

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

Other original suit No.5 /1989

(R.S. No.236-89)

Bhagwan Shri Ram Virajman and others.....Plaintiffs.

Versus

Rejendra Singh & others.....Defendants

STATEMENT OF O.P.W.No.13

SHRI NARAD SARAN

(Pages 1-114)

www.vadaprativada.in

INTHE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT
ALLAHABAD.

LUCKNOW BENCH, LUCKNOW

O.O.S. No.5 OF 1989

BHAGWAN SRI RAM VIRAJMAN AT
SHRI RAM JANAM BHOOMI AND OTHERS....Plaintiffs
Versus

SHRI RAJENDRA SINGH AND OTHERS....Defendants

Main statement,affidavit by Shri Narad Saran O.P.W. 13

UNDER order 18, rule4 of Code of Conduct Procedure.

I Narad Saran aged about 76 years disciple of late Shri Manohar Saran, Resident of Saraju Kunj, Rinmochan Ghat, Ayodhya, District Faizabad hereby give the following statement:-

1. I came to Ayodhya with Shri Ram Manohar Saran in 1946 with a desire to become a Sadhu, lived with him and learned the culture and tradition of Saint Society. Since then I have been living a life of Sadhu. Our preceptor Shri Ram Manohar Saran Ji was the Mahant (Head Priest) of saraju Kunj, Rinmochan Ghat, Ayodhya. He expired in 1979 and I succeeded him as Mahant of Saraju Kunj.

2. My preceptor used to ask my fellow disciples to bring daily pitcher full of water from Sitakooop (a well named after Sita) located near Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi for his drinking and offering to God. Sometimes I also used to fetch the water from Sitakooop which was regarded very pious and medicinal. Other hermitages also used the water of Sitakooop.

3. When I came to Ayodhya in 1946, I used to visit Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi, Kanak Bhavan, Hanumangarhi, Nageshwarnath, Bari Chhawani, Maniramdas Chhawani and HanumanBagh etc.

4. I used to visit Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi very rarely. The entry door to Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi was from eastward, people mostly used this gate which was called Hanumatdwar. There were Kausati pillars on either side of the gate engraved with flowers and leaves having pinnacles and idols of jai and

Vijay. At the entrance of the door (Hanumatdwar) there was a stone written with a numerical 1 and "Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi Nitya Yatra" (daily visit to Ram birth place).

5. There was a door in the northward side also which was called Singhdwar (Lion-gate). There was an idol of aquila flanked by two idols of lions. Inside the lion gate there was kitchen of Sita marked with her footprints having sitting wooden board, rolling pin, hearth etc. which were also worshipped.

6. After entering the Hanumatdwar (main gate) there was Ram Chabutara (platform) having the idols installed on it. Ram Chabutara was about of my waist height. Below Ram Chabutara there were caves on the either side. There were also idols. There was a idol of Lord Ram made of Astdhatu (eight metals) on the Ram Chabutara. This was the idol which was installed in the Sanctum-Sanctorum below the middle pinnacle of three domed building on 23rd december, 1949 in Brahm Muhurta.

7. When entering through the eastern gate there was a building with three domes west, just below the middle dome, there was sanctum-sanctorum which was worshipped. My preceptor had told me about this place that it was always the most worshipped as the birth place of Lord Ram since time immemorial. I have also worshipped this place and found that it was thronged by thousands of pilgrims who paid their obeisance to this holy shrine. They also visited and worshipped Sita Kitchen, Ram Chabutara etc., and made a full round of the entire premises after coming out of Hanumatdwar.

8. Since the time I came to Ayodhya till today. I have neither seen any Muslim coming towards Ram Janam Bhoomi nor reciting the Namaz there.

9. After the independence, the Sadhus, Bairagis and Hindu devotees started removing and weeding out the brambles grown in the surroundings of Ram Janam Bhoomi and organized continuous recitation of devotional songs, jap, worships etc. attended by thousands of people.

10. In May-June, 1992 the work of leveling the land near Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi was going on. Once when the land towards the east of Ram Janam Bhoomi was being levelled, a tractor got stuck at a distance of 15-20 steps from Hanumatdwar giving a strange sound of breakdown and could not be retrieved in to motion despite many efforts. Many people including me got assembled there and the driver put the tractor on the back gear. The labourers started digging the land where the hurdle had stopped the tractor. After digging it pieces of large stones started emerging out. When the labourers with their combined efforts brought it out, the pieces of stones appeared to be the remnants of old demolished temple.

Deponent
Sd/- (Narad Saran)
O.P.W.13
Lucknow
Date 27-1-2003

Attestation

I deponent hereby attest that the statement given at Para 1 to 10 of the affidavit is true to the best of my knowledge and belief. Nothing has been concealed in and there is no perjury about it. May God help me.

Deponent
Sd/- (Narad Saran)
O.P.W. 13
Lucknow
Date: 27-01-2003

I, Ved Prakash, Advocate hereby verify that the deponent, Shri Narad Saran (O.P.W. 13) has signed this affidavit today on 27-1-2003 in my presence.

Sd/-
(Ved Prakash)
Advocate

-Seal-
High Court, Allahabad
Lucknow
Date:27-01-2003

Sd/- (Stamp)
Oath Commissioner
Allahabad High Court.

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

O.O.S. No.5 OF 1989

(R.S. No.236 OF 1989)

Bhagwan Shri Ram Virajman AT
Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi & others.....Plaintiffs.

Versus

Rejendra Singh & others.....Defendants
(O.P.W.13 Shri Narad Saran)

An affidavit (from Page 1 to 5) was presented regarding main examination of Shri Narad Saran aged about 76 years, disciple of late Shri Ram Manohar Saran, R/o. of Saraju Kunj, Rinmochan Ghat, Ayodhya, District Faizabad, which has been recorded.

(Cross examination by Shri Ranjit Lal Verma, Advocate on behalf of Nirmohi Akhara, Defendant No.3)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Ram Manohar Saran had been living in Ayodhya for a long time. He was living in that temple where I am today. Shri Ram Manohar Saran was a sadhu of Ramanandi Sect. About 95 per cent Sadhus living in Ayodhya belong to Ramanandi Sect. The Akharas of Ramanandi Sect are also in Ayodhya. These Akhara are called Math (Monastery) also. Nirwani Akhara is one of the famous Akharas of Ramanandi Sect., Hanumangarhi Temple comes under it. The second famous Akhara is Nirmohi Akhara and Ram Janam Bhoomi temple comes under it. The third and fourth Akharas are Khaki and Digambar respectively. All these Akharas belong to Ramanandi Sect. Their Panchayat manages the Akharas. Elections are held to select the Mahant of Akhara, and the successful candidate holds the seat of Mahant. Shrimath of Ramanandi Sect. is in Kashi and Jangadguru Haryacharya is

its head presently. He also belongs to Ramanandi Sect. and he has been originally a Naga Sadhu of Hanumangarhi, Ayodhya. The Sadhus may belong to any Sect. but the selection of Jagadguru (Universal Teacher, Head of Shrimath) is made collectively by all. But a Sadhu from other Sect. cannot be the Jagatguru of Ramanandi Sect. All the Sadhus of Ramanandi Sect select the Jagatguru of Ramanandi Sect. collectively. Haryacharya succeeded succeeded Swami Shvramacharya. Haryacharya is a great scholar of vedic-sanatan literature and culture. I lived in District - Siddarthnagar (old Basti District) before coming to Ayodhya in 1946. I was 17-18 years old when I came to Ayodhya. I had a good understanding even at the age of 10 or so. I had never gone to Ayodhya before attaining the age of 17.

When I came to Ayodhya in 1946 it was summer season and went to visit Ram Janam Bhoomi temple. At that time no festival was going on there. For the first time when I entered the disputed site through the Hanumatdwar. I found on the left side a wooden Ganga Jamuni throne on Ram Chabutara. On this point the Advocate, cross examining the case, drew the attention of the witness towards a picture No. 57 of a coloured album Paper No. 200-C-1 pertaining to disputed structure prepared by U.P. Archeological Department and the witness said that it was the picture of the same platform (Chabutara) and confirmed that in 1946 when he first visited the site, the platform was in that condition. Towards the left and the right of the Chabutara the cave temple is also visible in this picture. After having a look at the picture No. 58 the witness replied that the cave temple was visible there but the idol which existed therein were not visible in the picture due to his poor eye sight now. Having seen the picture No. 59 of the same album the witness replied that it was the picture of Shiv-Darbar which existed inside the disputed site towards east-south of Ram Chabutara. Picture No. 61 of the album was showing the photos of Ganesh, Parvati, Kartikey,

Shankar, Nandi and Ardh-Shankar. The witness said that Picture No. 71 was the photo of "Chatti" worship site and rolling pin, hearth etc., were visible there. After seeing picture No.66 he said that it was the photo of rear Ram Chabutara. He said picture No.56 was showing the tin shed constructed towards the north of Ram Chabutara. H said all the above pictures were showing the statues which existed in the summer of 1946 at the time of his first visit to Ayodhya. He said "When I went there in 1946 many idols were installed on Ram Chabutara which included the idols of Ramlala, Laxmanji, Bharatji, etc., and some toys, many saligrams. There was an idol of Hanuman made of silver. There was only one idol of Lord Ram on the platform. There were prasad, flower, batasa vendors at the main gate of the disputed site, upto main road towards east and north. The devotees purchased batasa, flower etc., from the vendors when I used to go to Ram Chabutara for worship etc., the devotees offered prasad and get charnamrit and prasad. I also used to get charnamrit and prasad. The priests who received offerings, prasad and who distributed prasad and charnamrit were present there. It is true that there was a store, towards the north when entering through Hanumatdwar which prepared prasad and Sadhus lived there in a tin shed. I know Mahant Baldeo Das and also lived with him. Mahant Baldeo Das was a priest of Nirmohi Akhara. It is also true to say that Mahant Baldeo Das and the disciples lived at Ram Chabutara as the priests. Mahant Bhaskar Das disciple of Baldeo Das as is the Sarpanch of Nirmohi Akhara and is present in the Court. I have seen Mahant Bhaskar Das working as a priest between the years 1946 to 1949. The Sadhus who lived in the tin shed of Hanumantdwar mostly belonged to Nirmohi Akhara and other many Sadhus also lived with them. The non-Nirmohi Akhara Sadhus were the Sadhus from other Sect. and outsider Sadhus also. A Sadhu named Bhumia Saran had lived for sometime between 1946 to 1949 in that tin shed. Now I do not remember other names as they were migratory and

wandering Sadhus. Bhumia Sadhu became the disciple of Mahant Baldeo Das.

Three times Arati (worship with burning lamps) was used to be performed regularly in Ram Chabutara during the period from 1946 to 1949. Besides this, Shayan Arati was also performed and I have no knowledge about other Araties. Such daily three time Arati was offered in Shiv-Darbar and Chhatti site also. This time I do not remember whether any festival idol was installed in the Sanctum-Sanctorum during the period from 1946 to 1949. It is true that three times Arati was offered to the festival idol of Sanctum-Sanctorum. In the similar manner, the devotees used to respectfully bow and made offerings to the festival idol.

Before 23rd December, 1949 devotees in large numbers used to assemble in the field in front of Ram Janam Bhoomi temple for continuous recitation of Ramayan and devotional songs. I do not remember when Govt. attached the disputed site and also do not know the reason thereof, whether it was due to uncontrollable crowd or so. Later on I came to know that it was attached. I was not present there on 23rd December, 1949 on the occasion of installation of Lord Ram's idol in the Sanctum-Sanctorum below the middle dome of three domed building but on the same day in the morning I had a view of the idol of Ramlala in the Sanctum-Sanctorum. When I reached there in the morning the people were getting the view of the idol from outside of the Sanctum-Sanctorum, there was a big crowd but no police force. I do not remember if any priest was present in the Sanctum-Sanctorum. When I reached there the idol was visible on the throne. There was idol of Ramlala only in the throne, which was earlier kept on the platform. No other idol was therein the throne.

The idol of Ramlala which used to be kept on the platform was 5-6 inch tall and the same idol I found in the Sanctum-Sanctorum on 23rd December, 1949. The throne on Ram Chabutara had a number of idols which included the idols of

Ramlala, Laxman, Ramlala in the lap of mother Kaushalya, Bharat etc. After December, 1949 I came to know that the Sanctum-Sanctorum had been locked and receivers have been appointed. Even on appointing the receivers after December, 1949 I found that the arrangements for Shiv Darbar, Chhati Poojan, Ram Chabutara Darbar and store house had not been changed, it were same as 1946 but none it was under police protection.

Apart from Hanuman Mandir Hanumangarhi, there are Narsingh Gaddi, Ram Janaki Temple, Narsingh God's Temple and many other temples around the area. The temple of Sage Kapil is also within Nirwani Akhara. It is a fact that many temples may exist under one Akhara and this has been the tradition of Ramanandi Sect.

I do not remember whether many small temples towards the north of Sitakoop were in existence or not. There existed another Ram Janamsthan, Mandir, Gudartar and Sita Kitchen temple across the road towards the north of the disputed premise. These three temples are separate from Janambhoomi premise.

I am not a member of Vishwa Hindu Parisad. I know Ramchandra Das Paramhans very well. He is the Mahant of Digambar Akhara and I am also a Sadhu in this Akhara. Our area, also comes within that Akhara. I was informed that Mahant Ramchandra Das Paramhans had also filed a Suit about Ram Janam Bhoomi temple. I did not have any parley or consultation with him before giving witness in this case or after December, 1949.

(Cross examination by Shri Ranjit Lal Verma, Advocate on behalf of Nirmohi Akhara, Defendant No. 3 was concluded).

