Ramgulella Mandir in my main examinee affidavit. This temple is shown in document No. 289 C-1/202, as a Lomas Temple. In its support, list-A is attached. List-A is attached in support of Vighneshwar Bhagwan shown at para No. 21 of the affidavit. It is cited from Skand Puran List-A has been enclosed only in support of Vighneshwar. Vighneshwar is at a distance e approx. 100 meter from the western wall of the disputed. Bhawan. I have no knowledge about who established the Vighneshwar. This place is from the time of Ramchanderji. During the time of Ramchanderji, it was worshiped as Vighneshwar Ganesh.

There is no difference in between the practice of Nirvani Akhara and Nirmohi Akhara. The practice of Nirvani Akhara and Nirmohi Akhara are similar. I went to disputed site fpr darshan for 40-50 times from the period 1946 to 1992. Witness was shown the para 19 of his main

examinee affidavit, wherein he had stated that he used to go for darshan of Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir daily. Upon seeing it, witness said that he did not used to go daily. After attachment, I use to take darshan from the main gate fixed on the iron wall where there were two phataks.

The Phatak, from where I used to take darshan, has been shown in picture No. 37 of the black and white Album, in document No. 201 C-1. This Phatak is appearing in the picture by a side of a tree. Upon seeing the photo No. 107 of this Album, witness said I did not take the darshan from the gate appearing in this picture. The Phatak appearing in picture No. 37, is different from the Phatak appearing in picture No.107. The Phatak in the outer wall is appearing in photo No. 42 of this album, it is also called Hanumanthdwar, by some people including me. There were two Kaushoti pillars in it. One of the pillar is not appearing in the picture No. 27. This pillar is different from the pillar fixed at Hanumanthdwar. Whenever I go there for darshan, I used to give prasad to the priest, inside the iron grill wall, appointed by the receiver. His name was Baldev Dass. I cannot say whether Baldev Dass, was from. Nirmohi Akhara, and appointed by the receiver as a priest or no

I have stated in the statement given by me, that Baldev Dass was appointed by the receiver, is not correct. I have said that Baldev Dass was the priest at that time. I have not said, that he was appointed by the receiver. I have no knowledge whether Bhaskar Dassji was appointed as priest by the receiver or not. After attachment I saw Bhaskar Dass, inside of the iron grill wall. He said that priest keeps changing. After attachment, priest stay inside of the iron grill wall. But I have no knowledge whether they were the priest of Nirmohi Akhara or appointed by the

receiver or not. I, at para 42 of my main examinee affidavit stated that receiver was appointed for looking after the temple in the last of December, 1949. It is based on hearsay. I have no personal knowledge about this. I myself had written the above thing and not by my Lawyer. I have myself written the point, which I have mentioned at para 34 to 52 at page No. 13 of my affidavit. Its confirmation was based on hearsay. In my affidavit, at page 44, I have referred storeroom and Sant Niwas, covered by tins. Its wall was of the wood. Witness said that the wall was made of bricks and Chhajan was made of wood. This wall was in the southern side. On the eastern side of Sant Niwas and storeroom, there was a Chhatti Pujan Sthal and an old building of Ramjanmbhoomi. On the north side of Chhatti Pujan Sthal there was a wall of building with dome. Shankar Panchayatan was on the southern side covered by tins. Storeroom and Sant Niwas was about 15-16 feet in length and 7-8 feet in width. There was a small door in the north of Sant Niwas. No other door was there. The northern and southern wall of storeroom and Sant Niwas was made of concrete. Sant Niwas and storeroom was there before and after the attachment. There were small idols below the part of disputed Bhawan, where dome was fixed. These idols were covered by clothes. These idols were made of either from brass or eight metals. Idol of RamLalla was approx. 6 inches in height. I have mentioned at para 49 of my main examinee affidavit that structure (inner or outer part) was demolished by the crowd on 6th December, 1992. I was not present there, at that time I came to know about this from the people living in Ashram that structure was demolished at about 12 noon to 1.00 PM. I did not go there at the site since morning to evening. I stayed at my Ashram throughout the day on 6th December, 1992. The idols there remained intact because, these were covered

by solid articles from above. An idols, which were there till the morning of 6th December, 1992, remained intact. These were in the disputed Bhawan too during the time when structure was demolished. Till to-day these are there. The throne, Jhula, on which idols were kept, are still there. I have heard about it, as I have not went there for darshan after 6th December, 1992. I have heard it from the students and Sadhus of Ashram. I have heard about this from Ramdev Shastri Shashikant, Ram Dass, Ambreesh Mishra and Kamal Dass, all were the student and Sadhus. These people are still alive and residing in my Ashram.

