

**9540:**

**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**

Baboo Priya Dutt Ram and others ..... Defendants

**STATEMENT OF D.W.3/7**  
**MAHANT RAMJI DAS (PART -IIInd)**

**Date: 10.2.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

Before: Commissioner, Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional Distt. Judge/Special Executive Officer, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Other Main Case No.3/89 (Main Case No.26/58) Nirmohi Akhara and others versus Babu Priya Dutta and others-the orders passed by Hon'ble Full Bench dated 23.1.2004 by the designated commissioner).

(In continuation of 4.2.2004, the cross-examination of P.W.3/7, on affidavit of Defendant No.9, Sunni Central Waqf Board, Uttar Pradesh by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate).

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the portion of his statement made on 3.2.2004 at page 18 that....." The people of the Hindu community ..... the disputed site..... the pooja had been performed on the site," and was asked as to what was his intention in saying in his statement that the worship had been continuing since time immemorial? Seeing the above the witness replied that his intention of saying so was that the God did not appear only in 'TRETA' whenever Yogo has changed, various incarnations of God had appeared and they had appeared there only and, therefore, that place is famous as the birth place of Lord Rama, KAGABHASHUNDI JI had told GARUJI in UTTARA KAND of 'RAMCHARIT MANAS' that -Dekhe Shiva Vidhi Vishnu Aneka. Rama Roop Doosar Nahin Dekha" (Lord Shiva saw many Vishnus but he did not see any other like Rama).

In every TRETA YUGA, Ramchandra had not been born but he had taken birth in many Treta yugas. At present VARAH YUGA is continuing. After 50 years of birth of Brahma, from the first day & first PAHAR of 51<sup>st</sup> year, this KALPA is going on. One KALPA, life is KHARABAS of years. One Kharaba is equal to 100 Arabas and one Arba is equal to one hundred crores, one crore is equal to one hundred lakhs. The period of one KALPA is of more than many KHARABS of years. In one KALPA, one thousand CHATURYUGI are spent. In one day and one night of BRAHMAJI, two thousand CHATURUGIES are spent. One CHATURYUG is of forty-three lakh twenty thousand of years. There are four YUGAS in one CHATURYUGA and these respectively are SATYUG, TRETAYUG, DWAPARYUG & KALIYUG. The period of SATYUGA is of 17 lakh 28 thousand of years, the period of Tretayug is of 12 lakhs 96 thousands of years, DWAPARYUG period is 8 lakh 84 thousands years, KALIYUGA'S period is 4 lakhs thirty-two thousands of years. At present, Kaliyuga is continuing. In the last phase of fourth phase of Tretayug, the present God Ramchandraji had born. There are four phases in each yuga. In the last phrase of Tretayug, Ramchandraji had born. Ramachandra ji had born about 9 lakhs years before now. Again said that Ramchandra ji had born a few years before 9 lakhs years. Before this, 27 KALPAs have elapsed and in them incarnations of Bhagwan Rama have appeared. I do not know orally as in which Tretayug, Ramchandraji was born. Again said, the detail of 27 births is contained in "RAMACHARIT MANAS" and in "RAMAYANA" and in all the twenty seven times, the birth of Ramachandaraji had taken place on this place only, the detail of which is available in "Ramayana" & "Ramacharit Manas". With time immemorial (Anadikal), I mean KHARABs of years. The mention of performing Pooja at

this place from the good olden period has also been made in Sri Ramcharit Manas, Balmiki Ramayana, Adhyatam Ramayana, Vishnu Purana, Raghuwansh Mahakavya, Bhakti Kavya, Uttar Ramcharitam, Shimadbhagwt, Skanda Purana, Brahmand Purana, Padam Purana, Narad Purana and other Puranas as well as in Granthas.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness an original booklets "Ramacharit Manas". Paper No.258 C-1/2 and asked him at which place such a mention had been made in "Ramacharit Manas"? Seeing the above, the witness replied that it was in third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth Choupais after couplet No.71 (a)(b) in 'Uttar Kand' –

"Shri Ramaji is the same God who is unborn, a symbol of a scientist, Handsomest & full of vigour, Omnipresent, complete, endless, whose power never fail, and a God possessing six riches. He is Nirguna, Great, Voiceless, above senses, seeing everything, faultless, no body could attain victory over Him, without emotions, without a body, without affection, ever existing, provider of comforts.

Beyond nature, all powerfull, present in every heart, possessing no designs, having no defect, a God which cannot be destroyed....."

"Soi Sachidanand Ghan Rama. Aj Bigyan Roop Bal Dhama  
Byapak Vyapya Akhand Ananta. Akhil Amoghsakti Bhagwanta.  
Agun Adarbh Gria Gotita. Sabdarsi Anwaf Ajita.  
Nirmam Nirakar Nirmoha. Nitya Niranjan Sukh Sandoha.  
Prakriti Paar Prabhu sab Ur Basi. Brahm Nirih Biraj abinasi.  
Iha Moh Kar Karan Nahi. Rabi Sanmukh Tam Kabhu ki jahi."

and in this very "Uttarkand" there is a mention of birth of God in couplet No.72(a). After couplet No.74(b) of



Uttarkand only, a mention has been made in 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> choupai that Pooja had since had continued to be performed on that very place where Ramachandraji had taken birth. In addition to this such a mention has also been made in 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> choupai, after couplet No.79(b).

Question: My question was that where had been the mention in the “Ramacharit Manas” made that the pooja was being performed at the birth place of Ramachandraji since time immemorial. Should I take it that such a mention of performing pooja since time immemorial exist in all the “Chopais” mentioned by you, as above?

Answer: The complete version of births of God Rama and the version about His worship, the version about the worship of that place, has appeared in ‘SHIVA SANHITA’ in which God Shankar had given directions to God BRAHMA for performing worship there at the place.

Question: May I take it that there is no mention in the above couplets & chopais about Pooja, mentioned by you?

Answer: There is no mention in them about performing pooja but custom of performing pooja is mentioned.

Question: Is there mention of praise of Ramachandraji is made in 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> chopayees after above couplet No.71(b) in Uttarkand of “Shri Ramcharit Manas” and no mention about the birth place of Ramachandraji is made in them?

Answer: There is no mention about the birth place of Ramachandraji in the above chopayees, it is only about taking birth of Ramachandraji.

Similarly in couplet No.72(a) also, there is no mention about the birth place of Ramachandraji. There is no mention about the birth place in couplet 74 (b) either. In 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> chopayees, after above mentioned couplet No.74(b) also, there is no mention about the birth place but it is only about taking birth. Similarly after couplet No.79(b), in 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> & 8<sup>th</sup> chopayees also, mentioned about Ramachandraji's birth place is not made.

The above mentioned, the original booklet "Shri Ramacharit Manas" – paper No.258 C-1/2, was shown and was asked that the couplet and chopayee in which the mention about the birth place of Shri Ramachandraji has been made in "Shri Ramacharit Manas", may please be indicated. After seeing the above mentioned "Shri Ramacharit Manas" the witness replied that there was no definite mentioned about the birth palace of Shri Ramachandraji in it, only mention about his birth as well as about the Dasharath Palace had been made and the birth place of Bhagwan Ramachandraji also come under the same.

Question: According to your version there is a mention about Dasharath Mahal in "Shri Ramacharit Manas". Is the mention about Kaushalya Bhavan or Kaushalya Mahal is also made in this book?

Answer: In this book there is a mention about Dashrath Mahal in "Uttar Kand" and also the mention about the Palaces of all Mothers under that Mahal.

Question: My pointed question is whether the mention in the name of Kaushalya Bhavan or Kaushalya Mahal has been made in “Shri Ramacharit Manas”?

Answer: Such a mention has been made in “Shri Ramacharit Manas”.

After seeing the original booklet “Shri Ramacharit Manas” – paper No.258 C-1/2, the witness said that there was no mention about Kaushalaya Bhavan or Kaushalya Mahal in it.

The learned counsel arguing the case, showed the witness “Shri Ramacharit Manas” original document No.258 C-1/2 and asked whether any mention was made in Dasharath Mahal about taking birth by Shri Ramachandraji in it? Seeing the above, the witness replied that there was mention about Kaushalya Griha in 3<sup>rd</sup> choupayees after couplet No.147 of Ayodhya Kand and Bhagwan Rama was born in that very house. This house of Kaushalya was situated inside the same Dasharath Mahal. In “Shri Ramacharit Manas”, the area or the boundaries of Dashrath Mahal or Kaushalya Bhavan or Kaushalya Mahal are not defined. The area and boundaries of Dasharath Mahal are given in the Skandha Purana.

Skandha purana is the work of Vyasji. Vyasji existed before Srikrishnanji and after Ramachandraji. The original copies of Skandha Puran are in the custody of Geeta Press Gorakhpur and Venkatesh Press, Mumbai. Again said that where from the book was originally taken, was not known to him. I had seen the Skandha Purana first time, forty years back. That book of Skandh Purana which I had seen, was published by Geeta Press, Gorakhpur. I shall not be able to tell the year of its publication. I do not

know as to when Skandha Purana was published by Geeta Press Gorakhpur first time. I shall not be able to tell as by whom and wherefrom & when the ancient book of Skandha Purana was published 100 years back by Venkatesh Press. I have filed some Photocopies of certain portions of Skandha Purana alongwith the Affidavit at the time of my main examination. The learned counsel arguing the case, showed the affidavit of his main examination and asked him that which of the paper he had filed as the portion of Skandha Purana with his Affidavit? After seeing the above the witness stated that he had filed that as enclosed list No.3 at the time of his main examination which is paper No.9/17, linked paper 9/24A.

This list No.3 is a portion of Skandha Purana. The portion is called Ayodhya Mahatamya.

The paper of this list No.3, document No.9/20, page 18, contains the detail of place of birth and Ram Janam Bhoomi too is mentioned in the same. On this page, particular place and definite boundaries are not mentioned. The gist of four Shalokas of Sanskrit mentioned on this paper No.9/20, page-18 is given on this page 18 and page 19 but in this gist some of the portions are given different from their meaning. The book which contain this list no.3, is available with me duly printed. I have brought it today but is lying outside in the car at present and I can only tell after seeing the same that in which year and from which press, it was published.

Question: In the Shlokas written at page 18, there is no mention available about the birth place as well as boundaries. Nor it contains the definite place. So whether in any other Shloka in list No.3, filed with the affidavit at the time of your main

examination, the mention about the boundaries of birth place or a definite place of birth is available anywhere?

Answer: After seeing the above mention list No.3, the witness replied is Shloka No.1 on page 19 of this very paper No.9/20, the mention of birth place is the west of Sitakooop because what is mentioned in this Shloka, according to that, Sitakooop is lying in Agnikona and the birth place is in the west of Sitakooop.

Question: I have to say that none of the word used in above mentioned Shloka No.1, means 'west' anywhere?

Answer: None of word of this Shloka No.1 means west but there is Sitakooop in Agnikona of birth-place which proves that the birth place of Bhagwan Rama is in the west from Sitakooop.

Question: Is the meaning of Agnikona is 'East'?

Answer: The place between the 'East & South' is called Agnikona.

It is now here mentioned in this Shloka No.1 that how much is the distance of birth place from Sitakooop .

Question: Sitakooop falls on Agnikona from the Janamsthan Mandir situated on north of the disputed Bhavan?

Answer: Yes.

The distance from that birthplace to Sitakooop shall be 200 steps. Except in Shloka No.1, mentioned above, on mention of particular place or the boundaries of birth place, is made anywhere in any other Shloka in this list No.3. Heading 'Janam Sthan i.e. Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi'

at page 18 of paper No.9/20, has also been given in original Skandh Purana, which was published 100 years ago. I do not know as to who has written the gist of the book of which the list No.3 is one of the portions. The book, of which list 3 is the portion, was obtained by me on demand. I had obtained that book one year ago. I went through this book once & understood it and thereafter I did not feel any need to go through it again. Himself said – because I have myself visited these places and have seen them myself. While filing the affidavit at the time of main examination, I had given the entire book to the photocopier, asking him to make the photocopy of pages relating to Ram Janam Bhoomit, Kanak Bhavan & Nageshwarnath at Mayodhya. This shop of the photocopier is located at Shringar Hatt Mohalla in Ayodhya. The name of this shop is Amit Book Depot. I had given that book for undertaking photocopy after I arrived here on receipt of order from the court. He returned it immediately after doing the photocopy.

Question: Whether the shopkeeper of Photocopy gave you the photocopy of those pages which he thought proper and did you check it from the original book whether or not the photocopy of all the referred and relevant pages has been done?

Answer: I saw that from cursory look that one photocopy each of all the pages from 7 to 37 have been made.

Question: Did you know before hand that page 7 to page 37 of the book Skandh Purana, contained detail about Janam Bhoomi etc?

Answer: In the original Skandh Purana, there is detailed description about the places mentioned in list No.3.

Question: Is the list No.2 also contained the portion of that book which the list No.3 contained?

Answer: Yes sir, list No.2 is also the portion of that book, of which list No.3 is.

Question: I am asking whether the extracts of book of list No.2 are not the extracts of the book of list No.3. What do you say in this regard?

Answer: List No.2 and list No.3, both are the extracts of Skandha Purana.

Again said – it is correct that the portion of that book of which list No.2 is the photocopy, list No.3 is not the photocopy of that book. That book, the portion of which is list NO.2, was not published from that press from which the book, of which the list No.3 is a Photocopy, was published. The book, the photocopy of the portion of which is list No.2, should be in my possession but I can say so with certainty only after seeing the same. I have not brought that book to Lucknow today. The photocopy of the papers contained in list No.2 was also got done by me and was got done on the same day on which the photocopy of the papers of list No.3 was got done. The papers of that book, which are list No.2, contain four pages. This book I got about seven-eight months back and had been published by Kashi Vidwat Parishad and I got it when it was being distributed. I shall not be able to tell as to who was distributing the book because the persons concerned were unknown persons. This book has been written by Kashi Vidwat Parishad. As there is a stamp on paper No.9/16, which is list No.2, of Kashi Vidwat Parishad, I am saying that this book is written & published by them. I have no knowledge as to who is the Trustee or Manager or Editor of Kashi Vidwat Parishad.

Statement attested after reading it.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri  
10.02.2004

**9551:**

Typed by the stenographer in the open court, on my giving dictation. In continuation of this for further cross-examination in the matter, appear in the court on 23.2.2004.

Sd/- Narendra Prasad  
Commissioner  
10.02.2004.

*www.vadaprativada.in*

*www.vadaprativada.in*



**Date: 23.2.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

Before: Commissioner, Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional Distt. Judge/Special Executive Officer, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Other Main Case No.3/89 (Main Case No.26/59) The orders passed dated 23.1.2004 by Designate Commissioner in the matter of Nirmohi Akhara and others versus Babu Priya Dutta Ram & others).

(In continuation of 10.2.2004, the cross-examination of P.W.3/7, Defendant No.9 by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate on behalf of Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Uttar Pradesh continued).

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the paper No.9/13, linked paper No.9/16, filed as list No.2 with the affidavit to the witness and asked whether he had brought the original of all the above papers alongwith him in the court today? Seeing the above, the witness replied that he had brought with him those pamphlets to the court of which he had got the photocopy made. The original pamphlets were distributed in Ayodhya but I shall not be able tell the number of copies of them which were distributed i.e. may be in hundreds and thousands or more. It appears from the same had been printed in some press. If court orders so, I shall file this pamphlet in the court. In the original pamphlet no name of any press where from it would have been printed is given. I can bring the original pamphlet filed as list No.2 in the court every day, as I have no special difficulty in doing so. Seeing paper No.9/16 of the above list No.9, the witness said that the proof produced as written in the end is meant for the person producing that proof.

Question: I am to say that the original of the photocopy filed as list No.2 above, is not printed by the Shri Kashi Vidwat Parishad Trust rather it has been distributed by them. What do you say about this?

Answer: I have nothing to say by whom the same has been printed but this pamphlet has been distributed by the Kashi Vidwat Parishad Trust. Again himself said – the Shlokas in these pamphlets are greatly similar to the shlokas given in Ayodhya Mahatamya.

Question: My specific question is that above list No.2 (paper No.9/13 linked paper 9/16) is not printed by Kashi Vidwat Parishad Trust and it is not written on it as from which press it was printed. You please answer this question?

Answer: The original pamphlet of the above paper is neither printed by Kashi Vidwat Parishad Trust nor it is written on it as from where the same had been printed.

I have no knowledge whether or not it whether it is essential to print the name of the press if any thing is got printed through such a press.

Question: I have to say that if any book or pamphlet does not contain the name of the printing press on that, it is an offence to distribute such a book or pamphlet. What have you to say in this regard?

Answer: Those cases come under the category of offence, in which pamphlets contain such like material as may divide or may foment trouble in the society but if any fact is revealed with pertain to the religion, then it is not an offence.

Seeing the above paper No.9/13, the witness said that it is a portion of Ayodhya Mahatmya from Skandh Purana.

The Learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the list No.3, paper No.917 to 9/24A, filed with affidavit at the time of main examination and was asked whether these papers were the portions from Ayodhya Mahatmya of Skandh Purana?

Seeing the above, the witness replied that those papers were the portions of Ayodhya Mahatmya of Skandh Purana. The Shlokas in Sanskrit ins the above paper No.9/17 linked paper No.9/24, are the portions from Ayodhya Mahatmya of Skandh Purna but the meanings which are given in Hindi, are almost pertained to the same. I have carefully read all the papers filed as list No.2 & 3 with my affidavit at the time of my main examination.

Question: Please tell, where the Sanskrit Shlokas referred in list No.2, are given in list No.3?

After seeing both the list the witness replied that the Shloka No.5 of list No.2 is Shlokas No.3 in list No.3. Himself said – Shloka No.3 of list No.3 is supported by Shloka No.5 of list No.2. The above Shloka No.3 paper No.9/17A of the list No.3 is at page 8 and also at page 9, under the heading “SARYU MAHANADI”. The Shloka No.3 of page 8 starts from the word JANAM PRABHRITI and end at word PRANASHYATI. The Shloka No.1 of above paper no.9/71A is the shloka about which I have just told that it is also at page 9. There is no difference in the language of Shloka No.5 and paper No.9/17A of Shloka No.3 and 1 of page 8 &

# 9555:

9 of list No.2 above, rather these are complimentary to each other.

Question: Do you know that it is an offence to make false statement under oath in the court?

Answer: Yes, Sir.

Question: I have to say that your contention that the language of Shloka No.5 in list No.2, Shloka No.3 of paper No.9/71A at page 8 of list No.3 and Shloka No.1 of page No.9 of the same paper is not different, is a totally wrong statement and you are making a false statement that there is no difference in the language of these Shlokas. Whether have to say in this regard?

Answer: My submission is that "Saryu Salile snatva" and "Saryu Snanmatrain Sarvmaiv pranshyati" and "jalrupain brhamaiv Saryu mokshda sada" are complimentary to each other, as I have stated earlier, there is no difference in them and it is true.

Question: Do you understand that difference in language and difference in meaning are separate things?

Answer: Language and meanings are one and the same.

Question: My contention is that the language of any shloka i.e. its terminology and the meaning of that shloka or gist, are separate things?

Answer: Shlokas are in Sanskrit and their meanings could be in regional language but there is no difference in them.

# 9556:

Question: My contention is that the terminology used in Shloka No.5 of list No.2, as told by you i.e.

**“Saryu Saliley Snatwa Pindarkinch Poojyet.  
Papina Mohkartaram matidum Kratitrum Sada.”**

Is totally different from the following shloka no.3 of above paper No.9/17A at page 8 and you are willfully giving wrong statement that the terminology of both the shlokas is the same

**“Janmprabrahti Yatpapam Sichyo Va Purushasya Vaa.  
Saryusnanmatren Sarvmey Pranshayati.”**

Therefore, you please tell which of the words used in the above two Shlokas are the same.

(In this question the learned counsel for the plaintiffs in others Main case No.5/89, Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate raised the objection and stated that the question was mixed and misleading. Therefore, permission to ask such a question should not be given).

Answer: “ Saryuslilay snatava” i.e. every body has been directed to take bath in Saryu and in Shloka No.3 of page 8 of paper No.9/17A in list No.3, as well as in Shloka No.1 page NO.9, people have been made to believe that taking bath in Saryu is beneficial and there is no ambiguity in it i.e. the meaning of both is the same. Had the terminology of both the shlokas the same, there would have been demerit of repetition.

The Shlokas of above mentioned list No.3, are of the Skandh Purana, the writer of the same is Ved Vyasji. Shri Ved Vyasji had composed this Skandh Purana about four & half thousand years ago from today. I have brought that book with me in the court today from which I had got a photocopy made and which is filed as list No.3. I did not purchase but procured the book from which I have got a photocopy made, which is filed as list No.3. I obtained this book, as in which press it was printed but it contains the name of the publisher. The Name of Publisher written in this book is Shri Yashwant Rao Deshpandey, Kale Ram Mandir Trust, Ayodhya, and I know only him.

In this book the portion Skandh Purana only is including which is related to Ayodhya Mahatmya. Himself said – in this book the name of the Press has also been mentioned which is Mudrak Avam Akshar Rachna Anurag Computer, 714, Rayganj, Ayodhya. I have not filed the photocopy of the whole book, I have filed only some of the portions in which include maximum parts. I shall not be able to tell, by seeing this book, as to who has written the gist of its Sanskrit Shlokas. I can tell the word meaning as well as gist or both of this book.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness list No.3 (paper No.9/17, linked with 9/24), filed with the affidavit at the time of his main examination and asked him to tell as to which of the shlokas in this list pertains to the particulars location of “Ramjanambhoomi” in Ayodhya?