(Cross examination by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of Mohd. Ahmad, Defendant No.6)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

When I came to Ayodhya from Basti in 1946 my age was below 18-19 years. I had passed primary education by then. So

my education is only up to 4th standard. I know only Hindi language. My native village now has come under the Siddharthnagar District. This district Head Office has a small colony and a market. Now a Court has also come up there. As I do not go there frequently so I can't tell whether District Judge Court has been established there or not. Now I visit my village once in two-four years. I go to my village via Gonda-Balrampur-Tulsipur from Ayodhya. When I came to Ayodhya in 1946 I had a good understanding, When I came to Ayodhya in 1946, then I became the disciple of Mahant Ram Manohar Saran and helped him in worship etc. I started living with him at Saraju Kunj, Rin Mochan Ghat and was having meals with him also. I was living with my Guru at Saraju Kunj and till today I have been living in the same place. Till today I regard Ram Manohar Saran as my Guru. Now I am holding the seat of Mahant in Saraju Kunj and Rin Mochan Ghat, Ayodhya.

When I came to Ayodhya in 1946, I did not see any Mosque in the disputed premise. At that time, I saw temple and not mosque at the disputed site. It is true that I had seen three domes in the disputed structure. Temples also have three domes. We did not see any Mosque in the disputed site and there was no building of the Mosque below the disputed building. The building was below three domes. It is true that there were three rooms under the three domed building. the width of the wall of the building, having three rooms was about 4-5 feet. The combined length of all the three rooms must had been 30 hands. The middle room was comparatively higher than other two rooms. The inner width of one room may be about 8-10 feet.

Statement was attested after reading.

Sd/- Narad Saran

27-01-2003

Typed by a Stenographer in the Open Court on our dictation. Appear in the Court tomorrow on 28-1-2003 for further cross examination. The witnesses should also come.

Date: 28-1-2003O.P.W.-13 Shri Narad Saran

(In continuation of the proceedings of 27-1-2003, cross-examination of Shri Narad Saran. O.P.W. 13 by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate of Defendant No.6)

I cannot tell whether district Basti has a very high population of muslims or not. I have seen a Mosque in Basti district situated at a distance of 10-15 kilometers from my house. It had not three domes. I have not seen the Mosque having three domes. Otherwise I have seen many Mosques. Some Mosques are also seen on the way. There are turrets in the Mosque which make it prominent that it is a Mosque. I have not seen three domed building in Ayodhya. The building which was at the disputed site had three domes. I had gone inside it once or twice in 1946, perhaps after about 6 months when I came to Ayodhya. There was Hanumatdwar towards east of the disputed site and an iron gate in front of this dwar. After entering the iron gate there was a Courtyard measuring 10-15 hands width and 30-40 hands length and after that there was a building of the middle dome. There was nothing when I went inside of the three domed building in 1946. I went there to pay my obeisance to the Sanctum-Sanctorum. Again I went inside this building in 1992. At that time also the three domes were in the same position and condition. The three domes were constructed over the building. There was 12 black pillars below the domed building.

The building had 3 portion together. Each compartment of the disputed building had 4 pillars and all the pillars were about 5 feet high. These pillar were called "Kasauti". There was nothing inside the disputed building except the space. Each room of the disputed building had the measurement of about 8x10 feet, the middle room may be little larger. I have never seen the Namaz being offered in the disputed building. Non-Hindus did not used to go inside the building. The priests used to go there in 1946, one or two priests used to go inside the building for

sweeping and cleaning. A wall surrounded the disputed building from all the sides. There was Hanumatdwar towards its east and singh (lion) dwar towards the north. I have no knowledge about the fact that the Hindus lodged an F.I.R. on 23rd December, 1949 regarding forcibly occupying of the disputed building by the Hindus. I also do not know that some Ramdeo Dube wrote the aforesaid F.I.R.. I was present in Ayodhya on 23rd December, 1949. I did not hear any noise or commotion on 23rd December, 1949 at the disputed site. I went there in the morning on 23rd December, 1949 there was no police patrolling and people had assembled in thousands. They all were devotees and chanting devotional songs. There were very few people inside the disputed building. They all were Hindus. The Sadhus were coming in and out throughout the day from the building. No Muslim was there at that time I do not remember now that it was Friday on 23rd December, 1949.

No Muslim had gone to the disputed site on the day of Jumma. During leveling work in 1992 a tractor got stuck in front of the disputed site. When it was retrieved, a large piece of broken stone and many other broken pieces were found there. People assembled there to see the pieces of stone and it was a hot day in the month of June.

(Cross examination concluded by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of Defendant No.6)

(Cross examination started by Jaffaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of Sunni Central Board Waqf, Defendant No.4)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

When I went to the disputed building on 23rd December, 1949, I found there the idol of Ramlala on the wooden throne under the dome. On this point the Learned Advocate, cross examining the witness, showed the picture No. 152, 153, 154 and 155 from coloured album No.200 C-1 and the witness replied after seeing them that the photos were of the throne which he had seen on 23rd December, 1949 in the disputed building. He

said "on 23rd December, 1949. I have seen only the idol of ramlala in this throne. The throne was placed on a wooden plank and was under the middle dome with the support of the western wall. After that I did not go inside the disputed building till 1992. Before 6th December, 1992 I once or twice went in the disputed building. The throne was kept at the same place as was kept in 1949.

I went inside the disputed building not only on 23rd December, 1949 but also on 24th December, also.. After that it was my first visit to that place in 1992. In addition to the idol on the throne, there was also a picture of Ram Darbar hanged on the western wall on 23rd December, 1949. The picture was in the glass frame. Ram Darbar means the photos of Ram, Sita, Bharat, Laxman and Hanuman were in that pictures. Ram Darbar consisted of these 5 deities. Shri Ram was also wielding a bow. There was nothing in the disputed building except that of idol and the picture of Ram Darbar. The remaining part of the disputed building was empty. There were rooms under the three domes having arch shaped construction. There was no stair-case between the west and north walls of the middle dome. On this point the learned Advocate drew the attention of the witness towards the paper No. 154/13 and photo No. 10 submitted with original Suit No. 1/89 and the witness could not decide whether it was the photo of the inner site of the disputed building or not. He complained of his impaired eye-sight. He said "I cannot say that this photo taken in 1950 is of the lower portion under the middle dome. I do not remember that the idol was kept in the night of 22nd/23rd December, 1949 on this stair which is seen in this picture. So far I remember the throne was kept under the middle dome on 23rd December, 1949, so it is wrong to say that there was no throne on that day, as it has been shown in the aforesaid coloured picture No. 152, 152, 154 and 155.

Statement attested after reading it.

Sd/- Narad Saran

28-1-2003

Typed by the Stenographer in the Open Court on my dictation. In continuation of this, attend the Court on 29-1-2003 for further cross examination, witness should come.

Date: 29-1-2003

O.P.W.-13 Shri Narad Saran

(Cross-examination before the Full Bench by Shri Jaffaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of Defendant No.4 Sunni Central Board of Waqf in continuation of 28-1-2003).

I have gone to the disputed site many times since 1946. From 1946 to 23rd December, 1949, I went to the disputed site three or four times. I visited both the places viz; Ram Chabutara and Sita Kitchen at that time in the morning and evening also. I visited these places and there paid my obeisance at the disputed place. At that time the door of the inner railing wall used to be closed. I offered flowers in three places viz; Ram Chabutara, Sita Kitchen and the door of the disputed building. I offered the flowers inside the railing wall in 1946. Some flowers were already lying there. When I went to the disputed site for the second time the flowers lying there had been removed by the priest. There was no priest near the railing wall of the disputed building. The devotees used to put the flowers and sweets there. The priests were always there at the Ram Chabutara and sometimes the Sita Kitchen also. When I visited the disputed site in 1946 for the first time it was 7-8 'O' clock in the morning and 20-25 devotees were present there. Arti and worship had already been finished at Ram Chabutara when I reached there. The next time I went to the disputed site at 5.30 AM and it was summer season. The temple at Ayodhya where I resided at that time was at a distance of 1 ^{1/2} furlong from the disputed building. I am still living in that temple. I get up at 4.00 in the morning and perform the worship daily. This has been my routine till today since 1946, I regularly perform worship in my temple. During 1946 to 23rd

December, 1949 whenever I visited the disputed site I found no policeman on duty there but both the doors of the railing wall of the disputed building were always found to be closed. But the doors were not locked till 1949. So anybody who wanted to go inside could go and these who were not interested didn't go inside. There was no restriction for the devotees to enter the domed building. Because there used to be a chain on the doors, so I did not go inside and instead used to pay my obeisance from the outside. Since 1949 to 23rd December, 1949 I went inside the building only once and it was the evening time and the doors were opened because it was brooming and sweeping time. It was before sunset when I entered the building. There was no electricity in the disputed site at that time. As I had not gone to the disputed site after the sunset so I cannot tell whether lamp or lantern was used there. I did not see any lantern there. There was no earthen lamp (Diya) at Ram Chabutara also but there was Kerosene lantern.

I have not entered through the north door of the disputed building but have come out through it. There was a 5-6 feet wide land near the north door and going through that piece of land a path leads to the road which go from Dorahi well to Hanumangarhi and across the road there is Janamsthan temple. I have also gone there between 1946 to 1949. I have had the darshan of Lord Ram in Gurdartar temple. In the same temple, the idols of Ram, Sita, Laxman, Bharat and Hanuman have also been kept there. There is no Sita Kitchen in this temple but the name Sita Kitchen is added with the name of the temple. But I can't tell why the name Sita Kitchen is added there. I do not know that there is Sita Rasoi and it is worshipped, I cannot tell the name of the god whose birth place is this temple. I do not remember that there is an inscription at the gate of the Janamsthan temple like an inscription fixed at the gate of the disputed premise. I never went to janamsthan temple and the disputed site with my preceptor Ram Manohar Saran. I always

went at Janamsthan temple and the disputed site alone. For the first time when I went to the disputed site, there was some discussion at my residence that which were the places worth seeing there and came to conclusion that I have to visit the disputed site. I paid my obeisance to all the places where the devotees were doing so. I visited the disputed site after 2-3 days of my reaching at Ayodhya. Prior to this, discussions took place at my residence regarding the places to be seen there. In the said discussions not only the disputed place, but other places were also discussed to be visited. When I visited the disputed site within 2-3 days of reaching Ayodhya, on the same day, I visited Kanak Bhavan, Hanumangarhi and on the next day I visited Nageshwarnath, Hanumanbagh, big cantonment, Maniram Das Chhawani. During the period from 1946 to 1949 I visited Hanumangarhi and Kanak Bhavan about 5-10 times. Kanak Bhavan is at a distance of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ - 2 furlong and Hanumangarhi about 3 furlong from my residence. Nageshwarnath is at a distance of four furlong from my residence. Maniramdas Chhawani and Hanumanbagh are at a distance of 1 mile and Bari Chhawani at a distance of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles from my residence. During 1946 to 1949 I visited Maniramdas Chhawani, Hanumanbagh, Nageshwarnath 3 to 4 times but after 1949, I must have visited umpteen times. Before coming to Ayodhya I did not know the importance of these places which I have already described in Para 3 of affidavit. I had read Ramcharitmanas before going to Ayodhya but I could not read Valmiki Ramayan so far. I have read Ramcharitmanas originally. There is a mention of Ayodhya only in Ramcharitmanas and not other places which I have described in Para 3 of my affidavit. There is no mention of disputed site in Ramcharitmanas. This much is written only "My birth place and city is very beautiful where saryu flows in its north direction". It's meaning relates with the entire Ayodhya and not with a particular. I do not know who built the disputed building. When I saw it in 1946.

It was a complete building except that the rear wall was broken at some places. I did not try to know from my Guru or other people that who had really constructed this three domed disputed building. I also heard that the Commander of Babar constructed the three domed building. I was told that Babar was an emperor and a Muslim by religion. I was also told that he tried to construct the disputed building as a Mosque but it could not get the shape of a Mosque. I have also come to know that there was a continuous struggle for this building, sometimes Muslims tried to build it as Mosque and sometimes the Hindus tried to make it a temple. It is understood that the last struggle took place in 1934.

The places which I have described in Para 3 of my affidavit had idols except Sri Ram Janam Bhoomi temple. But the idol was kept in Ram Janam Bhoomi in the night of 22/23 December, 1949. But on all those places which have been mentioned in Para 3 of the affidavit, there have not been the idols of Lord Ram. There is an idol of Hanuman only in Hanumanbagh, there are idols of Shankar Darbar in Nageshwarnath in Hanumangarhi. There is an idol of Hanuman in the middle flanked by the idols of Ram Darbar, Kanak Bhavan has the idols of Ram, Sita and Laxman. There is a Sanctum-Sanctorum in Kanak Bhavan and the same is in square shape. I can't tell its length & weadth as we cannot enter the Sanctum-Sanctorum, and can pay obeisance from outside only.

I have seen electricity in Kanak Bhavan since 1946. It is the belief that Kanak Bhavan was the residence of Siraji. Between the Kanak Bhavan and the disputed site there are 7-8 buildings which are- Sakshi Gopal, Shri Fakira Ram Temple, Kaushalya Bhavan, Kaikeyi Bhavan, Ved Mandir, Rangmahal, Ram Kachhari, Kakbhusundi Temple etc. Kanak Bhavan is bigger than the disputed building and Kaushalya Bhavan and Kaikeyi Bhavan are also bigger than the disputed building. My own belief

that Kaikayi and Kaushalya Bhavan are the same where Queen Kaushalya lived respectively. Kaikeyi & Kaushalya were the queens of the King Dashratha. These were the residences of the three queens of King Dashratha. It is said that the present Ayodhya was within the premises of King Dashratha's palace. So we can assume that his palace was very big covering the area of many kilometers, I do not know that at which place in Ayodhya the palace of Dashratha started and where it ended. The present Dashratha Mahal in Ayodhya is not the palace of Dashratha but it is a temple. It has been told to me that the western end of Dashratha palace was beyond the disputed building.