Upon seeing the picture document No. 154/13 filed in the suit, Shri Gopal Singh Visarad versus Jahoor Ahmad and others, witness said when I visited to the disputed Bhawan for darshan, two-three years ago, for the last time, I saw the idol of RamLalla there in the same position at it is shown in the picture. And Jhula was in the same position as shown in picture No. 81 and 82 of the album, document No. 200 C-1. Similarly idol of Ramlalla was there upto 6th December, 1992 and I have heard that idol of Rama is in the same shape, even to-day. I did not visit the disputed site after demolition of structure because I am not keeping well and there are possibilities, of felling down. I have stated in para 52 of the affidavit that I have been taking darshan regularly from the date I came to Ayodhya. I had never seen any Muslim reading Namaj in the disputed Bhawan I am not aware if Namaj was being read before the time I came to Ayodhya. The richa of Rigved mentioned at para 53 of the affidavit is in regard to Saryu. I have also produced its translation next to it. Word "Ram" was used in the richas of Veds, which were referred at para 54 of the affidavit. Richa, referred at para 55 is about King Dasrath. Its translation is also given next to it. The word "Kaushal" used in the slok of Valmiki Ramayana,

referred by me in the para 57, also mean Ayodhya. It is another name of Ayodhya No. 31 and 32 of fifteenth canto of Valmiki Ramayana, referred at para 58 of the affidavit, were about the resolution taken by Bhagwan Vishnu before the birth of Rama.

Question: There is no reference of Jai in the sloks No. 31 and 32 of the 15th canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana, referred at para No. 58 of the affidavit?

Answer: When ground for taking birth was prepared, Bhagwan Rama divided himself into four characters. He translated the resolution into action by taking birth as a son of King Dasrath. The word Madhusudan used therein is also stand for Rama.

It was referred in slok No. 31 that God Rama divided himself into four characters. All the four character are the part of Bhagwan Vishnu. These are Ram, Laxman, Bharat and Satrugan. These four are the incarnation of Mahavishnu. It is stated in the 30th slok of 15th canto that Bhagwan Vishnu decided about the place, to born. Witness said the character and image comes before action.

Question: It is not stated in the slok No. 30, where the Janmbhoomi should be. Some short of resolution might have taken. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It becomes clear from the word "Tustubu Madhusudan" appearing in 32nd slok of this resolution that in accordance, with the resolution adopted before, Devtas bows. before the Madhusudan Bhagwan Ram in the Janmbhoomi.

Question: The word Madhusudan figuring in thirty-second slok is for the Bhagwan (God) not four Janm Bhoomi. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: Resolution regarding "Janm Bhoomi" in the slok, indicates the Janmbhoomi.

The above slok means slok No. 30. I have referred two books at para 59 of the affidavit and in this regard I have stated that the Lawyer of Nirmohi Akhara told me that these two books have been filed in connection with the suit. One book is "Shri Ramanand Sampradaya Ka Itihas" and second one is "Smriti Granth." "Shri Ramanand Sampradaya Ka itihās" is in two volumes. I have referred both the volumes as a book.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/-

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

5.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, the suit may be listed for advance cross-examination on 6.8.2004.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

5.8.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey, Additional
Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty, High Court,
Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 6.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench, Lucknow
vide order dated 16.7.2004, in other original suit No. 3/89.)

(Furtherance to dated 5.8.2004, cross-examination
by Shri Zaffaryab Zilani, Advocate, on behalf of defendant
No. 9, Sunni Central Board of Wakf, U.P. continues.)

Upon seeing the document No. 200 C-1 picture No.
104 to 108 of the colour album, witness said that two
pillars, one in each picture, are appearing in these
pictures. These pillars were in the disputed Bhawan. Idol
of Hanumanji on the pillars, are appearing in picture No.
104-108. These idols have been painted with Mahabiree. I
cannot say that at what places pillars appearing in picture
No. 104, Lagayat 198 were fixed. I cannot say, what part
of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in picture No. 103
because it is not clear. The pillars appearing in picture No.
109 lagayat 114 of the album, were of the Grabh Grih of
the disputed Bhawan, but I cannot say at what places
these were fixed. Idol of Hanumanji is appearing in picture
No. 109, 110 and 114 at the places where Mahabiree is
painted.

Question: No idol is appearing in the above pictures. But
only on the basis of Mahabiree, you are saying
that idol of Hanumanji is appearing in it.

Answer: It is not correct to say that no idol is appearing at the places where Mahabiree is painted.

The pillars appearing in the picture No. 121, lagayat 126 of this album were at the disputed Bhawan. These pillars are appearing one by one. Therefore I cannot say at what places of the disputed Bhawan, these pillars were. No idol is appearing on these pillars. The pillars appearing in picture No. 139, Lagayat 144 of the album, were in the disputed Bhawan. In picture No. 140, 141 and 143 an idol of Hanumanji is appearing at the places where Mahabiree is painted. The pillars appearing in picture No. 163 lagayat 166 of the album were in the disputed Bhawan. One pillar, each in the picture are appearing in these pictures. So I cannot say at what places, these were in the disputed Bhawan. In picture No. 166, 167, 163, idol of Hanumanji is appearing at the places where Mahabiree is painted with. The pillars appearing in picture No. 176 lagayat 180 of the album were in the disputed Bhawan but I cannot say at what places these were. An idol of Hanumanji is appearing in picture No. 180, 177, 176 at the places where Mahabiree is painted With. The pillar in picture No. 181, lagayat 186 of this album, were in the disputed Bhawan but at what places, is not clear. Photo of Hanumanji is appearing in picture No. 181, 183 and 185, where Mahabiree is painted with. Pillars appearing in picture No. 187 lagayat 192 of this album, were in the disputed Bhawan but at what places these were, I cannot say. An idol of Hanumanji is appearing in the picture No. 188, 189 and 190, at the places where Mahabiree is painted with. The pillars appearing in picture No. 193, lagayat 200, were in the disputed Bhawan but only one pillar is appearing therein. Therefore I cannot say at what places these pillars were. An idol of Hanumanji is appearing in picture No. 193, 194, 195 and 196, at the

