

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

OTHER ORIGINAL SUIT NO.5 OF 1989

Bhagwan Shri Ram Virajman
and others.

Plaintiffs

Versus

Shri Rajendra Singh
and others

Defendants

**EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY WAY OF AFFIDAVIT OF
JAGADGURU RAMANANDACHARYA – SWAMI RAM
BHADRACHARYA JI OPW NO. 16 UNDER ORDER 18
RULE 4 OF CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE .**

I, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Ramanandacharya, age about 54-years disciple of Shri Ishwar Dass resident of Shri. Tulsi Peeth Amodban, Chitrakoot, District Satna (M.P.), do hereby solemnly affirm on oath as under :

1. At the age of just two months, I was afflicted with eye disease and for want of medical cure, became blind.
2. My family name is Giridhar Mishra and the name of my father is Shri Pandit Rajdev Mishra and I received education under this name and obtained certificates and degrees.
3. After elementary education, I got admission in 'Prathma' in the then Varanasi Sanskrit Vishwavidyalaya, Varanasi which subsequently became

the "Sampoornanand Sanskrit Vishwavidyalaya, Varanasi". In the said University, I got degree of Acharya by doing Prathma, also the degrees of Vidyavaridhi and Vachaspati.

4. On obtaining maximum marks in the 1973 'Shastri' examination, I was awarded the first Gold Medal thereof by the University. In 1976, I was awarded five gold medals by the University for obtaining maximum marks in the 'Acharya' examination in 'Navya Vyakaran'.
5. In 1982, I was awarded Ph.D degree in Vidyavaridhi (Ph.D.) for research in 'Adhyatma Ramayane Apadiniya Prayoganam Vimarsha' and in the year 1995, I was awarded 'Vachaspati' (D.Litt.) on 'Paniniyashatadhayah Pratisutram Shabadbodh Sameeksha'.
6. From the beginning itself, I could not read on my own and right from childhood, my grandfather, my father and other relatives read out Tulsidas's literature to me which I did memorise. As a student also whatever my teachers lecturers read out to me regarding the subject, I did retain in my memory.
7. During my academic period, I did in-depth study of Ved-Vedang, Upanishad, grammar and religious texts (Dharamshastra) in this manner.
8. Till date, I have written 76 books, which include articles, reviews, commentaries etc. and all of them have since been published.
9. In 1983, from Swami Ramcharan Dass ji, I donned the

robes of a saint and started living at Chitrakoot where my name was changed from Giridhar Mishra to Rambhadracharya. By doing tapasya, sadhana and through my knowledge, I gave religious sermons to the people and worked for protection of the Hindu religion-culture and, established Siddh Peeth by the name of 'Shri Tulsi Peeth' at Chitrakoot in the year 1987.

10. I was made the Jagadguru Ramanandacharya at Kashi in 1989 and, on the occasion of Prayag Kumbh, I got unanimous support from Ramanandacharya Sect on the seat of Jagadguru Ramanandacharya and I was bestowed with the honour as Shri Tulsi Peethadheeshwar Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya.
11. With my individual efforts, I set up a 'Jagadguru Rambhadracharya Viklang Vishwavidyalaya' at Chitrakoot for the handicapped students and I am its lifetime Chancellor. In this Vishwavidyalaya (University), students are awarded degrees up to the level of graduation, post-graduation, Ph.D. and D.Litt. Students are provided boarding lodging education, clothing and books free of cost by the University. At present, 14 students are doing research work under my guidance.
12. I, who have been honored with the seat of Jagadguru Ramanandacharya belong to the Ramanandi Sect and revered God is Lord Rama. I have done an in-depth study of the revered god of the Ramanandi Sect Lord Rama in the religious texts.
13. Barring the Urdu language, I have knowledge of all

Indian languages and I am especially proficient in the Sanskrit language. I have written the first and the most voluminous epic of this century in Sanskrit known as 'Bhargava Raghviam' which was released by the Prime Minister Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee in 2002. I have written the epic 'Arundhati' in Hindi language which was released by the President Shri Shankar Dayal Sharma.

14. The international organization 'Vishwa Dharam Sansad', Chicago which selects at international level from among the scholars, scientists, religious heads of various disciplines one person every year for giving an award honoured me with the title of 'Dharamchakarvarti' in the year 1998.
15. My bio-data has published in the 'who is who of intellectuals' published by the Cambridge University, London in the year 2000.
16. I have given religious sermons in 14 countries. In 1992, in the ninth International Ramayana Mela, the Government of India had sent a delegation of scholars to Indonesia of which I was the head. I was entrusted with the responsibility of chairing all the four sessions of the discussions held on Ramayana in Indonesia.
17. In the year 2001, I had headed the Indian delegation in the conference of the Vishwa Shanti Shmiti, which is an international organization. In that conference, I was invited by the UNO for the concluding speech where I delivered the lecture for sixteen minutes and that was published in the national and foreign magazines.
18. According to my study and information, the disputed

site at Ayodhya is the birthplace of Lord Shri Ram and from time immemorial and as per traditions and faith, the disputed site is recognized as the birthplace of Lord Rama and that place is being worshipped on a continuing basis.