Sumitra Bhavan was situated at a distance of 40 steps towards south from hanumatdwar of the disputed premises. There were the idols of Ram Darbar in Sumitra Bhawan but I never went there to perform worship. I also did not go inside Kaushalya Bhavan and Kaikeyi Bhavan to perform worship. Sumitra Bhavan was in existence in 1946 but not today. This building was demolished in 1992 at the time of levelling the land. It was a small building and even smaller than the disputed building.

It was not towards the read going to Sitakoop but towards the right side at about a distance of 15-20 hands. I have not seen anyone doing worship in Sumitra Bhavan but visitors used to go there. In kaushalya Bhavan and Kaikeyi Bhavan the devotees used to come and worshipped through the priests. I do not know the name of any priest working in Kaushalya, Kaikeyi and Sumitra Bhavans. The water of Sitakoop has special significance because I have been told that the water brought from all the holy places of pilgrimage for the coronation of Ram was poured into Sitakoop. I believe that Sitakoop is there since the time of Ram. The hindus of Ayodhya and outside of Ayodhya believe so. People pay a visit to Sitakoop and take its water but no worship is performed there. No priest live there. It is a deep well made of Lakhori bricks and lime. It is so deep that the water

is not visible when we peep into the will. The priests living in the disputed building made the arrangements for Sitakoop. There was a way from Sitakoop to disputed site during 1946 to 1949 and were no bushes and brambles there. The way met to Sitakoop after leading from the south corner of Hanumatdwar of the disputed site. The bushes and brambles mentioned by me in Para 9 of the affidavit were towards south and north of this way. Sumitra Bhavan was situated towards south of this way. There were no brambles on the way leading to Sumitra Bhavan. There were thick bushes and brambles towards east-south and west of Sumitra Bhavan. The boundary of disputed premises appeared to be as old as the disputed building. Ram Chabutra which was within the disputed site also looked as old as the disputed building. Janamsthan temple which was towards the north of the disputed premise appeared less old than the disputed building. Sita Rasoi located in the disputed building appeared to be as old as the disputed building. The measurement of Sita Rasoi within the disputed building was about 8x10 feet. It was at an open place having no tin shade or roof. It was like a platform slightly (four-six finger) higher than the ground. It appeared to be made from lime mixture. there was a rolling pin and a dough board made of white stone, how old were it that I would not be able to tell. The hearth was made of lime mixture. The platform and the hearth appeared to be made in the same period. There were four foot prints on a white stone. These four foot prints were of a child. How old they were I do not now. Some people told me that mother kaushalya performed Chhati Poojan of Ram Chandra there. So that place is known S Chhati Poojan. my preceptor also told me this and I have also heard it from the people. I did not read this in any book. I have not heard that there was Kitchen of Sita but it is generally said that it was a place where at the time of Chhati Poojan of Ramji Chhati Poojan of ram was performed.

I have been told that at the time of King Vikramaditya a temple was constructed at the disputed site. My preceptor also told me this, but I have not read about it in any book. The place where I am living is called Saraju Kunj, Rinmochan Ghat. It is situated at a distance of one furlong towards South from Sarayu river. RinmochanGhat is the name of the Mohalla which covers the area from Katra to the bank of Sarayu, Sarayu Kunj which is my living place is the name of a temple. The bank of Sarju where people take bath is at a distance of one furlong from my residence. Devotees come to my temple themselves to perform worship etc. and go to the Ghat for taking bath. I do not take any devotee to the Ghats for taking bath. Whatever the devotees offer me as donation and Dakshina I take is as it is the only source of my livelihood. Some houses of the temple are also there in Ayodhya and I get some income from it as a rent. I never went to the disputed site and took any devotee for worship and "Darshan". Hanumangarhi and Nageshwarnath temples are very old temples of Ayodhya. I cannot tell whether these two temples were constructed before or after the disputed building. Kanak Bhavan is also very old temple. I remember that it was constructed after the disputed building that I do not know. Which is the oldest temple of Ayodhya that I do not know. There are more than 400 temples in Ayodhya and out of it I have seen 10-15 temples closely. Except the temple of Shankar no devotee or visitor can enter the Sanctum-Sanctorum of any temple. I have seen these 10-15 temple of Ayodhya closely from outside not from inside. The distance of Sanctum-Sanctorum from the main gate of Nageshwarnath temple is about 10 steps. There is a 10 feet wide way which is not open and having roof over it and its Sanctum-Sanctorum is in a square shape measuring less than 8x10 feet. There is no pinnacle or dome over the Sanctum-Sanctorum from the main gate of Hanumangarhi temple is about 15-20 steps. The way is partially shaded and partially open and there is a pinnacle over the

Sanctum-Sanctorum. The measurement of the Sanctum-Sanctorum maybe 8x10 feet. The pinnacle over this temple is entirely different from the dome of the disputed building.

On this point the Learned Cross Examiner drew the attention of the witness towards Paper No. 120 C-1/2 Page 164, Plate No. 2, and the witness replied that the pinnacle was almost similar to the Hanumangarhi temple but the design was different. The pinnacle (dome) of Hanumangarhi is not prominent by circular shape but by height. There is no pinnacle over the temple in the Kanak Bhavan. Bari Chhawani and Maniram Das Chhawani temples also have lofty pinnacles. The pinnacles of both the temples are higher than the pinnacle shown in Plate No. 2 of the book. There are four circular pinnacles in the temple of Nabinagar. This temple is more than 100 years old. I cannot say that it is less older or not than Hanumangarhi temple. Nabinagar temple has also the idols of Ram and Laxman. In this temple there is a pinnacle over the Sanctum-Sanctorum and other pinnacles are side by side and below these pinnacles are the idols of Hanuman and Shankar etc. separately. The portions of the pinnacles are separate and are at a distance. All these pinnacles are in the same compound having 40-50 feet length & breadth respectively. This type of pinnacle shown in Plate No.2 after Page No. 164 of the book, can be seen in other temples also of Ayodhya. The four circular pinnacles (domes) of Nabinagar temple are smaller than the domes of the disputed building. There is no pinnacle either circular or longer in Janamsthan temple, Gudartar. Similarly there was/is no pinnacle on the Kaushalya Bhawan, Kaikeyi Bhavan or Sumitra Bhavan (now demolished). Sakshi Gopal Temple has no pinnacles. I have not seen that temple after 1992. This Sakshi Gopal Temple is at a distance of 30-35 steps from the north-east corner of the disputed structure. It is true that the disputed building and Sakshi Gopal Temple were situated on the same site towards the south of the road between the disputed building, and Ram

Janamsthan Temple. Sakshi Gopal Temple was at a distance of 30-35 steps from the way connecting the road to Hanumatdwar towards east. This temple is not very old, not more than 100 years old. In June 1992 no portion of Gopal Temple was demolished during leveling work. I have not seen its' rear site and cannot tell if any portion of it was demolished or not. Leveling work was carried out upto Sitakoot in the east of the disputed building and toward south it was done in a long stretch. The leveling work was done at least upto 100 feet. When I saw the leveling work going on it must have started only 2-4 days ago. It was June, 1992. I visited the disputed site twice or thrice during the leveling work. I have told in Para 10 of my affidavit about a tractor which got stuck while working. I had seen it there myself as it was my first visit to the site during leveling work. I visited the place on the second and the third day also. A big stone and some stones were taken out in my presence. These stones were found at a distance of 15-20 feet towards east-south corner of the disputed structure. I came to know after 3 days of this incidence that the officers/staff of the Archaeological Survey of India had taken these stones to the Raj Sadan to see the stones. I had seen those pieces of stones only on the day of tractor incidence. The remaining days, I had not seen them. I had seen them buried in the earth. They were dugged out in my presence and kept at a distance of 2-4 hands towards east-south from the spot of their emanation.

The Learned Cross Examiner invited the attention of the witness towards Paper No. 118 C-1/35/37 and the witness replied after having seen it that the stones visible in the picture were those which he had seen digging out on the day when the tractor got stuck there. This picture belongs to that place where the stones were kept after digging out. Some labourers, a Constable and some other Constables and officers are also seen in the picture but I cannot tell the name and designation of the officers. The stones visible at Page 2 of the same book 118 C-

1/35 are not those stones but some other stones. This photo shows one room of the disputed building or not, I cannot understand. On the next day I did not go to see the stones but leveling work was in progress on that day. I did not read about the recovery of these stones

in any newspaper. I am not a habitual reader of newspaper but sometimes I read them. The picture seen above at Page 3 of the Book No. 118 C-1/35 is not familiar to me and I cannot tell that to which place it belongs. I also cannot tell that it belongs to the nearby site of the disputed premise. After leveling the land, the level of the nearby land of the disputed site may be 1 ^{1/2} hand down of the disputed building. At Page 2 of the book No. 118 C-1/35 some portion of the land is visible at low level but I cannot tell how much lower is it from other portion. It is not clear to me whether the upper portion was the part of the disputed building or not. I cannot tell whether this is the picture of the east or south side of the disputed building or not. Because during the leveling work I visited the disputed site only for three days so I cannot tell when the leveling work was finished. After June, 1992 I did not go to the leveling site for six or twelve months. In December, 1992 I went to the disputed building only through the leveling site. I do not remember whether in December, 1992 the position of the leveling site was the same as is visible at Page 2 of the Book No. 118 C-1/35, the witness said after using the magnifying glass that he could not tell to which place the picture given at Page 4 of the book No. 118 C-1/35 belonged. It is right to say that the that the middle picture at page 11 of the book No. 118 C-1/35 shows the disputed building and the leveling site before it. After looking at it attentively the full portion of the east and some portion of the south of the disputed building was visible there. This picture does not show that part of land from where those stones were taken out about which I have mentioned in Para 10 of my affidavit.

Statement attested after reading
Sd/- Narad Saran 29.1.2003

Typed by the Stenographer in the Open court on my dictation. In continuation of this attend the Court on 30-01-2003 for further cross examination.

Date 30-1-2003 O.P.W. 13 Shri Narad Saran

(Cross examination started before the Full bench by Shri Jafaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of Defendant No. 4 Sunni Central Board of Waqf in continuation of 29-1-2003)

When I say "Janam Bhoomi" it means Lord Ram got his birth in the disputed building but when I say "Janamsthan" I do not mean that Lord Ram got his birth there. Ayodhya is the Janam Bhoomi of Lord Ram and we take the place below middle dome of the disputed structure as his Janamsthan. Janamsthan and Janam Bhoomi have the same meaning. God Ram was born in Treta era. I do not know this calculation whether Treta Yug existed 10 lac years or 20 lac years ago but it is not possible that Ram was born before 5 thousand years. It is also not possible that he got birth before 10-20 thousand years. I have heard the name of Dwapar but do not know the serial number at which it comes. The present Yug is Kaliyug. I have knowledge about the period of time so will not be able to tell that Kaliyug has the period of 4 lac 32 thousand years. I do not know whether Lord Ram was born thousand years ago or lacs of years ago. Ram must have been born in the palace of Kaushalya. I have not read in any book that on which side of King Dashratha's palace, the palace of Kaushalya was situated, neither I have heard so from anybody that it was written in a particular book. Lord Ram got his birth in the disputed building. I am saying it on the basis of traditional belief. I have heard this from Ram Manohar Saran, Ram Govind Saran, Keshab Ram. These three persons have died. I have heard it from Ramayani Ram Subhagdas also who is alive and living in Ramkot, Ayodhya. He is about 90 years old. He is a

scholar of Ramayan. Ayodhya has been described as Awadh in the Ramcharitmanas and also have been called as Awadhपुरी, Manपुरी and Ayodhya also. Ayodhya is at a distance of 3 Yojan from Saraju. I have also not heard that in Valmiki Ramayan Ayodhya said to be at a distance of 3 Yojan from the bank of Saraju. The present Ayodhya is not the Ayodhya of Lord Ram's time. I have heard from the people that Ram Chandra departed to heaven from Guptar Ghat and all the people and the animals of Ayodhya also went with him and Ayodhya became desolate at that time. I have also heard that later on King Vikramaditya rehabilitated Ayodhya.

I do not know how Vikramaditya identified Ayodhya and rehabilitated it. I am not aware of any hearsay that at the time of King Vikramaditya a cow was let loose and where she dropped milk it was considered the birth place of Lord Ram. The fourth period of night is called Brahm Muhurta. The period of Brahma Muhurta in December is from 3 A.M. to 5 A.M. Brahma Muhurta has a great religious significance, because it is regarded very important time for worship, meditation, ritual etc. I have heard it from many people that the idol was placed in the disputed building in Brahma Muhurta. Shri Ram Surat Pande, Dharani Dhar Pandit, Balram Das etc., are few among them. Baba Balram Das and Dharani Dhar Pandit are alive and living in Ayodhya. I have said in my affidavit that the idol placed in Ram Chabutara was made of Astdhatu (eight metals). I had seen it in 1946 from a distance of 2-3 hands and came to know that it was made of Astdhatu. It was placed between a throne on the Ram Chabutara. The same throne which I saw in 1949 was on Ram Chabutara regularly till 1992, but I did not see that idol of Ramlala after 23 December, 1949 on that throne which was there from 1946 to 22nd December, 1949 there was another idol of Ramlala in the throne. Bothe the idols were almost of the same viz; 5-6 inch tall. On this point the Learned Cross Examiner drew the attention of the witness towards Picture No. 57, album paper No. 200 C-1.

and after its perusal the witness replied that the picture was of Ram Chabutara. He said "The throne is visible in this picture and this is the same throne which I saw in 1946 and it was there on the Chabutara till 1992. There is a big idol visible in the throne but I am unable to understand its face. There is no idol visible in this picture.