After seeing the above the witness replied that shloka No.1 of paper No.9/20 at page 18 in list No.3, indicates the location of “ Ramjanambhoomi” in Ayodhya.

Question: Is any limits of the location of Shri Ramjanambhoomi, as told by you, is mentioned in above Shloka No.1?

Answer: A very brief mention has been given in this Shloka of Janambhoomi but in Ayodhya Mahatamya of Skandh Purana the limits and location of Shri Ramjanambhoomi in Ayodhya, has been given.

Question: May I take if that the mention of limits and location of "Shri Ramjanambhoomi" is available in some Shloka other than those shlokas of Ayodhya Mahatamya of List No.3, the photocopy of which is stated to have been filed by you.

Answer: In list No.3, briefest detail of the places mentioned in it has been given and these have neither been tied down to any limits nor any distance has been indicated but in "Ayodhya Mahatamya" the distance and limits of all the places including the total limits from all the four sides of Ramhanambhoomi, has been described. Stated suo-moto that there is a description of limits of Ramjanambhoomi in list No.2, submitted by me.

Question: In which of the Shloka of list No.2 filed by you with the affidavit at the time of main examination, indicates the limits & location of Ramjanambhoomi, as told by you?

Answer: The aforesaid list no.2 shloka No.17 of Paper No.9/13 and Shloka No.18, 19 of paper No.9/14, gives detailed description of limits of Shri Ramjanambhoomi.

Above three shlokas are the extracts from "Ayodhya Mahatamya" of skandh puran. The mention of these

shlokas is not available in that book from which I have got a photocopy made of some documents, as contained in list No.3. Himself said that all the mentions made in that book are, only brief mentions. I had read the above three shlokas in "Ayodhya Mahatmya" and that book is compiled by Shri Panini Pandey Ji and published by Das Press, Katra, Ayodhya. This is not available with me, I have got a photocopy done of the main passages from this book. That photocopy I have brought to the court today. I can tell after checking from photocopy brought by me whether the above shloka No.17, 18 & 19 are there or not. I shall be able to tell tomorrow, if or not the above mentioned shlokas are there or not. The witness, after seeing the Shloka No.17 of paper No.9/13 of list No.2 filed with his affidavit at the time of main examination and the word meaning given there stated further that the meanings of words given for them in his opinion were correct.

Question: The word meaning, which you have just told as correct, is that the word meaning given in last three lines of above said paper No.9/13.

Answer: Yes Sir, these word meanings are correct.

Question: According to this word meaning, in the above said shloka No.17, neither is there any description of Shri Ramachandraji nor is there any mention about the birthplace. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: This Shloka is about Vighneshwar i.e. Ganesha. It is not about Ramachandraji.

The witness after seeing the word meaning under Shloka No.18 from 9<sup>th</sup> line from the above to 11<sup>th</sup> line of paper No.9/14 of above said list No.2, said that word meanings was correct. In this shloka, it is said that from the place of



Vignesh or Vighneshwar, the land of Bhagwan Ram is on the Ishan Kona. The central point towards North direction and Eastern direction is called ISHAN KONA. The place of Vighneshwar i.e. Vignesh would be at a distance of around one KM. Or more towards west of the place of Janambhoomi which now has been submerged in Saryuji. I do not know as to when this place submerged in Saryu. It did not submerge in Saryuji, in my memory or after attaining the age of understanding by me. I have heard this saying from the people and people have told me and I am giving my statement on the basis. I shall not be able to tell from whom I heard this saying of people. Himself said that the installation of Vighneshwar i.e. Ganeshji was done by Ikshwakoo at the instance of Brahmaji. Ikshwakoo was the ancestor of Raja Dasharathji and this dynasity had been started from him. This dynasity i.e. dynasity of Suryavansh is continuing since then. Raja Ikshwakoo was crores of years before the time of Raja Dasharatha. The installation of Vighneshwarji had taken place crores of years before Raja Dsharatha's time and was got done by Maharaj Ikshwakoo. When the installation of Vighneshwara was got done at a distance of one KM on the west of disputed site, the disputed building was existing at that time also and the disputed building was got constructed by Ikshwakoo only. Gold and Jwahirat etc. were installed in it and its seat was made of gold and it was donated by Brahmaji and idol of Ram hung on the seat was also donated by Brahmaji. The idol of Bhagwan Ram donated by Brahmaji, was made of gold. That idol remained there till the period of Bhagwan Ram and that idol was installed on the same place on which it is installed today. This idol was not there during the period of Raja Vikramaditya. Himself said that Bhawan Krishan had come to Ayodhya after 614 years of passing of Kaliyuga and that idol was existing till then i.e. that idol

which was donated by Brahamaji. The period of Shri Krishna is about four & a half thousand years old from today. When Shri Krishan came to Ayodhya, he performed Pooja in the disputed building and kanak Bhavan and got the repair of kanak Bhavan done. During the period of Shri Krishanji whether three domes were existing there in the disputed building is not known to me but there is a mention of a dome of a very long size and that of the seat made of gold donated by Brahmaji as well as that of the idol made of gold at that time. During the period of Krishnaji the description that in Ayodhya the buildings of all the three mothers, Kanak Bhavan, Raj Gaddi, Mahal of Maharaj Dasharathji, Mahal of Hanumanji and also that of all the Vanar Senapaties, is available. At that time a temple known as Hanumangarhi was also existing. It is said that during the period of Krishanji, Koushalya Bhavan, Kekai Bhavan and Sumitra Bhavan were situated on those places on which these are situated today in Ayodhya. These are in Mohalla Ramkot. When Krishanji came to Ayodhya, kanak Bhavan and Hanumangarhi were situated at those places on which these are situated these days. Dasharath Mahal was also situated on the same place on which it is situated today.

Statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri  
23.2.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on my giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear before Hon'ble full Bench tomorrow on 24.2.2004 for further cross-examination. Witness may appear.

Sd/- Narendra Prasad  
Commissioner  
10.02.2004

**Date: 24.2.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before the full Bench of Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench – In continuation of D.W. 3/7 the cross-examination of Defendants No.9, on oath on behalf of Sunni Central Board of Waqf, U.P. by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate continued).

In shloka No.19, in the paper No.9/14, the enclosure of my affidavit, there is a reference of birth place of Ram for which the use of “Janamsthanam Tatah Smritam” is made. The meaning of both these words is called “Janamsthan”. In three words, the description of limits of the birth place is also given in this very shloka. Its meaning is that the location of birth place has been stated on the east of Vighneshwar Temple and on the north of Vashishtha Rishi and towards western side of the ashram of Lomash Rishi. No description is given about the Janamsthan in the list No.3, which are the extracts from Ayodhya Mahatmya of Skandh Purana, filed with my affidavit as like shloka No.19 because it is described briefly in Ayodhya Mahatmya. Above Shloka No.19 is also the extract from Ayodhya Mahatmya but that is different from List No.3. In list No.3, all shlokas are taken from the original from Ayodhya Mahatmya. I have not read the Skandh Purana written by any other writer except Panini Pandey. In fact Panini Pandey neither has written Skandh Purana nor has he compiled Ayodhya Mahatmya rather he has compiled “Ayodhya Mahatmya” in a book called “Rudryamal”. I had inadvertently mentioned yesterday that I had read the above three shlokas in Ayodhya Mahatmya and are not compiled by Panini Pandey rather the correct position is that I have read

those shlokas in Skandh Purana compiled in Rudryamal Granth. I do not possess in original form the book "Rudryamaliya" compiled by Shri Panini Panday. I have kept some of its portions as a photocopy. Three shlokas No.17, 18 & 18-9 of list NO.2 are the extracts from Skandh Purana, these are not from Rudryamal. I had read these three shlikas 40 years back and did not read them in the meantime. I read Skandh Purana 40 years ago and I remember it since then. But a copy of it, has been got done by me from a pamphlet distributed by a Math and I have filed that ony Except these shlokas, I do not remember any other shloka of Skandh Purana from Ayodhya Mahatamya. These three shlokas were also not retained in my memory before reading the above mentioned pamphlet but after reading the pamphlet these got registered in my memory again. Except in list No.2 filed by me, there is no other paper in which the limits described in these two shlokas have been given. In the paper annexed as list No.1 to 8, except list No.2, there is no mention about the disputed birth place alongwith its boundary limits.

In today's Ayodhya Vashishtha Kund and Vashishtha Ashram are located at one place and that place is know as Vashishtha Kund Mohalla. This Vashishtha Kund place is situated at a distance of one furlong from the south-west point of the disputed temple and disputed building which now has fallen down. The Lomash Ashram in today's Ayodhya is situated within one furlong from the disputed building which now has fallen down and it is known by the name of Ram Gulela temple these days and also Lomash Ashram. Lomash Chabootra is also situated near the Lomash Ashram. Lomash Chabootra is located outside the Ram Gulela temple. That Lomash Chabootra is located within 50' feet from the southern wall of Ram Gulela

Temple. Ram Gulela temple is existing even today but I have not seen the Lomash Chabootra there after land was taken over. Therefore, I cannot tell the situation of the Chabootra as on today. Ram Gulela temple is situated in the East of Manas Bhavan. This temple was famous by the name of Lomash Ashram earlier and is also famous by this name even today.

I do not now as to how many other cases have been filed in addition to this case with regard to the disputed building. I mean to say I have no knowledge as to how many other cases are pending in this court regarding the disputed complex. I shall also not be able to tell as to who filed the case in which I am appearing as a witness. I have appeared in the court on receipt of summons by the court. I have heard the name of Param Hans Ramachandraji and I had acquaintance also with him. He had discussed with me the case filed over here but I do not have complete knowledge about the same. I have not come here to stand as witness at the instance of Bhaskar Das in the case filed by Nirmohi Akhara. It is correct that I accompany him from Ayodhya to this place for giving my evidence. The word "CHAURA" is also used for "CHABOOTRA", in addition to this word "Chaura" has other meaning also.

Lomash Chabootra is also called as Lomash Chaura by the People. Sitakoop is also situated between disputed building and Lomesh Chabootra. I do not possess any knowledge that one of the places between disputed building and Ram Gulela Temple is know as Shankar Chabootra or not. A temple by the name Sakshi Gopal is situated between Ram Gulela Temple and disputed building, certain remains of which are present even today.

The witness said after seeing the drawings filed as paper no.3/9 A-1 in original case No.3/89 that place known as "Lomash Chaura" is visible. It is correct that this chaura is shown in the south of Ramchabootra. The situation of Lomash Chaura in the above mentioned drawings is shown as correct. The situation of Sumitra Bhavan in these drawings is also shown as correct. In these drawings, Smadhi of Markandey and Smadhi of Angira Rishi have been shown in the north of Lomash Chaura. In these drawings the situation of Narad Chabootra in the north of Sita Rasoi has been shown, which is also correct. In these drawings there is a Ramjanam Mandir in the north of metal road, which has not been shown in the drawings. Himself said that temple was constructed after demolition of Janamsthan Mandir by Babar and that temple is also known by the name of Goodartar Mandir. The building which was demolished by Babar, was situated at the site of the disputed building only. I cannot say with certainty as after how many years after the demolition of that building, the Goodartor temple was constructed but I have heard that it was built within 10-20 years period only. Again said that its construction started after 10-20 years but it came into being in 50 years time.

This temple at birth place was constructed by a person called Goodar Baba. "TAR" means a saint of an organization. The birth place which was got constructed by Goodartar Baba was considered the birth place of Ramachandraji. In Goodartar temple birth place, I did not see the place known as Sita Rasoi. In my life span I might have visited Goodartar birth place temple about 100-200 times. After demolition of the disputed building in December, 1992, it is prohibited to go to inside the taken over Goodartar janamsthan Mandir, therefore, I am unable

to tell whether or not worship etc. is performed there these days i.e. after December, 1992, the worship etc. is performed in Janamsthan Mandir or not. In Janamsthan Mandir, idols of Ram, Lakshaman, Janki, Hanumanji as well as of Jaggannath Bhagwan were installed, as was the position as on 1992. I do not remember if any other idol was there in this temple or not. I shall not be able to tell whether upto December, 1992, the idols of Raja Dasharatha and his three queens were present there in the Janamsthan Goodartar temple or not. I never had darshanas of Raja Dasharatha and his three queens in the above Mandir. Similarly I did not have the Darshan of idols of Bharat & Shatrughan there ever nor it ever came to my mind then. As I have told above, all the idols of Bhagwan Ram, Sita, Lakshaman, Hanumanji and Jaggannathji were in one and the same Garbha Grih. This Garbha Brih was situated at a distance of around 25-30 feet inside the complex from the main eastern gate of Janamsthan Mandir. All these five idols were kept on one seat (Singhasan). Garbha Grih was an open complex spread from the Eastern Gate of Janamsthan Complex to main eastern gate. This open space was separate from the Jagmohan. Exactly in front of Garbha Grih, there was Jagmohan and exactly before Jagmohan, it was Angan (Lawn) and in the east of Angan, there was an entrance gate. The width of Jagmohan would have been around 7-8 feet. The roof was laid on the Jagmoha. The roofs of Jagmohan & Garbha Grih were separate from each other or were adjacent to each other, is not coming to my mind at present. Jagmohan was in the east portion of Garbha Grih, its length would have been around 30-35 feet. I did not see any SHIKHAR on the roof of the Garbh Grih. I do not possess any knowledge whether people would go for Darshan to any other place than the Garbha Grih of

**9567:**

Janamsthan Goodartar Mandir but I did not go for Darshan to any other place in that complex.

Attested after going through.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

24.2.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear for further cross-examination in the case on 25.2.2004.

*www.vadaprativada.in*

*www.vadaprativada.in*



**Date: 25.2.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before the full Bench of Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench. In continuation of dated 24.2.2004 the cross-examination of D.W. 3/7 Mahant Ramji Das on oath – by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendants No.9 - Sunni Central Board of Waqf, U.P.)

The disputed building which was demolished on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992, continued to exist since the time of Maharaj Dashrath, the installation of which was done by Maharaj Ikashwakoo and was donated by Brahmaji. The building which was demolished by Babur and on the place of which the disputed building was constructed, was got repaired by Bhagwan Shri Krishanji and later on by Rishabh Dev. Later on Vikramaditya made it in Yudhishtira Samwat 2431 and then the building was got repaired in Vikrami Samwat 444 by Samudra Gupta. I have prepared a note on the basis of mentions of Vikram Samwat and Yudhishtira Samwat, as found in the inscriptions and that note is just before me at present and I have given my reply after seeing the same. This inscription is installed in Kanak Bhavan mandir situated in Ayodhya. This inscription is available in Hindi, Sanskrit and English languages and I have read it also. I have noted it on this paper only after reading the same. This inscription is installed in the lawn of Kanak Bhavan and on the right side wall of Garbha Grih. Kanak Bhavan was constructed by Raja Dashrathji for Mata Kakei and its repair was done by Raja Tikamgarh in Vikram Samwat around the year 1965.

Vikram Samwat starts after Yudhishtira Samwat 2431. Vikram Samwat was started by King Vikramaditya. That

Vikramaditya, whom I am mentioning here, was the King of Ujain and was the Emperor of whole of India and was the son of Gandharv Sen. Yudhishtra Samwat starts from the coronation of Yudhishtira in Hastinapur. The disputed building which was demolished on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992, was constructed by Babur in the shape of Sita-Pak and not in the shape of a Mosque. As far as my knowledge goes, it is based on public saying and history. In the disputed building the Muslims were allowed to perform JUMA Namaz and on other times Hindus were allowed to perform Pooja during the regime of Akbar. The fact whether Namaz was performed or not by the Muslims or worship of Rama was performed or not by the Hindus inside the disputed building during regimes of Babur to Akbar, is not revealed in literature or history. As far as my knowledge goes and as I have been told, no Namaz was ever performed in the disputed building after the riots of 1934 rather the worship was regularly performed there, thereafter. As per my information, which is based on public saying, from the regime of Akbar to the year 1934, the Namaz of JUMA was performed. I had started to go to Ayodhya since 1934. First time I went to Ayodhya after the riots of 1934. When I went to Ayodhya first time in 1934, I saw the building in dispute, in the same position as it was in the year 1992. None of its portion was in a dilapidated condition. I had heard that during the riots of 1934, the dome and some other portion of the dispute building had been damaged. Again said – the dome in the middle had been demolished which was repaired later on. I did not hear as who were the people involved in demolishing the dome in that riot but only heard that Hindus demolished that I shall not be able to tell whether the people had demolished the middle dome by taking the building as a temple or taking it as a mosque but it was heard that Hindus had done so in protest against cow slaughtering.

The books pertaining to the literature and history of Ramjanambhoomi, have definitely been read by me. In this regard I had read the books written by Kanhaiya Lal Manik Lal Munshi (Ex-Governor, U.P.), Damodar Vinayak Sawarkar and Purushotam Narain Oak. I have no knowledge about the book written by Lala Sita Ram from Awadh on this subject. I have read the book namely "Ramjanambhoomi ka Raqt Ranjit Itihas" by Shri Ram Gopal Pandey Sharad. I read English and I can also read books written in English. I have not read the book "Ayodhya ka Itihas" by Dr. S.P. Gupta and Thakur Prasad Verma, and I am hearing about this book first time to day, I also do not know both these men.

The learned counsel arguing the case drew the attention of the witness towards (other main case no.3/89) the papers No.44 C-1/1 to 44 C-1/8 filed in the case, the witness seeing them said that this was the extract from the book namely "Ramjanambhoomi Ka Raqt Ranjit Itihas". The attention of the witness was drawn towards paper No.44 C-1/4 (O.O.S. No.3/89) filed in the case on the subject, particularly towards first six lines of first six lines of first paragraph of above paper and the learned counsel asked whether or not he agreed with the view point expressed in it? The witness replied after reading them that neither he agrees nor he disagrees with the views expressed in these lines but he did have heard it from public saying. After reading first 11 lines of paper No. 44 C-1/6 that he had heard so and he also believe upon all what was written in them.

The witness stated after reading first para of page 95 of paper No. 44 C-1/7 that he agreed with all what is written there. Again said that the statement given in it that

on 22.12.1949, the Bhagwan Shri Ramji again appeared on the birth place i.e. in my opinion Bhagwan Ram was already existing there and his worship already used to take place. Bhagwan Shri Ram had appeared in the disputed building crores of years ago. At present, the period of appearing of Bhagwan Ram is 9 Lakhs years before and not that he appeared in the year 1949. According to me Bhagwan Shri Ram last time appeared about 9 lakhs years before. I am saying so on the basis of mentions made in "Adhyatam Ramayan".

It is correct that I have enclosed a photocopy of some of the portions of "Adhyatm Ramayan" with my affidavit, which is as list No.6, from paper No.9/34 to 9/50. Appearance of Shri Ramachandraji 9 lakhs years before is not mentioned in BAL KAND of Adhyatm Ramayan, of which extract I have field but it is found in Sundarkand. With my affidavit only a few portion of "BAL KAND" of "Adhyatm Ramayan" has been enclosed. I have enclosed above portion of Bal Kand from "Adhyatm Ramayan" and filed with my affidavit with the intention of giving information relating to the appearance of Bhagwan, BAL LILA and marriage etc. When was he born, how many years before he was born, such detail is in Sunder kand and not in bal Kand. It is correct that detail about the birth of Shri Ramachandra is found in BAL KAND but it is not the complete detail. It is stated in the Bal Kand of "Adhyatm Ramayan" that the birth of Shri Ram took place in TRETA YUGA but there is no such detail as in which TRETA YUG, and its detail is given in Sunder Kand where it is said that he was born in 28<sup>th</sup> TRETA YUG. Bhagwan Ram did not take birth in every Treta Yug. He took birth only in a few Treta Yugs. According to "Shri Ramcharit Manas" by Tulsi Dasji, Shri Ramchandrajji took birth 27 times and this birth was taken separately in 27 Treta Yugs. These 27 Treta Yugs are in separate KALPS. At

present SHWET-VARAH KALP is running. Which KALP is running at present i.e. which is the number of that KALP, I can tell that only after doing counting. In one CHATUR YUG there are forty-three lakhs twenty thousand years.

The meaning of 13<sup>th</sup> Shloka of SARGA 3 of Balkand from "Adhyatm Ramayan", which is quoted in paper No.9/39, annexed with the affidavit, is correct, as given there. The place where Shri Ram was born has been called as Raj Mandir. It is correct that the where about of Raj Bhavan where Shri Ram had born, where was it located, what were its boundary limits or what was its area, that detail was not mentioned or described in the portions of Balkand from "Adhyatm Ramayana" filed by me. The description of the area of the Rajbhavan is available in Rudryamal Granth. I possess a photocopy of Rudryamal Granth. I can file a photocopy of Rudryamal Granth. At the time when I filed my affidavit in this Court, the photocopy of Rudraymal Granth was not available with me.