19. As per the Hindu scriptures, the idol and the abode of God is sacrosanct and revered and by offering prayers there, man attains Moksha (salvation).
20. As per the Hindu Scriptures, the place in particular has its own importance which is worthy of reverence and worship. Places such as these are from time immemorial, the best places because of the faith people have in them and as per the traditions. At such godly places, there is no need of a Shivait or Sarvaraha or a Mahant. Pilgrimages made by man do need a Shivait or a Sarvarahakar or a Mahant.
21. In the Valmiki Ramayana, Atharvaved, Yajurved, Ramtapniyopanishad, Skandpuran, and the literature of Tulsi Das the description of God Lord Rama and the disputed site being the place of worship of Lord Rama is found. In his work, 'Shri Tulsi Dohashatak' Goswami Tulsi Das has clearly mentioned as to how the muslims and the misdeeds of Baber led to the dismantling of the Shri Ram Janma Mandir by Mirbaki to build a mosque there in the following lines:

Mantra upnishad Brahmanhu, Bahu Puram itihās I
 Javan Jaraye ros bhari, Kari Tulsi pariahs II
 Shikha Śutra se heeav kari, Bal te Hindu Log I
 Bhadhari bhagaye desh se, Tulsi kathin kujog II
 Babar barbar aaike, Kar linee Karwal I
 Hane pachari- pachari jan, Tulsi Kar karal II
 Sambat sar vasu ban nabh, Grisham ritu anuman I

Tulsi awadhahi jar javan, Anarath kiy ankhani II
 Ram Janam mahi mandirahi, tori masit banay I
 Javahi bahu Hindun hate, Tulsi kinhi hai II
 Dalyo mibaki Awadh, Mandir Ram samaj I
 Tulsi rovat hirdai hati, Trahi trahi Raghuraj II
 Ram Janam Mandir jahan, lasat Awadh ke beech I
 Tulsi rachi masit tah, meerbaki bal neech II
 Ramayan ghari ghanth jahan, shruti puran upkhaan II
 Tulsi javan ajan tahe , kiyo kuran ajan II

(Extract from "Tulsi Dohashatak" written by Tulsi Dass)

22. In the following lines from his work 'Kavitavali', Goswami Tulsi dass while describing his detachment from the society and expressing his faith and devotion to Lord Rama, has made mention of the disputed site.

Dhoot kahon Awdhoot kahon, Rajpoot kahon, Jolaha kahon kou I
 Kahu ki beti se beta na bhyahab, Kahhu ki jat bigaran sou II
 Tulsi sar nam gulam hai ram ke, Jake rache so kahe kachu jou I
 Mangi ka khaibo, Masit main saibo, Laibo ko eku na deve ke Dou II

23. According to the Vedas, the 'Valmiki Ramayana' was written during the period of Lord Rama. In episode 18 (Bal Khand) of Valmiki Ramayana, while describing the season, stars, planets etc. at the time of Lord Ram's birth it has described the disputed site through the word "Sarvalok Namaskrat" and given a clear description of the birthplace of Lord Ram in the following shlokas:

Tato yagye samapte tu rituna shut Samtyayuh I
 Tatshach dwadashey mase chatre Navmike titho II
 Nakhatreaditi devatye Swochchsanshatheshu panchsu
 Grahesu Karkate legne vakyatavinduna sah II
 Prodhmane jagnnatham sarvlok namaskratam I
 Kaushlyajanyad Rama divya Lakshnam Sanyuktam II

24. In the religious scripture, especially

Ramtapniyopanishad, Ved Vedang, all the four manifestations of the Lord, i.e. (1) Name (2) Manifestation (3) Leela (4) Dham have been described and how they are to be worshipped. The term 'dham' stands for birthplace as is clear from the under mentioned shlok:-

Dharma sthane prkeshe cha janambhuma tathev cha I
Kirane chev vigyeyam tatha chandanrashamino II

Thus, it is clear that Ram Janam Bhoomi is worthy of worship like the revered Lord and is being worshipped from time immemorial by the Hindus.

25. I am familiar with the Ayodhya Mahatamya of the Vaishnav Khand of Skand Puran published in 1966 in the press established by Shri Krishnadasatmaj Kshemraj Shresthi in which the birthplace of Lord Shri Rama has been clearly described. The photocopy of the cover page and the photocopy of shloka Nos. 1 to 25 on page No. 292 of chapter 10 of this book is enclosed with this affidavit as enclosure-1 which is the true photocopy of the original book.
26. I have also brought with me books like Ramtapniyopanishad, and Valmiki Ramayana.
27. According to Bhagwati Shruti of the Taittriya Shakha of Yajurved – Ayodhya is the abode of gods where Lord Rama was born.

Deponent

Thumb impression

(Jagadguru Ramanandacharya
Swami Ramanandacharya)

O.P.W. No. 16

VERIFICATION

I, the above mentioned deponent, Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Rama Bhadracharya, do hereby testify on oath that all the statements made by me in Paras 1 to 27 of my this affidavit have been written under my instructions which I have heard carefully after having got it read out. All these statements are true as per my knowledge. May God help me.

Deponent

Thumb impression

(Jagadguru Ramanandacharya

Swami Ramanandacharya)

O.P.W. No. 16

I, Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate of the deponent know and recognize Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Rama Bhadracharya O.P.W. No. 16. I have written the statements contained in this affidavit under instructions from the deponent and have read out the contents to the deponent. After hearing all the contents written therein, the said deponent in token of having accepted the contents, has on this day of 15.07.2003, put his signature/thumb impression on this affidavit in my presence.

Lucknow

Sd/-

Dated: 15.7.2003

(Ajay Kumar Pandey)

Advocate

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

(R.S. No. 236/1989)

O.O.S No. 5 of 89

Bhagwan Shri Ram Virajman

and others.

Plaintiffs

Versus

Rajendra Singh

and others.

Defendants

O.P.W.16

Jagadgur Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya

The affidavit page No.1 to 9 of the examination in chief was submitted and taken on record.

(Cross-examination on oath begins by Advocate Shri Ranjit Lal Verma on behalf of Defendant No. 3 of Minjanib Nirmohi Akhara.)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

I am also the Jagadguru Ramanandacharya of Ramanandi Sect. Shri Adya Ramanandacharya came into existence seven hundred years ago. He wrote Anandbhashya on 10 Upanishads, Srimad Bhagwat Gita and Brahmsutra. All the above scriptures are known as Prasthantreya and the commentary written thereon is known as Anand Bashya. This is the reason that the writer of these three commentaries is known as Anand

Bhashyakar. There is no difference between philosophy and principles and it is Vishishtadwait only, which is our philosophy. There were twelve main disciples of Shri Adya Ramanandacharya Ji. The name of his third and fourth disciple is Sursuranandacharya and Anubhavanandacharya. The disciple of Anubhavanandacharya is Virajanandacharya and the disciple of Virajanandacharya is Balanandacharya who established the Akharas.