places where Mahabiree is painted with. The pillars appearing in picture No. 126 lagayat 138 of this album, were in the disputed Bhawan but at what places of the disputed Bhawan, these were, I do not know. Idol of Hanumanji is appearing at picture No. 136 and 137 at the places where Mahabiree is painted with. The pillar appearing in picture No. 127 of the album was in the disputed Bhawan but at what places, I do not know. The pillars appearing in picture No. 49 lagayat 54 were in the disputed Bhawan but only one pillar is appearing in the picture. Therefore, I cannot say at what places these were in the disputed Bhavah. An idols of Hanumanji, appearing in picture No. 50, 51, 52 and 54, are at the places where Mahabiree is painted. The pillars appearing in picture No. 115 lagayat 120, of the album, were at the disputed Bhawan, but at what places these were, I cannot say. An idol of Hanumanji in picture No. 115, 117 and 120 are at the places where Mahabiree is painted. In picture No. 40, two fishes and two lions are appearing at the door. Garurji is there in between two lions. In picture No. 79 and 80 of the album, the outer part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing. From outer part, I mean these pictures were at the Hanumanthdwar. Picture No. 87 and 88 of the album are partly visible and takhein are appearing in picture No. 88. I cannot say, which part of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in these picture. A curtain and policemen are appearing in picture No. 85 and 86. Which parts of the disputed Bhawan is appearing in these picture, I do not know. I cannot say, which parts of the disputed Bhawan are appearing in picture No. 91, 92 and 93 of this album. It is not clear from the picture No. 99 and 100 of this album, which parts are appearing in these pictures. It is not correct to say that I did not visit the disputed Bhawan prior to 1950. It is also not correct to say that no idol was there in the disputed Bhawan upto 22nd December, 1949. It is

not correct to say regular Namaj was being read there in the disputed Bhawan upto 22nd December, 1949. It is not correct to say that I visited to the disputed Bhawan only two to four times only and hence I have a little knowledge about disputed Bhawan. It is also not correct that disputed Bhawan, since its construction, is being used as Babri Masjid. It is not correct to say that disputed Bhawan was never been a Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir. It is also not correct that disputed Bhawan was not constructed after demolition of Mandir. It is not correct that I have been related to Akharas and as such I am giving false statement in favour of Nirmohi Akhara.

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

(Cross-examination by Shri Mustaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff No. 7 in Other Original suit No. 4/89 aTid defendant No. 5 Mohd. Hasim in Other Original Suit No. 5/89, begins.)

xxx

xxx

xxx

xxx

The word "Jagadguru" and "Ramanandacharya" prefix in my name is a title. It is one title. This title was honoured to me in Prayag Kumbh held in 1999. Haryacharya is not a title. It is my name. I want to add, that I am a scholar of religion, history, literature and languages. I have the knowledge of Hindi, Sanskrit, English and Urdu. I have done M.A. in Hindi subject. I cannot say in which year, I got it from Avadh University. I am deposing in favour of Nirmohi Akhara. I cannot say against whom I am deposing. I am deposing in Ram Janm Bhoomi Suit, Nirmohi Akhara versus Muslim brothers.

Question: In your affidavit, you have written the name of parties, Nirmohi Akhara versus Priya Dutt Ram and others, as plaintiff and defendant respectively. Is defendant priya Dutt Ram is a Muslim?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89 raised an objection that it is not possible on the basis of name Priya Dutt Ram, plaintiff, to say that he is a Muslim or not. Therefore, there is no justification in asking about the name of parties, particularly when it was told that the suit was filed against Muslim community. Hence such question cannot be allowed.)

(Upon this learned cross-examiner said, India is big country and such types of names are there, that on the basis of names, it is not possible to identify, who is Hindu and who is Muslim.)

Answer: The defendant, Priya Dull Ram is not a Muslim.

I do not know Priya Dull Ram. I am right if I say that this suit has been filed against Mushms. The witness, upon seeing the suit document of Other Original Suit No. 3/8 9, said the name of Priya Dull Ram has been deleted as defendant No. 1 and it is replaced by Jamuna Prasad.

Question: In the above suit, decree has been asked for against defendant No. 1. What you have to say in this regard?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that in accordance with the judgment given by Hon'ble High Court on 24.10.1994,

such question has become redundant and there is no need to ask such question particularly when witness said that the suit has been filed against Muslim community.)

Answer: It is correct that decree has been asked for, against defendant No. 1.

It becomes clear from the suit document that Shri Umesh Chander Pandey has been referred as defendant No.10.

Question: It is clear from the suit document that Anutosh (order) has been asked for against defendant No. 1 only. What you have to say in this regard?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that question from witness cannot be asked about which he is not concerned. Hence such question should not be allowed.)

Answer: It is correct that decree (Anutosh) has been asked for against the defendant No. 1, only.