In the list No.7 which is paper No.9/51, enclosed with my affidavit, there is extract from HRISHIKESH PANCHANG, which has been published by a Jyotish Institute of Varanasi and this Panchang is published every year by the above Institute. List No.7 is the extract of Panchang of current Samwat. Eh purpose of filing this list by me was that it confirmed by that statement in which I had said that Brahmaji's one single day comprised of one thousand CHATURYUG and one single night comprised of the thousand Chaturyugs. That means in twenty-four hours there are two thousand CHATURYUGS. The witness said that it is no where written in list No.7 that one day and one night i.e. 24 hours of Brahma comprise of two thousand Chaturyugs. It is given in list No.7 that

a Chaturyug comprises of many years and I consider it as correct. In list No.7, in 10<sup>th</sup> line the beginning of Kalp has been discussed. The Kalp has started from beginning of Kaliyug. It is stated that it started 1 Arab, 95 crores 58 lakhs 85 thousand 105 years from the beginning of Kaliyug. It is correct. TAHRIR under the heading "Raja Ravi Falam" of list No.7 has no relation with Shri Ramachandraji.

List No.8 which is paper No.9/52 filed with my affidavit, is the extract of "Ganesh Appa Panchang" which is published from Varanasi. My intention of filing List No.8 was to tell that Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh were the part (Ansh) of Ram Bhagwan and such a belief is continuing since time immemorial and in that paper the calculation of age of the above mentioned three Gods, has been mentioned. Entire List 8 has been written in Sanskrit language.

(On the request of Shri Jilani it was directed that the Hindi version of List No.8, which is in Sanskrit, be filed by tomorrow).

List No.1 enclosed with my affidavit (paper No.9/1, linked with 9/12), is an extract from PRATISARGA PARV of "BHAVISHYOTRA PURAN". I have read the entire "BHAVISHYOTRA PURAN". I read this Puran two months back. The original Bhavishotra Puran" is written in Sanskrit language, the composer of which is said to be Ved Vyasji. I do not remember at present as to who was the publisher and printer of the original Bhavishyotra Puran written in Sanskrit language and read by me 40 years back and that book is not available now. The extracts of Bhavishyatra Puran filed as List No.1, is entirely in Hindi and I have brought that with me and that

has been published by Geeta Press, Gorakhpur. In list No.1, only one Shloka is given in Sanskrit language and it is for doing Namaskar. This shloka is the extract from original "Bhavisyotra Puran". In addition to this shloka there is an extract of translation from "Bhavishyotra Puran" as well as its gist. The "Bhavishyotra Puran" extract of which I have filed as List No.1, and which I have brought today alongwith me, which has been referred above, in that many shlokas except one shloka, have been given, all those shlokas are from original "Bhavishyotra Puran". In List No.1, the ruling Dynasty of Suryavansha & Chandravansh have been given from beginning to end and it also contains the description of would be Kings of future. Ved Vyasji came before Krishna and he was his contemporary also. Ved Vyasji remained even after Krishna but I cannot say with certainty as upto which time he existed. Shri Krishna was born in the end of Dwapar Era and the beginning of Kaliyug. Kaliyug started 5105 years before now. Shri Krishna was born some time in the year 5105 only. The life span of Krishna is considered to be 125 years and at some places it is given 135 years also. Nar-Nariman was the son of Dharma and incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. Shri Krishna was the incarnation of Nar-Narain. My belief is that Shri Krishna was the incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu. According to my belief Arjun was the incarnation of NAR and Krishna was the incarnation of his brother Narain. The meaning given below of shloka in List No.1, is the extract from original Puran composed by Ved Vyasji. In this translation, by Namaskar to Ved Vyas means, salute (Namaskar) to 24 Ved Vyas working before this Ved Vyas who was the composer of Bhavishyotra Puran. Mahamuni Acharya Shounakji was disciple of Ved Vyasji and similarly Sootji also was the disciple of Ved Vyasji. Raja Ikshwakoo, whose reference, has been given at page I of

list-I was ancestor of Bhagwan Ram. Raja Ikshwakoo was the staunch follower of Bhagwan Vishnu. This Raja Ikshwakoo appeared crores of years ago. Raja Ikshwakoo appeared in that first Satyug, in the last Chaturyug of Tretayug, present Shri Ram was born. This Satyug was the Satyug of first Chaturyug of present Kalp in which period Maharaj Ikshwakoo had been there. King Harishchandra whose mention has been made in third line of second column of paper No.235(9/2)-list No.1, was the Emperor Harishchandra of Ayodhya only who was there in the Satyug of Chaturyug before the present chaturyug. Similarly, that Raja Dasharath whose mention is made in second line of first column of paper No:236- 9/3 at 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this list, is not Raja Dasharath who was the father of Bhagwan Ram but that mention is of Dasharath who happened during the Satyug which was before this Chaturyug. The mention of Maharaj Dasharath (2<sup>nd</sup>) made in fourth line from below, in column one on this page, was the Maharaja Dasharath whose son was Bhagwan Ram. Here the mention of fourth phase of Tretayug of present Chaturyug, has been made. The mention of Shri Ramachandraji and other names and periods of his Dynasty, made in first and second column of this page is correct and such a mention is also made in "Bhavishyotra Puran" and this is its translation but the names of certain Kings of this Dynasty have been left in Valmiki Ramayana i.e. some names are less in Valmiki Ramayana, however, mention of all the names has been made in Shrimad Bhagwat. That what is written in 10<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup> line of first column of (9/4) page 237 of list No.1 that "they all Maharaja used to be involved in....." means only Sanjay the son of Rananjay i.e. it is not meant for the names before Rananjay and what is written in 13<sup>th</sup> line of first column of this page that "who were in the line of Budha..... they were not" was said in the context



of Mahatma Gautam Budha. Mahatma Gautam Budha was also in the lineage of Shri Ramachandraji. The mention made in 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of column first of this very page No.237 about the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of Tretayug, that mention is about that Tretayug which happened during first Chaturyug. That mention is about hundreds of years before.

In 7<sup>th</sup> line of this paragraph the mention of marriage of Budha has been made, this mention is not about Mahatma Gautam Budha but it is about Budh the son of Chanderma. In 3<sup>rd</sup> line of this paragraph, mention of Prayag has been made, it is the same Prayag which is known today by the name of Allahabad. The mention of Chandra Gupta made in 11<sup>th</sup> line of first column of (paper No.9/11) page 244 of list No.1, is the Emperor Chandra Gupta of Maurya Dynasty, who was the disciple of Chanakya and he did not have any concern with Raja Vikramaditya after whose name Vikrami Samwat is continuing. I cannot tell whether this Chandra Gupta happened before Raja Vikramaditya, however, I can tell so after making calculation. The mention of Ashoka made in 2<sup>nd</sup> line of 2<sup>nd</sup> column of (9/11) of this page, refers to the same Ashoka who is known as Emperor Ashoka the Great. In 9<sup>th</sup> & 10<sup>th</sup> line of this page that what is written "these people..... has been destroyed". In it "these people" refers to above mentioned Parmar, Chauhan, Gaharwar & Parihar dynasties. The Gaharwar dynasty belonged to Raja Jaichand of Kanauj. Ayodhya never remained under the jurisdiction of his Kingdom. One of the Kings of Gaharwar dynasty had come to Ayodhya and he undertook some repair work of Ramjanambhoomi Mandir but I do not remember the name of that king at this point of time. I cannot tell if any temple constructed by these Gaharwal Kings exist in Ayodhya or not. On this page

**9577:**

(9/11) chapter "Maharaj Vikramaditya ke charitra ka upkram Adhyaya" is about Raja Vikramaditya under whose name the Vikrami Samvat is continuing. In last two lines and in 2<sup>nd</sup> column of paper No.9/11 which is filed as list No.1 with my affidavit, it mentioned that "**Kalyug ke 3710 Varsh ..... Adhye samay tak rajya kiya**". I cannot say of which Kingdom these kings were but they were Indian king only. Himself said- The period which we are referring to, the boundaries of India at that time were spread upto today's Iraq, Iran, Turkey, Egypt, Yamen, Rome, Yunan, Palestine and upto many other nations, Afhganistan, Tuzbekistan, Turaumenstan, Ujbekistan, Kirgistan, Combodia in east upto Japan i.e. wherever the sun rises, India's boundary was there.

Statement attested after reading.

Sd/-

25.2.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear for the further cross-examination in the case on 26.2.2004.

Sd/-

25.2.2004

//true copy//

Dated: 26.2.2004

D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das

(Before Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench dated 25.2.2004- In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W.3/7 Mahant Ramji Das by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

I shall not be able to tell today that Mohamad mentioned in the last two lines of first column and first two lines of second column of page 1 (paper No.9/11) of list No.1 of my affidavit, is the same Mohd. who was the Paigamber Mohd. or some one else. Again said –I shall try to reply this today or tomorrow.

About Rishabh Dev stated in the statement made yesterday, was not that Rishabh Dev who was Thirthankar of Jains. I do not remember at which period of time that Raja Rishabh Dev about whom I had given statement yesterday at page 74 ruled. Himself said-the inscription installed at Kanak Bhavan in Ayodhya, contained his description. That king Rishabh Dev whose mention is made in paper No.261 Company-1/2 in 10<sup>th</sup> Shloka of 111 Sarga of Uttarakand in Valmiki Ramayan (page 830-831) is a different person from the Rishabh Dev stated in the statement. The witness after reading the same shloka of the said Ramayana said that he believes what was written there. All the people of Ayodhya went with Bhagwan Ram when he went to the heavenly abode and entire Ayodhya became desert for some time. I cannot say with certainty as after how many days Ayodhya became rehabilitated after becoming deserted. Again said – I shall be able to tell after studying Rudryamal

Granth as after how much time Ayodhya was rehabilitated. The witness saw the Rudryamal Granth and after seeing the same said that no definite description of time had been given i.e. after how many days Ayodhya was rehabilitated in Rudryamal also. Ayodhya was rehabilitated by Kush the elder son of Shri Ramachandraji, who became the King of Kushawati. Again said that he was the king of entire Ayodhya Empire. Bhagwan Ram had given his both the sons separate kingdoms during his own life time. Lav was given Lavepuri which is called Lahore and Kush was given the reign of Kaushal region, the capital of which was Kushawati. It is called Kushinagar by the historians at present. The learned counsel arguing the case drew the attention of the witness on this point towards shlokas No.5 & 6 of Sarga 108 of "Valmikiye Ramayana". The witness said after reading the same that for Love, a beautiful city was habitated namely Shravasti and the Reign of the same was given to him. I agree with what is written in it. Again said that but there was no mention about coronation in that. At this point of time I cannot say with certainly whether coronation of Lav was held for Shravasti or not. On this point, the attention of the witness was invited towards shloka No.18<sup>th</sup> of Sarga-107 of "Uttarakand" of Valmiki Ramayana, after going through the same the witness replied that it is written in it that coronation of brave Kush on south Kaushal and of Lav on North Kaushal Empire was undertaken the same day. It is correct that Bhagwan Ram had coronated during his life time brave Lav & Kush on North & South of Kaushal. Himself said that city shravasti was rehabilitated by Maharaj Shrawasta, who happened to be much before Ramachandraji. There is no place known as shravasti between Bahraich & Gonda. Again said that there is a place known as Shravasti in the right direction of

Balramur. I read newspaper only off and on. I have heard that recently a district by the name of Shrawasti has been created by dividing District Gonda & District Bahraich. The present Shrawasti is on the north of Ayodhya. Similarly Kushinagar also is situated in the north of Ayodhya. Kushinagar and Shrawasti both are in the north of Ayodhya. I shall not be able to tell as to where that Shrawasti is located, the Reign of which was given by Bhagwan Ram to Lav and with what name that place is known today and I shall also not be able to tell as to which direction from Ayodhya, Shrawasti is located. Bhagwan Ram gave Kush the Rajya of Kushawati, that Kushawati is known by the name of Kushinagar now a days. This distance of Kushinagar from Vindhyaachal Parvat is about 400-500 Kms. On this point the learned counsel, arguing the case drew the attention of the witness towards 4<sup>th</sup> shloka of Sarga 108 of Uttarkand of "Valmiki Ramayan". After going through the same the witness said that it is written here that Bhagwan Ram had got a beautiful city built by the name of Kushawati on the side of Vidhyachal Parvat for Kush. What is written in it is correct and its meaning is also correct but the geographical location shown in it is not correct.

Question: Is it not possible that Kushawati which is described in above shloka, might not be existing today anywhere?

Answer: I have no knowledge about this, therefore, I am unable to reply this question.

There was a place known as Madhura or Madhupuri. That place today is Mathura. In second shloka of Sarga 108 of Uttarkand of "Valmiki Ramayan", the mention of Madhura has been made which these days is known as

Mathura. This Madhura (Mathura) was not got habituated by Shatrughnji but it was already habituated.

Ayodhya habituated by Kush remained upto the period of Mahabharat and became deserted thereafter. I mean to say it remained the same Ayodhya till 2431 Yudhishtir Samwat which was rehabilitated by Kush. Again said that Ayodhya rehabilitated by Kush, remained upto Yudhistir Samwat 614. Who was ruling Ayodhya during Yudhishtir Samwat 614 can be told only after consulting the book. Probably it was Vrihadwal, his father or his son. I can tell with certainly later on after consulting "Shrimadbhagwat" that who was ruling Ayodhya during Yudhishtir Samwat 614. From Yudhishtir Samwat 631 to the middle of Yudhishtir Samwat 2431, there was rule of Vrihadwal and kings of his lineage in Ayodha and they were of Shri Ramachandra's lineage. I shall not be able to tell anything with regard to the area of Ayodhya after Shri Ramachandraji, whether it remained the same upto Yudhishtir Samwat 2431 or got reduced or increased. In fifth Sarga (paper No.261 Company-1/1 – page 41 to 43) of Balkand of "Valmiki Ramayan", the description of Ayodhya of that time is available. It is stated in 7<sup>th</sup> shloka of this Sarga that Ayodhya was 12 Yojan in length and three Yojan in width. That is around 96 miles or 48 kose in length and 24 miles or 12 kose in width. After Rama's going to heavenly abode Ayodhya became deserted and thereafter when his son Maharaj Kush rehabilitated it, whether he rehabilitated it on its earlier area or on less area or on more area, this information I am unable to give. I shall also not be able to tell whether the palaces, Bazars etc. those which were existing during Shri Ramchandra's period in Ayodhya, were all there or not during Maharaja Kush's period. Again said, these were not there during Maharaja Kush's period

because after Bhagwan Ram's leaving the place, only walls were left.

Maharaja Vikramaditya summoned the then scholars and got identified the places of Ayodhya as mentioned in Skandh Puran & Rudrayamal and made them rehabilitated i.e. Maharaja Vikramaditya got done complete research undertaken and then only got Ayodhya rehabilitated. I am saying this on the basis of public saying as well as on the basis of facts written on inscriptions installed in Kanak Bhavan situated in Ayodhya. Mention of the fact that Maharaja Vikramaditya had got Ayodhya rehabilitated after undertaking research is made in one Granth also but I am not able to tell the name of that Granth at this point of time. The name of Granth is not being recalled now by me. It is wrong to say that no mention has been made in any Granth of such an investigation. It is correct that according to a public saying Prayag Raj had told Vikramaditya that Ayodhya can be identified through the medium of "Kamdhenu".

In "Shrimadbhagwat" there is a description of incarnation Shri Ram and his various activities but there is no mention about his definite place of birth. In "Valmiki Ramayan" there is a description of birth and birth place of Shri Ram. A photocopy of some of the portions of "Valmiki Ramayan" I have enclosed with my affidavit as list No.4 (paper No.9/25 to 9/30). The above extracts are not the part of any Kand of "Valmiki Ramayana" rather these are the part of Mahatamya of "Valmiki Ramayan". "Valmiki Ramayan" – paper No.261 Company-1/1, "Valmikikey Ramayan Mahatamya" which is from page No.7 to page No.25, and is the photocopy of some portions is list No.4 only. The meaning of all the shlokas is given in the relevant portion of paper No.261 Company-

1/1 of above said book. It is correct that there is no mention of birth place of Shri Ramachandraji in "Valmikiya Ramayan Mahatamya" enclosed as list No.4 with my affidavit filed in the Court.

At present one of the two parts of "Valmikiya Ramayana" which is before me at present is a complete "Valmikiya Ramayana" (the witness said after seeing paper No.261 C-1/1 & paper No.261 C-1/2), i.e. any part of this Ramayana except these two parts does not exist any where. I cannot say confirmly at this point of time in which of the Kand Sarga or shloka of 'Valmikiya Ramayan' contains the description of birth place but I shall tell after consulting the whole Ramayan. Perhaps it is in 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Sarga of Balkand.

Attested after reading the statement.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

26.2.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 27.2.2004 for further cross examination.

26.2.2004

//true copy//



Dated: 27.2.2004

D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das

(Before full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench dated 26.2.2004- In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W.3/7 Mahant Ramji Das by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.6-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

In Shloka No.31, Sarga 15 of Balkand in "Valmiki Ramayan" description of birth place of Ramachandraji is given but it cannot be said definitely and according to CHOUDHI that the disputed place is the birth place, the description of which is given in Shloka No.31. Again said that boundary of course has not been described but that place is only the disputed place. With regard to the above Shloka I have to say that from the word Janambhoomi itself it is my belief that Bhagwan Ramchandra had appeared on the disputed site. Except Janambhoomi, there is no other word in the above shloka, which denotes the meaning of Janambhoomi. Word "Janambhoomi" is a Sanskrit word, which has been adopted in Hindi language also. Janambhoomi and Janamsthan are almost the parallel words. Janamsthan word is also a Sanskrit language word and it has been adopted in Hindi language also. Except Shloka No.31 of Sarga 15 of Balkand in "Valmiki Ramayan", the use of words Janambhoomi or Janamsthan has not been made anywhere else.

In "Shrimadbhagwat" no mention of appearance or taking birth by Bhagwan Ram at a particular place, has been made but there is a description of his appearance in Dashrath Mahal in Ayodhya. With reference to paper No.9/11 filed as list No.1, I had stated yesterday during

any evidence about one Mahamad (Mohd.). This Mohd. was the Mahamad of Islam Religion but his father was the worshiper of Vishnu Bhagwan and hence he was a Vaishnav. It is wrong to say that Paigamber Mohd. of Islam religion had no relation with Vaishnav religion. Above Paigamber Mohd. Sahab had not born in India but in Saudi Arab. Saudi Arab and Mecca Madina etc. of today were all Hindu nations earlier and at that time Saudi Arab was known by the name "Valheek". Himself said that Mohd. Sahab whose reference has been made in paper No.9/11 of above list, was the ancestor of Hindu King Vikramadiya. I do not agree with the suggestion that the Paigamber Mohd. Sahib of Islam had born sometime between 1500 years from today. It is wrong to say that the name of father of Paigamber Mohd. Saheb of Islam religion was Abdulla, rather his name was Pramr. It is wrong to say that the name of none of sons of Paigamber Mohd. Sahab was not Dewapi. The Mahamad (Mohd.) Sahab being referred here was born around 1650 years ago from today. Gandharav Sen whose reference has come in paper No.9/11, was the father of that Raja Vikramaditya in whose name, the Vikrmi Samwat is going on. The intention of filing List No.5 by me with my affidavit is to show that Bhagwan Ram had born to teach the entire race of humanity about his conduct and deeds. All the three papers of list No.5, are the part of "Bhagwat". (The Learned counsel for Nirmohi Akhara Shri R.L. Verma was directed to file Hindi Translation of three pages of list No.5-paper No.9/31 linked with 9/33.

Paper No.107 C-1/1 (O.O.S.-5/89) is the part of Ayodhya Mahatamya of Skandh Puran but there are certain typographical errors. In shloka No.16, of paper No.107 C-1/75 linked with 18, the mention of boundaries of Ramjanambhoomi, has been made. It is written in these

shlokas that it should be visited and it is very auspicious to do so during Navratri. The worship of Vighneshwar on its west, should be performed, from Vighneshwar to Ishan Kon i.e. in north-east at the corner, have the Darshan of Ram Janam Bhoomi. By its darshan one gets MOKSHA, money and richness, it is the boundary (Chouhadi).

The drawings made in book O.O.S.-5/89, paper No.289 C-1/202 has been prepared wrongly. I cannot say if the Vighnesh temple shown in the map above Hanumangarhi, is the same temple or not which has been described in shlok No.17 of paper No.107 C-1/75. I cannot tell whether the existence of Vighneshwar temple described in shlok No.17 of Ayodhya or not. The situation of Vashishtha Kund in south of Ramjanambhoomi is shown as correct in the Map (Manchitra) No.2 paper No.289 C-1/2. In front of it the situation of Lomash and Samitra Bhavan is shown as correct. In this map Ramjanambhoomi and Babari structure has been shown as correct. In map No.3, paper No.289 C-1/203, the Ramlal Virajman and disputed structure, have been shown and at one place on its east foundation laying stone (Shila Nyas) have been shown and Sakshi Gopal Mandir complex has been above it, under the Shilanyas and Lomash Rishi Ashram has been shown. The situation of all these has been shown as correct. Again again-the Ashram of Lomash Rishi is on the east of Janambhoomi, but in the map it is shown in southern side which is wrong. That place was only meant for sitting. The entire complex of disputed site is famous for Sita Pak name. Disputed site complex was made by Babar as Sita Pak by demolishing the Mandir and not Masjid and from then onward it is known by the name of Sita Pak and Ramjanambhoomi. This fact that Babur had

constructed bhavan known as Sita Pak on the disputed site, is not given in any Granth/book or Map. Sita Pak words were written at the disputed site only. But it was not Baburi Sita Pak i.e. not with reference to the name of Babur, or in the name of Babur. Himself said-on the disputed building a SHATKON of TARAK YANTRA of Ramchandra had been constructed. Himself said – Babur had got written Sita Pak on the disputed building because when ever he made efforts to construct the mosque, he failed, as Hanumanji used to demolish the building. Then in consultation with Sadhus & Saints, Babur got Sita Pak written on it and minarets were broken and an order was passed that Muslim would perform Namaz on juma only here and on remaining days Dev Pooja & Rishi Path etc. shall be performed. Sita Pak was written on the front of Garbha Grih, not on any stone and one stone which was installed in the name of Janambhoomi on the eastern gate of disputed building, was installed by Mahant Swami Ram Manohar Prasadacharyaji in around 1902.