The aim of the Ramanandi Sect is the propagation of the Vedic culture and its principled analysis of the Indian scriptures. Propagation of the Vedic culture is a holistic component of history. Among the sources of the ancient history, the complete Veda has more importance. Each code of the Vedas has separate Brahman scriptures. I do not consider Brahmans different from the Vedas since Brahmans are covered under the Vedas, they should not be considered separate from them and they have equal importance in ancient history. With a view to gaining knowledge of the Vedas, 6 Vedangas are taken recourse to. For the Yajurveda, there is the reference of the shatpath Brahman scripture. To know about the ancient Indian history, Valmiki's Ramayana and Puranas are important. The writer of the Puranas is Shri Krishnadwaipayan Vedvyas. This is wrong to say that the writer of the Puranas is Lomharsh or his son Udrashava. Valmiki Ramayana is not considered to be Purana – it is considered history. The period during which Valmiki Ramayana was written is the period of Lord Rama – the incarnation of God. The word Sanskriti (culture) has very deep meaning and brief, I would say that Sanskrit (culture) is that system of vedic tradition by following which the whole mankind is blessed and experiences lasting comfort. It would be wrong to say that culture takes within its fold the refined mental activities and

expressions which he sees as proof and which he considers to be his mental and spiritual achievement. The sphere of activity of Indian culture is religion also. The Ramayana Sanskriti period is considered to be Vedic period only. There is no such thing as Pur Sanskriti period. Nagar Sanskriti period is not a part of the Vedic Sanskriti period. According to the chronology of the Puranas, Shri Rama descended on this earth about one crore, fifty lacs and eighty thousand years ago and that is the Ramayana period. The period of Shatpath Brahman and Vedas cannot be told because the Vedas like God are timeless. Shatpath Brahman was not written because it is apourusheya. It is correct that the description in the Valmiki Ramayana is of the same period when Lord Rama's leela took place.

In shloka No. 8 to 11 of the Balkaand of Valmiki's Ramayana, Valmiki has described the incarnation of Lord Rama. Prior to this in the 6th shloka of the fifth Sarga of the same very Valimiki Ramayana, description of the Ayodhya city finds mention. 'Ayodhyanam Nagri Tatrasi lokkam Vishruta Manuna Manvendren or Puri Nirmita swayam', meaning that Ayodhya city is in that Koshal country whose boundaries have been defined by Manvendra Manu himself. The word 'Nirmita' here means 'whole boundary has been defined'. It was on the basis of this that Valmiki called the Ayodhya the city of Shri RamJanambhoomi and called Dashrath the king of Ayodhya and after describing his state governance and the Yagna he says "Prodyamaanc Jagannath Sarvalok Namaskratam.", Valmiki has described in this very chapter the birthplace of Lord Rama. In Para 23 of my affidavit, there is a shloka in the fifth line of which is written 'sarvalok namaskratam' which means a place where all the people come and pay obeisance and it was at this place that Lord Rama was born. It is correct that in my

affidavit, the whole of Ayodhya has not been described, but in the Balkaand of Valmiki Ramayana (sixth Shloka fifth sarga), Ayodhya has been described. If the word Ramayana is split, it means that it is a medium of reaching Lord Rama. The word Ramayana does not mean Ram's home but it means of reaching to him. It is correct that the revered god of Swami Ramanandacharya is Lord Rama and of all the followers of his Sect also the revered god is Lord Rama. The idol of Lord Rama is worshipped and his birthplace is also worshipped. Lord Rama is Mahavishnu. Ramanandacharya believes that Lord Rama is the incarnation of all. This is the reason that he has been called Maha Vishnu in Ramtapniyopanishad. The followers of Swami Ramanandacharya are known as a Shri Ramanandiya Shri Vaishnav. The Ramayana is the entire narrative of the life of Lord Rama. It would be wrong to say that in the Valmiki Ramayana, it has been said that Lord Rama took birth. As a matter of fact, in the Valmiki Ramayana, it has been mentioned that Lord Rama had incarnated himself. However, those who describe the Leela of Lord Rama, make use of the word 'Janma'.

It would be wrong to say that Swami Ramanandacharya set up several monasteries. As a matter of fact, he established only monastery at Varanasi, which is known as Shrimath. It is true that his followers set up several religious monasteries and they continue to do so. Wherever these monasteries were established – Lord Rama is present there. In our Vishishtadwati philosophy in addition to the worshipping of the idols, the site where Lord Rama made his appearance is also worshipped which we call Dham. It is true that prior to Swami Ramanandacharya Adi Shankracharya had appeared on the scene. It is correct to say that the Philosophy of Shankracharya was Nirakar

(formless). It is wrong to say that Shankracharya was a pseudo Buddha, i.e. he was considered to be a hidden Baudha. However, this is the view of some people and not of all. It is wholly wrong to say that Swami Ramanandacharya imagined the Saakaar Brahma. It is true that in the philosophy of Swami Ramanandacharya, there is provision for the worship of Saakaar Brahma. The Vedas have laid down four parameters for the incarnation of God, i.e. name, manifestation, leela and dham. Shri Ramanandiya Shri Vaishnav worship all these four according to the tenets of Saakaar. Some manifestations are revered daily and as such in their case, Pratishtha is not needed e.g. Dham. The word 'dham' means the place of birth- e.g. Mathura Dham, Ayodhya Dham, Jaggannathpuri Dham etc. It is wholly wrong to say that wherever the lingas of Lord Shanker were established, they were known as Dham. In the monastery set up by Shri Ramanandacharya at Varanasi, the idol of Lord Rama was established by Adyaramanandacharya which is worshipped even today. I cannot say whether or not five times worship is held in the monastery at Kashi, but I do know that worship of Lord Rama is held there continuously. According to the evidence available in the religious texts, two-time worship is mandatory in the temple of Ramanandi Sect-once in the morning and once in the evening. It is true that after the establishment of any idol as per the traditions, the idol is given a bath, food and then laid to rest. It is wrong to say that in the Vedas, one does not find description of the worship of the Saakaar deities. As a matter of fact, complete details are there in the Vedas regarding this. Description of temples also is found in the Vedas. This is also wrong to say that in the Vedas, for fire, air and rain Lord Indira is not worshipped. The fact of the matter is that complete description of the worship of the Saakaar is found

in the Vedas. Whatever details about the worship of the deities and the temples are mentioned in the Vedas, details of their physical description are also available. It has been said that the Puranas are eighteen (18) in number. It is wrong to say that the Puranas can be divided into 5 sections. It is true that in the Puranas, 5 subjects have been described which are categorized as Sarga, Visarga, Vansh, Manvantar, and Vanshanuchrit. It is true that as per the category and the subject, the family traditions of the Rishis and the deities have been described. It is also true in Vanshanuchrit, characters of the ancient royal families have been described.