After perusing picture No.58 the witness said that no idol was visible in that picture also. Only 2-3 red stops were visible but I cannot tell what they are. Three rooms are visible in picture No. 57 of this album. No idols kept separately in all the rooms but all the idols were at one place. After seeing the picture No. 9 of the album the witness said "this is the photo of Hanumatdwar an outer gate of the disputed building. There were pictures of Jay & Vijay on the pillars of Hanumatdwar but they are not visible in this picture. Where the russet colour is seen on the pillar there were the idol of Jay-Vijay. The gate of iron rod wall is also not visible in this picture". Having seen the picture of the north side of Hanumatdwar. There appeared to be a pillar of Kasauti in the picture. One stone was also visible but what was written on it was not visible. There were some changes in Hanumatdwar in 1949 in comparison to the position that I saw in 1946, some marble stones were affixed there and something was written on it. After perusing the picture No. 47, 48, 52 and 52 the witness said that the marble with some inscription on them were not there till 1949. About the picture No. 40 he said "This is the Picture of the upper portion of Singhdwar. Something is carved which is not clear. Something is made there it may be fish or anything else. On seeing the picture No. 38, 39, 41 and 42 he said "This is also the picture of Singhdwar of the disputed building". He said about picture No. 37 "the northern way of the disputed building is visible here which emanated from northern gate to meet the road. This width of this way is 6-7 hands. There is a barricade, and a broad way towards it's south is visible in the picture. The road of Dorahi Kuan was also as broad as the

said way. Having seen the picture No. 74 he replied - "it is also a picture of any gate of the disputed building but I do not remember which is this door? White marbles were used in the platform of Kaushalya Rasoi, outside of the disputed building after 1949. White stones were also laid near "Kathghare wali" wall of the disputed building after 1949. After seeing Picture No. 71-72 of the coloured album the witness replied "this is Kaushalya Rasoi with white marbles but I have not seen the marbles before 1949. The throne visible in picture No. 71-72 written Kaushalya Rasoi was not there till 1949. According to my belief it was Chhati Poojan Sthal and not Kaushalya Rasoi or Sita Rasoi. The tin shed visible in picture No. 70-71 of this Album was not there till 1949. I have seen this tin shed there beyond two years from 1949. The Katghara seen in Picture No. 70 was northern wall of the disputed building.

There was no door to enter inside the north Katghara wall of the disputed building. The gate which is visible to the right of the picture is Singhdwar (north door) of the disputed building". About Picture No. 68 of the coloured album the witness said "this is the picture of the east - Katghare wall of the disputed building. At the lower portion of the wall there is something written in block letters on white stone. All these stones were fixed after 1949". About picture No. 63, 64, 65 of the coloured album he said that it was the picture of the eastern Katghara wall of the disputed building. On seeing the picture No. 77 the witness said this was the picture of the door of the east Katghara wall of the disputed building. The door which is visible in the Katghara wall is in front of Hanumatdwar and the tree before it is of Maulsari. About picture No. 75, 76 he said that the tree visible in the picture was the same as seen in picture No. 77. About picture No. 201 he said that the door which was visible in the Katghara wall may be before the Hanumatdwar. It may be possible that the door visible picture No. 77 was north door of the east Katghara

wall of the disputed building. After seeing the picture No. 84, 85 the witness said that the room which is visible might be the picture of the middle room of the disputed building.

The photo of the door seen in the picture No. 103 belongs to the disputed building but which is the door that I may not be able to tell properly. I will not be able to tell whether it is of the middle door or not of the disputed building. At the both corners of the door, black stones are visible. About Picture No. 84, 85 of the coloured album he said that stones were not clearly visible there but stones were fixed there. It is wrong to say that the door of the disputed building, seen in picture No. 84-85, had no black stones outside. After seeing picture No. 86 he said that it was the middle door of the disputed building. He said "I cannot say definitely after seeing this picture whether this is the picture of southern door of the disputed building or not". having seen the picture No. 87-88 of the coloured album, the witness said that it was the picture of both side wall of the middle door of the disputed building where such type of niches were built. Having seen the picture No. 89 of the coloured album the witness said that it was the picture of the upper portion of the middle door of the disputed building.

Statement attested after hearing it.

Sd/- 30-1-2003

Typed by the Stenographer in the Open Court on my dictation. In continuation of it appear before the Commissioner, Shri Narendra Prasad, O.S.D./A.D.J. after the recess for further cross examination.

Date 30-1-2003 O.P.W. 13 Shri Narad Saran

Before - Commissioner Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/ Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow.

(Appointed by the Order of Hon'ble Full Bench dated 30-1-2003 in Original Suit No. 5/89)

(In continuation of 30-1-2003 (forenoon) cross examination started after recess by Shri Jafaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of Defendant No.4)

The witness was shown the Picture No. 79 of document No. 200 C-1 of the coloured album and he said that a door of the disputed building was visible in the picture but the inner courtyard of the disputed building was not visible. He said "some people are seen there standing but I cannot tell properly, it appears to me that the people are standing in the outer courtyard of the disputed building". After looking at the Picture No. 80 he said "some eastern part of the disputed building is seen here which is also visible in Picture No. 79 I cannot tell whether the people standing in Picture No. 80 are standing in inner courtyard or outer courtyard but it is definite that they are in the courtyard. The courtyard seen in Picture No. 79 and 80 has a width of about 7-8 hands. It may be possible that the courtyard seen in Picture No. 79 and 80 is the inner courtyard of the disputed building which was between Katghara wall and domed building. It is; not correct to say that the width of the courtyard visible in these pictures is about 20-25 hands but it must be 10-12 hands only". Taking a view of Picture No.79 he said "I cannot tell clearly but the door visible in this picture seems to be door below the southern dome. After that the tree which is visible there, was out of the disputed building. Beyond the part of the

domed building visible in Picture No. 79 there was a boundary wall. This boundary wall is not clear in this picture. It was with southern wall of the domed building. It was from the building towards the east and in the east it started from Ram Chabutara running towards south and met with the east wall where Hanumatdwar was situated. I do not remember that there was about 20 feet vacant area between the domed building and the middle of the boundary wall which was in the shape of a platform. I did not see there any place for urinating or ablution of hands etc". The witness saw the document No. 154/16 submitted with the Original Suit No. 1/89 and said "this picture does not appear to me of any part of the disputed building. It is wrong to say that it was the picture of the place of urination on the platform formed with the south boundary wall of the disputed building". He was shown document No. 154/8 submitted for other Original Suit No. 1/89 and he said that the disputed building with domes was visible there. He could not tell from which direction of the disputed building the photo was taken. He said that he could not see any boundary wall in that picture. He looked at the document No. 154/6 submitted with O.O. Suit No. 1/89 and told that the upper part of the disputed building was visible there but could not tell the part to which it belonged. He was shown document No. 154/5 submitted with O.O.S. No. 1/89 and he replied that the north gate and the outer boundary wall of the disputed building was visible in that picture. Staircases were also visible towards the right of the stairs in the picture but said that he could not tell whether it was a platform or a grave. The witness was also shown document No. 154/12, 154/14 and 154/15 submitted with O.O.S. No. 1/89. After having a look on them he said "I have not seen these parts in the disputed building. It is wrong to say that the upper part of the western wall below

the middle dome is visible in this picture. It appears to me that some leaves and flowers are inscribed in the wall towards upper side. I do not know whether Allah was inscribed there or not. The other inscription below that inscription also seem to be flower and leaves to me and I cannot tell if do not anything in Arabi is written there. The inscriptions do not seem to be written in any language, nothing is written there in Hindi or Sanskrit also.

Question: I am to say that the word Allah and the lines written in Arabi are visible here in the photo which can be in any Masjid only, not in any temple. What do you say about it ?

Ans: I have not read Urdu or Arabi and I have to say that the above inscriptions are leaves and flowers only.

There are three inscriptions visible in above picture No. 154/14 and 154/15 which are like designs and in round shape. I cannot tell if Allah is written or not within two - two circles.

Question: I am to say that such designs on both the pictures can be on the Masjid wall only and not on the wall of any temple. What do you say about it?

Ans: Such designs can be in the temple also but Allah cannot be written there.

If Allah is written in such designs then it cannot be the design of the temple. If in the design of this picture, Allah is written then this wall cannot be the wall of the temple.

The witness was shown the Picture No. 82 of the coloured album 200 C-1 and after having a glance of it he said "one dome of the disputed building is visible there but which dome is it, northern or southern that I caould not

understand. One tree is also visible there which is out of the disputed building. I cannot tell that the part of the disputed building visible here may be southern dome or the lower wall of the disputed building and the tree may be at the platform of the southern wall and within the southern boundary wall. After seeing the Picture No. 83 of the album the witness said - "this picture can be of any part of the disputed building but exactly of which part that I cannot tell. I cannot tell if it is the picture of the upstairs with the southern wall of the disputed building. I also cannot tell if the stairs seen in Picture No. 81 and 82 are the same as seen in Picture No. 83. The tree seen in Picture No. 81 and 82 is at some distance from the building but I cannot tell if the tree was within or out of the boundary wall. The tree is visible quite adjacent to the building in the picture and its real distance cannot be determined". To see the picture No. 84 he said "the curtains are seen there on the door. I did not see the curtains in 1946. I had seen them only since 1949. The constable visible in these pictures was seen by we after 1949. About Picture No. 87 and 88 he said that those pictures were of the western wall of the middle door of the disputed building. The niches seen in the picture were built in western wall. Western wall means the wall below the dome. Having seen the Picture No. 91, 92 and 93 of the album the witness said "these pictures appear to be of the disputed building but of which part of the building they belong, I am unable to understand. It is true that pictures are of the upper portion of the disputed building where a stone was affixed and something written on it. I cannot tell in which dialect or language it was written". After seeing the Picture No. 97 the witness said "I am unable to tell whether the niches seen in the picture were built in the western wall below the dome or in the eastern wall". About Picture No. 98 he said "this is the picture of

the dome or the door of the disputed building but I cannot tell if it is of north dome or door or south dome or door". About Picture No. 99 and 100 he said "I cannot tell whether the door visible in these pictures is the door below the south-dome or north dome. One Constable is visible to me in Picture No. 99 and 100 but no board by the side of the constable is visible. He looked at Picture No. 102 and told "this is the picture of the disputed building but it is not clear to me to which portion of the disputed building does it belong. A large wooden cage is visible to me behind the Constable in this picture. Behind the Katghara (Wooden cage) wall the northern gate is visible to me". About Picture No. 104 and 105 he said "black pillars are visible to me in these pictures but I cannot tell their location, whether they are in eastern or western wall of the building". After seeing the picture No. 106, 107 and 108 the witness said "the pillars seen here are of the disputed building but I cannot tell where and at which wall of the disputed building the pillars were installed. I cannot tell that the pillars seen in the above three pictures were inside or the outside of the building". Having seen the Picture No. 109 and the enclosure No. 114 the witness told that the pillars seen in the pictures were of the disputed building but he could not tell where and at which wall the pillars were raised and were they inside or the outside of the building.

Statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Narad Saran

30-1-2003

Typed by the Stenographer in the Open Court on my dictation. Attend the Court on 31-12-2003 in its continuation for further cross examination.

Date 30-1-2003 O.P.W. 13 Shri Narad Saran

Before - Commissioner Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow.

(Appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench's Order dated 30-1-2003 in other Original Suit No. 5/89)

(In continuation of 30-1-2003 cross examination of Shri Narad Saran O.P.W. - 13 by Shri Jafaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of Defendant No.4)

The Learned Advocate showed to witness Picture No. 115 enclosure 127 of document No. 200 C-1 and he replied that the pillars seen in the picture were of the disputed building. He said "but I cannot tell to which wall or part of the disputed building the pillars belong. Some appear to be of inner side walls and some of the outer wall. The pillars seen in picture No.115, 120, 126 and 127 are of the outer side of the disputed building. Out of these pillars 2 pillars were in the east of the middle door and 2 pillars were at Hanumatdwar but I am not clear about two pillars which were at the door below the middle dome and which were at the Hanumatdwar. Having seen Picture No. 116 and 117 the witness said that the picture of Ramlala was visible to him in Picture No. 116 but it was not clear to him whether the picture was in a calendar or in a wooden frame. He said "I am also not clear that at which part of the disputed building this picture has been hung. There is no picture of Ramlala visible to me in Picture No. 117. I do not remember if I had seen the picture of Ramlala visible in Picture No. 116 hanging anywhere in the disputed building". He was asked to see the Picture No. 128 and 129 and he replied

that both the pictures appeared to be of the building but to which part of the building they belonged, he did not know it. He said "These pictures are not of the outer side of the disputed building but of the inner side. It is not clear to me to which inside wall the pictures belong. I cannot recognize the photo visible in both the pictures. I have never seen such pictures in the disputed building. Picture No. 130 enclosure 135 of the album was displayed to the witness and he said that the picture was of the inner side of the disputed building but to which inner part it belonged he could not tell. He continued - "Those photos are of the door and the roof also but not clear to which door or roof they belong. He looked the photos No. 136 to 147 and said that the photos were of the pillars of the disputed building. But it was not clear to him that to which wall or part they belonged. He said "some pillars visible in the picture were of the inner side and some were of the outer side. The pillars seen in Picture No. 140, 141, 143 and 147 seem to be of the outer side of the disputed building. Out of them, which pillars are of the room below the dome and which are of the Hanumatdwar that I cannot tell. The Picture No. 148 enclosure 151 of the album were shown to the witness and he replied that the pictures were of the disputed building. He also looked at Picture No. 148 and 150 of the same album and said that the picture appeared to be of the portion below the middle dome of the disputed building. He said "An umbrella and the face of a man are visible in Picture No. 148 and an umbrella is there in Picture No. 150 also but I do not recognize that man and before today, I have never seen the umbrella installed in the disputed building". After seeing the Picture No. 156 of the same album he said "the floor is visible to me but I cannot tell definitely if the floor is of any part of the disputed building. i do not remember that I had ever seen such a floor in the

disputed building. About the picture No. 157 enclosure 167 he told that these were the pictures of the pillars of the disputed building but he did not recollect the part of the building where such pillars were raised. Picture No. 168 of the same album was shown to him and he replied that it belonged to the disputed building but of which part of building, he could not recollect. Picture No. 169 enclosure 175 of the same album was shown to him and he gave the same answer as of the picture No. 168 above.