Attested after reading the statement.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

27.2.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 1.3.2004 for further cross examination.

27.2.2004

//true copy//

**Dated: 1.3.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional Distt. Judge/Special Executive Officer, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.

(Other Original Case No.26/59) the orders dated 27.2.2004 passed in the matter of Mirmohi Akhara & others versus Babu Priya Dutt ram & others by Hon'ble Full Bench through Designated Commissioner).

In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W.3/7 Mahant Ramji Das by Shri Zaffaryab jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9 – Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued.)

Learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the coloured Album paper No.200 C-1 and pictures on it No.104, 105 and it was asked whether what is seen as written on wall, was Sita Pak also written in the similar manner in disputed Bhavan? Seeing the above the witness said that – writings in these pictures on wall appeared to be different from Sita Pak written on any of the walls of disputed building. Rather it was written with lime and cement, again said – with lime below the middle dome on the upper portion of gate it was written Sita Pak and just near it was written the Mantra of Ram & His yantra was made. Seeing picture No.201 of this Album, the witness said – that appears to be the portion of wall, which had bars. Seeing the picture No.173 of this very Album the witness said – this picture appears to be of the portion inside below the dome because it has a fan hung there. The witness said after seeing picture No.128, 129 that those pictures were of the inside portions below the dome.

These pictures are of some wall inside the disputed building but of which wall these are, I cannot tell. The statue appearing on these pictures is of Gurdit Singh who was the former City magistrate of Faizabad. I have no knowledge as to when this picture of Gurdutt Singh has hung in the disputed building. This picture of Gurdutt Singh might be hung after attachment. I have seen this picture in disputed building but I would not be able to tell whether this picture of Gurdutt Singh was seen by me after opening the lock of the disputed building or before that. The lock of the disputed building was opened in February, 1986. Seeing picture No.103 of the same coloured Album, the witness said that the picture was of the inside portion of the disputed building. In the disputed building, there were three domes and under each dome, there had been one gate (DAR) each. In this picture, out of the three domes, it appears to be the gate (DAR) of the middle dome. After seeing the picture No.99, 100 of this very Album, the witness said that in those picture the gate of the lower (DAR) of the south side dome was being seen. After seeing picture No.91, 92 of this Album, the witness said that these pictures were of upper portion of the lower gate (DAR) of the middle dome. The witness said after seeing picture No.93 of this Album that this picture was of the same portion of which the pictures No.91, 92 were. The lengthy stone being seen in picture No.91, 92, 93 and carving on it, on the upper portion of it Ram Mantra is written and Ram Yantra is made and Sita Pak is made of lime but this is not seen in these pictures. The Ram Mantra was written there in such a language as it could be made out as written in Hindi or made out to be written in Sanskrit. There was written “**Ra Ramayanam:**” and a Shatkona was made which was the SHATKONA YANTRA of Ram Mantra. The Shatkona yantra was made 14-15 feet above the ground level and Ram Mantra was written but

that Shakon Yantra and ram Mantra are not seen in above pictures No.91, 92. It is wrong to say that Ram Mantra, Shatkon yantra or Sita Pak was not made or written there. The witness said after seeing picture No.89 & 90 of this very Album that these pictures were of upper portion of lower DAR of the middle dome. The witness said after seeing the above pictures that in those pictures also the Shalkon Yantra and Ram Mantra as well as Sita Pak constructed or written were being seen, but by looking on these pictures it appears that the above SHATKON YANTRA, RAM MANTRA and Sita Pak had duly been defaced and washed out.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness black & white Album – paper No.201 of picture No.48 & 49 and the witness said after seeing them that both these pictures were also of the upper portion of the lower gate of middle dome. In these pictures also Ram Mantra, Ram Yantra or Sita Pak, duly written, is not being seen though that existed on that place only of which the picture was. The above picture No.49 was that of lengthy stone and something written on it was being seen. This stone I had seen installed on upper portion of lower gate of middle dome of disputed building. On this stone, the language written was not Hindi and Sanskrit, what language it was, I shall not be able to tell. I do not remember if anything on any portion of the disputed building, was written in Hindi or Sanskrit or not written. I cannot recognize any of languages amongst Urdu, Pharsi and Arabic. For going on the terrace, there was staircase constructed in the disputed building. That staircase was on the south of disputed building.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture No.81, 82 & 83 of coloured Album – paper No.200 C-1, seeing them the witness said that he was seeing

those stairs in these pictures about which I had told only now above. Seeing picture No.84 of the same Album, the witness said that picture was of the lower DAR of south side dome. In this picture No.84, one curtain is seen hung. I do not possess any knowledge if or not the curtain seen in this picture was ever opened. Again said – that curtain was seen opened also sometimes. The curtain might be hung after attachment, it was not there before attachment. Seeing picture No.79, 80 of this very Album, the witness said that in these pictures the inside portion of the south of disputed building was seen. In these pictures, portion of outside lawn of the building of three domes was seen. I see two trees in these pictures. Out of them one tree was near the stair case and the second one was little far. The trees seen in these pictures, one was near the stair and the other one near Shankar Chabootra. It is wrong to say that only one tree was seen in these pictures and not two trees. It is wrong to say that only a tree near the stairs is seen in these pictures and not the one near the Shankar Chabootra. The width of the lawn which was spreading upto bar wall outside dispute disputed building with three domes, was 25-30 feet. The lawn from the bar wall outside the disputed complex upto main eastern wall was around 60 feet. Again said it would be more than 60 feet wide. It may be possible that the width of the lawn in between the main eastern gate of the disputed complex, would be less than 60 feet.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture No.75 of paper No.200 C-1. The witness said on seeing it that the wall with railing and trees were seen in that picture. The distance from this wall with railing to main eastern door of the disputed complex would be around 20-25 feet. The tree being seen in this picture No.75 was of Neem or Moulshree. After seeing picture



No.77 of this Album, the witness said that in this picture No.77 also the same tree is seen which was being seen in picture No.75. In this picture that gate of wall with railing in front of the tree was being seen. There was three or four gates in total in the wall with railing. Again said the entrance gate were two only but there were three-four made of iron-bars. There was one gate in the middle of the wall with railing, the second one was in its north and the middle entrance gate of the wall with railing was seen in above mentioned picture No.77. After looking the picture No.78 of this very Album the paper No.200 C-1, the witness said – in this picture some outer portion of the disputed complex is seen and some branches of the tree above, are seen. I had seen Sita Pak written there till the locks of disputed building are opened. I have gone inside disputed building thousands of time. I have gone thousands of time under the dome where Thakurji were installed. That lower portion of the dome I visited first time in 1934-35 alongwith my father. I do not remember how many idols were there when I went there first time. But I remember that the idol of Ram Lalla was there on the SINHASAN at that time. That SINHASAN was made of wood and carving of silver was done on that. I do not remember what were the length, breadth & height of the said Sinhasan. Himself said –my only purpose was to have Darshan of Thakurji. The idol kept on that Sinhasan was around one feet in height. That idol was seating inside the Sinhasan was around one feet in height. That idol was seating inside the Sinhasan. Bhagwan Saligram was definitely there on the Sinhasan but it is not recalled which of other idols were there on the Sinhasan at that time. Again said - there was idol of Hanumanji also in front of Sinhasan. That idol of Ram Lallaji was made of Ashtadhatu (eight metal) which exists today also. Himself said that was under the care of Nirmohi

Akhara. Sinhasan was kept on the fixed place which was the place fixed for Thakurji.

The Learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture No.154/13 filed in other original case No.1/89. The witness seeing the same said that the idol seen of the Ram Lalla in this picture is of his youth period and when I went there first time, I saw there the idol of Ram Lalla (the idol of Ramchandra of his BALYAKAL). I do not recall that idol of Shri Ramachandraji seen in this picture was there or not when I visited that place first time. After seeing the above mentioned picture paper No.154/13, the witness said that it was not clear from the picture as whose idols these were, as seen in the picture. In this picture I am seeing the SINHASAN kept there. I do not recall that the Sinhasan seen in this picture was also kept there when I went there first time or not. I do not recall that the Sinhasan seen in this picture, was seen by me in disputed building or not. I am seeing three stairs in this picture. The throne (Sinhasan) seen in this picture is not kept on the stairs but down on the floor. Something is kept on the 2<sup>nd</sup> stairs as I see in the picture but it is not clear what it is. In this picture the idols of Bhagwan Saligram are seen kept. In this picture paper No.154/13, I see the idol of Hanumanji. This idol of Hanumanji I must have seen on the spot in disputed bhavan but I do not recall at present. In the above mentioned picture – paper No.154/13, two pictures are seen, out of which, in one of the pictures nothing is seen, whereas on the other picture Hanumanji is seen. The above mentioned picture-paper No.154/13, is seen, as hung on the wall, on which OM is written. I might have seen it hung on the spot. This picture is appeared to be hung on the western side wall of the disputed bhavan. I do not recall it now that this picture was there on the spot i.e. in the disputed building because already a period of

70 years has elapsed since then. In this in between period of 70 years. I must have seen the picture and idols seen in paper No.154/13. I had the last Darshan of inside portion of the disputed building on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992. At that time the crowd was very much and due to that reason I could only have the Darshan of Thakurji and therefore, I shall not be able to tell whether the idols and picture seen in above paper No.154/13 were there or not. On 6<sup>th</sup> of December, 1992 I had reached there around 10.00 AM and I stayed there upto around 5.00 p.m. When on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992 I went inside the disputed building the idols were kept on the same place at that time as is seen in the picture-paper No.154/13. I stayed inside the disputed complex for over half an hour. When the people were riding on the dome of disputed Bhavan on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992, I was in the lawn of disputed complex. When on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992, first dome was demolished, I was inside the disputed complex at that time. When the 2<sup>nd</sup> dome was demolished, at that time also I was inside the disputed complex, near the Neem tree. When on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992, the 3<sup>rd</sup> dome of the disputed building came down, I was in the disputed complex at that time. When last dome of the disputed building was demolished, the time was about 4.00-4.30 evening. In addition to me 50-60 thousand people had collected there all around the disputed complex and there were lakhs of people gathered outside disputed complex.

When the disputed building of three domes completely got destructed, I went there after only from there. Perhaps the idols kept there were already removed before the demolition of the disputed building but I did not see them being removed. I have no knowledge where were those idols taken to and who took them

after removal. When the disputed building was being brought down, at that time I was moving from one place to the other because of crowd and did not remain there at one place continuously. When the disputed building was being demolished, I was standing near the Ram Chabootra for some time but exactly at what time that I do not know. The time of breaking of roof of Ram Chabootra and Chabootra itself is not recalled by me with certainty. As far as I remember when I came out from the disputed complex, Ram Chabootra had already been broken.

I had gone to disputed complex on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992 at 10.00 a.m. At that time, the speeches had started to be delivered at Katha Kunj. Noise was so much that it was not understood as to who was delivering speech and when noise used to stop then only it would be known who was delivering speech. I left the disputed complex around 5.00 p.m. During this period between 10.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. I also wanted to hear Lalkrishnan Advani's speech. But I do not recall whether I heard the speech of Murli Manohar Joshi or not although he was very much present there. The Choochla, Chakla, Belan, Charan Paduka etc. kept on the Chhathi Poojan in the disputed complex were taken away by somebody or might have been broken, I do not recall anything about it. After demolition of disputed building, I had gone there the next day on 7<sup>th</sup> December, 1992, the curfew by then had not been clamped. When I went there on 7<sup>th</sup> December, 1992 there must be five-seven thousand people all around at that time. A boundary wall was being constructed there then. It had been constructed upto four feet and Thakurji had been installed there. I do not know as to who brought Thakurji over there. Again said Puraji might have brought him there because this

work was his responsibility. But at what time did he come with Thakurji is not known to me. At that time Lal Desai or Satyendra Dasji perhaps, was the Pujari. I do not recall which of the Pujaries brought him there because one is a main Pujari and rest are his associate Pujaries. On 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> December curfew was clamped down there. I do not remember whether it was clamped down on 7<sup>th</sup> December or 8<sup>th</sup> December, 1992 but I only remember was that on 7<sup>th</sup> December, 1992 curfew had not been clamped down. It is wrong to say that curfew had been clamped down in Ayodhya on 6<sup>th</sup> of December, 1992. The boundary wall which exist today on the disputed site, became ready by 7<sup>th</sup> December, 1992 by the evening. I did not go at the disputed site after 7<sup>th</sup> December, 1992 till such time curfew was there and after how many days thereafter, I went, is not remembered. I do not know whether the cloth put on the boundary wall on the disputed site was put in my presence or after my departure from there. After 7<sup>th</sup> December, 1992, the Darshan of idols kept there at the disputed site, is done from a distance of 30 feet. The idol of Ram Lalla, kept there, though is clearly visible. The idols of Ramachandraji and Lakshmanji should be kept of their childhood days. Again said that except the above said idols of Ramchandraji and Lakshmanji, other idols kept there are not clearly visible because visitors come there in large number to have the Darshan there. The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture No.152 of paper No.200 C-1 of coloured Album, the witness after seeing the same said that the Sinhasan being seen in this picture is the same as is existing today. In this picture the idol of Saligram Bhagwan and Lalji are seen in the swing in the Sinhasan and the idol of Ram Lalla too is seen in this very swing and any idols is not visible clearly in the above mentioned picture No.152. Seeing the picture

No.153 of this Album the witness said that in that picture also he was seeing the idols of picture No.152. In this picture No.153, the Pujari seen standing there, who is supporting beard, is pujari Lalji Das. This Pujari Lalji Das has since been murdered. The murder of Lalji Das took place after demolition of disputed building. It may be possible that the murder of Pujari Lalji Das might have taken place before the demolition of disputed building. Seeing picture No.154 & 155, the witness said that these pictures are also of the same Sinhasan of which above said picture No.152, 153 are. After seeing picture No.156 of this Album, the witness said that the floor seen in this picture is the floor of the eastern side of the above said Sinhasan. The Sinhasan seen in above said picture No.152, 153 & 154 was seen by me after the KURKI of disputed building but I do not remember if I had seen Sinhasan before attachment (KURKI) or not. The Sinhasan seen in the disputed building in the above pictures had a CHHATRA on it which is seen in picture No.153 & 155. The Sinhasan seen in the above mentioned pictures was closely touching the floor. This Sinhasan was kept adjacent to western wall under the middle dome. The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness paper picture No.154/13, filed in the main case No.1/89 and was asked that at how much distance and on which direction from the steps seen in this picture, the Sinhasan seen in picture No.152 linked 155, was kept? After seeing the above the witness replied that the above Sinhasan was kept on southern side of the steps seen in paper No.154/13 and sometimes Sinhasan was kept adjacent to the steps and sometimes one feet away from it. Again said that in picture No.152 linked picture 155 of paper No.200 C-1 of the coloured Album, the Swing (Jhoola) is seen and not the Sinhasan whereas the Sinhasan is seen in picture

paper No.154/13. I do not remember that when I went to the disputed building first time with my father, the Jhoola seen in above mentioned picture No.152 was there or not. When I went to the disputed building with my father first time, the idols seen in picture paper No.154/13 were kept there in the similar fashion. I had seen the idols kept on the swing seen in above mentioned paper No.152 linked 155 of coloured Album. It never happened that in any day when I went to the disputed building, the idols seen were kept on the Sinhasan in the manner as shown in picture -paper No.154/13 and picture No.152 linked 155 of Album paper No.200 1C. Whether the idols seen in Jhoola in above picture No.152 linked 155, be brought every day or not, depended upon the will of Pujariji and it was not essential that idols be brought on the Jhoola daily. There is no special religious procedure or custom to bring the idols on the Jhoola from Sinhasan. When in the month of Savan the idol is established on the Jhoola, Arti is sung and BHOG takes place and except Savan, on other days the idol is established on JHOOLA from Sinhasan after Bhog. When the idols were to be brought on the Jhoola from Sinhasan, all the idols on Sinhasan were brought on Jhoola. Hanumanji's idol was also brought on Jhoola.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture -paper No.154/12 filed in other original case No.1/89, seeing the same the witness said that in this picture, in the middle, something like Taj is seen and below it on the black stone, some thing written is seen. I do not have any idea if I had seen it in the disputed building on the western side wall, under the middle dome, or not. I have no knowledge whether there was something like Taj made on it and carving below it on the black stone was there or not. I do not know Allah was

written on that which appeared like Taj or not. I do not know as well that the carving written in black below, had something written in Arabic or not. The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture No.154/5 filed in other original case No.1/89, seeing the same the witness said that the steps existing on the north side of the disputed complex, are seen in this picture and these steps are outside the northern gate of the disputed complex. On the north of these steps something like chabootra made out there is seen. I shall not be able to tell whether this chabootra was the grave of any Muslim or not, I shall also not be able to tell whether this chabootra is for sitting purposes.

I am residing in Ayobhya permanently since 1948. I have not seen any grave of the Muslim beyond the path seen in above mentioned picture No.154/5 and in the line of Chabootra. The above mentioned picture-paper No.154/5 was a road on the lower side of the chabootra seen here, which used go to Hanumangarhi via Dorahi Kuan.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture paper No.154/11 filed in others original case No.1/89. The witness said after seeing the same that-that picture could be the upper portion of lower side gate of middle dome of the disputed building. In this picture I do not see anywhere written as Sita Pak, Ram Mantra, Ram Yantra (Shatkon made). The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness paper No.picture 154/16 filed in others original case No.1/89, seeing that the witness said that I do not recall if what is seen like a constructed wall in this picture, had been seen by me in disputed complex or not. I did not see any such wall adjacent to the south side wall on the



**9600:**

southern Chabootra of disputed complex where there is a urinal on one side. The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness pictures paper No.154/14 & 154/15 filed in others original case No.1/89 and was asked of which part of the disputed building, these pictures were? After seeing the above, the witness replied that it appears that these were the pictures of western side wall of disputed building and carving made is seen in these pictures. I shall not be able to tell whether these pictures were of western side wall of lower portion of the middle dome or of lower portion of western wall of northern or southern domes. I shall not be able to tell whether Allah was written on these pictures in the middle.

Statement attested after reading.

*www.vadaprativada.in*

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

1.3.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 3.3.2004 for further cross examination.

Commissioner

1.3.2004

//true copy//

*www.vadaprativada.in*

**Dated: 3.3.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/Special Executive Office, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow).

(Other Original Case No.26/59) the orders dated 27.2.2004 passed in the matter of Nirmohi Akhara & others versus Babu Priya Dutt Ram & others by Hon'ble Full Bench through Designated Commissioner).

(Before Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench-In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W. 3/7 Mahant Ramji Das dated 1.3.2004 by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture paper No.154/9 filed in original case No.1/89, the witness after seeing the same said that it was the picture of outer portion of the disputed building. A lion made is seen in this picture, therefore it appears that this picture is of outer gate (Singh Dwar) of the disputed building. It is wrong to say that it is the fish which is seen and not the lion made on the gate is seen. After seeing paper No.154/8 filed in original case No.1/89, the witness said that the domes of the disputed building were seen in this picture, one of domes in it was the middle dome and it was not clear whether the 2<sup>nd</sup> one seen was of north side or of south side. In this picture one wall is seen before the dome and this wall was on oath the sides after north dome and south dome.

Question: I have to say the wall seen in picture-paper No.154/8 is of south side and at that time i.e. in 1950, the wall of north side was not like this, rather the portion of north side wall was in dilapidated condition. What do you say in this regard?

(At this question the learned counsel for the Defendant Shri Ranjit Lal Verma raised the objection saying that the question was a mixed one as information about many facts has been asked in one question, therefore, these should be asked one by one separately.)

Answer: This picture is a confusing one, and not complete because if the photo of the disputed land is taken from the front side, it will be complete and if it is taken from the rear side, then it would become just the opposite.

Question: I have to say that since you visited the disputed site rarely, therefore, you are not able to recognize the pictures pertaining to the disputed site and its complex properly. What do you say in this regard?

Answer: It is wrong to say so.

After seeing picture No.154/6, the witness said that, that was the picture of the rear portion of the disputed building.

Question: I have to say that the above mentioned photo paper No.154/6, of the disputed building has been taken from the northern direction, in which the outer wall of the north is seen in a dilapidated condition what do you say in this regard?

Answer: I shall not be able to tell as from which direction the above mentioned photo has been taken. I shall only say that the photo in question is of outside portion of the disputed building.