I do not subscribe to the view that the construction of the temples began in the poraanik era and that the physical features of the deities emerged as the three ideologies – i.e. Shaiv, Vaishnav and Shakt- and it was from then on that the practice of the establishment of the idols started. Description of royal families is found in each of the Puranas. It is absolutely wrong to say that the description of the royal hierarchy is available only in five Puranas, i.e. the Matsya Purana, Vayu Purana, Garud Purana, Brahmand Purana and Bhagwat Purana. On the contrary, the fact of the matter is that the description of the royal hierarchy is available in the Puranas. In some Puranas, the description is detailed while in others it is in brief. I have read all the Puranas. So far as Matsya Puran is concerned, I have heard it. It is a very ancient Puran. In the Matsya Puran, there is mainly the mention of the kings belonging to the Suryavansh and Chandravansh. In the Matsya Puran, there is the description of the hierarchies of the Nand Vansh, Maurya Vansh, Gupt Vansh and Satyavahan. However, all these hierarchies come within the purview of the Suryavansh and Chandravansh. It is not correct to say

that the authenticity of the Puranas dates back to the sixth century B.C. As a matter of fact, the Puranas have been there since the beginning of the Vedic era.

There is the contribution of the Smritis to know the traditions of history of ancient times. I know about the Narad Smriti. It is wrong to say that in the Narad Smriti, there is the tradition of the Gupt era. The fact is that the Smriti which includes Narad Smriti also explains the vedic tenets.

I have no knowledge that in the Atharvveda, king Parikshit is called the last king of the Kurus. I can tell this only after gathering information about this.

It is true that in every monastery, there is a temple in which an idol of Lord Rama is placed. In one Ramanandiya monastery, there can be more than one temple. All this depends on the head of the monastery.

The Anubhavnandacharya era can be considered as dating back to 500 years from now. I have no objection to the view "that the birth of Anubhavnandacharya took place in Vikram era 1503 at Kanyakubj family. However, I am not yet sure about its authenticity. Shri Anantnandacharya and Bhavanandacharya and Sursuranandacharya and Narharyanandacharya were the disciples of Anubhavnandacharya but it would be wrong to say that he was Guru brother of Anubhavnandacharya. It is true that during his time, Anubhavnandacharya had propounded the military according to which he made a provision for imparting training to his disciples in the art of wielding a Barchha, Arrow, and Spear etc. It is correct to say that this military system was implemented in the Akharas. It is

correct to say that the foremost concern of such soldiers was to protect the religion, to protect one's sect and to protect the temples and monasteries for which they were prepared to put up a fight. I have been to Ayodhya and I know about it. It is correct to say that at Ayodhya, there are three of Ramanandi Sect known by the names of Digambar, Nirmohi and Nirvani Akharas. In addition, there are sub-Akharas also but the above three are the main Akharas. It is correct to say that the Hanumangarhi temple under the Nirvani Akhara is situated at Ayodhya. I do not know whether or not there is any temple near Lord Hanuman temple of Hanumangarhi.

'Ani' means army. All the above three Akhara are 'Ani'. It is correct to say that the traditions which apply to one Ani of the Akhara of Ramanandiya Sect will be applicable to the 'Ani' of the remaining two Akhara also. It is true that there is Panchayati arrangement in all the Akhara. This is also true that the Panchayat of every Akhara has to work according to the majority opinion. It is correct to say that the Mahants of all the Akhara are elected by the Panchs. It is true that the main job of a Mahant of any Akhara is to give religious sermons. It is true that the remaining jobs of a monastery Akhara are like management, worship of the temple and are looked after by the Panchgan and not by the Mahant. In the same very management of the Panchgana-are the Pujaris. Golki, Panch and Sarpanch etc. It is true that the Nagapana of any sadhu of the Akhara is done in any Kumbha. Digambar Akhara holds the most prominent place among all the Akhara. As per the tradition of every Akhara, in every Kumbha, all the three Akhara are in the first row at the time of the first bath as per decision.

The cases for which I have come to appear as a witness – I have knowledge about them from the very beginning. According to my information, the cases had started from the year 1949 itself. Though I was not born at that time but I have knowledge about the cases since 1984. According to my information, the O.O.S. 5/89 was filed after the constitution of the Ram Janam Bhoomi Trust. I am not holding any office in the Ram Janam Bhoomi Trust nor am I holding any office in the Vishwa Hindu Parishad. As per my information, the Ram Janam Bhoomi Trust was constituted after 1984 only. I keep getting information about the cases through my discussion with various people. I had information about the cases prior to 1985 also. I cannot tell anything about the parties of the 1949 cases but I have heard the name of Ramchander Paramhans Dass as one party.