I am aware of that the suit is about they disputed Bhawan but I have heard that other peoples have also filed the suit. I have no knowledge about it.

Question: You are deposing only in this suit, what you have to say in this regard?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that such question should not be allowed, particularly when many other suits are linked with

each other and examination is being done together. In view of this such question should not be allowed.)

Answer: I am deposing only in the suit "Nirmohi Akhara versus Priya Dutt" and not in another.

I know Gopal Singh Visarad, who was living in Ayodhya. He was residing in Raiganj Mohalla and was a Hindi Teacher in Divya Kala Vidyalaya. Besides he was a poet and used to take part in meetings etc. I have heard that he has filed the suit in regard to disputed Bhawan. I have no knowledge about the suit filed by him. He had a house in Ayodhya but whether the said house exist or not, I do not know. List-A is attached with my main examinee affidavit.

Question: Can you tell, in brief, what you want to say through your affidavit?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, has raised an objection that to give brief of the affidavit is not possible when the statement of main examinee has been recorded in the affidavit and such question should not be allowed.)

Answer: On the conjecture of the people, that Ayodhya, Saryu are not there. Its chauhadi is not correct. Ramjanmbhoomi reference is not in the books. These all are not correct. It has been Ramjanmbhoomi and still exists.

I have, at para 13 of my main examinee affidavit, referred Ancient History and Ancient India History at para

16. The word I have used Ancient History, is for the Ancient History of the world.

Question: Is Ancient Word History is the subject matter of this Suit?

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate, Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit raised an objection that question about the subject matter of the suit cannot be asked from witness. Hence such question should not be allowed.)

Answer: This suit is related to universal humanity. Hence I referred the world history.

The word "Swami" is figuring in my name in the affidavit. The word swami is an indicative of honour. One who holds Dand is called swami. It is not in any way related to ownership or Lord. The word Ramanandacharya is referring early Ramanandacharya. Sampradayacharya means present head of Sampradaya. I am holding both these two titles. My first guru was Rambalak Das When I hold Dand and when I was honoured with Jagadguru, Swami Shivramacharya was my second guru.

The Mahant, who sits in the 1-Tanumangarhi on the seat, is called Gaddinaseen. My Guru was Gaddinaseen. It is Urdu word. The word "Sadiq" disciple of Mahant Parmeshwar Dass was referred at the first page of the affidavit, is not correct. It should be "Sadhak." Mahant Permashwar Dass was also my Guru. Thus I had three Gurus, Balakram Dass, Permashwar Dass and Shivramacharya. I have not mentioned about my third Guru in my affidavit.

The Digember Gurukul referred at para 7 of my main examinee affidavit is situated in Katra Mohalla and not at Jalpa drain. The word Patti Sagaria is figuring at para 8 of the affidavit. There are four Patti in Hanumangarhi, Patti Sagaria, Patti Vasantia, Patti Ujjainia and Patti Haridwari. Patti means a line or group. He himself said Patties are named on the basis of four Kumbh. Ramanandiya Sect is a Sect of Hindus thought. I was a family person before entering into this sect. In Ramananda Sampradaya, some are family men, some are Virakt and some are Vanprastha. Before joining Ramanand Sampradaya. I was a family man. The Bhawan, which was demolished on 6th December, 1992, was the reconstructed Bhawan. I do not know, when it was constructed.

Question: Para 3 of the document in suit, in Other Original Suit No. 3i89 and attached map was shown to witness and he was asked whether the alphabet referred at para 3 A, B, C, D and E, F, G, K, P, N, M, L are exist in the map.

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, has raised an objection that such type of question cannot be asked for from witness. Neither it can be shown to witness nor it can be referred. Neither the witness has prepared this map nor he is a party. Hence such question cannot be asked. Two question being asked through a single question. Hence permission may not be granted.)

Answer: Alphabet A, B and D is visible. C is not visible.

There are four 0 in the map. Besides, alphabet G,H. P. N are in the map. I cannot certify whether this map is of the disputed Bhawan or not?

Question: Please tell, after reading para 3 of the suit document whether fact referred at this para is subject matter of disputed Bhawan.

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, has raised an objection that neither the subject matter can be shown to witness nor question in this regard can be asked from the witness because witness is not a party. Hence such question cannot be asked for.)

(Learned Advocate cross-examiner has raised counter objection that witness is a witness of plaintiff and question being asked, is based on the suit document filed by plaintiff. Hence showing and reading out the suit document is legal and question can be asked for.)

Answer: Smriti Bhawan of Shri Ram is referred in this para and not the disputed Bhawan.

Question: After reading the paras, next to para 3, tell us, whether disputed Bhawan is referred there anywhere?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, raised an objection that this question is vague, so it should not be allowed.)

Answer: It appears from these paras, that some Muslims wanted to enter into the disputed premises but could not. They have tried in 1934 but could not.

There is no reference about disputed premises at para 4 and 5 and also at para 6 and 7 and para 4A and 4B of the document.

Question: The statement given by witness to-day that It appears from these paras, that "some Muslims wanted to enter into the disputed premises but could not. They have tried in 1934 but could not" was read out to witness and he was asked if there is no reference about the disputed premises in the documents, than on what basis you said that Muslims have tried to enter into.