After seeing the picture-paper No.154/4 filed in others original suit No.1/89, the witness said that the photo was of the front portion of the disputed building.

Question: With the front portion of the disputed building you mean lower portion of the dome or the outer wall of the disputed complex or any other portion?

Answer: There are two photos in the above picture, which have been mixed into one after joining them.

After seeing the picture -paper No.154/7 and paper No.154/10, the witness said that those were the pictures of the rear portions of the disputed complex. These are not the white strips but the photo has been taken after extracting grass (Kai) from there. Had these been strips, these would have been uniform. I cannot tell whether it is white washed or not.

The learned counsel arguing the case, showed the witness picture No.4 of black and white album -paper No.201 C-1, the witness said after seeing the same that picture appeared to be of western and southern portions of the disputed building. I am seeing in this picture the sacks of sand and no wall is seen below it. The witness said after seeing picture No.8 of this Album that the picture appeared to be of side of entrance gate of the

disputed complex. It appeared to be the picture of the side of entrance gate of eastern side. In this picture where people are seen as standing, a tree is seen there, inside the wall. This tree appears to be of Neem tree or Maulshree tree. I had seen this tree on the spot also. When I say this tree in the disputed complex, it was the tree of Maulshree then. This tree was painted near the place of Kirtan, at one side in the disputed complex. After demolition of the disputed building, I last went there about 5-6 months ago. I do not remember if or not I had seen this Maulshree tree over there. The wall seen in this picture No.8 is the northern side wall of the eastern gate. This wall had been plastered with SUKHI-CHOONA.

Question: Had you ever seen some flowers leaves or carving done or idols inscribed on the wall seen in above mentioned picture No.8?

Answer: I do not remember that.

Seeing this very Album-picture No.7, the witness said that the picture appeared to be that of entrance gate of disputed building.

Question: The gates seen in this picture No.7, are the eastern or northern gates of the outer wall of disputed complex or the gates of internal wall with railing. What do you say in this regard?

Answer: In this picture the part of outer portion and part of a door of some inside portion of the disputed complex is seen in the picture.

The witness said after seeing picture No.11-12 of the Album that the walls of different directions are seen in these pictures. In picture No.11, the wall of the southern side and in picture No.12, the wall of the rear

portion of the disputed complex are seen or appeared to be seen. Picture No.11 appeared to be of outer portion of southern wall of the disputed complex. In picture No.12, the inner portion of the same southern wall appears to be there. The witness said after seeing picture No.15 of this Album that this picture appears to be the outer portion southern part of the disputed complex. Lakhauri bricks were used in the rear wall of the disputed building. With rear wall I mean the wall of the western side. The witness said after seeing picture No.18 of this Album that in this wall the stone of big size and Lakhauri bricks are seen to have been used.

As per the orders of the Hon'ble Full Bench I have brought Hindi Translation of List No.5 & 8 enclosed with my affidavit filed in the court and am filing that in the Court.

(Thereafter through the above said application No.31-0/2004 annexed with list No.48 C-1, Hindi Translation of list No.5 and list NO.8, enclosed with the affidavit of main examination, was filed. The Hindi translation of list No.5 was included after paper No.9/31 linked 9/33 as paper No.9/33/1 linked 9/33/17 and of list No.8 was included after paper No.9/52 as 9/52/1 & 9/52/2, as per the orders of the Hon'ble Full Bench.)

The Hindi translation of list No.8- paper No.9/53 filed with the affidavit of main examination as paper No.9/52/1 and 9/52/2 and this translation has been done by me. The book, the portion of which is above said list No.8, has not been brought in the Court by me, I had brought that with me on the day before yesterday and I can bring that tomorrow. The name of this book is "GANESH APPAJI KA PANCHANG". "GANESH APPAJJI" is the name

of the Panchang. Panchang is a component of astrology (Jyotish Shastra) which contain, Day, Date, NAKSHATRA, Yogkaran, dates and Samwatsar, Hindi, English Christian Era dates, and Hijri etc. all are described in it. The auspicious occasions for the marriage etc. and the mental impression about the life of man is described in it. The Editor of this "Ganesh Appaji" Panchang and Editorial Board as well as Publishers are there but I do not recall the names of any one of them. This Panchang was written many years ago. I shall not be able to tell whether this Panchang was written two years earlier or how many years earlier, but it contains calculation of hundreds of years. It may also be possible that the Panchang published in this Vikrami Samwat, might have been written fifty or hundred years before. The Learned counsel arguing the case, showed the witness paper No.9/52/1 of Hindi Translation of list No.8 filed with the affidavit of main examination and asked-whether in its 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> line of para three the mention about its continuing from first year of 51<sup>st</sup> year, the year is meant for the present Samwat or some other year? After seeing the above, the witness replied that it is meant for the first year of 51<sup>st</sup> year of the age of Brahmaji and this year is continuing even now. In fifth line of this paragraph, a sentence "VISHNU BHAGWAN KI EK GHATI" has appeared, is the evening of GHATI is that when one Ghati of Vishnu passes, the period of one thousand Brahmaji is over i.e. the period of one thousand BRAHMAS is over. The year of Brahmaji is called "BRAHAM-VARSHA". When the period of one thousand Brahamas is over, then one lakh "Braham-Varsh" is over. The twenty-four minutes of Vishnu Bhagwan are equal to one lakh Braham Varsh. In one hour i.e. 60 minutes of Vishnu Bhagwan contain two & half GATI. In one day's of Vishnu Bhagwan i.e. in 25 hours, there are 60 GHATIES. The words "RUDRA"

**9607:**

appearing in seventh & eighth lines of above paragraph, have been used for Shankar Bhagwan. In this paragraph the use of "Adhikla" has been made for the Adhi Kala of Shankar Bhagwan in which, as per the age year of Shankar Bhagwan it comes to 12 minutes i.e. according of Age-years of Shankar Bhagwan, one Kla contains 24 minutes and according to his age proof, there are two & half klas in one hour i.e. in 60 minutes of Shankar Bhagwan.

Question: As per the calculation of period (KALGANANA) as written in above Hindi Translation of list No.8 filed by you, is one year of Brahma contains 15 KHARAB, 76 ARAB and 80 crore years of human being?

Answer: I shall tell this after making calculation. Thereafter the witness said after seeing list No.7-paper No.9/51, filed with affidavit of main examination that since the beginning of KALP till the beginning of KALIYUG, one Arab, Ninety five crore, fifty eight lakhs, eighty five thousand one hundred five years, have elapsed in five thousand, one hundred and five years.

Statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

3.3.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 4.3.2004 for further cross examination.

Commissioner

3.3.2004

//true copy//



**Dated: 4.3.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/Special Executive Office, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow).

(Other Original Case No.26/59) the orders dated 27.2.2004 passed in the matter of Nirmohi Akhara & others versus Babu Priya Dutt Ram & others by Hon'ble Full Bench through Designated Commissioner).

(Before Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench-In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W. 3/7 Mahant Ramji Das dated 1.3.2004 by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture paper No.9/52/1, the page of Hindi translation of list No.8, paper No.9/52 filed with affidavit of his main examination and was asked as in one Brahm Varsh of Brahmaji, how many crores or Arab years of human being are including? Seeing the above the witness said that the question pertained to astrology and mathematics. Therefore, the answer of this question can be given only after doing the calculations. I shall not be able to do this calculation at this time.

**Question:** I am to say that my question is of simple calculation, it is not the question of astrology. What have you to say in this regard?

**Answer:** It is the question of astrology and not of simple calculation.

Question: Can you tell what would be the answer if you multiply 43,20,000 by one thousand?

Answer: It is possible (thereafter the witness said after calculating it on paper). By multiplying forty three lakhs, twenty thousand by one thousand comes to four Arab thirty two crores of years. Four Arab thirty two crore years are equal to one day i.e. 12 hours of Brahamaji. One night of Brahamaji is also equal to these many years. In this way one day and one night of Brahmaji are equal to Eight Arab Sixty Eight crores of human being years. In a year there are 365 days according to English calendar.

Question: How many days in a year are there according to your religious faith?

Answer: I do not know this but it is written in Panchang as how many days comprise of one year.

List No.8 filed with my affidavit of main examination is the portion of Panchang but it is not written there in it as how many days a year is comprised of according to my religious faith. According to my religious theory sometime there are less than 360 days in a year and some times these may be more than 365 days.

Question: Will you please tell as to how many days the year of the animals has been considered whose estimated age has been mentioned on paper No.9/52/2 of translation of above said Panchang by you?

Answer: It is a general calculation. There is no detail of 365 days or 360 days in it.

Question: While doing the above calculation can a year be considered of 300 days or less than that?

Answer: I shall not be able to tell that.

Question: Similarly, you will also not be able to tell with regard to the mention of seventeen lakh twenty eight thousand years in the last to last line of paper No.9/52/1 that of how many days a year is equal to?

Answer: This also I shall not be able to tell.

Question: May I take it that you cannot tell the calculation of age of Brahmaji, age of Vishnuji and age of Shankarji, mentioned in the translation of list No.8, filed by you?

Answer: It is a subject matter of astrology, it can be told by an astrologer only. I shall not be able to tell.

The Panchang –list No.8-paper No.9/52, filed with my affidavit of main examination is entirely a subject matter of astrology.

Question: When entire Panchang filed with the above quoted list No.8 is related to astrology, then for what purpose you have filed it in this case because you, as per your own statement, also do not understand astrology?

Answer: It is correct that I do not possess the knowledge of astrology, I understand properly the facts mentioned in the paper and this subject matter of age has been determined by the astrologers and Religious scholars and any suspicion on the same is baseless.

Question: When you are not able to do the calculation of Brahan Vansh etc. written in the translation of Panchang (paper No.9/52/1 & 9/52/2) according to human years, then how do you say that you understand the Panchang?

Answer: The calculation of human years is simply correct but learned counsel has raised the question whether there are 365 days or 360 days in the calculation of the year. I have already replied this question because the days are increased or decreased as per the calculation of astrology. Hence increase or decrease does not take place in days of the year.

Question: When you are not able to tell as to how many days are there in one year of Brahmaji then how can you calculate the human years in one year of Brahmaji and how many human years would be in his 100 years?

Answer: According to the principles of religion in astrology, the Rishies and Munies have described it and this calculation of the year is continuing even today.

Question: You have not answered my question and have made altogether a different statement. May I take it that you do not want to answer my question?

Answer: As far as possible I have answered the questions properly and I have not suppressed anything in them, and also not spoken wrongly, and it is wrong to say that I do not want to give answer.

Question: As you are not able to tell as to how many human years comprise of one Brahamaji year and how many years would be there in his 100 years, therefore, cannot you tell also that in one Ghati of Vishnuji and one Ghati of Shankarji or in one Kala how many Arab or Kharab human year would be?

Answer: It is a subject matter of mathematics and it can be replied only after making calculations.

Question: Because you are not able to make calculation therefore, you are not replying these questions. What do you say in this regard?

Answer: It is the subject matter of astrology and only the astrologer can tell you this, I shall not be able to tell.

Question: Is there any bases available in any religious or astrology book about all those things which are written in the above mentioned Panchang?

Answer: These things are described in Puranas and in astrology and there are basis and principles also of them.

I have not read such books pertaining to astrology but I have studied the religious books pertaining to them. The name of those religious books are as follows- Shrimadbhagwat, Vishnu Puran, Nirsingh Puran, Skandh Puran, Vaivart Puran, Matasya Puran, Matasya Puran, Brahmand Puran, and in all the Purans, those proofs which are available in above Panchang about the age of Brahma are available. Out of these books I have filed with my affidavit of main examination only portions of Shrimadbhagwat. No portion from any of the above

mentioned books, has been filed with my affidavit in the main examination.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness list No.5-paper No.9/31 linked paper 9/33 filed with the affidavit of his main examination and asked whether in this portion of Shrimadbhagwat the facts of the above mentioned Panchang relating to list No.8 are written? After seeing the above, the witness replied that it was not so, i.e. in list No.5, the facts relating to list No.8 are not written. I can tell after seeing Shrimadbhagwat book, that where were the things relating to list No.8 written in Shrimadbhagwat. I have not brought Shrimadbhagwat with me today. It is wrong to say that facts written in above mentioned Panchang –list No.8 (paper No.9/52) are not written in Shrimadbhagwat. I have read whole of Shrimadbhagwat. Whenever I get the opportunity, I read Shrimadbhagwat. I last read Shrimadbhagwat about a year back.

I had read Vishn Puran last time about seven-eight years ago from today. I had read the entire Vishnu Puran and it is available both in Hindi and Sanskrit. Original Vishnu Puran is in Sanskrit and I have read whole of it.

Question: I have to say what is written in Vishnu Puran, is written in Panchang filed through list No.8, what do you say in this regard?

Answer: In religious books and in Vishnu Puran and in Shrimadbhagwat, there is description of age of Brahma in Ghati, Pal and its system of calculation and the many of the subjects of the Panchang which I have filed with my affidavit as list No.8, are given in other books of astrology.

Because that Panchang is in a brief form, therefore, I have filed the same.

Question: When you have said that you have not read the books relating to astrology then how you are saying that the mention of what is written in Panchang is made in the books relating to astrology?

Answer: It is correct that I have not read the books on astrology but the Panchang which has been filed in read every year on the occasion of PRATIPADA.

I shall not be able to tell how many pages the book of original Vishnu Puran, which I have read and is in Sanskrit language, contain. I shall also not be able to tell that original book of Vishnu Purana, which was available both in Hindi & Sanskrit and which was read by me, contained how many pages. I have no idea whether the above mentioned both the Granthas were of 100 pages or of one thousand pages or less than that or more pages than this. Both the books are available with me at home even today. Again said-the book of original Vishnu Puran available with me is in Hindi & English both, and Vishnu Puran only in Sanskrit language is not available with me and the Vishnu Puran read by me is from the same book which is available both in Sanskrit and Hindi, and that Granth is not with me at present, somebody has taken it from me. That Granth was taken from me by one Mahatma three-four months ago, that Mahatma hails from Ayodhya only but I do not remember his name. The Vishnu Puran which I have read is published from Gita Press, Gorakhpur but the name of the Editor and Translator is not recalled by me. I read the Nrsingh Puran last time about twenty-twenty two days before in a

shop. I do not possess Nrisingh Puran personally. This Nrisingh Puran which I had read, contained more than hundred pages and that Nrisingh Puran is also written both in Sanskrit and Hindi. The Nrisingh Puran which I read in the shop, was not the entire book but I had only read its contents and those chapters which I considered necessary. That Nrisingh Puran I had not read before except on the shop as stated above. I had read in that Nrisingh Puran about the divine aeroplane, which Brahamaji had given to Ikshwakoo alongwith Bhagwan. The calculation of period as given in Panchang, was not seen by me in the Nrisingh Puran that day.

Question: When you did not read the mention of time calculation (kal Ganana) written in above list No.8 (Panchang) in Nrisingh Puran, then how can you say that such facts are available in Nrisingh Puran?

Answer: Because there is a mention of its in the subject contents, that is why I am saying so.

Skandh Puran has been read by me completely and I read it last over forty years before. I possess the knowledge of contents of Skandh Puran but I do not know its complete detail. Whether the facts mentioned in Panchang (list 8) are available in Skandh Puran or not, is not remembered by me. I have read some portion of Braham Vaivart Puran. I have read it only during the duration when I was giving my statements in the Court. At present Braham Vaivart Puran is not available with me.

Braham Vaivart Puran, I read only in a shop. I read that also cursorily. I had tried to have information about Janambhoomi in the Vaivart Puran but no such information was found in that. I had read about the



Kal Ganana mentioned in list No.8, which is Panchang, filed with the affidavit of my main examination, in Braham Vaivart Puran. This mention of Kal Ganana (time calculation) in Braham Vaivart Puran had been made in two pages only. The Braham Vaivart Puran which I read, is in Hindi language. The Braham Vaivart Puran read by me, was published by Gita Press, but the name of translator is not known to me. This Braham Vaivart Puran runs into around 200 pages. In that book of Braham Vaivart Puran which runs into 200 pages, has not any shloka in Sanskrit, it was the Hindi translation in the whole book. That book is not available with me.

I have not read Matasya Puran till to date. Again said- I had read sometime back but do not remember when was it read.

Brahmand Puran last time I read was 15-16 years before. The Brahmand Puran read by me was in Hindi only, there was no Sanskrit shloka in it. When I got the Brahmand Puran, I read that for many days and had read that completely. This Brahmand Puran is published by Gita Press Gorakhpur but I do not remember by whom was it translated. The Brahmand Puran which I had read, had the mention of time calculation (kal Ganana) given in above Panchang (in list No.8 filed with the Affidavit). It is wrong to say that there is no mention of Kal Ganana given in the above Panchang in Brahma Vaivart Puran, Matasya Puran and Brahmand Puran.

According to above Panchang the period of Vishnu is thousands of time more than the period of Brahmaji. According to this Panchang in one Kal of Vishnuji, there comes thousands of Brahmaji, it is my belief also. According to above mentioned Panchang and my belief,

the Kal (period) of Shankarji is lakhs of times more than the Kal of Vishnuji. Bhagwan Vishnu is the Ansh of Bhagwan Ram, Brahma, Vishnu Mahesh all the three are the Ansh of Bhagwan Ram. Bhagwan Ram is permanent and He is the only creator of Brahama-Vishnu and Mahesh. The Kal (period) of Ramachandraji is Kharabs of years old and the calculation of his Kal is not possible. The existence of Ayodhya is also continuing for Kharabs of years.

There are three kinds of Pralaya stated in Shastras, one is daily pralaya, second is Pralaya of Manvantry, and third Pralaya takes place when brahmaji's one day is completed and that is called Mahapralaya. According to human calculations Nitya Pralaya occurs daily that mean when people sleep, that is called Pralaya. When the period of one Manvantri is completed and period of second Manvantri starts, then comes in the middle of that the Manvantri Pralaya. Third Mahapralaya takes place when Brahmaji's one day is completed. One day of Brahamaji is equal to Four Arab, thirty-two crore human years. It has been mentioned that impact of Pralaya has taken place some times in Ayodhya. When period of one Manu is ended and the period of second Manu is started, then in between takes place the Manvantri Pralaya and that only is called Manvantri Pralaya. The period of one Manu is more than 71 Chaturyugies. 71 Chaturyugies are of more than thirty crore years. In Ayodhya no Pralaya has taken place during last nine lakh years.

At present the period of 7<sup>th</sup> Manu is continuing. I call this seventh Manu as Vaivashvat Manu and all people also called him in this manner and such is the mention in Dharamshastra as well. The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the Hindi translation portion

page – paper No.9/52/1 of list No.8, paper No.9/52, enclosed with affidavit of main examination that states “in this manner in one day of Brahmaji – these are the 14 MANUS”, and was asked whether he fully agreed with the above portion. Seeing the above the witness replied that “Seven Manvantri have elapsed” is written in it, is a typographical error. In fact 6 Manvantari have elapsed and 7<sup>th</sup> Vavashwat Manu is continuing. I agree with other things written in the said portion. The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the portions “**Shri Brahma ke dwitiye prahar ke aadhe pratham versh – char awtar huain hain**” and was asked whether he fully agreed with complete version made as above. Seeing the above the witness replied that, there is a typographical error in this portion as well and “**Dwitiye prahar**” has been wrongly typed in it, and in this sentence after “**Aadhe**” word “**Ayu**” should have been written. I agree with the whole of the remaining portion. In the above portion, the meaning by “**Sandhya-sandhyansh**” is day & night. In the above portion the meaning of “**Uss main sai**” is with “**Satyug**”.

In the above portion, all the four incarnations viz Matasya, Kachchhap, varah and Nrisingh, mentioned, are the incarnations of Bhagwan Ram only and Bhagwan Ram is called Vishnu, Prabh Vishnu and Maha Vishnu also.

At the time when vaivashwat Manu was doing TARPANA, Matasya bhagwan appeared in his hand. I do not remember where was Vaivashwat Manu when bhawan Vaivashwat appeared on the palm of Manu. The incarnation of kachchhayap Bhagwan took place in Kshirsagar. I have no knowledge, where kshirsagar is. The name of Kshirsagar exist in Panchang and in all other Puranas. Varah Bhagwan was also born in the sea but in

which sea he was born, is not known to me. The birth of Nrisingh Bhagwan took place in the capital and palace of HIRNAYA KASHYAP. The capital of HIRNAYA KASHYAP is in India only but at which place in India, it is not known to me.

There is a mention of the birth place of all the above AVTARS but it is not remembered by me now. I do not have the information whether or not any temple exists on the birth places of these four incarnations. I have not seen any temples of these four incarnations. Now a new temple Nrisingh has been constructed which I have seen. In that Nrisingh temple, an idol of Ramachandraji, Janakiji and Lakshmanji are established. The idol of Nrisingh Bhagwan has been seen by me in other temple also in Ayodhya but I do not remember now at which place that temple in Ayodhya is located. The idol of Matasya Bhagwan has been seen by me somewhere but I do not now where I have seen that and the idol of Kachchhap Bhagwan too has been seen by me but I do not remember in which place the same was seen. Similarly the temple of Varah Bhagwan has been seen by me outside Ayodhya but I do not remember where have I seen it. Again said it is in Varaha Shukar areas, which is in Gounda Distt. I do not remember if I have seen the temple or idol of Varah anywhere in Ayodhya.