Whatever information I have about the 1949 case, according to that – all I know is that Param Hans Ram Chander Das who was connected with that case, had filed his suit. However, I do not know about the attachment. This information I came to know from other people apart from Param Hans Ram Chander Das. I know Param Hans Ram Chander Das ever since I came to senses. I had known him as a forceful sadhu. I cannot say whether or not in 1957, Mahant Ramchander Dass was the Mahant of Digambar Jain Akhara. I had gone to the disputed site in 1957 and thereafter also a number of times and the day the lock was opened I was present there. Since the year 1957, till the time the lock was broken, I had gone to the disputed site a number of times. I had personally seen and touched the lock which was there on the main gate of the Ram Janam Bhoomi. I do not know whether or not there was any Ram Chabutra in the premises outside the place, which was

locked. I do not know anything about the charanchinh (footprints) and Chhatti Pooja outside the place, which was locked. About all these. I had discussion with my father but I did not have darshans. All that was discussed was that outside the lock, there is only one Ram Chabutra and nothing else. I had no such discussion with my father that the idols of all four brothers Ram-Lakshman-Bharat- and Shatrughan are on the Ram Chabutra and that there is Chakla-Chulha also over there. I do know and there was discussion also to this effect that in the portion inside the locked site, pooja has going on continuously. I knew it and had darshans also that locked portion Lord Rama's idol was there and that, it is his place of birth. I know that the site inside the locked portion is Lord Rama himself. He further added that there is no doubt, that place is worthy of worship. Besides that the idol of Lord Rama was also there within the locked portion since time immemorial. What I mean to say is that ever since the Lord made his appearance, the idol has been there since then. According to my information, there is no other Hindu shrine in India, where without any idol or prints or figure or Linga – only the place is worshipped.

Mahabharat is not Purana. According to my information, no religious scholar has ever treated Mahabharat as Purana – Mahabharat is history.

I do not know whether or not, at the spot where Lord Vishnu crushed Kaitabh in the fight of Mudh Kaitabh on the hill Mandaar in the Jharkhand state, there are foot-prints of Lord Vishnu and nor do I know whether or not that hill is worshipped. In the 13th shloka of the 13th chapter of Shrimad Bhagwat Gita, the Lord did mention about his omnipresence but the same very god in the 51st shloka of

the 11th chapter by showing Arjun his two-armed manifestation – satisfied him. It is true that among the five manifestations of Braham, 'Archa' is an incarnation (Avtar). In the Dev temple, the 'Archa' incarnation of the Lord is visible in Naam-Roop-Leela and Dham manifestations. It is true 'Archa' is the easy path to Vighraha Bhakti. It is correct to say that in the idol vighraha there are said to be eight types and in all of them, there is saakar akriti.

At Chitakoot in Tulsi Peeth, there is a beautiful temple, which I got constructed and had also done Partishtha of the Lord. That temple has the idols of Ram – Sita and Lakshman. Those idol are worshipped which have Pratishtha (established according to religious rites). Moorti Pratishtha is a Vecdic ritual whose details are available in the Vedas and the Puranas. The ritual of Pratishtha – as has been mentioned in the Partishtha Granth – lasts for five days. It is true after the installation of idol as per religious rites (pratishtha), a Mahant or a Sarvasahkar is required. In the temple at Tulsi Peeth, I myself am the Manager (Vyavasthapak). It is true that in a 'Vyavasthapak', religious spirituality is vested. The Vyavasthapaks in the temple located inside the courtyard Akhara, are the Panchans of the Akhara.

The writing of Tulsi Das begin from the year 1631. I do not know who was the king during. That historical period. It is correct to say that during the reign of Akbar, there was Abdurrahim Khankhana, who was a contemporary of Tulsi Das. It is wrong to say that Tulsi Das said the verse (Saraiya) mentioned in Para 22 of my affidavit to wash off the allegation leveled against him that he was following the transition of Kabir. It is wrong to say that Tulsi Das was influenced by the Kabir tradition. It is

true that saint Kabir was the disciple of Ramanandacharya and similarly, Tulsi Das Ji was the disciple of Swami Ramanandacharya. It is not correct to say that Kabir and Tulsi Das followed the principle of Ramanandacharya. As a matter of fact, it is true that both were the followers of his Sect but whereas Kabir's Principle were that of Nirguna and those of Tulsi Das were Saguna. It is correct to say that through his writings, Goswami Tulsi Das had a dig at the wrong customs and conventions prevalent in the society at that time.

Tulsi Das Ji's 'Shri Tulsi Doha Shatak' was written in the year 1647. It is wrong to suggest that Shri Tulsi Doha Shatak has been compiled on the basis of various books. As a matter of fact, it is his original and independent creation. It is likely that Tulsi Das might have written the Doha Shatak at Kashi, Prayag, Chitrakoot or Ayodhya – I do not know anything about this. It was first got published by the Tallukedar of Rai Bareilly Babu Rai Bahadur Singh. Doha Shatak has not been published by the Geeta Press, Gorakhpur. The doha I have quoted in Para 21 of my affidavit (line 9) which is concerned with the details of Ramjanma Mandir – that means that by demolishing the temple built at the Ramjanma sthal, a mosque shaped structure was built. Tulsi Das has described it by saying that in this temple, there was the idol of Lord Rama. In line 11 also the Ram temple has been portrayed with the idol of Lord Rama and it is clear that the temple of Ram ke Samaj was demolished. This conveys the sense that it was the Ram temple and not the temple of the samaj.

There are three evidences of the Hindu religion – Shruti, Smriti and Sutra. It is wrong to say that Shruti is a divine-gifted scripture. Shruti encompasses all the Vedas,

Brahmanas, Aranayak and Uprishads. It is true that the Rishis who had the darshan of Vedas and Mantras, they wrote the Smritis by learning the tenets of Vedic principles. It is not correct to say that according to Yagvalakya, religion has four pillars, viz: Shruti, Smriti, Bhashya, Nibandh and Prakathayein. The truth is that religion has only three bases – Shruti – Smriti and Sutra which are known as Prasthantrayi. It is correct that all the sects who have faith in the Hindu religion have their own customs and traditions and all of them have the sanction of the Shruti. It is correct to say that the various religious scholars have made mention of the different traditions in their writing but their authenticity depends on the religious scholars only. It is wrong to say that Nyaya, Purana, Meemansa and Dharamshastra can be the basis of various religious faiths. As a matter of fact, these are all the basis of religious tenets. It is correct that the judicial systems of Manu Smriti are based on Vedic religion. I cannot say that according to Manu Smriti the Vyavasthapak of any material property is the claimant of the title of that property.