He said "A door is seen in picture No. 173 and it appears to be the picture of the door below the dome". About picture No. 176 enclosure 200 he said "the pillars of the disputed building are seen here but to which part of the building they belong is not clear to me. Whether the pillars were installed inside or the outside of the building is also not clear to me.

The Learned Cross Examiner showed him the Hindi commentary of the seventh sloka at Page 41 document No. 261-C-1/1 of Valmiki Ramayan and the witness said that he was unable to read it. He said "If it is written in the seventh sloka of fifth Act of Valmiki Ramayan that Ayodhya was twelve Yojan long and three Yojan wide, it may be true. I accept it. The Learned Advocate recited the following 6th quatrain below couplet No. 32 b from Balkand of Ramcharitmanas (document No. 258C-1/2) to the Witness:-

"Nana Bhanti Ram Avtara Ramayan Sat Koti Aparā"
and asked the meaning of it. The witness replied "it means Ramchandra has incarnated himself in many forms and there are 100 crore Ramayans and innumerable also". Tulsidasji in the said Chaupai have also said that Ramji had many incarnations and Ramayan must be 100 crore and innumerable.

Question:- How many incarnations and names of Ramchandra do you know?

Ans:- According to my knowledge I can describe 10 incarnations of Ramchandra which include fish, tortoise, dwarf, Narhari, boar, Parasuram, Krishna, Vedvyas etc. The rest of the names I do not remember at this time.

Picture No. 36 of album 200C-1 was displayed to the witness and he said "this picture may be of any part of the disputed building but I cannot tell its place, direction etc. He was also given Picture No. 4, 5 and 6 of black and white album No. 201 C-1 for perusal. He replied "these pictures are of the disputed building but from which direction the snaps were taken that I cannot tell. The pictures are of the dome of the disputed building but I cannot tell their direction viz; east, west, north, south". He also looked at Picture No. 13 of the same album and said "this picture is of the disputed building but the place, direction and the part of the dome to which it belong, I cannot tell. He was also shown the Picture No. 32 and 33 of the same album and he said "something is written in black on the white stone there but I cannot tell if these stones were fixed there after 1949. I do not remember when I saw these stones on this Chabutara (platform)". After seeing Picture No. 77 and 78 of the album he replied "these pictures appear to be of the disputed building but the pictures are incomplete so I cannot tell the place of the disputed building to which they belong. He also looked at Picture No. 81 and 82 of the same album and replied "these pictures are of the disputed building and belong to middle door. I do not remember how long have I been seeing this throne kept in this place. When I went in the disputed building on 23rd December, 1949 the throne was there but cannot tell whether it is the same throne or the other throne. He looked the picture No.83 and 84 of the same album and said that the pictures were of the disputed building and appeared to be of the same floor but he could not remember properly whether

that floor was inside the disputed building or on the courtyard.

Question:- Were Sri Krishna and Parasuram not the incarnations of God Vishnu ?

Ans:- They both were the incarnations of God. God is one, I do not agree to any differentiation among them.

Lord Vishnu and Lord Ram are one, the difference is only in their characters. Similarly Ram and Krishna are also one with different character. Sri Krishna was not born in Treta but in Dwapar Yug. There is a vast difference between their periods but exactly what the span of the period, I do not know. This difference is in lacs of years. Ramchandra got incarnated before Krishna. Parasuram was before Ramchandra, there is no difference in the incarnations of Ram and Parasuram, difference is only of their deeds and characters.

Ramchandra did other works incarnated as Parasuram. He did different deeds as Ram. Parasuram took a vow to eliminate the Ksyatriyas and Ram himself was Ksyatri of Sun dynasty.

Question:- Did Ram take a vow to eliminate his own caste incarnated as Parasuram?

Ans:- Yes he did.

Question: Did Ram succeed in it?

Ans: Yes, he got success.

I cannot tell whether Parasuramji got his incarnation thousand or lac of years earlier than Ramchandraji. Parasuram got his birth in Satyug. There is a mention about Parasuram in Ramcharitmanas when he himself said that he killed atrocious Ksyatriyas by his axe. This has been mentioned in Balkand or Ayodhya Kand of Ramcharitmanas. This time I cannot tell where it is written in the book due to my poor eye-sight. When the atrocities and sins had crossed the limit Lord Vishnu declared to incarnate himself

as a man in Sun dynasty to give riddance to the people from such atrocities. Ramcharitmanas describes so. He also said that he would incarnate himself in Raghukul with his 3 brothers in the best form. The meaning of four brothers is Ram, Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughana. The brothers were also the partial incarnations of Lord Vishnu. It has been described in the Balkand of Ramcharitmanas that Ram got birth at noon on Nawami of Chaitra month in such kind of weather. When there was not much cold or heat. There is no description in Ramcharitmanas about the place of his birth only Ayodhya has been described there. The prosody after "Doha" No. 191 (Paper No. 258C-1/2) "Bhaye Pragat Kripala..... Kharari" was read out to the witness and he was asked whether the description about wearing garland and ornaments on the arms etc., was related to the time of his birth or after that"? The witness replied that he could not tell if it was on the birth or after that but the gods visualized this appearance while offering prayer to him. He said "it may possible that first of all Kaushalya had seen this form as described in the above prosody. I have read the entire Ramcharitmanas and take everything correct as described in it" "Bhavan Ved Dhuni..... Janusani" this quatrain below Couplet No. 194 in Balkand of Ramcharitmanas was read out to the witness and asked what he meant by "Bhavan" word as described in the quatrain. The witness replied that Bhavan was used here for the palace (Rah Bhavan).

He said "I have not read any veda. Vedas are prior to Ram. Vedas are above all the Granths and are regarded as the voice of God himself. Vedas are eternal.

Question:- Is the creation of earth is before Satyug according to your belief?

Ans:- According to my belief the creation gets destroyed at the last of each Yug and new creation occurs for next yug. The earth was created first but it is not known if its creation was from satyug or Kalyug. Vedas might have emerged as oracles (the voice of god) before Satyug. Vedas were there before Treta also. The learned advocate read out to the witness a quatrain after Couplet No. 33 of Balkand (Paper No. 258 C-1/2 Naumi Bhaumvar Tahan Chaliawahin" () and asked "whether it has been described in this quatrain that according to Vedas all the places of pilgrimage come to Ayodhya on the birthday of Ram. He replied that it had been described so.

Question:- According to your statement the Vedas are regarded as the oracles before the birth of Ram then how there is description about the birth of Ram in it?

Ans:- Vedas are called eternal. They have no concern with anybody's birth.

It is impossible that the number of Vedas was increased and the description of Ramchandra's birth was added later on. In the description of Ayodhya in Ramcharitmanas during the period of Ram only one thing is available at present, that is river Sarayu. I do not know if any other thing is available or not in the present Ayodhya which may indicate the existence of that Ayodhya. People say that Sitakoot indicates the Ayodhya of that time but I cannot say so. I have no such knowledge that Tulsidas composed another book "Vinay Patrika" after Ramcharitmanas and God Ram put his signature on it. It is true that Tulsidas wrote the Ramcharitmanas after Babar's arrival in India and the construction of the disputed building.

Tulsidas was one of the greatest devotees of Ramchadrajī of that time.

Question: Would it be appropriate to say that if any Ram Janam Bhoomi existed there before writing Ramcharitmanas and Mosque had been constructed by demolishing it, Tulsidas must have definitely described so?

Ans:- Tulsidasji in his Ramcharitmanas had described only character and the deeds of Ram, if there is any history it belongs only to that period when Ram was born.

The Learned Advocate read out a quatrain below Couplet No. 15 from Balkand of Ramcharitmanas "Bandaun Avadhpuri Kalikalush Nasavani" () to the witness and asked if there was a description of Kaliyug. The witness replied that the description was about Awadhpuri and Sarayu river which destroys the sins of Kailiyug. The Learned Advocate also read out the stanza after Couplet No. 9 " Mangalkaran..... SuhawaniPavani" () before the witness and asked that in this stanza Tulsidas had said "the story of Raghunath does the welfare and destroys the sins of kaliyug". Does it mean with the story of Ramchandra. The witness replied that it was related to the story of Ram of - course.

The seventh stanza of Balkand was read out before the witness i.e. "Nana Puran Bhashanibandhmatimanjulmatnoti" , () and asked "Tulsidas has written that whatever is ordained and acceptable in Puranas, Vedas, Shastras and Ramayans and also in other books relating to the stories of Raghunath have been compiled and composed by him in lucid and attractive language for his self satisfaction".

The witness replied that it was true that Tulsidasji had also used in the Ramcharitmanas material available from other sources.

Question: Keeping in view the facts stated above is it not right to say that if anything relating to Ram Janam Bhoomi had been available. Tulsidasji must have used it and described in Ramcharitmanas because it would have been instrumental to glorify the Ram?

Ans:- Ramcharitmanas is the description of Ram's deeds and character, it is not a history or geography so there is no description of Ram Janam Bhoomi" in Ramcharitmanas.

I have said at Para 8 of my statement that no Muslim was seen by me coming to Ram Janam Bhoomi and offering Namaz there till this date, this statement was given by me in relation to that period when I went to the disputed place. During these days when I had not gone at the disputed site, I have no personal knowledge of that time. I do not know if any Muslim went and he read Namaz there or not, I only heard about it. In Para 9 of my affidavit I have told about the removal of brambles etc. This cleaning operation was done up to long distance encompassing Sitakoop, Sakshigopal temple and Sumitra Bhavan towards east and south of the disputed building. There were no shrubs and brambles in the north of the disputed building. There were no such brambles after Parikrama way towards the north but side by side of Parikrama there were brambles people also used to sit towards the west of the disputed building for recitation of Ramcharitmanas. People were sitting and reciting path below and alcove the ground measuring 30-40 feet which was towards the west of the disputed building the recitation lasted about 2-3 months towards the west also. I do not remember whether tent was raised there towards west during recitation of Ramcharitmanas or not. Towards the east of the disputed building there was no tent and electricity in the entire area. There was no recitation during night towards the east and west also. Only continuous kirtan was organized during the night towards

the east of the disputed building. About 50-60 people used to participate in the kirtan. the kirtan continued round the clock. I do not remember whether there was arrangement of loudspeaker or not, but tent was there for the people. The tent had the sitting capacity of 100-200 people. I do not know the measurement of the tent. The head of the kirtan party is called Kotwal. Shri Ram Dayal Das was the Kotwal of that party. Now he has expired. Ram Balak Das was another Kotwal. He is also no more in this world. Some members of the Kirtan party are still alive but I do not remember their names. Two or four people are still alive whom I see often in kirtans in Ayodhya, They still live in Ayodhya. I have not seen the Sadhus who used to come in the disputed during 1946-49 for the last 2-4 years.

I have said in Para 7 of my affidavit "Always.....since the eternal time". I have written so on the basis of my preceptor's preaching. I have no personal knowledge about it.

Statement attested after reading.

Sd/- Narad Saran

31-1-2003.

Typed by the stenographer in the Open Court on my dictation. In continuation of this attend the Court on 3-2-2003 for further cross examination.

Sd/-

Date: 3-2-2003 **O.P.W. 13 Shri Narad Saran**

Commissioner Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow.

(Appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench's Order dated 30-1-2003 in O.O.S. No. 5/89)

(Cross examination of Shri Narad Saran O.P.W. 13 in continuation of dated 31-1-2003 by Shri Jafaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of Defendant No.4)

The Learned Advocate showed to the witness Picture No. 66 of paper No. 200 C-1 of the coloured album. After seeing the picture the witness said "where the man is standing, something is written on a white stone there. In this picture something is visible written on a white stone also below the platform. I do not remember if these stones were fixed after 1949. When I saw this Chabutara (platform) for the first time in 1949, I do not remember whether this white stone existed there or not". The witness was shown picture No. 31 of Paper No. 201 C-1 of black and white album and he replied that something written in black on the white stone was visible there above and below the cave. But he could not remember after that. Picture No. 29, 30 of the same album were also shown to the witness and he replied that something written in black on the white stone above the cave was seen there. The way from eastern gate to the north road was 4-5 hands wide. No car could come to the eastern gate of the disputed building through that way.

I was asked to give witness in this case by Shri Triloki Nath Pandey who is present in the Court. He is Prosecutor in the case. I do not know which post Shri Triloki Nath Pandey is holding in Vishwa Hindu Parishad. Shri Devkinandan Ji filed this case, in which I am giving witness, and I have heard his name. Shri

Devkinandan has expired and who is the plaintiff in his place now that I do not know. I had a talk with Triloki Nath for witness 3-4 months ago. He told me "you were present at the time of leveling the land and the stone was dugged out in your presence so you should give the witness" Shri Triloki Nath was also present at the time of leveling I know him for the last 10-15 years. He belongs to Balia and used to come Ayodhya, so he is acquainted to me. He is living in Ayodhya for the last 10 years.