The learned counsel showed the witness, the Hindi translation of list No.8 – paper No.9/52 filed with the affidavit of main examination and marked as paper No.9/52/2 which states” **Shukla Tritia ..... Shri Ram ke avtar huye hain**” The incarnation of Shri Ram took birth on \_\_\_\_\_ Vaishakh, in third day of Shukla Paksha” and was asked whether there was mention of three incarnations or two incarnations in this portion.

Seeing the above, the witness replied that in this portion there is mention of three incarnations. In these incarnations one is VAMAN AVTAR 2<sup>nd</sup> in PARSHURAM AVTAR and third AVTAR is bhagwan Shri Ram. The VAMAN AVTAR took place in the Ashram of Kashyapji in Himalaya Parwat. I have no knowledge whether any idol or any temple of VAMAN Bhagwan is located in Ayodhya or not. Again said – there is temple of Vaman Bhagwan in Swargadwar Mohalla.

The statement attached after reading.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

4.3.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 5.3.2004 for further cross examination.

Commissioner

4.3.2004

**Dated: 5.3.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/Special Executive Office, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow).

(Other Original Case No.26/59) the orders dated 27.2.2004 passed in the matter of Nirmohi Akhara & others versus Babu Priya Dutt Ram & others by Hon'ble Full Bench through Designated Commissioner).

(Before Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench- In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W. 3/7 Mahant Ramji Das dated 1.3.2004 by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

The name of Vaman Bhagwan is Vaman only and he led a life of celibacy. In the temple located in Swargadwar Mohalla of Ayodhya, of Vaman Bhagwan, the idol of Vaman Bhagwan is also established, which is of his celibate life and its height is less than two feet. That idol is fifty-two Anguli in height. In Amava temple of Ayodhya also the idol of Vaman Bhagwan is existing. Apart from these, whether any other idol of Vaman Bhagwan exists in Ayodhya or not, is not known to me. The birth day of Vaman Bhagwan is celebrated on Bavan Duadashi. Vaman Duadashi falls in the month of Bhadon.

Holi is burnt on Purnima and 2<sup>nd</sup> day of it falls pratipada, and Panchang is read on the day of Pratipada. In addition to this the Pratipada of Chaitra Shukla Paksha is called

Varsh Pratipada and new Samvatsar starts from that day. Pratipada's use is made for the year and not for the day.

Parshuramji is the Anshvatar only of Shri Ramachandraji, and not his puran Avtar. Parshuram is not the puran avtar of any one. Matasya, Kachchap, Varah, Nrisingh and Vaman are the puran Avtar of Bhagwan Ram. In Puran Avtar Bhagwan comes himself and in Anshik Avtar he sends his power only. Parshuram's birth took place in Himalaya Parvat in Jamdaginiji Ashram. The place where Parshuramji had born, has his temple there. At present that place is called uttarkashi. Parshuramji's birth took place many thousands years before the birth of Ramachandraji. The father of Parshuramji was killed by the sons of Sahastrarjun, therefore, he took pledge to destroy Kshatriyas. Parshuramji was a Brahman. Himself said - there was no caste system earlier and it was Varna – Vyavastha. Shri Ramachandraji was Kshatriya of Surya Vansh.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the Hindi translation of list No.8 enclosed with the affidavit of his main examination and marked as paper No.9/52/2, the witness said after seeing the same that the Avtar of Vamanji, Parshuramji and Bhagwan Shri Ramji took place in Tretayug and the period of Tretayug in this paper has been given as 92 lakhs 96 thousand years, it is correct. Again said – the period of Tretayug which is given above as 92 lakhs and 96 thousand years, is wrongly typed, in fact it should be 12 lakhs 96 thousand years. The portion “**Madh Krishan Pakch Amavasya – do Avtar huain hain**” of this paper No.9/52/2 was shown to the witness by the learned counsel arguing the case. After seeing the same the witness said that the above portion is absolutely correct, he also agreed with that. Krishnaji is

not the avtar of Ramachandraji, rather the avtar of Narayan and Narayan is the Anshavtar of Ramji. Budha mean Mahatma Budha only. Mahatma Bhudha is considered to be the Anshavtar of Shri Krishnaji. From the point of view of Kalpbheda Shri Krishanji and Mahatma Budha are considered to be the Avtar of Vishnuji. Vishnuji has been the Avtar of Ramachandraji also and also of Bharatji i.e. the avtar of Bharatji the brother of Shri Ramachandraji, is Vishnu Bhagwan. In my belief Bharatji himself was Bhagwan. From Kalpbhed Bharatji was the avtar of Vishnuji and Anshavtar of Ramchandraji also. 5105 years have elapsed of the beginning of Kaliyug. It means 5105 years have elapsed of the end of Dwapar Yug. I have told the age of Shri Krishanji as 125 years already. I have also told earlier that Shri Krishanji had gone to Ayodhya about four thousand years ago from today.

Question: Will Shri Krishanji be called of the Kaliyug and not of Dwaparyug, as per your statements?

Answer: From Kalpbhed Shri Krishanji can be called of Kaliyug also because on the inscription in Kanak Bhavan it is written that after the lapse of 614 years of last Kaliyug, Shri Krishan Bhagwan had come in Ayodhya.

Question: May I take that according to above inscription in Kanak Bhavan, as told by you, in the translation of Panchang (list No.8) – paper No.9/52/2 the mention that the birth of Shri Krishnaji in Dwapar yug, is proved wrong?

Answer: I have some confusion in above mentioned thing in above Panchang (list No.8).



I am of the belief that Shri Krishan Bhagwan was born in the end of Dwapar. The birth of Mahatma Budha in Dwapar does not appear to be believable to me. The birth of Mahatma Budha had taken place one and a half to two thousand years ago.

Question: If, as per your statement, the birth of Mahatma Budha is considered to be one and a half to two thousand years before, then will it be considered to have taken place after the period of Raja Vikramaditya (after whose name Vikrami Samwat goes)?

Answer: As per the calculation, according to me Mahatma Budha would be the contemporary of above mentioned Raja Vikramaditya.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the Hindi translation of above mentioned list No.8 – paper No.9/52/2, enclosed with the affidavit of main examination, the portion “**Kali ke prarambh hone par ----**  
**----- Kalik Bhagwan ka hoga**”. The witness after seeing the same said that in this portion the mention of birth of Kaliyug and birth of one incarnation has been made. I am little suspicious about the birth period of Budha in the above mentioned portion but I agree with the rest of the portion. In the above portion, after “**Kikat desh main hoainge**” there should full stop. It is the only shortcoming in the above portion, I agree with the remaining portion. In the above portion the mention of “**Jinke putr budh**” has been made. In that “**Jinke**” is meant for Maharaj Shudodhan who was the father of Bhagwan Bhudha and the real name of Budha Bhagwan is Sidharatha. In the above portion the “**Kikat Desh**” is meant for that part between Basti & Nepal in which there are Kapilvastu &

Naugarh at present. In the above portion the mention of words “**Kal praman**” are meant for “**Karyakal**”. I consider the one Avtar of Kaliyug is Bhagwan Budha.

Question: As per your belief and faith, as well as studies, is one Avtar of Kaliyug is Bhagwan Shri Krishan?

Answer: As per my studies and belief, what is described in Purnas, Bhagwan Krishan's existence is stated to be in the end of Dwapar and in the inscription in kanak bhavan Shri Krishan's appearance in Ayodhya had been stated to be the year “**Gatkali**” 614. After calculation of the period, correct conclusion can be drawn.

Question: Are you unable tell at present whether Shri Krishanji was Avtar of Dwapar Yug or that of Kaliyug?

Answer: it is correct i.e. I am unable to tell it now whether Shri Krishan was the Avtar of Dwapar or Kaliyug.

It is written in the above said Panchang (list No.8) that one of the Avtar in this yug would be of Kalki Bhagwan, which has not happened as yet. It is mentioned in Purans that, that Avtar shall appear when Kaliyug's life shall remain 810 years.

In Hindi translation page – paper No.9/52/2, reading the sentence past “**Sarir ka pariman sade teen hath**”, the witness said that in this sentence the height of the Man in Kaliyug has been stated and “**Pariman**” is meant for height. Seeing the portion “**Manushya Ke Ayu 120 varsh 5 ratri hai**” (the age of man is 120 years and 5 night), the witness said that in it, the age of man of Kaliyug has been described and five RATRI is meant for

five days. There is no mention of height and age of men in Tretayug, Dwapar and Satyug in Panchang but it has been made in other Granths. Such a mention I have definitely read but in which granth have I read it, is not recalled. In the above Hindi translation the use of “**Sade teen hath**” (three and a half hand) comes to 5' or 5 ¼ and 'Ek Hath' in Panchang mean 1 ½ feet.

What I have read, according to that the height of man in Satyug used to be thirty one hand (Ekatis Haths) and it used to be in the portion of length of man's hand. I shall not be able to tell as to how much would be length of man's hand during Tretayug & Satyug. No such mention is made as to what would have been the length of man's hand 1 ½ feet, three feet or five-six feet or less than that or more than that. What I am narrating here was read by me in Purnas. I have read it mentioned there that the height of person in Dwapar used to be equal to twenty one hands which used to be in proportion of length of hand of the man of that period. The height of man in every Kaliyug used to be what it is mentioned in Panchang. One kaliyug is continuing these days and the earlier kaliyug had been forty-three lakhs years ago and in that kaliyug also the height of man used to be three and a half hands. In Dwapar yug, preceding this kaliyug, the height of man as told by me was twenty-one hands. The same used to be the height of man of Dwapar yug, which used to be before the earlier Kaliyug lasting forty lakhs years also. Tretayug which passed in this Chaturyug, the height of man described by me was Thirty one hands (Ektees Hath), the same height used to be there of man of that Tretayug which was the Tretayug as passed around forty-three lakh years of earlier Kaliyug. At present the Kaliyug of 28<sup>th</sup> Chaturyug is continuing. The height of man which I have told in Satyug, Dwaparyug, Tretayug and Kaliyug of

twenty-eighth chaturyug, the same was height of men is satyug, tretayug, dwaparyug and kaliyug of twenty seventh chaturyug. According to my opinion, the height of Dashrathaji, Shri Ramachandraji, Lakshmanji, Bharatji, Shatrughnji and Sitaji would have been thirty one hands (Ekatees Haths) and their other limbs such as hands and feet etc would have been in the same proportion. Their hands and feet would have been robust, strong and of glowing in nature. The height of all the three queens of Dashrathji, Vashishthaji and Hanumanji would have been the same Ekatees hands. The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the pictures made on paper No.261 C-1/1, page No.261 C-1/1/1 of Valmikiya Ramayan's first part and was asked whether the picture shown in it of Valmikiji was real or imaginary according to you? Seeing the above the witness replied that the picture of Valmiki in it was imaginary but the descriptions are made, as appear in the picture. I do not possess any knowledge about the real pictures of Valmikiji. But in words, the description of all the Gods is available. On seeing page No.261 C-1/2 of this Ramayan, the witness said that the pictures of kaushalyaji and Shri Ramachandraji in it are made in such a way by the artist by his imagination, as the description of them is made in Ramayan & Puranas. This picture is based on the imagination of the artist.

Question: On the basis of picture of kaushalyaji shown in above said paper no.261 C-1/2, can you tell that the height of this personality was thirty-one hands (Ekatees Haths), which was the height of your man of Tretayug?

Answer: This picture has been prepared by the artist, no standard of his measurement has been

**9628:**

described. Hence, I am unable to reply the question on this subject.

The statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

5.3.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 10.3.2004 for further cross examination.

Commissioner

5.3.2004

//true copy//

*www.vadaprativada.in*

*www.vadaprativada.in*

**Dated: 10.3.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/Special Executive Office, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow).

(Other Original Case No.26/59) the orders dated 27.2.2004 passed in the matter of Nirmohi Akhara & others versus Babu Priya Dutt Ram & others by Hon'ble Full Bench through Designated Commissioner).

(Before Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench-In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W. 3/7 Mahant Ramji Das dated 1.3.2004 by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

In the temple of Bhagwan Vaman situated in Swargadwar Mohalla, I would have gone 10-20 times. This temple of Bhagwan Vaman Dav is larger than the disputed building with three domes i.e. the area of Bhagwan Vamanji's temple was larger than the area of disputed building with three domes. There is no dome in the Bhagwan Vamanji temple. In this temple of Vamanji there is one Garbha Grih and 10-15 rooms. The Garbha of this temple would be 15-16' in length and 10' in width. There is no SHIKHAR also in the temple of Bhagwan Vamanji. In the Garbha Grih of above temple of Bhagwan Vamanji, there is idol of Bhagwan Vamanji and Shri Ramji, Janakiji and Lakshmanji. In this Garbha grih the idols of Bhagwan Vamanji and Shri Ramji are made the ashtadhatu (eight metals) and the idols of Sitaji & Lakshmanji are also made of Ashtadhatu. In the above temple of Bhagwan, the

**9630:**

height of all the idols would be around two feet. There may be little difference in their height. This temple is in the name of Bhagwan Vamanji and all the idols in the are the main idols. 12 Angul is equal to around 12" and 52 Angul equal to 52".

The statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

10.3.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 11.3.2004 for further cross examination.

Commissioner

10.3.2004

*www.vadaprativada.in*

*www.vadaprativada.in*

Dated: 11.3.2004

D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji

Das

(Before Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/Special Executive Office, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow).

(Other Original Case No.26/59) the orders dated 27.2.2004 passed in the matter of Nirmohi Akhara & others versus Babu Priya Dutt Ram & others by Hon'ble Full Bench through Designated Commissioner).

(Before Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench- In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W. 3/7 Mahant Ramji Das dated 1.3.2004 by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

The learned counsel arguing the case was showed the portion of his statement at page 136 on 5.3.2004 that **“ Ayodhya ke swarg dwar mohalleymein jo vaman Bhagwan ka mandir hai, usmey Vaman Bhagwan ki Murti padhari hui hai ..... Ayodhya ke avaman mandir mein bhi vaman Bhagwan ki murti hai “** (In Swarga Dwar Mohalla of Ayodhya where there is temple of Vaman Bhagwan, an idol of Vaman Bhagwan has been established ..... there is an idol of Vaman Bhagwan in Amawa temple of Ayodhya also) and was asked whether his statement was correct? Seeing the above the witness replied, in my statement the height which I have told as 52 Anguls, that I have said wrongly, the rest of my statement, as given is correct. In Vaman Bhagwan's temple in Ayodhya the height of idol is stated to be around 2 feet by me and that 2 feet is equal to 24 Anguls.



In my life time I have visited Kanak Bhavan thousands of times. Similarly I would have visited the hunmangarhi temple of Ayodhya also thousands of times. I might have gone to Dasharath Mahal and big (BARI) Chhavani, which is called Raghunath Dass Chhavani also thousand of times. In addition to the above temples there are other temples in Ayodhya such as a Chhavani of Mani Dasji, Hanumanbagh, Hanuman Vatika, Ram Vallabhakunj, Janaki Ghat, Lakshman Quila, Lakshmanghat etc. out of the above temples there is one Shikhar each in Lakshman Quila Mandir & Hanuman Vatika Mandir. In the Mani Ram Dasji ki Chhavani, Valmiki Bhavan has been constructed which contains three SHIKHARS, in rest of the temples there is no domes or tops (Shikhars) in any. Again said, there is a top (one SHIKHAR) in Hanumangarhi temple. Again said – in Hanumangarhi it is the temple of Hanumanji which has got a SHIKHAR and in Ram-Janaki-Lashmanji temple which is a separate temple from the temple of Hanumanji, has a dome as well as SHIKHAR and there is yet another temple behind the temple of Hanumanji, which too has a SHIKHAR on it. My own temple which is known by the name of Tulsi Manas temples also has a dome. In addition to the above there are dome and SHIKHAR on the temple of Tiwariji in Nayaghat. In Madhavikuj, there is a SHIKHAR and also a SHIKHAR on Acharyaji temple, which is located by its side. In Rajsadan there is a temple of Bhagwan Shankar, and that too has a Shikhar on it and there is Rajya Sabha mandir, on it also there is a SHIKHAR. There is only a little difference between a SHIKHAR and dome and not a significant difference. SHIKHARS has more height and less globutar area whereas dome has a eight as well as globutar area and it is PAHALDAR and some of the domes are lubricant. The domes are there is temples and mosques both the Shikhars are only in temples. Again

said – I have seen SHIKHARS in the mosques also in Ayodhya. The artisan work in temples and mosques in the same in both. Only little difference is in the method of worship. In two mosques situated in Kaziana Mohalla of Ayodhya which are situated side by side, I have seen SHIKHARS constructed on them. I do not remember about the other mosques presently. Both these mosques might be hundred years old. It is wrong to say that no SHIKHARS have been built on any mosque of Ayodhya, rather domes have been built. I do not remember if or not there is any mosque in Ayodhya which does not have dome made on it. The domes made in the disputed building are called round domes. There were no PAHAL etc. in those domes. There is mosque in Vashishtha Kund Mohalla, a Pahaldar dome is made on it and this Pahaldar dome is of the same Kind, as it is on the temples. As far as my memory goes, this Pahaldar mosque is being seen by me but I shall not be able to tell how old it is. I cannot form opinion about the oldness of any building just by looking at it. I have not counted the PAHALS of the dome of that mosque situated in Vashishthakund Mohalla, therefore I cannot tell, as how many pahals are there in that dome. A SHIKHAR having eight PAHALS, I have seen, in Hanuman Vatika. I have not counted the pahals of that also but looking from the above, one finds that there are eight Pahals in it. I have neither counted nor seen any top (SHIKHAR) in Ayodhya, which have six Pahals.

Kanak Bhavan is an old temple and its resurrection has been made many a times. The present appearance of kanak Bhavan is around 150 years old. There is no Shikhar in Kanak Bhavan. The length & breadth of kanak Bhavan's Garbha Grih would be 15' x 12' feet. In addition to this Garbha Grih, there are 20-25 more rooms in Kanak Bhavan and all those rooms are of bigger size than

Garbha Grih. In the Garbha Grih of Kanak Bhavan, there are the idols of Ramji and Sitaji. Kanak Bhavan does not have the idol of Laxmanji because Kanak Bhavan was the personal palace of Ramachandraji. After Bhagwan Ramachandraji's disappearance, the construction of Kanak Bhavan was got done by his son Kush and thereafter Rishabh Dev got its resurrection done and again after that Shrikrishan Bhagwan got its resurrection done. Then Vikramaditya got it de-novo constructed and Samudragupta thereafter got it resurrection and even after that the king of Orchha had its resurrection done, the present form of which is available today. The place on which kushji had got the Kanak Bhavan constructed, it is still continuing on that place only. Kanak Bhavan was also existing during Shri Ramji's regime and it was on the same site then also. Mata Kakaiyi had given this Bhavan to Sitaji as Muhun-Dikhai (seeing her face first time after marriage) and Maharaja Dashratha had got this Bhavan constructed for Mata Kakaiyi. Shri Ramachandraji used to live in this Bhavan only during his period. It was inside the then palace of Dasharathji. During the regime of Dasharathji, Dasharathji's Bhavan in which he used to reside, was closely adjacent to Kanak Bhavan. Raja Sadan was the name of a fort which existed during the regime of Raja Dasharath and there were many Bhavans inside Raj Sadan. According to me there was no difference between Dasharath Mahal & Raj Sadan. The place, on which Raja Dasharathji used to hold his Darbar, was called Raj Darbar. At present the distance from disputed Bhavan to Kanak Bhavan and Dasharath Mahal would be one furlong. The distance between Hanumangarhi and disputed Bhavan is about two furlong in between disputed Bhavan – Hanumangarhi there are many temples such as Amava Temple, Kaushlya Bhavan, Dasharath Mahal, Kakaiyee Bhavan etc. it is wrong to say that the distance from

Hanumangarhi to disputed Bhavan is half a Km. Himself said – the distance between the boundary of disputed Bhavan and the boundary of Hanumangarhi, shall not be more than 1  $\frac{3}{4}$  furlong rather it would be less only.

The place where Hanumangarhi is situated today, Maharaj Ikshwakoo had got his palace constructed on that and the Hanumangarhi temple has been constructed around 200 years before from today. Maharaj Ikshwakoo was the ancestor of Dasharathji and Ikshwakoo dynasity started with Maharaj Ikshwakoo. Raja Ikshwakoo had existed Arabs of years before Raja Dasharath. The temple of Hanumangarhi existed inside the palace constructed by Raja Ikshwakoo. During the regime of Raja Dasharath there was no building in the Hanumangarhi. During the period of Shri Ramachandraji also, the building namely, Hanumangarhi did not exist.

Question: Whether any building existed after the name of Hanumanji during the period of Shri Ramachandraji on present Hanumangarhi?

Answer: No sir.

During the regime of Kush, there was a building after the name of hanumaji on the site of present Hanumangarhi which was known as palace of Hanumanji or Hanumanji's temple. After Kush, the reconstruction of Hanumangarhi was got done by Vikramditya. In between Rishabh Devji or krishanji did not get the construction done of Hanumangarhi. Hanumangarhi's re-construction was not done around 200 years before but it was only the resurrected and that resurrection was of that Bhavan which was got constructed by Vikrmadityaji. In resurrection work no bhavan either is increased nor

decreased. There is a difference in resurrection and reconstruction, is not known to me.