The most authentic scriptures of the religious texts of Hindu religious are Prayshchitendu Shekhar and Nirnaysindhu and Dharamsindhu. All these three religious texts are concerned with Ram, Ram temple and Ayodhya. Prayshchitendu Shekhar has been written by Negendra Bhatt and was written in the 8th century while the other two books are the compilations of the 16th century. It is clearly mentioned in this text that to the north of Ayodhya flows the Saryu River. It is correct to say that in the Valmiki Ramayana also, the Saryu river has been described as flowing to the north of Ayodhya. In the Prayshchitendu text, there is description of the worship of Ramji but not especially of the Ram temple. This is so because this book

pertains to the general rituals and procedures. It is wrong to say that the Tulsidas Ramcharitmanas is concerned with the narrative of Lord Rama only. As a matter of fact, the description of Ram Janam Bhoomi is also there in it. In all the four Vedas, there is discussion about the Ikshvakuvansh. It is in this dynasty only after the name of Dashratha, the name of Lord Rama figures. In the term Ram or Rama Mantra – Sita is vested and not vested also, because in the Ramanandi Sect, there is the tradition of Yugal Mantra (Mantra of the couple). It is wrong to say that the first plural number of Vedic Ram Shabad is Ramash and that even after dipping the present 'S' in it becomes 'C' and that 'S' changes into feminine. This is also wrong to say that it becomes Sita. It is also wrong that by prefixing 'Ram' it becomes Virmaya. In the feminine synonym of the word Ram, it becomes Rama and as such in the word Ram, the Sita Mantra is also vested.

It is correct to say that in the Valmiki Ramayana, Lord Krishan has been acknowledged as the future incarnation. It is correct to say that in the Mahabhartar, there is mention of Ramavtar Hanuman and Jambvan.

I have no Knowledge about this as to whether or not prior to 1949, any other suit were going on regarding this disputed site. In 1988, I had gathered this information that the Nirmohi Akhara was fighting for its rights in the disputed site. This information was given to me by Shri Vinay Katiyar and had said that I should tell the Nirmohi Akhara people that they should keep Lord Rama uppermost in their minds and as such not indulge in such fight. At that time, Vinay Katiyar was the head of the Bajrang Dal and he did not want that the controversy should aggravate. Shri Vinay Katiyar had said the above thing to me because of

his love for me. At his instance, I remained neutral and as such the thing appeared to me neither right nor wrong. I do not mean to say that the Nirmohi Akhara people do not believe in Lord Rama. I do not know that in the year 1991 in the month of Kwar, the U.P. Government had acquired the land along with its twenty temples of Nirmohi Akhara. I do not know this also that barring the domes (gumbads) of the disputed building, the remaining land was acquired. I do know that in protest against the U.P. Governments decision of acquiring land, the Nirmohi Akhara had filed a writ Petition. That the disputed structure was demolished is known to the whole world and I also know it. It is wrong to say that knowing about the demolition of the twenty temples of the Nirmohi Akhara, I am making a wrong statement. I am giving evidence in this suit at the instance of Shri Triloki Nath Pandey and not at the instance of Shri vinay Katiyar.

Verified the statement after hearing

Thumb Impression

Jagadgur Ramanandacharya

Swami Rambhadracharya

15.07.2003

Cross-examination by Advocate Shri Ranjit Lal Verma on Behalf of Defendant No. 3 concluded.

Typed by the Stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this present on 16.7.2003 for further cross-examination.

Sd/-

15.07.2003

O.P.W.16Jagadgur Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya

(In continuation of 15.07.2003 before the Hon'ble Full Bench the statement on oath of O.P.W.16 Jagadgur Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya)

Cross-examination by Advocate Shri Adbul Mannan on behalf of Defendant No. 6:-

XXX XXX XXX XXX

It is true that there are three Universities at Kashi – viz: BHU, Kashi Vidyapeth and Sampooranad Vishwavidyalaya. I was a student of Sampooranad Vishwavidyalaya where I studied upto the Acharya level and from there only I got the degree of Ph.D. and D. Litt. Prathma degree is equivalent to 8th class.

My father is a resident of Sandi Khurd Village of Jaunpur district. At present, he is living there. I had got my primary education in my village and upto Uttar Madhyama. I got education at Gauri Shanker Sanskrit Vidyalaya which is affiliated to Sampooranand Vishwavidyalaya. Then again I came to Sampooranand Vishwavidyalaya for studying Shastri which is equivalent to B.A. At that time, I was 22 years of age. During those days the Shastri course used to be of 2 years duration. Thereafter, I did the 3-year Acharya course from that very University. Then I did research from that very University which took 4 years. From the year 1971 to 14 October 1981, I was at Kashi after which I came to Chitrakoot. I had come to Chitrakoot in 1981 itself. At Chitrakoot, I did not start teaching instead I started spiritual

meditation. Spiritual meditation means the study of scriptures and chanting hymns of God. This I am doing till now. In addition, I keep myself busy in other activities also connected with religion and side by side I do social service too. In my religious activities, I teach and study the religious scriptures and write different religious texts. Our students and others who live there write while I speak. At present, my students are Jai Prakash Gautam, Chandra Dutt Suvedi and my elder sister Ms. Dr. Geeta Devi Misra etc. At Chitrakoot, two years back, I established the Jagadguru Rambhadracharya Viklang Vishwavidyalya which is recognized by the UGC. In that Vishwavidyalya, graduate and post-graduate classes are run. That University grants the degrees of graduation, post-graduation, Ph. D. and D. Litt. I am a life-time Chancellor of that University. The degree and certificates of this University will be valid all over the world. This University is meant only for the handicapped and at present, 300 students are studying there. Students come to this University for graduation degrees and they leave after doing Ph.D. and D.Litt. The graduation course is of 2 years duration – post-graduate course – 3 years duration, Ph.D. of minimum 18 months duration while D.Litt. is minimum 30 months. I have not done teaching job for any monetary purpose. I take M.A. classes of my own accord.