I have not read the newspapers for the last 2-4 years due to the reason that the print is very small. Previously it I used to read the papers. I had read in the newspapers that there was Babri Masjid in Ayodhya which was demolished. I had read and heard it in 1992. Whom we say Ram Janam Bhoomi, the other party says it Babri Masjid. From the very beginning I have been hearing that what we call Ram Janam Bhoomi, the other party calls it Babri Masjid. When I had come to in Ayodhya in 1946 it had become known to me that the place when we call Ram Janam Bhoomi, the other party called it Babri Masjid. I know it that many people in the name of Babri Masjid demolished the disputed building. Did they belong to V.H.P. or they were Kar Sewaks or otherwise. I do not know. Whether Muslims were also in that group I do not know. I had been seeing that three domed building till 1992. The disputed building till 1992. The disputed building with three domes whom the other party says Babri Masjid, had been seen by me very closely. I have said at page 14 of my statement that no Masjid of three domes has been seen by me in Ayodhya. The people of the other party used to say this three domed disputed building as Babri Masjid. We regarded this disputed building as Ram Janam Bhoomi and we had no feeling of joy and woe on its demolition. I felt sorrow on demolishing the building of Ram Janam Bhoomi. We in society cannot say good to anyone

instrumental in demolishing the things. The people who demolished disputed building, which I regard as Ram Janam

Bhoomi, were good or bad element, i cannot say because if it was their intention to rebuilt the building then they were good people. It is not necessary that lacs of people are required to demolish an old temple for reconstruction. Many temples were demolished for reconstruction before my eyes. Vashishtha Bhavan, Naya Ghat, Dandiya Temple at Janaki Ghat, Ved Mandir in Ramkot, Chaturbhuji Temple at Vidhya Kund, Jugal Priya Kunj Temple at Rinmochan Ghat etc. are such temples in Ayodhya which were reconstructed after demolition. Out of these temples, Vashishtha Temple is the first temple which was reconstructed 25 years ago after demolition. I have not seen this temple felling down. I do not know how many days it took to demolish it, in one day one week one month. The temple is still under construction for the last 25 years. The building of this temple covers an area of 3-4 bighas. The main idols of the temple were placed in the old building adjoining to it and even today the idols are worshipped there. There is an old building at a distance of 10-15 hands from the new building where these idols are kept, which include the idols of Ram, Sita, Hanuman, Laxman etc. Some idols are of stones and the others of metals. The Sanctum Sanctorum of the new temple of Vashishtha bhavan is under construction. The idols were kept in the old building when the main room of that building was demolished. The idols were kept there with rituals, after reciting Ved-Mantras by the Brahmins etc. Janaki Ghat Dandiya Temple was demolished 3-4 years back and I am the witness of its demolition. It took perhaps 10-15 days to remove this temple because it was a small temple. This temple was of 30 hand long and 15 hands wide. Its reconstruction was completed within 3-4 years. It houses a grand idol of Hanumanji and full Darbar of Ram-Laxman and the statue of the local preceptor Dandiya Baba is also there. Dandiya baba was the preceptor of that place about 100-150 years back. The demolished temple was also 100-150 years old and made of lime. There was no pinnacle on the temple. No pinnacle was made on

the new temple also. Till the reconstruction of this temple, the idols of it were kept in the side house and were again installed after proper consecration in the new temple. The Sanctum Sanctorum of this temple may be of 6 feet long and 8 feet wide. The Ved Mandir of Ramkot was demolished 8-10 years back. It must have taken 10-15 days time to demolish the temple. I have seen this temple being demolished. The new temple in place of old temple was reconstructed within 3-4 years. The new temple is bigger than the old one. The old temple was in one bigha and the new temple covers the area of 3-4 bighas. This new temple is at a distance of about 1 furlong towards north of the disputed building. The idols of Bhagwan Ram, Laxman, Janki, Hanumanji are there in this temple. Before demolition of the old temple, only these idols were there. For a period of about 3-4 years till the reconstruction of the temple the idols were kept in a side house. Chaturbhuji temple of Vidya Kund was demolished about 8-10 years ago. This temple was in area of $2-2^{1/2}$ bigha, The new temple is in an area of 3 bighas. It must have taken a time of 10-15 days to demolish it. The Sanctum Sanctorum of the old temple was 10-12 feet long and 8-9 feet wide. The area of the Sanctum Sanctorum of the new temple is the same as the Sanctum Sanctorum of the old one. It would have taken a time of 2-4 years in its construction. The Sanctum Sanctorum of Ved Mandir at Ramkot is approximately 8-9 feet long and 8-9 feet wide also. The area of Yugalpriya Kunj at Rinmochan Ghat was earlier in Panch Biswa. The new temple is also in the same area. The Sanctum Sanctorum of this temple is in an area of $3^{1/2} \times 2^{1/2}$ feet. The new Sanctum Sanctorum covers the same area as of old one. It must have taken 3-4 days time to demolish the old temple and reconstruction of the new temple in its place must have taken about 3-4 years time. Till the reconstruction of the new temple and demolition of the old temple, the idols were kept in the house which was in close proximity. This temple had the small idols of Ram and Janaki and

the statue of the Guru of the concerned Sect. This is the temple of Shri Sect. of Ramanandi Sect.

It is wrong to say that till the 22nd December, 1949 the disputed building was used as a Mosque and five times Namaz and the Namaz of Jumma were offered there. It is also wrong to say that till 22nd December, 1949, no waship was performed in the disputed building. It is also wrong to say that there was no storehouse towards north of the eastern gate of the disputed building and it was the living place of Muazzin. It is also wrong to say that till 22nd December, 1949 there was no priest in Ram Chabutara and Sita Rasoi and no Bhajan, Kirtan, Arti was performed there. It is also wrong to say till 22nd December, 1949 there were no idols of Shiv Darbar in the disputed premises. It is also wrong to say that till 22nd December, 1949 the Muslims used to lock the doors of the iron rod wall of the disputed building and kept the keys with them and no priest locked the doors. It is also wrong to say that I am giving false statement on the behest of Triloki Nath Pandey.

(Cross examination concluded by Shri Jafaryab Jilani, advocate of Defendant No. 4, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, U.P.)

(Cross examination started by Shri Mushtak Ahmed Siddiqui, Advocate on behalf of Defendant No.5)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Where the idols are placed, we call it Sanctum Sanctorum, it means that every temple has one Sanctum Sanctorum where idols are placed. There is some space before the temple which is called Jagmohan. Some temples have this Jagmohan inside and some have outside. Sanctum Sanctorum is essential in temples but Jagmohan is not necessary. If there is some space available in temple then Jagmohan is provided there. Apart from the Sanctum Sanctorum there must be a refectory (Kitchen), lodging for the Sadhus etc., in the temple. On the availability of the space there are Dharmshalas, Gaushala (cowshed), and school

etc. also exist in the temples apart from Jagmohan. Some temples on the availability of the space keep the provision of Parikrama and some have not.

Where the idols of Lord Ram or others gods and goddesses or in carnations are kept are regarded as temples. Such a building will be called temple even if it has no suffix of the word Mandir. There is no word Mandir suffixed with Sarayu Kunj but it is a temple. When I came to Ayodhya from Basti in 1946 with Shri Ram Manohar Saran Ji, he had 4-5 other disciples also, excluding me. After that more disciples joined him and some died also. No disciple of Shri Ram Manohar Saran who preceded me is alive till this time.

When Shri Ram Manohar Saran expired in 1979 he left behind only three disciples and none of them remained his disciple when I came to Ayodhya in 1946. When Shri Saran expired all his three surviving disciples were older to me in age. At the time of his death I was his disciple of shortest period in comparison to others who were his disciples for a long time. In the presence of those disciples Shri Ram Manohar Saran had made a will in my favour and this was the reason that I became Mahant. Being pleased with my service Shri Ram Manohar Saran made a will in my favor. Rinmochan Ghat is full Mohalla. There is a Rinmochan Ghat at Sarayu also and on the basis of the same the name of this Mohalla was kept. It was a Government Ghat and was not under the management of Ram Mohan Saran or myself. In Ayodhya towards north of Rinmochan Mohalla is Laxman Quila, towards south is Katra Mohalla, Ramkot in east Tulsi Nagar and Ramanand Nagar, in west there is Raj Ghat Mohalla. Laxman Quila is not the name of Mohalla but of a temple.

The western part of Hanumangarhi comes in Ramkot Mohalla and eastern Part in Raiganj in Dantdhawan Kund Mohalla. The disputed building comes in Kot Ramchandra Mohalla. Where is Kot Ramchandra Village is not known to me.

When any new temple is constructed, before it the idol is consecrated and placed in the temple. At the time of consecration the idol is not inside the temple but out of it. The process and procedure of consecration (Pran Prathishtha) is long and many people take part in it. Consecration is performed outside at another place and then the idol is brought in the temple for installation. Consecration or infusion of life in the idol creates divine power in it. After consecration only the divine power comes into existence. I am well acquainted with the Ayodhya City. At present there may be many (in twenties) Mosques in Ayodhya except the disputed building. I know Naugaji Tomb. I have not seen Hazrat Ibrahim Shah Tomb. I have not seen and heard about Bizli Shaheed Rauza in Mohalla Raiganj. There is an enclosure in Maniparbat far away from Ayodhya. What is its name that I do not know. Muslims might be giving importance to it with religious point of view. There are important places of Sikhism also in Ayodhya. According to my knowledge there are no such important places of Buddhism in Ayodhya. There are important places of Jainism also in Ayodhya. I know about Naugaji Mazar only this much that it is a tomb. Ayodhya is predominantly a place of pilgrimage for Hindus but is also important centre for Muslims, Sikhs and Jains also.

I do not know since when Ram Chabutara is in existence in the disputed building. Ram Chabutara has religious importance for us because our God Ramchandra is there and his place is adorable and worshipable to us. Where there are idols of Ram and are worshipped by people, it will be called a temple not anything other else. If any temple is known by any other name it will be regarded that there are no idols. Shivalaya means the house of Shiv Ji. We keep the idol of Shiv Shankar in Shivalaya. There may be the idol of Vishnu's incarnations in Shivalaya, but at a different place from Shiva's idol. There are the idols of Shiv

Ji in Ayodhya. Nageshwarnath temple has idol of Shiv and also of Ram there. This temple is at the bank of Sarayu I do not know whether people believe that Nageshwarnath temple is oldest temple in Ayodhya. In my opinion, Sarayu is the oldest in Ayodhya and all other places are after that. After Sarayu river, Ram Janam Bhoomi is the oldest place in Ayodhya. Ram Janam Bhoomi means the disputed building demolished on 6th December, 1992. I think this building was in a dilapidated condition, so it was demolished for reconstruction. Hanuman Bagh is located at the North-east outskirt of Ayodhya. There were trees of mango, lemon etc. in Hanuman Bagh previously but there are no trees now. I do not know how it was named Hanuman Bagh. Perhaps it was not named after Hanuman Shav, Who was a landlord. There are four Chhawanis in Ayodhya which include Tulsidas Chhawani, Baba Maniram Das Chhawani, Shri Tapaswi Chhawani, Baba Raghunath's Bari Chhawani. Maniram Das Chhawani is called Chhoti (small) Chhawani also. Here Chhawani means the place where the Sadhus live in groups. Group means where there are many Sadhus. Naga Sadhus are also included in the Sadhus. Naga Sadhus are not different from ordinary Sadhus but it is the name (Naga) of Sadhus. They can be identified only by telling (that they became Naga at Hanumangarhi, they were initiated there) and not by seeing them. They are initiated separately in Hanumangarhi to become Naga irrespective of their origin of Sadhu anywhere. The Naga Sadhus are not household but detached Sadhus. Sadhus are those who become detached. Household can also be Sadhu. Once he becomes Sadhu he will be detached. Detachment is an initiation, a conduct and one who practices it he will be definitely detached recluse (Sadhu). If any married person lives with his wife he cannot be called detached.

There is a Swargdwar Mohalla in Ayodhya. It is towards north of Ramkot. Ramkot Mohalla and Swargdwar Mohalla have no common boundary. Between them are Tulsi Nagar, Balda,

Ramanand Nagar, New Colony. Chakratirth is also a Mohalla. A Ghat has been there of this name. In Chakratirth Mohalla presently there is no such religious place by the name Chakratirth Temple. There is a temple of Baba Ramragade Das Ji in Chakratirth Mohalla. This temple is known as Ramragade Das Ji Temple. Baba Ramragade had constructed this temple. I do not know the idol of which god is there in this temple because I have not gone there. There is a place named Vashishtha Kund in Ayodhya. The Mohalla is also called Vashishtha Kund where this temple is located. There is Kund as well as temple in Vashishtha Kund. The Chhawani known as Tulsidas Chhawani is after the name of Tulsidas.

Where Tulsidas lived in Ayodhya, I do not know but I can tell the place where he started writing Ramcharitmanas. He started writing Ramcharitmanas in a Chabutara (platform) situated in the east of Dantdhawan Kund Temple. Dantdhawan Kund and temple are still there. This is a pukka Kund with stairs in it. The Chabutara where Tulsidas started writing Ramcharitmanas has been transformed now into a temple. The temple where he started writing is called Tulsi Chaura. Dantdhawan temple and Tulsi Chaura Temple are at a juxtaposition. Tulsi Chaura Temple was not built during the time of Tulsidas but later on. I do not know if Dantdhawan Temple was before Tulsidas or not. I have not visited Dantdhawan Temple but seen it from a distance. I do not know about the idols of which god/gods are placed in Dantdhawan Temple. I am also not aware of the belief or the concept of the people that Ramchandra used to clean his teeth at Dantdhawan Kund. There is Ramgulela Temple in Ayodhya. This temple is situated in Mohalla Ramkot. There is a hearsay that Lord Ram used to play in that temple. I also believe on this hearsay. There is Ram Khelona Temple and Ram Jharokha Temple in Ayodhya. What is the hearsay about these two temples that I do not know. There may be any hearsay about

Datun Kund but I do not know. Is there any hearsay about Ram-Kachahari that also I do not know.