At present the main place or Dashrath Mahal is situated at the same place where Dasharath Mahal was located at the time of Dashrathji. Himself said that the entire Ramkot Mohalla of today was under Dashrath Mahal at that time. It has never been investigated that which building was situated during Raja Dashrath's period on the place on which presently known Dashrath Palace i.e. bit (Bara) place is situated today. The Raj Darbar of Raja Dashrath's period is known today as Dashrath Mahal. This reference has come in Valmiki Ramayan.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the first and second parts of Valmiki Ramayan i.e. paper No.261 C-1/1 and 261 C-1/2 respectively and was asked as in which of the Kand or Sarga, such a mention has been made. After seeing the above, the witness replied that in 41<sup>st</sup> shloka of 18<sup>th</sup> Sarga of Balkand of the first part of Valmikiye Ramayan, the description of "Rajbhavan" has been made. In addition to this, in shloka No.19 & 20 of Sarga 3 of Ayodhya kand of first part of shri Valmikiye Ramayan, an order has been given to the troops to enter the lawn of Raja Dasharath Mahal. It was given at the time of selection of Bhagwan Ram as Yuvraj and in Shlok No.22 to 25 of this very Sarga, the description of Rajbhavan has been made. In shlok No.26 & 27 of this very Sarga, it has been mentioned that all the kings, hailing from East, North & South, Malechchh Arya and the people residing in forests and hills, sitting in that Rajbhavan, were working Raja Dashrath in the same way as Devtas were doing of Devraj Indra. Raja Dashrath sitting amongst those people in his high palatial mansion was looking like Dev Raj Indra. From there he saw his son

Shri coming towards him to his palace. The Ayodhya of today is not the Ayodhya of Raja Dashrath's period.

Question: In the shlokas you have referred from the Valmikiye Ramayan, it is nowhere written that the Big place (**Bada Sthan**) or Dashrath Palace is situated on the same place, where Raja Dashrath, during his period, used to hold his Darbar. What have to say in this regard?

Answer: The inscriptions installed in today's Ayodhya in Dashrath mahal points towards the fact that Dashrath Palace is situated on the same place where it was situated during Dashrath's period.

Question: But no such mention has been made anywhere in Valmikiye Ramayan' that the present Dashrath mahal only was the Raj Darbar during Dashrathji's period. What have you to say in the matter?

Answer: It is correct that such a mention is not available in 'Valmikiy Ramayan'.

The learned counsel arguing the case, showed the witness Hindi translation paper No.9/33/1 linked paper 9/33/17 of list No.5 – paper No.9/31 linked paper 9/33 filed with the affidavit of main examination and was asked whether any mention in that was available of disputed Bhavan, kanak Bhavan or Dashrath Bhavan?

After seeing the above, the witness replied that in these, the mention in the name of Dashrath Mahal is not available, but the mention of Raj Mahal is available. The mention of Kanak Mahal too is not here but it has been mentioned that Sitaji entered into her palace and Bhagwan Ram too entered his Raj Mahal. By Sitaji's Mahal and

Ramji's Mahal, mean Kanak Mahal only. The mention from the birth of Shri Ramachandraji till his victory over Shrilanka and thereafter getting the throne etc. is available in that paper, though briefly. In the above mentioned papers there is no mention of birth place of Shri Ramachandraji available and similarly no mention in them is made about the Ramjanambhoomi. Even so, there is a mention about taking Avtar by Shri Ramachandraji here and the place where avtar was taken, would be the Janam Bhoomi.

Question: At what page and at what place in these documents – 9/33/1 linked 9/33/17, the mention about taking Avtar by Shri Ramachandraji and that of the place of taking avtar is made?

Answer: In these documents the description of taking Avtar by Shri Ramchandra is of course available but the description of place of taking Avtar is not available.

In one of the above mentioned documents, on document No.9/33/1 it has been mentioned that, - “ **Apka manushya avtar keval rakashas ke vadh ke liye hi nahi ,iska mukhya uddesh to manushya ko siksha dena hai** “your incarnation as a man is not only for killing the evils (Rakahas) but its main purpose is to educate the humanity.” In this way the mention of Avtar did come in the above document. This is about the Avtar of Bhagwan Ram. The Hanuman Bagh temple of Ayodhya is a new temple and big Chhavani is old one. Bari Chhawani is not of the days of Raja Dashrath, rather it is about two and a half hundred years old. The Chhawani of Mani Ram Dassji too is not of the days of Dashrath rather it is three-three and a half hundred years old. Hanuman Vatika also is not

of the days of Dashrathji rather it is one hundred-hundred and a half years old. Ram Vallabh Kunj is not of days of Raja Dashrath rather it is temple over one and a half century old. Janaki Ghat is above 200 years old and not of the days of Dashrath. Laxman Quila is also not of the days of Dashrath rather it is around 300 years old. Laxman Ghat is also not of the period of Raja Dashrath rather it is 2000 years old. Himself said – the present day Ayodhya is not the Ayodhya of the period of Raja Dashrath, however that land is the same. That means Ayodhya is situated on the same place today on which it was situated during the regime of Dashrath. Shri Ramachandraji had gone to Saket Dham from Guptar Ghat. The correct name of Guptar Ghat is “Gupt Hari Ghat” and it is also called “Go-Pratap Ghat”. This Ghat is situated on the bank of Saryu River even today. It is situated at the same place at which it was situated in the days of Shri Ramachandraji. In the last rainy season, I visited the Guptar Ghat last time. At that time also the Guptar Ghat was on the bank of Saryu and Saryuji was flowing there only.

Question: Is flow/course of Saryu is the same as it was 1000 years ago?

Answer: I shall not be able to tell about 1000 years, as my age is not that old.

Question: Is your age is of nine lakhs years, as you have told about the events which took place nine lakhs years ago.

Answer: It is correct that my age is not nine lakh years old but the Dharma Shastra contain the complete detail. So I told, which I had read.

Question: Is there not any mention about changing the course/flow by Saryu, in any book?



Answer: I have no knowledge about the fact that the mention of changing course/flow by Saryu River is given in any of the books or not.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the book "Ayodhya Ka Itihas Avam Puratatva" page No.289 C-1/202, exhibit as O.O.S. 5-3 and was asked whether the Prahalad Ghat, Braham Kund, Sumitra Tirath and Kaushlya Tirath, written on this map, are on the bank of Saryu river at present? After seeing the above, the witness replied that the places described above are far from Saryu River these days. In the area of Brahma Kund and Prahalad Ghat, I last visited, was eight-nine years ago. At that time also the places referred above, were far from Saryu River. I shall not be able to tell that the distance of Saryu River, from these places, was one KM. Or less than that or more. The name of 'Chakra Tirath' place, have been heard by me, that is a famous place. The place namely "Chakra Tirath" shown in the map – paper No.289 C-1/202, is situated at the same place where it is shown in the map in Ayodhya. Chakratirath is the name of a Mohalla. I have no knowledge whether or not a temple by the name of Chakratirath, exist in Chakratirath Mohalla. I shall not be able to tell as how far, Saryu river is flowing from Chakratirath Mohalla. In north of Chakratirath is situated the Vashishtha Kund. Saryu river is far from Vashishtha kund. I shall not be able to tell whether the distance of Saryu River from Vashishtha Kund is one KM, less than that or more than that.

Question: Is it written Babri structure and Ramjanam Bhoomi on the North of Vashishtha Kund, in the Map?

Answer: Yes sir.

How far is the Saryu River flowing from the place which I consider as the Ram Janam Bhoomi, I shall not be able to tell. I have not gone towards Saryu river for the last 7-8 years. I had gone on the Naya Ghat of Saryu River only 15 days ago. This Naya Ghat is situated in Ayodhya and it is at a distance of around one and a half Furlong on the eastern side from New (Naya) Laxman Ghat. The disputed site from the Naya Ghat is over two KMs. Away. The Brahm Kund would be around 3 KMs away from Naya Ghat. As per my information Prahalad Ghat, Kaushalya Tirath, Sumitra Tirath and Brahm Kund would be situated on the bank of Saryu River once. I have heard about kaushalya ghat and Sumitra Ghat but I shall not be able to tell how far these are from Saryu River. I have not heard about Kaushalya Tirath & Sumitra Tirath so far.

Question: Have you ever heard or read that Saryu River would be flowing four-five hundred years ago from that place, on which Prahalad Ghat & Brahm Kund etc. are shown in the map. Paper No.289 C-1/202 ?

Answer: I have heard it but I have not read anywhere in this regard.

The distance from Naya Ghat on Saryu River to Guptar Ghat would be over nine KMs.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness shlok No.22 of Sarga 110 of "Uttra kand" of Valmiki Ramayan – paper No.261 C-1/2, and was asked, is the same Ghat called Guptar Ghat as told by you above and the mention of which is made in this shloka? Seeing the above the witness replied affirmatively and said it is the same Go-Pratar Ghat.

**9642:**

The statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

11.3.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 12.3.2004 for further cross examination.

Commissioner

11.3.2004

*www.vadaprativada.in*

*www.vadaprativada.in*

**Dated: 12.3.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/Special Executive Office, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow).

(Other Original Case No.26/59) the orders dated 27.2.2004 passed in the matter of Nirmohi Akhara & others versus Babu Priya Dutt Ram & others by Hon'ble Full Bench through Designated Commissioner).

(Before Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench-In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W. 3/7 Mahant Ramji Das dated 1.3.2004 by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

In Valmikiye Ramayan the distance from Guptar Ghat to Ayodhya has been given and that distance has been told about that path which leads through the bank of Sarya from Ayodhya to Guptar Ghat. The learned counsel arguing the case, showed the witness Part 2 – paper No.261 C-1/2 of Valmikiye Ramayan and was asked in which of the Shloka of uttrakand the distance from Ayodhya to Guptar Ghat has been mentioned. Seeing the above, the witness replied that in first shloka of 110<sup>th</sup> Sarga of Uttarkand of this Ramayan, this distance is given and it is written as 1 ½ yojan, 1 ½ yojan is equal to 12 miles – one yojan is equal to four kose. Even at present the distance from Ayodhya to Guptar Ghat routing through the bank of Saryu is 12 miles.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness para-3 of the affidavit of his main examination and was asked that in that affidavit he (the witness) had called himself of Kshatriya Chola – so what he meant by chola. Seeing the above, the witness replied that “Chola” means “Varna” also as well as “Caste” i.e. I belong to kshatriya caste as well as Kshatriya Varna. Para 9 of this affidavit was showed to the witness by the learned counsel arguing the case and he asked him that he (the witness) had stated that the idol of Ramlalla was still there, so did he mean by there the disputed building. Seeing the above the witness replied that the idol of Ramlalla, he was seeing there in the disputed building continuously and by ‘there’ he meant disputed building and that idol is still existing at the disputed site dispute demolition of the building.

Question: you have not written in your affidavit that the idols of Lakshan Lal and Hanumanji which were kept in the disputed building before 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992, are also existing at disputed site even today. Should it, therefore, be taken that these idols are not available on the disputed site at present?

Answer: The idols of Lakshan Lal and Hanumanji are there at disputed site. This could not be mentioned in the affidavit.

Seeing section 10 of his affidavit the witness said that he had been seeing the Bhandargrih (store) from the beginning to the demolition of the disputed building i.e. the day from which he started visiting the disputed site till the disputed building was demolished, the said Bhandargrih was there at site and seen by him.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness the black-white Album paper No.201 C-1 – the picture No.37, seeing the same the witness said that from that picture, the wall of KATHARE WALI of the disputed complex and a tree outside towards east were seen in the picture. In that picture the Bhandargrih was not seen to him. The Bhandargrih was situated at 8-10 steps – again said 4-5 steps away towards east from the tree being seen in the picture and that Bhandargrih was constructed adjacent to eastern wall and gaining entry through Hanumat Dwar, that Bhandar Grih was situated adjoining the wall towards the north side at a distance of five-seven feet. The roof of that Bhandar Grih was made of Kans grass.

The witness was shown the colored Album – picture No.66 of paper No.200 C-1 by the learned counsel arguing the case. The witness after seeing the same said that the Chhappar (roof) seen on that picture, appear like the Chhappar put on the Bhandar Grih. The Chhappar seen in this picture, appear like that of Ramchabootra.

Question: On the above picture No.66, was the southern part of Chabootra or the Northern part of Chabootra Seen?

Answer: The Northern part of Chabootra was seen in this picture.

This picture is not clear, therefore, correct answer cannot be given whether the northern part or southern part of chabootra was seen in this picture.

Question: I have to say that in the above picture No.66, the southern part of chabootra was seen

clearly and the picture is totally clear. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: The picture is not completely clear and therefore, correct answer cannot be given. May be so that this picture be of southern part of chabootra. After seeing picture No.56 & 57 of this album, the witness said that in picture No.57, the Sinhasan, was seen which was there inside the disputed building with three domes. Picture 56 is of the disputed Complex but which part of the complex it is, is not understood.

Question: I have to say that in both the above pictures 56 & 57, the northern part of the chabootra, outside the building of three domes, is seen. What have you to say in this regard?

Answer: Both these pictures are of northern side of Ramchabootra. My above statement that in picture No.57, Sinhasan, Kept inside the disputed building of three domes, was seen, has proved wrong.

In the above mentioned picture No.56 and 57, the roof (Chhappar) made of grass is seen. The Chhappar seen in both these pictures, appear to be the one which was there in the disputed complex before the demolition was existing the disputed complex, before or after 1950. After seeing picture No.59 & 60 of this Album, the witness said that in those pictures the Chabootra of Shiv Darbar existing in south of Ramchabootra, was only seen. In these pictures I see white stone which were of marble and written on them in black. I do not remember if these stones were installed there before 1950 or not but when the disputed building was demolished, those were

installed there till then. After seeing the picture No.75 of this Album and picture No. 37 of black & white Album - paper No.201 C-1, the witness said that the wall and trees which are seen in above referred picture NO.75, are the same wall and tree as are in picture No.37. After seeing coloured Album picture No.75 & 77, the witness said that the tree seen in picture No.75 is different from the tree seen in picture. No.77 i.e. both the picture are not appearing to be of one and the same tree but the wall in both the pictures is the same. I am seeing a gate in picture no.77 but I do not see a gate in picture No.75. It may be possible that both these picture would of the same place but might have been taken from different angles, and therefore, are not seen clearly. In Picture No.75, the Bhandargrih is not becoming clear to me because the people are standing there for doing Darshan. The eastern side direction from the tree there, is not being understood by me. The Bhandargrih in the disputed complex was 15' – 16' in length and 7'-8' in width. There were no walls in the Bhandargrih, the roof was standing with the help of bamboos. There was also a door in the Bhandargrih (Stone house) which was made of Bamboos. The people used to do cooking in the stone house, and a place adjoining that was called Sant Niwas where Sadhoos used to stay. The witness was shown the affidavit of his main examination by the learned counsel arguing the case and he was asked whether he had made mention of Sant-Niwas in that anywhere. Seeing the above, the witness replied that he would be able to reply the question only after half an hour, after seeing the same. It is wrong to say that there was no store house (Bhandargrih) or Sant Niwas till 1950 in the disputed complex.

Chhathi Pujan site was also called Sita Rasoi, but it was not called Kaushalya Rasoi. The learned counsel arguing



the case showed the witness the picture No. 71 & 72 of coloured album paper No. 200 C-1. Seeing the same, the witness said that it was not clear from those pictures whether or not they were the pictures of Chhatthi Poojan site. It is also not clear whether or not the above mentioned both the pictures were of Sita Rasoi. After looking through the picture No. 70 of this Album, the witness said that he was seeing the gate in that and ahead of gate a man known as Sant Prasad was seen standing there. It appears that the inside portion of northern gate of the disputed complex was seen in picture No. 70. In the southern side of the gate in this picture, was seen a tin-shed. The tin shed seen in this picture was of the inside of the disputed complex. A wall is seen in south of tin shed. In picture No. 71 of this album, a constable is seen on one side and another person is standing on the other, and the side on which that person is standing, a wall is seen there, which is the north wall of the disputed building of three domes and the side on which the constable is standing, the outer wall of the north side is seen. In between this wall, a Sinhasan is seen on which two fishes are seen made. The lower portion of the above mentioned tin shed in picture No. 70, is seen in picture No. 71, and that Sinhasan which is seen in picture No. 71, the same Sinhasan is seen in picture No. 72 of this album. The learned council arguing the case showed the witness the pictures No. 71 & 72 of the above album and picture No. 38 & 39 of white and black album and was asked whether that Sinhasan & Chabootra seen in picture no. 38 & 39 also. Seeing the above the witness replied in affirmation and said Yes it is so. In the above mentioned black and white album- in picture No. 39, I am seeing Kaushalya Tasoi written on that and Chhatthi Pujan place is also seen written over there. It is the picture of that Chhatthi Pujan site only, the mention of which had been

made by me in para 10 of my affidavit of main examination. The site, seen in the above picture No. 39, is also called Kaushalya Rasoi by the people and is also called Chhathi Pujan site. This picture also I am seeing the white stones with writing in black ink on them. It may be so that these white stones with writing in black ink put on here after the year 1950. The Chabootra is seen in above picture No. 39 but it is not clear from the picture, as of what height the chabootra is from the ground. I do not remember if I had see this chabootra in the disputed complex before 1950 or after 1950.

In the above said picture No.39, I see the prints of foot made, which are eight in numbers. Again said not eight but four foot-prints were seen in picture No.39. These four foot-prints are of the four brothers and these foot-prints were imprinted on marble only. There is no difference between foot-prints and charan Paduka. Again said – “Kharauns” are also called Charan Paduka. It is correct to say that ‘KHARAUNS” only are called charan Paduka and no prints are made on “KHARAUNS”. The foot prints were made on the chabootra, I do not remember if the Kharauns were kept there or not. The foot-prints of all the four brothers i.e. eight foot-prints were made on the chabootra, which are seen in picture No.39. these four brothers were- Shri Ramachandraji, Bharatji, Lakshmanji and Shatrughanji. These foot-prints were of the childhood days of these four brothers. I shall not be able to tell as of how many inches, all these foot-prints would be. I shall also not be able to tell that these foot prints were more than 4 inches or less than 4 inches. These foot-prints were made on the basis of assumptions, which denote faith and belief. These foot-prints were made on assumptions on the basis of description of the four brothers made in words. I shall not be able to tell if the foot-prints were 100

years old or 500 years old or 200 years old. I shall also not be able to tell as to who had got these foot-prints made. I have not read in any books about the foot-prints made at the site of Chhatthi Pujan. The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness fifth & sixth line of para 10 of the affidavit of main examination and was asked whether by the 8 foot prints he meant "four foot prints"? seeing the above the witness said yes that was so. In that very paragraph he had stated about the CHUHLA, CHAKALA BELAN made of marble and he had also said in the paragraph only that Chhatthi Pujan site was known as kaushalya Rasoi as well. The learned counsel arguing the case shoed the witness the portion of his statement of todaywhcih states "Chhatthi Poojan sthal ko Sita Rasoi Bhi kaha Jata Tha, Prantu use Kaushalya Rasoi Nahin Kaha Jata tha" (Chhatti Poojan site was called Sita Rasoi also but it was not called kaushalya Rasoi) and was asked whether his above statement was wrong? Seeing the above the witness replied that the Chhatti Poojan site was not called the Kaushalya Rasoi, he had stated so inadvertently. I had narrated the facts mentioned in the affidavit of main examination, to the counsel and my counsel had got this affidavit prepared. He had given it to me duly typed and I signed it only after giving it a cursory look. I shall not be able to tell as to where had my affidavit been typed i.e. at Faizabad or at Lucknow. After it was typed, it was handed over to me at Lucknow. It was given to me at Lucknow, duly typed and I had signed it at Lucknow only. I had signed the affidavit on all pages in the room of Oath Commissioner before him. At the time of signing the affidavit I had not read that. I had read this affidavit in the court room itself after coming into the court room.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness para 12 of affidavit of his main examination, seeing the same the witness said, in its third line with the word “**Masaledar Bagh**” I meant that mixture which was made by mixing lime, sand, Dal of Urad, Bel etc. I had not seen the mixture by ascending the place where the tiger (BHAGH) had been built rather I had seen it while standing on the ground below. It is wrong to say that the tiger had not been built on the gate referred in para 12, the fact, however, is that a tiger was made on the upper side of the gate and below one fish each on side and a total of two fishes were made.

The learned counsel arguing the case showed the witness picture No.47 & 48 of coloured album paper No.200 C-1, seeing the same the witness said that the pillor of KASAUTI were seen in both these pictures. The pillors seen in these pictures appear like those installed on Hanumat Dwar. In both these pictures are also seen the white stones written in black ink. I shall not be able to say clearly since when had I seen these white stones written with black ink i.e. whether I had seen them before 1950 or after 1950. On the pillars seen in these pictures, the idols appear to have been inscribed but these are not clear. Again said that in those pillars on which MAHAVIRI has been applied, these were the idols of Hanuman, the idols got reduced with the constant application of MAHAVIRI and these are not clearly visible even by looking at them with the help of magnifying glass. Again said, the idol is visible but it is not clear. The idols of Jai-Vijay are seen in these pictures made o pillars and these are seen also on the lower side of the pillars. The witness said after seeing picture NO.50 & 54 of this album that he was seeing the pillars even on those pictures. Wherever the Mahaviri is applied in these pillors, these appears to be the idol of

**9652:**

Hanumanji and the idols are also seen on these pillars but it is not getting clear as whose idols these are. Seeing the picture No.113 & 114 of this very Album, the witness said that the idols are also seen on these pillars but it is not clear as whose idols there are. After seeing picture No.109 & 112 of this album, the witness said that the idols are there on the pillars seen in the pictures but it is not clear as whose idols these are and Mahaviri has been applied in picture No.109 but the idol is not seen clearly there also. After seeing the picture No.121 & 126 of this very album, the witness said that the idols on pillars are seen in the applied on the pillars seen in picture No.121, which has covered the idol. Similarly Mahaviri is applied on the pillars seen in picture No.126, as a result of which the idol is seen covered.

The statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

12.3.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 15.3.2004 for further cross examination.

Commissioner

12.3.2004

**Dated: 16.3.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench dated 12.3.2004 -In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W. 3/7 Mahant Ramji Das by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

I have not read "Gitawali" composed by Shri Tulsi Dasji. But I have heard its name. Apart from Ramcharit Manas by Shri Tulsi Dasji, I have read his books such as Dohavali, Baravai Ramayan, Ramlalla Nehchhu also. It is said that Shri Tulsi Dasji had written 12 books. I have not read his any other book except above mentioned books/Granth.

The mention of that Mahavishnu in para 29 of my affidavit, is different from VISHNU. Mahavishnu is Bhagwan Ram and Vishnu is an Ansh of Bhagwan Ram. The people who worship Shri Ram & Sitaji both, are called "Shri Vaishnav".

**Question:** According to you, the meaning of first lie written in para 29 of your affidavit, is that Bhagwan Ram is the incarnation of Shri Ramachandraji?

**Answer:** The second name of Bhagwan Ram is Ramchandra and there is no difference between Mahavishnu and Bhagwan Ram.

A man if he is a great power, can only be his own incarnation. Incarnation of Vishnu had been Bharatji also.

That means, the incarnation of Bharatji also was Bhagwan Vishnu.

In para 30 of the affidavit, Ramanandiy Shri Vaishnav Vairagi, was the follower of Shri Ramachandraji. The mention made by me in para 31 of my affidavit that Bhagwan Vishnu took Avtar as Shri Ramachandraji is correct and as I stated in the course of argument that Bhagwan Vishnuji was the incarnation of Shri Ramachandraji, is also correct. It is wrong to say that Bhagwan Ram never took birth at the disputed site. It is also wrong to say that Bhagwan Ram never appeared on that site. It is also wrong to say that Bhagwan Vishnu never took birth or appeared on the disputed site. It is also wrong to say that there were no idols in the disputed building till 22 December, 1949. It is also wrong to say that I never went to that disputed building or complex till 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 1949 or before 1950. It is wrong to say also that till 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 1949, five times Namaz and Namaze Juma etc. was performed in disputed building. It is also wrong to say that since the regime of Babur till 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 1949, the disputed building was invariably used as a Mosque.

(The argument of behalf of Respondent No.9, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Uttar Pradesh, by Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate over).

(In other Main Suite No.4/89, Defendant No.7 and in others Main suite No.5/89, Respondent No.5, the argument on behalf of Mohd. Hashim, by Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddiqui, starts).

XXX

XXX

XXX

I have told you in my statement that Shri Ramachandraji appeared on the disputed site nine lakhs years before. After this nine lakh years before, Shri Ramachandraji did never appear again. The idols available in different temples are the idols of the same Ramachandraji, who appeared nine lakhs years before. All the idols of Shri Ramachandraji, seen in the temples are seen with bow in hand. Apart from this, these are available for the childhood days as well. Childhood days idols are also of the incarnation who appeared nine lakhs years before. The idols of the childhood days are available in every temple and the idols of youth times are available in every temple as well. I mean to say that such like idols are available in Shri Ram Temples. In the temples where the idols are of youth days, the idols of Mata Sitaji, and Shri Laxmanji are also available with his idol. I have not seen in any of the temple the idol only of Shri Rama's childhood. I have not seen Ram's idol only of his youthful days without the idol of childhood days in any temple.

A temple is known after the name of that God or Deity only, whose idol is installed in that temple. Shri Ramachandraji is also called Thakur. The temple, which is called Thakurdwara, is also the temple of Shri Ram.

I had passed Shastri's examination in the year 1962. It was passed from Varanasi University. I was the institutional student of this examination. I got the certificate for passing the examination. It contains date of birth also. In that my date of birth is 13.4.1923.

I became Sadhu in the year 1948. In the beginning I became the disciple of Mahant Ram Sundar Dasji. I became his disciple only. My Mentor (Guruji) was of Ramanandany Vairagi sect, there are Sadhus of other



sects also. Such as the Sadhu of Shaive, Shakya, Goun, Madhava sect. One would recognize by seeing the Sadhu as to which sect he belongs to. They are recognized the way they put the tilak.

Brahma, Vishnu, Mahesh are the creator, preservator etc. appointed by Shri Ram. Shri Ram has appointed these three, many a times. Their appointment made in the present kalp, is continuing till today. Their appointment as such was made Arabs of years ago. When Shri Ram took avtar nine lakh years ago, the appointment of above Brahma, Vishnu, Mahesh had been much before that by Shri Ramji because he is eternal. The appointment of these three is temporary. When they got the appointment they held their job and till such time as their job is taken back, they would continue to hold it.

The main functions of Sarvarhkar is to do service of Thakur, worship him, do the service of the people coming in the temple and to maintain social harmony. SARVARAHKAR is appointed. I have been appointed as SARVARAHKAR of Bhagwan Ram Janaki by the people. I was appointed as SARVARAHKAR in the year 1969. When I became SARVARAHKAR, then I became the Mahamta also of the temple. I was made Mahant by the Sants. I am the Mahant of the temple.

The idol of Shri Ram of his childhood days is available in kanak Bhavan situated in Ayodhya, as well as in dasharath mahal, also situated there. Dashrath mahal is called as Bara Sthan Mandir. Dashrath mahal only, is not the main temple of Ram in Ayodhya rather the main temple is Shri Ramjanambhoomi which is disputed. Rest of the temples were constructed later. It is correct that the people offer their property out of faith toward Shri Ram.

There is lot of property in the name of Ram, with Bara Sthan. The property is movable as well as of immovable nature. This property is existing in Uttar Pradesh and outside Uttar Pradesh also. It is correct that as much property, both movable and immovable, as is in the possession of Bara Sthan Mandir, is not in the possession of any other temple of Shri Ram situated in Ayodhya. The whole of property of Bara Sthan Mandir, has been given by the devotees as offering. Shri Ramjanam sthan temple too has property, the detail of which is available with Nirmohi Akhara. I can tell about some property of this Ram Janam Bhoomi disputed complex but the complete detail can be given by Nirmohi Akhara only.

The property of Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi is moveable and immovable, both. The immovable property of this disputed temple is at Ramghat Mohalla, Naka Muzaffara Faizabad, in Ayodhya. The immovable property, which I am telling at Naka Muzaffara, is that of Hanumangarhi temple.

Hanmumagarhi Mandir Naka Muzaffara Faizabad, is the property of Ramachandraji. The witness said after seeing paper No.45 C-1/1/6 that the description and boundary given of the temple vide list Aliff, that temple is the temple of Ramachandraji situated at Ramghat. I know about one temple entered in paper No.45 C-1/1/7 at S.No.4. This property, is the property of Ramji. I cannot tell about the property entered in list "Be" on this page itself, whether or not it is the property of Ramachandraji. I have no information that who was Shri Mahant Ramcharan Das Chela, Mudayi (Petitioner) entered in paper No.45 C-1/1. In the list of (Muddalhan) Respondents on this very paper, Respondent No. (muddalhan No.) 1,4,7,8, Raghunath Das, are known to me. I do not know the name

of person who follower Raghunath Das was. All these four persons were the office Bearers of Nirmohi Akhara. I used to talk to them and they were known to me. I do not know if Mahant Ramcharan Das Chela had been the Mahant of Purshottam Das Nirmohi Akhara and he had filed a case No.95 of 41 dated 1.6.41. Respondent No.7 Shri Ramlakhan Das has since expired. Death took place many years back – about more than 10-15 years might have elapsed. So long as he was alive, he remained the cashier of Nirmohi Akhara. I do not know, who made him the cashier. I do not know when did he become cashier either. Baba Narayan Das was also the Mahant or Nirmohi Akhara. Raghunath Das, who was known to me, is also not alive now. He was the Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara.

I know about the property entered into paper No.45 C-1/1/6. The Janam Bhoomi written in it is the property of Nirmohi Akhara. The Graveyard shown in its boundary towards east as entered in the paper has never been seen by me. Baburi Masjid as shown on the western side is also wrong and the Kabristan shown in the south is also wrong. Property No.3, entered on this paper, is also property of Nirmohi Akhara, not of Bhagwan Ramachandraji. The kabristans mentioned in its boundary, in east and north, are wrong. The above statement about the property of Nirmohi Akhara and not of Shri Ramachandraji, has been given by me on the basis of other people statements and on the basis of my own knowledge. In the map – paper No.45 C-1/2A – the complete detail is not given. The Chabootra shown in it, is the same Janamsthan Chabootra which is situated outside the disputed site and known by the name of Ram Chabootra. There is no detail in it of the temple building having three domes but it is correct that the Chabootra is written on left of Janamsthan. Baburi Masjid written on it is wrong. Chabootra shown, as

Janamsthan is also wrong. It was only Ramchabootra here. Janamsthan was inside the disputed building, which is shown as janamsthatn, is that Chabootra which was situated outside the disputed building but it is not the janamsthan. Janamsthan was inside the disputed building. The place where "Charan Paduka" is written is not clear. It is not clear whether it is the same place which was called as Chatthi Poojan Sthal.

I know Siyaraghav Saran. He was the Poojari of janambhoomi, appointed by Nirmohi Akhara. I do not know whose follower he was and I also do not know if he is alive as yet or not. He had faith in Bhagwan Ram. It may be possible that suite No.57/78, the copy of which is paper No.109 C-1/3, would have been filed by this very Siyaraghav Saran who was known to me. I shall not be able to tell case, is the same disputed property or not. It of course appear that in this map – paper No.109 C-1/7, given in the end of case file, the disputed property is shown. In the end of this case file, in second page of paper No.109 C-1/8, detail of property (present Case) is given, which appears to be of disputed property.

As per my knowledge, wherever there is idol of Hanumanji, Mahaviri is applied over it. Sindhoor & Ghit mixed together and applied on the idol of Hanuman is called Mahaviri. It is correct that if Mahaviri is applied for 100-200 years and if the idol is small, then the idol get covered with Mahaviri but if the idol is large, then the idol becomes clearly visible. Small idol is recognized that it is of Hanumanji, if Mahaviri is applied on it. As per my information, it is not that the Mahaviri has been applied for identifying the broken idols at disputed site. It is wrong to say that Mahaviri has been applied without the idol just to prove that the same was Hanuman's idol. Mahaviri is

applied on the idols of Hanumanji and Ganeshji. In addition to this the Mahaviri is also applied on the idols of Mata. On the idol of Mata SINDOOR is applied only on forehead and not every where.

In para 17 of my affidavit there is a reference of thakur Ramjanaki Temple in Maniram Dass Chhavani. In this temple there are the idols of Ram, Sita, Laxman, Hanumanji, Radhakrishan and Saligram Bhagwanji. In this temple the idols of Ramji of his youth days and childhood days both are available. There is a Garbhagirh in Maniram Dass Chhavani temple. Garbhagrih is followed by Jagmohan. After Jagmohan it is prikrama, then Sant Niwas and it is a road. Road is outside the temple complex. There is parkirama all round the temple complex, inside the wall.

In north of disputed site it is a road and in the north of road it is Janamsthan Goodartar temple. In south of Goodartar temple, there is little slopes because of that its surface is low. According to my information, no sun shade (Chhajja) in the south of Goodartar temple is protruding outside. I am not making any false statement at this stage and there is no use of making false statement. The earlier Mahant of Goodartar temple was Harihar Dasji. After his death who became mahant, is not known to me. After taken over process, going into the temple was disallowed. Therefore, I cannot tell even as to who was the Poojari of this temple. I used to visit this temple before being taken over. At that time Bhaskar Dass was the Poojari of this temple for quite sometime. The temple has a property but the detail is not known to me. I know Mahant Raghbar Prasadacharya disciple, Mahant Rammanohar Prasadacharya, of Bari Jagah, Dasharath Mahal. When he was not the Mahant in the beginning, he was called

Raghudar Dass but after becoming Mahant, he was called Raghubar Prasadacharya. Raghubar Prasadacharya had been connected to Goodartar temple for quite sometime. He himself was the mahant here. Earlier he was neither the Mahant nor the Poojari of Ramchabootra temple at disputed site. Ram Lakhan Das, Golaki (Cashier) used to teach me about Pooja-archana. He used to tell me that the idol of Ramlalla, installed inside the disputed temple was very ancient. He had told me that it was there since inception of Ayodhya. I do not remember if he had told me about the Sarpanch of Nirmohi Akhara or not. He only had given me the information that the Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara was Raghunath Dasji and he had also told me that Baldev Dasji was Poojari of that time. I do not know, whose disciple Raghunathji was. At that time there were many Sadhus, such as Siyaraghav Saran, Bhaskar Das and others, whose names I cannot recall now, in Nirmohi Akhara. Mahant Bhaskar Dass was the disciple of Baldev Dass Pujari. Mahant Bhaskar Das and his Guru Pujari Baldev Das, were the Mahant as well as Pujari of Ramjanam Bhoomi. Mahant Bhaskar Dasji is still the Mahant of Janambhoomi. Mahant Bhaskar Das was the Pujari of Ramchabootra of Janambhoomi earlier. Himself said that he used to worship Ramlalla installed inside the disputed building. Till 15 years from Now, Mahant Bhaskar Dass was the Priest (Pujari) of the temple at disputed site. I do not know who became the priest later on. Siyaraghav Saran had been the priest of temple of Ramchabootra. He became the priest of that place after Bhaskar Dass. There may be so many Pujaries (priests) in a temple. Therefore, Siya Raghav Saran was the contemporary Pujari of Bhaskar Dasji. I cannot say with certainty whether Siya Raghav Saran remained the priest (Pujari) in disputed site or Ramchabootra after attaining high position by Mahant Bhaskar Das. I have correctly written in para 19 of

**9662:**

my affidavit that I had seen Mahant Bhaskar Dass as a Pujari or scores of years at Ramchabootra Mandir & Chhatthi Pooja site etc, and thereafter Siyaraghav Saran became Pujari.

The statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

16.3.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. In continuation of this appear on 17.3.2004 for further cross examination.

Commissioner

16.3.2004

*www.vadaprativada.in*

*www.vadaprativada.in*

**Dated: 17.3.2004**

**D.W.3/7, Mahant Ramji Das**

(Before Full Bench of Hon'ble High Court Lucknow Bench dated 16.3.2004 -In continuation of the cross-examination on oath of D.W. 3/7 Mahant Ramji Das by Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.9-Sunni Central Board of Waqf continued).

I know the place known as DORAHIKUAN CHORAHA in Ayodhya. The road, which led to Hanumangarhi from this Choraha, has now been closed. From the Choraha while going towards west, a Gurudwara is situated. I cannot recall if one house ahead of this Choraha, a mosque is there or not. On the road coming from south side, it is connected with the Faizabad road. On the road coming from the south side, there, of course is a mosque on Dorahi Kuan Choraha on Faizabad road. In addition there are two mosques at Kajiyana. I do not remember if except above mentioned three mosques, another mosque exist in Ayodhya or not. I do not recall if any mosque in the name of Almgiri Masjid exist in Sargadwar Mohalla or not. There is a small Masjid near Ayodhya Kotwali but I do not know if it is famous by name Keware Wali Masjid or not. I cannot tell so. I have no information if any Mazar of Hazrat Ibrahim exist in Ayodhya or not or some fair (Mela) is held here or not. I know Mohd. Hashim but I do not know if any Maqabara by the name of Rouza Bijali Shahib exist little ahead of his house or not. Himself said – on Maqabara is seen there. A place known as Mani Parvat exist is south side the Ayodhya. In south of it, sort of Hata is constructed there which opens towards west. I do not know if Mazar of Shish Paigamber exist in that AHATA or not. Himself said – m information is that a temple of



Laxmanji was situated on that Ahata, which was demolished by Aurangzeb. Aurangzeb had demolished the temple of Laxmanji after many generation of building of Sita Pak i.e. disputed Bhavan. I shall not be able to tell if graveyard for Muslims exist in Ayodhya or not. As I have never been to any Kabristan, therefore I shall not be able to tell whether a kabristan of Muslims exist in Ayodhya or not. I am living in Ayodhya for the last 50 years. Many Muslims might have died in Ayodhya in these 50 years. But I do not know where are they buried. I do not know as to how last rites of Muslims are performed after their death. I also do not know if the dead body of Muslim is cremated or buried or is left floating in water.

Naugazi Mohalla is situated behind kotwali in Ayodhya. I have no information, how it was named as Naugazi. I shall not be able to tell if a grave nine yards in length is located in that Mohalla and because of that if name was kept as naugazi Mohalla. Two-three jain temples are located in Ayodhya. No religious site of Bodh religion is located in Ayodhya. When ever I wished, I used to go to disputed bhavan, there was no fixed time for the same. I never stayed during night at disputed bhavan. Whenever I went, I came back after darshan and performing parikrama. I never stayed in disputed bhavan during day time and when ever I used to go, I would come back after having Darshan and performing parikrama. I would perform parikrama outside the disputed building and did not do parikrama of Ram Chabootra separately. Himself said – Ram Chabootra was inside the disputed complex and I would do parikrama from outside. Therefore, its parikrama would taken place automatically. Some devotees used to perform parikrama of Ram Chabootra and used to return after performing Parikrama from outside. I shall not be able to tell whether some of the visitors performed

parikrama or not. Muslim used to go to Masjid, what are their rules or what time do they go, all this I do not know. I do not know what for Muslims go to Masjid, again said – they would be performing prayer of their God. I do not know, what Azan is. I do not know if any place known as Sita Pak other than the disputed site is there is Ayodhya or not. I have gone on a visit outside Ayodhya. I shall not be able to tell if a Hindu religious place known as Sita Pak is situated anywhere in whole of India or not. In Ramcharit Manas by Go-Swami Tulsi Das, the detail about Bhagwan Ram is mentioned. Apart from this, the detail about Bhagwan Ram is mentioned in Bhagwan, Valmiki Ramayan also. There are similarities as well as differences in giving detail at some place in these three books. The idols of Bhagwan Ram are of different type in them. Which means similarity is not there in all the them. In the above religious books, the description of activities of Bhagwan Ram during childhood days and of adulthood days, has been given simultaneously. The Artisan, manufacture the idols on the basis of his assumptions, as I have told in my statement made above, that in books, mention is made in words and on the same basis the Artisan manufacture the idols based on his assumptions.

My connection is with Digamber Akhara. I am not the Sadhu of Digambar Akhara but I only have my relation with that. As per the sect, my connection is with Nirmohi Akhara also. Himself said – every saint has his connections with the three Akharas, i.e. with the three Anies i.e. Digamber Ani, Nirmohi Ani & Nirvani Ani and the whole sect is connected with these three.

From September to December, 1949, there used to take place lot of Pooja-path in and around the disputed complex so that a grand temple could be constructed

there. I had participated in that path. I participated in that worship, pooja-path several times.

In 1934, because of cow slaughter, the disputed building was damaged. Where was that cow-slaughter took place, is not known to me. I do not know personally as by whom the cow was killed. I do not remember presently as what was broken in the disputed building at that time. After 1934, after the damage to the disputed bhavan, its repairs was also done. Perhaps that was done on behalf of the state govt.

I am aware of the Hindi words "Ankit" and "Utkiran". In addition to this case, I have given my statements in the lower court, in this case. Those cases are still continuing. The temple is neither sold nor auctioned. In my statement made earlier, what I had said about purchasing in auction, that I had said in respect of "KHAJURHUT HOUSE" and that was not a temple. It is wrong to say that I have wrongly told the year of my birth as 1923. It is also wrong to say that I did not go to the disputed complex or around it anytime before 1950. It is wrong to say that the disputed building which was demolished on 6<sup>th</sup> December, 1992, was a mosque. It is also wrong to say that 5 times Namaz was performed in that disputed building. It is also wrong to say that the Namaz of Juma & Taraviah Namaz was performed in the disputed building. It is also wrong to say that there was no idol in the disputed bhavan before 22 December, 1949.

(On behalf of Mohd. Hashim in others original Suits No.4/89 plaintiff No.7 and in Other Original Suits No.5/89, Defendant No.5, the argument of Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddique over).

**9667:**

(On behalf of Defendant No.6/1 and Defendant NO.6/2, Irphan Ahmad, Advocate, on behalf of Defendant No.26 in others original suit No.5/89, Shri C.M. Shukla, Advocate accepted the arguments conducted by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate, Shri Zaffaryab Jillani, Advocate and Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddique, Advocate).

The argument on behalf of all Defendants/Parties over).

The statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Mahant Ramji Das Shastri

17.3.2004

Typed by the stenographer in the open court on giving dictation by me. The witness is now free to go.

Commissioner

17.3.2004