As I have stated above, I have been regularly going to Ayodhya since 1957. In one year I go to Ayodhya tens of time. I have not seen Babri Masjid at Ayodhya. Of course, I have seen a mosque like structure and that I had been seeing since 1957. When in 1957, I went to Ayodhya for the first time, my father told me that a mosque like structure was built there by demolishing a temple of the Hindus there. I was told that this mosque like structure was built in June 1528. I did not ask him as to when this mosque was

built. When I went to Chitrakoot for the first time, my age then was 32. From Chitrakoot, I often came to Ayodhya. It takes about 8-10 hours to reach Ayodhya from Chitrakoot. When I went to Ayodhya for the first time, the mosque like structure was there. I cannot tell the length and breadth of the mosque because I cannot see. However, the roof of that structure would have been about 8-10 feet which I could not reach (touch). I do not know whether or not people came there but I had done Parikarma there. There was a specific place for Parikarma but it was very close to the wall. I have been to Ayodhya hundreds of times.

When the disputed structure was demolished, I was present there. The disputed structure was demolished between 11.45 A.M. and 04.47 P.M. on 6th December 1992. Those who demolished the structure were the Hindu devotees of Lord Rama who were thousands in numbers. It is likely that their number might be one to two lakhs. When the disputed structure was being demolished, the whole place was so crowded that I did not get acquainted with any particular person. At that time, I was standing out with the spectators at a distance of about 100 steps. There was so much of rush at that time that it was difficult to move from there and, therefore, I kept standing there for 5-6 hours. There was so much of rush at that time that I could not stop anybody nor could anybody listen to me. When the disputed structure was being demolished, there was so much of noise. At that time, the noise of the people and the noise emanating from the demolition process – both could be heard. At that point of time, I had gone to Ayodhya in connection with the Kartik Shukla Navami for Parikarma. That day was Ekadashi and I had stayed there in connection with Parikarma. There are two types of Parikarmas. One is Panchkosi and other is Chaudahkosi.

We were coming after doing the Panchkosi Parikarma. The Panchkosi Parikarma is of five kose. After doing the Panchkosi Parikarma, I had come not in front of the Babri Masjid but in front of the disputed structure. Since I could not move forward, I kept standing there. It is wrong to suggest that on the night of 22/23 December, the idol of Lord Rama was kept in the masjid.

(The cross-examination by Advocate Shri Abdul Mannan on behalf of Defendant No. 6 concluded.)

Cross-examination by Advocate Shri Zaffaryab Jilani begins on behalf of Defendant No. 4 – Sunni Central Board of Wakf.)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

The subject on which I had done research and the subject of which I had made a mention in Sanskrit in Para 5 of my affidavit, the Hindi meaning of that is (in the Adhyatam Ramayana, as per the Panini Grammar) reflection on the experiments connected with the worship of God. By Ramayana, I mean the Adhyatam Ram which is different from the Valmiki Ramayana and the writer of which is considered to be Vedvyas. In the world of Ramayana, the Adhyatam Ramayana also gets recognition. People of the Ramanand Sect do not consider the Adhyatam Ramayana at par with the Valmiki Ramayana – they give it less importance than the Valmiki Ramayana.

The subject on which I was awarded the D.Litt. degree – its name is also mentioned in Para 5 of my affidavit and the Hindi meaning can be seen in all the eight chapters of Majority Panini Grammar where every shloka has been translated with comments thereon. The research book of

D.Litt I had written at Chitrakoot. This research book I had written while living in the Tulsi Peeth established by me. I had established the Tulsi Peeth in 1987. At Tulsi Peeth, a school for the blind girls and boys from class I to class XII is being run in which students of all religions are studying. Tulsi Peeth is an institution, which is run by a Trust, which is known as Tulsi Peeth Sewa Nyas. I am the main trustee of this Trust. I lived at various places at Chitrakoot since 1982 and was giving religious lectures. The University which I have established there is in that part of Chitrakoot which is a part of U.P. while Tulsi Peeth, situated in that part of Chitrakoot which is a part of Madhya Pradesh. I had established the University directly and not through medium of any school. All the students in that University are handicapped and the biggest thing about that University is that students of any religion can study in this University. At the graduate and the Postgraduate level subjects like Hindi, English, History, Social Studies, Computer, Arts, Music, Philosophy etc. are taught. The convocation of this University is going to be held on the forthcoming 4th of August. The convocation address will be delivered by the Union human Resources Development Minister Shri Murli Manohar Joshi. I shall be the Chairman of this convocation by virtue of my being the Chancellor. This University is managed by the Board of Governors which is the apex body and of which I am the Chariman. The above University has been established under the Handicapped University Act 2001 passed by the Government of Uttar Pradesh. The full name of the Act is Jagadguru Rambhadracharya Viklang Vishwavidyalaya Chitrakoot U.P. Act.

Among the subjects mentioned above, by the subject Philosophy, I mean Philosophy in which Philosophy every religion is taught. There is no such subject in this

University, which is solely concerned with Hindu religion or Hindu scriptures etc. Out of the 76 books that I have written and which I have given reference in Para 8 of my affidavit, 10-15 books are concerned with the Ramayana. 9 of these are concerned with the Ramayana written by Tulsidas and the rest with the narrative of Lord Rama. None of these is concerned with the Valmiki Ramayana but I have discussed Valmiki Ramayana in these books. The books that I have written relating to the Ramayana written by Tulsidas are as follows: (1) Sumitra in Manas (2) Parambarbhagi Jatayu (3) Manas Sushma (4) Bharat Mahima (5) Sita Ram Vivah Darshan (6) Prabhu Kari Kripa Pavri Deenhi (7) Manas Mein Tapas Prasang (8) Sugreev Kee Kuchaal Va Vibheeshan Kee Kartoot (9) Sita Nirvasan Naheen. All the books are in Hindi language while some extracts are in Sanskrit also. All these books have been published by Tulsi Peeth Prakashan. 'Bharat Mahima' – the first book was published about 2 years back. My book titled 'Manas Mein Sumitra' has been published by Tulsi Peeth Seva Trust Publication which is our Trust only. The publication of my second book 'Param Barbhagi Jatayu' was done by some other publisher named Shri Raghav Sahitya Prakashan, Haridwar. This publication center also belongs to me because I have a center at Haridwar also known by the name of Vashishthayanam. In all my above 9 books, the main reference is that of the Ramayana written by Tulsidas. Some extracts there are from the Ramayana of Tulsidas while others are from his writings also.