I do not know about the hearsay that Ramchandra used to decide cases and dispensed justice sitting at Ram Kachahari. This conception may be in respect of Treta yug and not of this Yug. There is no mention of Ramgulela Temple, Datun Kund Temple in Ramcharitmanas. There is no Swargdwar Temple in Ayodhya, according to my knowledge. I have no information about Ramchandra's going to heaven in an aero plane. I only know that Ramchandra had gone to heaven. How did he go to heaven by aero plan or by his own is not known to me. I have the knowledge that all the people of Ayodhya also went to heaven with him and Ayodhya became desolate. Vikramaditya again rehabilitated Ayodhya in Kaliyug. Vikrami Samwat has been initiated in his name. In Treta Yug Ramchandra ascended into heaven from Ayodhya and Ayodhya became desolate. King Vikramaditya rehabilitated it in this age. During this interval I do not know what happened in Ayodhya. Many lacs of years has passed from Treta yug to this period but I do not know the exact number. Ayodhya as a place. was the same in Treta and in the present age. I mean as a land Ayodhya was the same. In treta yug, Sarayu was in the north of Ayodhya and at present also it is in the north. There are holy places, the stones, Kunds which symbolize the places of sages etc. Ayodhya was in an arch shape and these symptoms and marks are still available. So I am saying that it is the same Ayodhya which existed in Treta.

Statement attested after hearing it.

Sd/- Narad Saran

3-2-2003

Typed by the Stenographer in the Open Court on my dictation. In continuation of this attend the Court on 4-2-2003 for additional cross examination.

Date: 4-2-2003 O.P.W. 13 Shri Narad Saran

Before- Commissioner Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District Judge/Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble High Court, Lucknow.

(Appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide Order of dated 30-1-2003 in Original Suit No. 5/89)

(In continuation of 3-2-2003 cross examination of Shri Narad Saran, O.P.W. No. 13 by Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate on behalf of the Defendant No. 5).

It is my belief that the present names of Kunds (Pit for sacrificial fire or tank as consecrated to a deity) and the living places of sages have been continuing from Treta Yug. I have not read anywhere but only heard about the Kunds and the living places of sages in Treta Yug. On the basis of the stones, sign boards fixed at the Kunds and the places, I am saying about the continuity of names from Treta Yug. I have heard about it from the Sadhus, Saints etc. during sermons and story narrations. During the deliverance of stories by Sant, Mahatmas, I have heard about Vashishtha Kund, Brihaspati Kund, Agni Kund, Vibhisan Kund, Dantdhawan Kund, Vidya Kund, Suraj Kund, Khajua Kund, Dadhichi Kund, Hanuman Kund, Swarnkar Kund etc. I do not remember which were the residences of sages. Vashishtha Kund was the place of Vashishthaji. I have been told about the residence of other sages but now I do not remember. I have not heard about the activities and the places of living of Shri Ramchandra. The Kunds which I have mentioned above mostly exist in Ayodhya even today but some have got destructed but their remnants are there in Ayodhya. Vibhisan Kund is in the Mohalla and Vibhisan Kund is the name of a Mohalla also. There is a stone fixed on the Vibhisan Kund and I have not heard anything more about it. This name is related to that Vibhisan who was Ram's Minister. Suraj Kund is situated in Darshan Nagar towards south of Ayodhya. Darshan Nagar is 4-5 kilometers away from Ayodhya.

Question:- Just you have stated that all the above Kunds are in Ayodhya, is it your correct statement?

Ans:- Yes I am correct.

Question: At one time you say that all the Kunds are within Ayodhya City and on the other you say that Suraj Kund is in Dharshan Nagar 5 kilometers away from Ayodhya. Do you not see any contradiction between these two statements?

Ans:- This Kund was constructed there according to the Ayodhya of Treta . The present Ayodhya is smaller than that Ayodhya in which Suraj Kund was also included.

The shape of Ayodhya is like a bow, I mean to it that the runway of Sarayu is in a arch shape. So I told it for Sarayu and not for Ayodhya which was in the context of Treta and the present age. Sarayu flows in a bow shape in Ayodhya. It comes from West direction and turns from east to north and then to south and at last again comes to the east. This position of Sarayu was in Treta also. I have not read it but heard so about the flow of Sarayu from the scholars and the learned people of scriptures. Shri Akhileshwar Das Ji told me this fifty years back in Ayodhya. I have heard this from Sadhus also during story narration. These Sadhus included Ram Balak Das Ramayani, Uddhavdas Vyas, Pt. Hanuman Datt etc. I do not remember the names of others. Out of the Sadhus stated above, nobody is alive now.

When my Guru Ram Manohar Saran Das expired in 1979, Shri Siyaram Saran was his oldest disciple among others. He told me that he was only 10 years younger than Guruji. Siyaram Saran Das with his Pongest tenure remained his disciple for forty years. The other two disciples were Laxman Saran and Bhumija Saran. What was the tenure of Laxman Saran as a disciple of Guruji, that I do not remember but the period was less than Siyaram Saran. Shri Siyaram Saran told me that he had been the disciple

of my Guru for forty years. My Guru expired in 1979 it means it was the year 1939 since he became his disciple. Yesterday I have given a statement that none of them was his disciple in 1946, it is not true. The reality is that all the three disciples were householder disciples, they became detached later on. I have no proper knowledge that the period of 40 years of Shri Siyaram Saran as a disciple was as a house holder or as a detached or both. It is wrong to say that I am concealing something on this point. When I came to Shri Ram Manohar Saran, Shri Siyaram Saran was there in his service but had not been initiated as detached disciple. I do not know when he was initiated as a detached disciple, but was initiated later on. When I came to Shri Ram Manohar Saran, the remaining two disciples were living in Bihar at that time and supervised the work there. There was also the land and a temple belonging to Shri Ram Manohar Saran. They looked after it. Shri Ram Manohar Saran lived in Ayodhya only. The disciple who were in Bihar also used to come Ayodhya. They did not live there regularly but used to come to Ayodhya in connection with the work and during fairs, festivals etc. lived there for 15-20 days. I always lived with my Guruji and Siyaram Saran used to come from time to time. So Siyaram lived in the west. I was the only disciple who lived regularly there but sometimes used to go somewhere with his permission. My Guru Sri Ram Manohar Saran had always one or the other disciple, he never lived alone. The disciple or any Sadhu who lived with him used to fetch water from Sitakoo. Guru Bhai means any Sadhu who is senior of the same age. The Sadhu may be disciple of the same Guru or other guru. Guru Bhai does not mean that both are the disciple of the same Guru. This I am telling with my firm belief. I have not got any education in Ayodhya which awards certificates. In addition to Ramcharitmanas, I have read Vinay Patrika, Dohawali, Ramlala Nahachhu, Parwati Mangal etc. All these books are in Hindi. I have not ready any book in Sanskrit. Each Kand of Ramcharitmanas starts with some Sanskrit slokas.

I read the commentary to understand the meaning of slokas. I do not know Sanskrit language. Shivji was there before Ramchandra. Shivji married Parvati. There is a detailed mention of Shiva's marriage to Parvatiji in Ramcharitmanas. he marriage of Shivji is before the period of Ramchandra. I can tell with reference to the context whether the description of Shiva's marriage is in historic form or in any other form. On this point the Learned Counsel narrated to the witness Couplet No. 89 to 104 (upto fourth quatrain of 104) from Balkand (Paper No. 258 C-1/2) and asked if it was in historical form? The witness replied that according to him it may be the description of any ancient history. He said " Ramcharitmanas describes many mountains, rivers and their height, depth, location etc. There is description of places also according to the context, which place/mountain/river is where located can be a subject of Geography but Ramcharitmanas describes it according to the context. There are some names of rivers, mountains and places given in Ramcharitmanas according to the reference of that period which are of that historical period.

Question:- If some one says that there is no mention at all of Geographical and historical facts in Ramcharitmanas would it be right or wrong to say?

Ans:- In the context of the present age it will be wrong but according to the relevant past period the description was right. It will be wrong to say that there is no mention at all of historical and geographical facts in Ramcharitmanas but the period which Tulsidas depicted belonged to Treta Yug.

Out of the mountains, rivers and places described by Tulsidas in Ramcharitmanas some still exist in the world and some do not, I have heard the name of Tamasa river which has been mentioned in Ramcharitmanas also. It still exists in the present age also. I have heard the name of Kailash mountain at present is there which still exists and Ramcharitmanas described it. Sringvarpuris described in Ramcharitmanas which still exists in India but quit

possible that in the present age it may have got some other name. Ashoka Trees are still found which have been described in Ramcharitmanas. It will be wrong to say that the rivers, mountains, places of Treta Yug described in Ramcharitmanas have no relevance with the present rivers, mountains etc. Tamasa river is still in Faizabad which is called now Madaha also. There is a description of Tamasa river in Ramcharitmanas but I cannot say if it was the same Tamasa river which is in Faizabad or any other river. The description of rivers, mountains and places described in Ramcharitmanas belongs to very ancient time so I cannot say if they are still there in that form even today.

"Garbh-grih" is a Hindi word. Its literal meaning is labour-room or delivery room where the child gets birth. With reference to the temples it has a symbolic use. It is regarded that after consecration of the idols of the God they become powerful or get infused with divine life. After it where they are installed that place in common man's language is called Garbh Grih (Sanctum-Sanctorum) or the palace of god or Murti-Mandap.

I always entered the disputed building from the eastern gate. It was convenient to enter through this gate due to open ground. This open land was of about 8-10 hands wide. Going further to that open land there was iron rod wall and after that there was courtyard like ground. I do not remember properly if or not the ground was slightly at a higher level. The land was even upto the southern wall of Ram Chabutara, only that place was at a bit higher level where the idols of Shankar and Nandishwar were placed. That piece of land was only 1-1^{1/2} hand long and wide. Why the idols were kept on Ram Chabutara. I did not try to know the reason. I had no such curiosity in this regard.

I have herd about Deokinandan Ji. I was told that when Ramchandra Paramhans withdrew his Suit. Deokinandan Ji filed this Suit. I was also told that Deokinandan frequently used to come to Ayodhya but I was not there when he came to Ayodhya. I have never seen him doing pooja or darshan at Ram Chabutara.

I do not know when he came to Ayodhya and when he went out. I know that he followed Hindu religion which is evident from his name and deeds. I do not know whether he followed the ideology of Vaishnavites or Shaivites. It is also not known to me whether he belonged to Ramanandi Sect, or not.. Whether he belonged to Nirmohi Akhara Nirwani Akhara or Digambar Akhara and the detached tradition. All these Akharas come under Ramanandi Sect. I belong to Ramanandi Sect. and Digambar Akhara. There can be many temples in one Akhara and they can be located anywhere in India. The people of the other Akhara can also look after these temples if required. Generally the people of the concerned Akhara look after them. There may be 2-4 temples of Nirmohi Akhara in Ayodhya. I do not have the full knowledge that how many temples of Nirvani Akhara are there in Ayodhya. Digambar Akhara is one Akhara. There can be many small and big temples of Digambar Akhara in Ayodhya. These temples and the Akharas have other immovable property also. There is immovable property near Hanumangarhi in the form of buildings. Hanumangarhi thus owns these buildings and their rent is received by hanumangarhi. There are the idols of Ramchandra, Hanuman and rarely of Radha Krishna also in the temples of these three Akharas. The people of these three Akharas worship Ramchandraj. I do not have the full knowledge as how these Akharas have acquired this property. Whether people have donated this out of faith and devotion or otherwise. I also do not now if the people have donated or not their property to the idol of Ramchandraj in Ayodhya. Mandir and Akharas have no work or business to earn. Hanumangarhi is a Pachayati Akhara and whatever property or the articles are offered to these Panchayati Akharas on the worship, are given to the Mahant of each patti as per rules. That property belongs to the temple or the Akhara not to the Mahant or Panch of the Akhara. Whatever property the temples own it has been acquired by offerings and donations. My temple, where I am appointed as Mahant, has only 1-2 houses.

There is a temple in Ayodhya named Barasthan. It is said that the temple has the highest property. There is also the idol of Ramchandra. The Janamsthan temple situated across the road towards north of the disputed building has also immovable property. According to my knowledge the disputed building, which I regard as temple, has no property.

I have heard the name of Gopal Singh Visharad of Ayodhya. He is no more alive. He was an Advocate and did he do any other work or not, I do not know. I do not have the full knowledge whether Gopal Singh Visharad was the original resident of Ayodhya or migrated from outside. I also do not know if any member of his family is presently living in Ayodhya or not. It is also not known to me if Visharad had any house of his own in Ayodhya or was he living in a rented house. I do not know when Gopal Singh Visharad died. I was not told that Gopal Singh Visharad was a resident of Rajasthan. Was he a follower of Shaivites or Vishnavites, I do not know. Did he belong to Ramanandi Sect. is also not known to me.

Question:- You have very little knowledge about Gopal Singh Visharad. Is the reason of it may be that he was an ordinary man and assumed no importance in the context of Ayodhya?

Ans:- He commanded importance because once he filed a Suit about Ram Janam Bhoomi, so we all know him. I have heard the name of Babu Priya Datt Ram. He was a respectable man of Faizabad. There was a joint Municipality of Faizabad and Ayodhya previously and he was its Chairman. He may be the devotee of Ram. I have heard that after attachment of the disputed building Babu Priya Datt Ram was appointed its first receiver. I do not know whether he remained its life time receiver till his death or not.