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate Shri R.L. Verma, on behalf of plaintiff in Other Original Suit No. 3/89 has raised an objection that a question is being asked from the witness, which he had already replied. So the question about the subject matter involved cannot be asked for again.)

Answer: I have not said that they entered into the disputed premises. I have said that they had tried but could not.

Muslims have tried to enter into. This was referred at the first line of para 5 of the suit document. "Said temple building" is written at para 5. He himself said it is a court language. I cannot understand it fully. "Said temple Building" I mean, they have tried to enter into Shri Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd/
Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya
6.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open court. Furtherance to this, the suit may be listed for cross examination for 9.8.2004, before Hon'ble Full bench.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)
Commissioner
6.8.2004

Before: Commissioner, Shri Han Shankar Dubey, Additional
Distt. Judge/Officer on Special Duty, High Court,
Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

Dated 16.8.2004

**D.W. 3/14, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami
Haryacharya**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench,
Lucknow vide order dated 13.8.2004, in Other Original
Suit No. 3/89.)

(Cross examination, furtherance to dated 6.8.2004,
by Shri Mustaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate, on behalf of
plaintiff No. 7 in Other Original Suit No. 4/89 and
defendant No. 5 in Other Original Suit No. 5/89, continues.)

After reading the full suit document, witness said that
he has read the full document. I could not understand a
part, in which court language was used. Witness said that
after understanding the meaning of para 2, the points
mentioned therein are clear to me. There is no such point,
which I cannot understand. Nothing about the suit, in
which I am deposing here, is written in the suit document.
A part of his statement made on 6.8.2004 at page No. 165
"in this para, disputed Bhawan Shri Ram
Smriti Bhawan is mentioned" was read out to witness.
Upon this the witness said, some where in the suit
document it has been mentioned that this Bhawan was
constructed in the memory of Shri Rama. On the basis of
which, I have mentioned, in the reply given by me, about
Shri Ram's Smriti Bhawan. I do not know, at what place
the Shri Ram's Smriti Bhawan, referred in suit document,
is. I also do not know about its length and width. A part of
his statement "Some Muslims tried to enter into the

disputed premises" was read out to him and he was asked, what does he mean by disputed premises. Witness said, that disputed premises means Rajanmbhoomi. The disputed site, in which I am giving statement, is a disputed premise. The outer portion of Ramjanmbhoomi cordoned by wall, is called disputed premises. The disputed premises is open, it is not cordoned by wall. There were a few shops in the eastern side of the disputed premises and a road on the eastern side of the shops. There was open space in the north of disputed site and road ahead. This road leads to Vasistha Kund from Janmsthan. There was a big platform on the southern side of the disputed premises, where Satsarg and Katha was used to held. A disputed premise was above 100 feet in length and 80 feet in width. Ramjanmbhoomi is on the western side of disputed premises. Ramjanmbhoomi is cordoned by iron grilled wall. In the west of disputed premises, there is an iron grilled wall and Nirmohi Akhara's storeroom of tin is in the western side of iron grilled wall, where sadhus lives. I do not remember whether there was anything in the west side of the iron grill wall. It is not like that I do not want to tell the facts. I am not keeping well. My memory is good. A part of the statement given by witness on 6.8.2004, at page No. 166 was readout to him that 'It appears from these paras. that Muslims wanted to enter into the disputed premises but could not' and he was asked if it is necessary to have wall around to enter into or entry can be effected through open space. Witness said, it could be for open space.

List "A" attached with his main examinee affidavit was shown to witness. This list contains a part from Ayodhya Mahatamya. The edition of Skand Puran, from where list-A was taken, is read by me. This edition of Skand Puran is published by Kashi Vidwat Parishad. The

year, in which it was published, is written in the book. I do not remember its year of edition, because it was published much before. I do not know what edition no. it has. Vaishnav Khand is written there in the book. This book might have published 2-4 years back. The sloks given in List-A, is followed by their proposition, literal meanings, meaning in Hindi and its English translation. In my view, the sloks given therein are correct and their proposition literal meaning, Hindi and English translation is correct. The word "Pindarak" in English translation in slok No. 15, is correct. "Pindarak" . still exist in Ayodhya in between Sugreev Fort and Diwid Fort, which is in a dilapidated position now a days. This is the place of Surya, where Suryavanshi King used to do prayer. It is an open space now a days. Most of its part is under cultivation. Pindarak is at the distance of 100 meters from the disputed site. A disputed premise is in the west-south side of the Pindarak and Pindarak is in the east side of the disputed premises. I have stated in the statement given by me to-day that there were a few shops in the east of disputed premises and a road ahead. This place, Pindarak is in the east of the road referred above. Pindarak is at a distance of 100-150 meter from the road and is in the east. This road leads to Faizabad from Janmbhoomi via Kaziwana. In English translation of slok No. 15, it is written as Pindarik but in the translation of slok No. 16, it is written as Pindarik, which is a clerical mistake. Upon reading the English translation of slok No. 17, List No. A, witness said the place, referred as Vighneshwar is still exist. It is in Ayodhya. Vighneshwar is in the east of Pindarak. It is at a distance approx. 100-200 meters from Pindarak. It is a worship place. Ganeshji is worshiped here. There is no temple at that place. It is an open place. There is a small place of Vighneshwar, like a temple, at a height of 10 feet from the ground level. It is in a form of temple. There is

an idol of Ganesha in it. There are fields around it and a road. This road is in the south side of Vighneshwar. This road is at a distance of 10-15 meter from Vighneshwar. This road leads to Janmbhoomi from Hanumangarhi. Vighneshwar is aside by it. This temple of Ganeshji is less than 200-400 years old. Pindarak is in the form of a stone, which was worshiped by the princes of Suryavanshi. It is an old place approx. 500-600 years old.

“Hermitage” of Vasista, referred in English translation of slok No. 20 is in the south side of Ramjanmbhoomi in Ayodhya. There is a grand temple of Vasista and a Kund. This temple of Vasista is very old, contemporary to Rama. It may be in a ruined position but now its major part is build-up. The bricks fixed in the temple are very old because these type of bricks are not produced now a days. Wall of temple is cemented but bricks of Kund are not plastered. The entire Kund is made of bricks. These bricks are in square form and big in size. I do not know whether engraving is there on the bricks or not. On one stone “daily Vasist Kund Yatra” is written. Number is not written on the stone. It is said by the Sadhus that this stone is from the time of Rama. I have not seen any number or writings on it except the writing on the stone “Vasista Kund daily yatra.” It is not correct to say that something is written in English on the stone. It is also not correct to say that a number is written on it. The Lomas Hermitage is referred in the above slok. A number over a stone is written there... There is a place called Ramgulella where Lothasji used to come and stay. There is a temple at the place of Ramgulella. Ramgulella temple is less old than Vasisht Temple. It appears from the stone that Vasisht used to stay there, whenever he comes there. The stone fixed there is a Makrana stone, which is thousands years old. The writings on the stone is in Hindi

script. Hindi script was in vogue in India and is still in vogue. Scholar of to-day says Hindi has no script and Hindi is written in another script. It is said about Ramgulella place that Ramchanderji used to play a ball here i.e. play Gulel there. Lomas Mandir might be in the east-south side of the disputed premises. The temple of Vasisht is also towards this direction.

Three roads leads to Dorahi Kuan from Hanumangarhi. The road adjacent to Ramjanm Sthan, leads to Dorahi Kuan from Hanumangarhi. On the southern side of the road, there is Vighneshwar place. Vighneshwar place is at a distance of 20- 22 meter, approx. from this road and Pindarak is in the south of the road. Pindarak is at a distance of 40-50 meter from the road. Temple of Vasishta is in east-north side from this road. Lomas temple is in east-south direction from the road. I agree with the Hindi-English translation of the sloks mentioned at list-A. In my view nothing is wrong therein. Misprinting might be there.

A part "Mata Kaushaliya with folded hand..... people make fun" of statement given by him on 23.7.2004 at page No. 18, was readout to him. Witness said the above mentioned facts were spoken by Mata Kaushaliya.

Birth, incarnation and fame of Ramchanderji were described in Ved and Purans. Veds and Purans are contemporary. I believe that Veds are divine, which cannot be confined to a particular time. Similarly Purans are also divine. He himself said Purans are referred in Veds. Veds and Puran were there before the time of Rama. Veds were there before Rama. Rama was referred in Veds because Rama ever existent is time immemorial. Therefore,

Ramchanderji was referred in Veds. Ved and Purans are in Sanskrit. These existed in writing since eternal. Ramchander born as a son of King Dasratha and Ramlila is organized about which, is referred in Veds. Ramchanderji takes birth in every Kalpa. At present first stage of Kalyuga is going on, It was lasted 5000 years before. Ramchanderji will take birth in the last phase of Kalyuga. Kalyuga follows by Satyuga and than Tretayug. At the eve of Dwaperyuga and the last of Treta, Bhagwan Rama takes birth in Ayodhya again.

I referred "Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj" in my statement. The word sanatan means continous process. Arya Samaj, Hindus and Budhs are derivative of Sanatan Dharma. Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj spread over to whole India. It is also spread over to England, Switzerland, Paris etc. People from there comes here for pindtaran. The people living in India, all comes under Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj. The follower of all religion i.e. Hindu, Muslims, Sikh, Christians, Budhs and Jams comes under it.

There is a River Ganga in India. He himself said that five rivers are called a Ganga. One brought to earth by Maharaj Bhagirath and is at prayag. Second is Krishna Ganga, in Madhya Pradesh, third is Manorama, at Makhsthali in Ayodhya. Makhsthali is situated in Distt. Gaunda, in the north of Saryu. Fourth one is Kaveri, near Sonbhadra in Bihar and fifth one is Tiloshawar flows below Mani Prabat in Ayodhya. It exists even to-day. It flows from Tiloshwar and meet with sea. All the rivers flows to sea. This river merges at a point where Damodar and Brahmputra merge. Mani Prabat, I referred above, is in Ayodhya. Tiloshwar is in Chhatisgarh. This river merges from Tileshwar and flows to Ayodhya. He himself said there is little water in it. All these five Gangas are from the