The temple of Shiv is called Shivalya. In addition to Shivling, the combined idols of Parvati, Ganesh, Kartikey, Nandi etc. are kept there. Somewhere there is the idol of Shivji and "ling" is installed specially. Shiv is called Shambu or Swaymabhu means self born and he is not the incarnation of any God. I do not know about the incarnations of Lord Shiv. I also do not know that there had been conflict between the followers of Shiv and Vaishnav from time to time. No scholar or in any story I have been told like so.

I cannot tell how may preceptor Shri Ram Manohar Saran came to know that there was Sanctum-Sanctorum below the middle dome. It was a common belief in Ayodhya that there was the Sanctum-Sanctorum below the middle dome. I cannot tell how long this belief was in vogue but traditionally it was a Question:-

What is the base of your statement that it was a common belief from the traditions?

Ans:- The basis of my statement is that on the occasions of Ram Navami, Kartikpurnima, Shrawan Jhoola, etc. thousands of people throng to this place for worship and parikrama.
common belief.

This belief is in vogue since my birth and it was much before I have been told. For the first time when I came to Ayodhya I saw it and before it also I was told in the village that fair and worships are organized in Ram Janam Bhoomi at Ayodhya. The devotees take apart in the fair and shops also arranged. During the time of Sawan Jhoola when people come there, sights and displays are organized in the temple and people visit there to have the glimpses of the display. The scholars deliver lectures at many places. The people who come Ayodhya for the first time visit all the places. All the places means Ayodhya and its nearby holy places and temples. For example, Bharat Kund, Suraj Kund, Guptar Ghat, Nirmala Kund, Vilwahari Ghat etc. Vilwahari Ghat is

the next railway station from Ayodhya. Towards the north of that railway station, Vilwahari Ghat is situated. Darshan Nagar is also a railway station. It is located at the east south corner of Ayodhya. Vilwahari Ghat railway station comes after Darshan Nagar railway station and so far as I think there is no other railway station between them. Vilwahari Ghat is also related to Ramchandraji and an important place because there is a memorial of King Dashratha and he was cremated at this place. A Saint by the name of Vilwahari may be was in that period and his seat was also there.

The temple of Shiv is called shivalay. In addition to shivling, the combined idols of Parvati, Ganesh, Kartikey, Nandi etc. are kept there. Somewhere there is the idol of Shivji and "ling" is installed specially. Shiv is called Shambhu or Swayambhu means self born and he is not the incarnation of any God. I do not know about the incarnations of Lord Shiv. I also do not know that there had been conflict between the followers of Shiv and Vaishnav from time to time. No scholar or in any story I have been told like so.

I cannot tell how my preceptor Shri Manohar Saran came to know that there was Sanctum-Sanctorum below the middle dome. It was a common belief in Ayodhya.

That there was the Sanctum-Sanctorum below the middle dome. I cannot tell how long this belief was in vogue but traditionally it was a common belief.

Question:- What is the base of your statement that it was a common belief from the traditions?

Ans:- The basis of my statement is that on the occasions of Ram Navami, Kartikpurnima, Shrawan Jhoola etc. thousands, of people throng to this place for worship and parikrama.

This belief is in vogue since my birth and it was much before I have been told. For the first time when I came to Ayodhya I saw it and before it also I was told in the village that fair and worships are organized in Ram Janam Bhoomi at Ayodhya. The devotees take apart in the fair and shops also arranged. During the time of Sawan Jhoola when people visit there to have the glimpses of the display. The scholars deliver lectures at many places. The people who come Ayodhya for the first time visit all the places. All the places means Ayodhya and its nearby holy places and temples. For examples, Bharat Kund, Suraj Kund, Guptar Ghat, Nirmala Kund, Vilwahari Ghat etc. Vilwahari is the next railway station from Ayodhya. Towards the north of that railway station, Vilwahari Ghat is situated. Darshan Nagar is also a railway station. It is located at the east south corner of Ayodhya. Vilwahari Ghat railway station comes after Darshan Nagar railway station and so far as I think there is no other railway station between them. Vilwahari Ghat is also related to Ramchandraj and an important place because there is a memorial of King Dashratha and he was cremated at this place. A Saint by the name of Vilwahari may be was in that period and his seat was also there. There is no mention of these places in Ramcharitmanas, but it was written there that King Dashratha was cremated there but where and when it has not been specifically described. There is also a stone written "Vilwahari Ghat" on it in this place. There is no description on the stone that King Dashratha was cremated and a memorial was made in this place. I am telling this on the bases of what I heard from the people. In the Ramcharitmanas it is written that the funeral pyre was made at the bank of that Sarayu river which flows in Ayodhya. The river comes from the west side and flows towards north and then east in Ayodhya. There is a confluence of Sarayu and Ghagra in Barah area of Gonda District. From this place it is called Sarayu and Ghagra loses its existence. After that the river flows towards east upto Chhapra District and then merges with

Ganga. So far as it flows in east it is called Sarayu and not Ghagra. If the plaintiffs of this case say that the river is called Ghagra after going further east of Ayodhya, then according to me it will not be correct to say. I think Sarayu is only one river. If the plaintiffs say that there are many Saryu rivers, then I think it will not be correct.

On this point the Learned Advocate showed to the witness a book titled "Ayodhya Itihas Aur Puratatva" (Page 289, C-1/201, O.O.S.5-3) and asked:

Question:- Three Sarayu rivers have been shown in this paper and which is the river among them where south of it Ayodhya is situated?

(On this question the Learned Advocate of the plaintiffs Shri Ved Prakash raised the objection that the witness was neither the author of any book nor a student of geography, his sight was also weak, there was no relevance of the question with the suit, so there should be no permission given to ask such questions).

(In reply to the objection the Learned Cross Examiner said that Sarayu was the only identification mark since Treta yug which showed Ayodhya at its place, so this question is much relevant in view of this).

Ans:- The three rivers shown in this paper are the streams of Sarayu river. Sarayu river is only one.

The three streams shown in the paper No. 289 C-1/201 are of Sarayu river and Ayodhya is in the south of all the streams.

Question:- Should it be taken that there are three Ayodhyas?

Ans:- No, Sir, There is one Ayodhya only.

Question:- This map i.e. Paper No. 289-C-1/201 is drawn according to measurement and all the Sarayu are at a distance of more than 10 Kilometer from each other, so do you want to say that Ayodhya is so vast which comes in the south of all the Sarayu.

(The Learned Advocate of the plaintiffs Shri Ved Prakash raised the objection that the question asked relating to the map is misleading.

The witness has not drawn the map himself and is not expert in the matter. So such questions should not be allowed to ask)

Ans:- I cannot understand the map according to the measurement. I am understanding this is Sarayu in the map only by saying.

Sarayu is in the north of Ayodhya but the map is beyond my comprehension.

Question:- First you did not say about not understanding the map but told all the Sarayus as the streams of one Sarayu and now are you telling so to evade the answer of this question?

Ans:- At first it appeared to me that all were the currents of Sarayu so I said so but really I am not able to understanding the map at all.

Statement attested after reading

Sd/- Narad Saran

04-02-2003

Typed by the Stenographer in the Open Court on my dictation.
Attend the Court on 5-2-2003 for further cross examination.

www.vadaprativada.in

www.vadaprativada.in

Date:5-2-2003OPW 13 Si Narad Saran

Before — Commissioner Shri Narendra Prasad, Additional District judge/Officer on Special Duty, Hon'ble High Court, Lucow.

(Appointed by the order of Hon'ble Full Bench dated 30.1.2003 in Original Suit No. 5/89)

(Cross examination of Shri Narad Saran O.P.W. 13 in continuation of dated 4-2-2003 by Shri Mushtaque Ahmef Siddiqui, Advocate on _____ behalf of Defendant No. 5)

I do not now how extensive was the kingdom of Vikramaditya, but I am certain of the fact that the present Ayodhya was in his territory and the present Ayodhya was established by him. King Vikramaditya established the present Ayodhya as a place of pilgrimage with a religious feeling. It being the birth place of Shri Ramchandra, King Vikramaditya rehabilitated Ayodhya as a place of pilgrimage. He must have been knowing that it was the birth place of Shri Ram Chandraji and he must have decided something. This knowledge was perhaps given to him by the sages and saints of that time. How he rehabilitated it, I did not hear about it in any story or lecture.

Question:- Had you ever come to know how King Vikramaditya heard that this was the same place where Ramchandrajai is said to have born in Treta?

(On this question Shri AKumar Pandey, the Learned Advocate of the plaintiffs raised the objection that the witness has replied the same question today so that questions of the same nature should not be asked time and again).

Ans:- I have heard nothing about it, I have not heard any hearsay also. Hearsay means whatever the common people say. It may be correct or wrong. Whatever is believable I accept it otherwise I give no cognizance to it. I make efforts to understand and after much deliberations I decide what is worth believing and what is not. Ashoka Tree is not connected with the name of any King but it is the name of a tree.

Shri Ramchandras was born in Treta Yuga and I regard him the incarnation of Lord Vishnu. I regard him as God. Ramchandraji had other incarnations also. I regard him an incarnation born from the womb of Kaushalya and the son of Dashratha. There is no inter-conflict among these three concepts. All these three forms of Ramchandraji as incarnation belong to the (incarnation of Vishnu, God and son of Dashratha) one and the same period of Treta. I have heard and read so. I have read it in Ramcharitmanas. We have three sources of determination viz; what the Vedas tell, what the Gurus (preceptors) or great people say, and what our conscience accepts.

These are the three grounds of my belief. To make the hearsay believable, I take the resort of these three grounds.

I know Kuber Teela situated towards south at a distance of one furlong from the disputed building. It is a high hillock, it is not in my knowledge that Muslims regard it as a tomb of Khwaja Hattai and go there to read FATHIHA on each Thursday.

I have given the statement about clearing and removing the old and the new brambles around the disputed building. So far as I remember the brambles around the disputed building were removed in 1949 and I do not know about other places in Ayodhya where brambles were cut and removed. The brambles around the disputed building were removed after Independence because worship, kirtan, recitation etc., were performed there. This worship, kirtan etc., had no special relation with the Independence of the country, but people were performing pooja on this occasion also. India got its freedom on 15th August, 1947. There was no move of removing the brambles, cleaning the site around the disputed building in 1947 and 1948, there was no move to perform pooja also. Although collective worshipping and Nawanah Parayan were performed in 1947-48 in Hanumangarhi etc., to celebrate the occasion of Independence. I do not know if there was any restriction on removing the brambles and worshipping around the disputed building. In Para 9 of my affidavit I have used the words

"After the Independence" which means it was the period of Independence.

We regard "Utsav Murti" to that idol only which is movable. I do not know much about the construction of the Mosque. So far as I think there are high minaretes, round domes and niches in the minarets of the Mosque. All the Mosques seen by me have these features. Even in the Mosques of Ayodhya which I have seen, there are minarets round domes and niches in the minaretes. Some have small minaretes. There were no minarets in the disputed building. No Masjid has the pictures of Hindu religion on the pillars, Masjid has no Parikrama but the disputed building had Parikrama also. On this grounds I say that the disputed building was not a Masjid.

Sitakoot still exists there. There was a moving wheel to draw the water but now a days how the water is drawn that I do not know. There is plinth of lime (Jagat) around the mouth of the wall. It is made of lime on the upper surface and what is below it, brick or anything I do not know.

Tableau and displays are exhibited almost in all the small and big temples during Sawan Jhoola specially in Kanak Bhavan Rangmahal. Khaki Akhara, Laxman Quila, Goal Ghat, Hanumant Niwas, Hanumat Sadan etc., The festival of Ram's birth on Ramnavami is celebrated. All the small and big temples celebrate it. The third festival of Ayodhya is Parikrama. One is 14 Koshi Parikrama, second is 5 Koshi Parikrama. Those are the three main festivals. Where regular worship is performed in this temples, priests are appointed, Only priest can perform worship inside the temple and the devotees pay their obeisance from outside. Our temple has also priests. In the absence of the priests I myself perform worship. In the presence of the priest, I pay my obeisance etc. Like an ordinary man. If I visit any other temple, than I pray and worship in the same manner.

Metals are of many kinds, From a distance of 1-2 hands I can tell which is metal and which is non-metal and also the name of the metal. A pen was shown to the witness from a distance of two hands and he replied that appeared to be a metallic pen with brass on top and steel below.

About anything if Vedas are silent but the conscience and elderly/learned people accept it then it will be taken as true and real and if elderly/learned people and Vedas do not accept but ones own conscience is accepting them it will be untrue and false. If my Guru has told me and my conscience also accepts it, then it will be true for me . Those who preach us and show the right path are our Guru. The teachers who teach us from class one to four are our educational Gurus. The educational Gurus are part of Guru sentence. It is wrong to say that I am giving false witness with a feeling of malice. It is wrong to say that the disputed building was a Mosque. It is also wrong to say that 5 times Namaz and Azan and Namaz of Jumma was performed in the disputed building till 22nd December, 1949. It is also not true that Imam and Muazzin were appointed in the disputed building to teach Namaz and to give Azan respectively. It is also wrong to say that Muazzins also lived in that building.

(Cross examination concluded by Shri Mushtak Ahmad Siddiqui, Learned Advocate on behalf of Defendant No. 5)

(The cross examination done by Defendant No. 4, 5 & 6 was accepted by Sayed Irfan Ahmad, Advocate on behalf of Defendant No. 26)

(On behalf of Defendant No. 6/1 and 6/2 Suit No. 3/89, Shri Mohd. Azhar, Advocate accepted the cross examination done by Defendant No. 4, 5, & 6)

Cross examination on behalf of all the defendants/parties was concluded and witnesses discharged.

2374

Statement attested after reading

Sd/-

Narad Saran

05-02-2003

Typed by the Stenographer in the Open Court on my
dictation.

www.vadaprativada.in

www.vadaprativada.in