time of Ramchanderji. It is not correct to say that there is Ganga, namely Trilokiya, in Ayodhya and I am giving false statement in this regard. Besides there were other Gangas during the time of Ramchanderji. These five Gangas were described in Ramcharitmanas. Gomati, Ganga, Saiganga, Tonsganga are in addition to above five. There may be more Gangas, Tons river and above two rivers are known as Ganga even to-day. Saryu River, at some distance is called Ghaghra. He himself said that after a distance of 360 Dhanus in east and 360 Dhanus in south, it is called Ghaghra. One Dhanus is equal to 11 man hand. 11 man hand, I mean, sixteen and half feet. At Faizabad, at the distance of 360 Dhanus from Ayodhya, it is called Ghaghra. From Mastakbagh to Ramghat it is called Saryu and from there it is called Ghaghra. Some part of Mastakbagh falls in Ayodhya and some part in Faizabad. With the passage of time, the name of Mastakbagh changed to Mahtab Bagh. This place has a religious importance. Bhagwan Ramchanderji used to come here for walk. This place is also referred in Valmiki Ramayana and Ramcharitmanas. In Valmiki Ramayana it is called Mahad Vanam. By which name it is referred in Ramcharitmanas not known to me. He himself said that in Ramcharitmanas it is referred as Goptarghat. During the period of Nawab the name of Mahad, Vanam changed to Mahatab Bagh. I came to know about this from the Tamrapatra kept in Hanumangarhi. This Tamrapatra is in Arabi language and belongs to the period of Asifudola. I do not know Arabi language but another Mahatma read it for me. It was mentioned in that Tamrapatra that land was given to Hanumangarhi. King donated 51 bigha land to Hanumangarhi after he recovered from leprosy. The King was Sirajudola. It was mentioned in the Tamrapatra that the place known by the name of Mahad Vanam is now called Mahtab Bagh. There is no reference about it, anywhere. He himself said that

Britishers caused partridges to fight with each other at this place and address them by the name Pappu Gappu etc. It is not possible in Veds, to reduce something and to highlight something because whatever reduced or highlighted, it should be in Lokik Sanskrit. So by using Sanskrit in vogue it is not possible. There are some Purans, wherein reference about modern Kings is found, where it is possible to reduce and to extend the facts. The Purans where some part is added cannot be called divine. Such Purans will not be included in the list of 18 Purans. Nothing has been reduced or extended in Skand Puran. Some Variation were made in Devi Puran, Kalika Puran and Bhavisya Puran. Alallaho Puran is there also. This Puran is not covered under 18 Purans.

No addition or reduction is made in 18 Purans. I am saying this after reading them. It was written in Devi Puran that Sukdev Swami was married to 100 women. This part was added in Devi Puran. Except this, all facts given in Devi Puran are certified. Witness said that there are four more Purans, where some portions were added. Devi Puran is not included in 18 Purans. Devi Puran is also treated as an honoured Puran but the added portion is not treated as honoured one. Alallaho is not a Puran. It is Upnishad. The statement given by me earlier that Alallaho is Puran, is not correct. It is an Upnishad. It is written in Tretrayopni shad that Utkastam Jagrat, Varanyabodhak. Azan of Kuran is taken from there. The word Allahu, Allahu, Allahu Akbar is taken from the above upnishad.

Document No. 109 C-1/3 of Other Original Suit No. 5/89, which is suit document in original suit No. 57/8, court of Munsif Sadar, Faizabad, was shown to witness. Upon reading the details Mandir Nizai, given in the last of the suit document, witness said the material differs from the

suit No. 3/89, in which I am giving statement. The disputed subject of both the suit differ from each other.

Question: In your statement you have used the word disputed premises and also said that this disputed premises is different from the subject of other original suit No. 3/89. You have also told about the area and Chouhadi of disputed premises. Whether the disputed property involved in this suit is in agreement with the property of the above disputed premises.

Answer: The Chouhadi of disputed premises I referred in my statement above is different from the disputed property referred in this suit. These are not in agreement.

Document No. 45 C-1/1/1 of Other Original Suit No. 3/89 was shown to witness. Witness said the person, Raghunath Dass, Baldev Dass, Sukhram Dass, Naga Charan Dass and Ram Lakhan Dass, referred in agreement, are known to me. I do not know Mahant Ramchanran Dass referred as plaintiff in the agreement. The person known to me, were from Nirmohi Akhara. They were office bearer of Nirmohi Akhara. Vide para- 1, of this agreement Mahant Raghunath Dass of Nirmohi Akhara was authorized to perform Puja etc. of Shri Ram Mandir. Raghunath Dass was declared the Mahant of all properties of Nirmohi Akhara. It was also stated in the agreement that plaintiff Ramchander Dass have no right over the property of Nirmohi Akhara. At para-2 of the agreement, temple of Nirmohi Akhara, situated at Ramghat was also referred in. In the last of this para, rights in regard to other properties, as mentioned in the list, was given to Raghunath Dass. Document No. 45 C-1/1/6 is the list of properties mentioned in the agreement. The List-A

enclosed with the document and Chouhadi of a temple, is of the temple of Nirmohi Akhara, situated at Ramghat. In my view there are number of anomalies in this Chouhi. Than said that the Chaudhi of the temple of Nirmohi Akhara at Ramghat is correct but the Mahant who erase the property of Akhara is expelled at once. Like Ranikewal Dass, who donated the land of Ramjanmbhoomi, was expelled at once. Ramkewal Dass donated the land of Ramjanmbhoomi to V.H.P. and others. When it became known to Akhara's people, they removed Ramkewal Dass from the Mahant. The details and Chaudhi given at document No. 2, cannot be said correct. The old Chaudhi has not been mentioned anywhere. Only present Chaudhi was given. The Chaudhi mentioned at Sl. No. 3 of this document is not correct. The Tulsi Dass and Chabutra Lomas on the west and Sumitra Bhawan in south, is correctly mentioned and graveyard is written in the eastern Chaudhi, which is not correct because graveyard never seen there. In document No. 45 C-1/1/5 Almarkoom Yadoom June 42 is written, which means 'that this agreement was written on 1st June, 1942. Upon seeing the documents No. 45 C-1/2A, of this suit, witness said outer part of the disputed premises is shown in the map. The southern part referred by me is shown here. Disputed premises is shown in the map as Chabutra. This is the same disputed premises, which I referred in the statement. A road in the north was shown in this map. This is the same road, which leads to Hanumangarhi from Dorahi Kuan and in its north there is Janmsthan Mandir. Southern part beyond the road has been shown in the map. The item shown in the southern part, in the map are correct. It appears that Ramchabutra, Shankarji Ka Sthan and Bhandar Grih, which I saw during childhood, are shown in the map. But I am not sure that the points shown in the map are correct. The map shows the things, which I have

seen. But beyond the Chabutra, shown in the map, there were field. I have mentioned a word Vanprastha in my statement, which means, people go to forest for chanting Bhajan etc. I have mentioned that humanity is related to this issue, which means brotherhood. I have stated that all people living in India are the part of Sanatan Vedic Hindu Samaj. None was excluded from it. The present dispute is like a small boil, it requires operation. Unless it is taken out, will spoil the atmosphere. The incident of 6th December, 1992, in Ayodhya cannot be treated as good one. It shows differences. Problem can be solved mutually. It is because politics has entered in to religion have not tried because none has asked for me. This problem can be solved either through court or by mutually accepted decision. Court is the highest authority. The decision of court should be honored by all concerned. I have referred the Ayodhya and Janmbhoomi, which were referred in Valrniki Ramayana. The reference in Valmiki Ramayana is not imaginary. It is not correct to say that I did not know about Babri Masjid before 1950. I was a child at that time. I had heard that some dispute taken place in between Hindus and Muslims and with the result the temple was attached. I have heard that some people have lost their lives and some were injured. I have heard about it. I did not went there because I was bounded with the principle of Ashram. The big temple in Ayodhya have huge properties. I cannot say that Barasthan Mandir has the huge property but once it was said that the Mahant of Barasthan had Kohinoor Diamond in his possession and the properties in various district U.P. and in four-five states. Hanumangarhi also had a huge property but after abolition of Jamindari, its property has been reduced substantially. Chavani and Ban Chavani also have the properties. Mahant of Chhottee Chavani, Nirtya Gopal Dass is at present a national hero. Janmsthan Mandir also

had the property but now it has been reduced. People have encroached upon its property. The property, which peoples used to donate to temple, became the property of temple. Ramjanmbhoomi had no distinct existence. It was a part/branch of Nirmohi Akhara. It might be possible that there was no role of local Hindus in the dispute, which took place in 1949 and in the incident of installing an idol in the disputed Bhawan. The outsider sadhus were responsible for this. I do not know whether any Hindu of Ayodhya was involved in the suit for attachment. I have heard that clash took place in the night. The first suit in connection of taking out an idol from the disputed Bhawan was filed by Gopal Singh Visharad. I cannot say that Gopal Singh Visharad was from Ayodhya or not. Then said he was from Ayodhya I treated him as the original resident of Ayodhya. But he was not. I do not know that he was residing in a rented house. I have not seen Namaj was being read for five times a day upto 22nd December, 1949. Muslims keeps Roza. This I know. It is not correct to say that Namaj was being read there during Roza. I am not aware of the fact that Priest seating on Chabutra used to distribute Ladoo to the Namazee or not. It is not correct to say that Namaj was being read there in the disputed Bhawan upto 22nd December, 1949. It is also not correct that disputed Bhawan was not called as Ramjanm Mandir by any person. A well is a part of Masjid. Where people do Vaju. But there was no well in the disputed Bhawan. And at present also there is no well. It is not correct to say that I am making false statement about Ramjanmbhoomi disputed structure.

Shri Sayyed Irfan Ahmad, Advocate, on behalf of defendant No. 26 in Other Original Suit No. 5/89, has accepted the cross-examination done by Shri Zaffaryab Geelani and Shri Mustaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate.

Shri Fazie Alam, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No. 6/1 and 6/2 in Other Original Suit No. 3/89, has accepted the cross-examination done by Shri Abdul Mannan, Shri Zaffaryab Zilani and Shri Mustaqu Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate.

Cross-examination by all defendants/parties concluded.

Witness is discharged.

Statement read and confirmed.

Sd

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Haryacharya

16.8.2004

I have dictated to stenographer, who typed it in the open

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

16.8.2004