I have read the entire literature of Tulsidas. 11 writings of Tulsidas were Published by 'Kashi Nagri Prachirni Sabha', which include Ramcharitmanas, Kavitavali, Ramgetavali, Kishnageetavali, Ramagyaprashan, Dohawali, Janaki Mangal, Parvati

Mangal, Ramlala Nehchhu, Vinay Patrika, Barvai Ramayan. In addition to these, the Geeta Press has separately published the 'Hanuman Bahuk'. Apart from this, the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan has published 'Vrihad Barvai Ramayana'. Besides this, the Talukedar of Rai Bareilly Babu Rai Bahadur Singh published a small book named 'Tulsi Doha Shatak' and Dr. Sita Ram Chaturvedi published 'Tulsi Granthavali' by collecting the books of Tulsidas, which has a compilation of 21 books. This compilation does not include two books namely 'Vrihad Barvai Ramayan' and 'Tulsi Doha Shatak'. Tulsidas also wrote 'Hanuman Chaleesa' which has been published separately by different publishers. I had read all these books during the period I was a student. I consider my student life upto the time I got the D.Litt. Degree, i.e. 1995. I had learnt the 'Dohashatak' written by Tulsidas in 1957-58 when my father read it out to me. It is a book of 3-4 pages with only 100 dohas. Eight dohas of the same very book I have got written in Para 21 of my affidavit. This book is not there either at my Tulsipeeth or University but I can have this books sent from my paternal native place if needed – though I have no link with my family because I have turned a Sanyasi. By 'having no link' what I mean is that I do not go there. I respect my parents but what all goes on there – I have no knowledge about that. I cannot call for that book on my own. However, if the court directs so, I can have it called for. I do not remember the year when Tulsi Doha Shatak was published. I guess that it had been published prior to my birth and then only my grand father had made me learn it by heart. My grand father had told me that this book was published by the Ramjantralya of Rai Bareilly. Ramjantralya is the name of a printing press and I do not know as to where it is situated in Rai Bareilly. After 1957-58, I have not touched this book of course. I did hear discussions about this book

after that. I have not seen that book. I did not get that book purchased for my University or Tulsi Peeth nor did I make any efforts in this regard. The Tulsi Doha Shatak is not taught in my University. In my books written about the writings of Tulsi Das, I have given examples of Tulsi Doha Shatak. In my book 'Sita Ram Vivah Darshan' – I have given exmple of two Dohas, which are as follows: Ek Bharoso Ek Bal, Ek Aas Vishwas (2) Ram Vam Disi Janaki. This Doha is from Tulsi Doha Shatak. However, I do not remember as to of which serial number this Doha is. The extracts of Tulsi Doha Shatak, which I have given in Para 21 of my affidavit – all from doha number 85 to 93. I remember the first doha of this book which is as under:-

Ram bam disi Janaki Lakhan dahini ore,
Dhyan sakal kalyanmay surtar Tulsi tor.

I do not remember the last Doha of this book. Out of the 100 dohas, I remembered 20 dohas. Earlier, I remembered all the dohas but now most of them I have forgotten.

When I had learnt about the above-mentioned book, at that time the Tulsi Doha Shatak book was in front of my grand father. It was at that time that my grand father had told me this also as to where, and when was this book written and who wrote it. I do not remember the exact year of its publication; perhaps it was 1945, told to me. It was after reading from that book only my father told me that Tulsidas wrote 'Shri Tulsi Doha Shatak' in 1647. My grand father expired in 1971. He had read out this book to me several times. It was my grand father only who made me learn the Ramcharitmanas.

Several books have been written on the life and literature of Tulsidas out of which I have read the books of Acharya Ramchandra Shukla, Dr. Nagendra Nath, Acharya Vshhwanath Prasad Mishra, Dr. Hazari Prasad Dwivedi etc. I have not heard about the book written by Dr. Mata Prasad Gupta, on the literature of Tulsidas. Dr. Mata Prasad was a teacher in the Allahabad University. I have heard about the book named 'Tulsi Kay Hari' written by Shri Vishnu Kant Shastri – the present Governor of Uttar Pradesh, but I do not know the contents thereof, I have no information about a book written by Sudhakar Pandey on the Kavitavali of Tulsidas. The above-mentioned names of the writers who have written about Tulsidas, out of them the extracts of 'Shri Tulsi Doha Shatak' figure in the book named 'Triveni' written by Shri Ramchander Shukl and the book named 'Tulsi Ki Shabad Sadhana' written by Acharya Vishwanath Prasad. The extracts of Tulsi Doha shatak could be in book other than also. The extracts of those of eight dohas of which I have made a mention in Para 21 of my 'Affidavit', I have not heard about its extracts in any other book written on Tulsidas.

I have heard the name of Shri Justice Devki Nandan Aggarwal but I have not had any personal acquaintance with him. I have no acquaintance either with the present Plaintiff of this suit Dr. Thakur Prasad. I do not know Dr. T.P. Verma who is one of the Defendants. I know Shri Paramhans Ramchander Das since 1957 – ever since I have been visiting Ayodhya. I know him personally since 1983 when I had got inducted into sainthood. I know Shri Ashok Singhal, the Executive President of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad since 1984. I do not have any acquaintance with Shri V.K.S. Chaudhary, Senior Advocate. I have no acquaintance either with Dr. S.P. Gupta who is a witness in

this case. I got acquainted with Shri Veereshwar Dwivedi and Shri Madan Mohan Pandey – the Advocates of this case, a couple of months from now.

About those dohas of Tulsi Doha Shatak, which have been quoted in Para 21 of my affidavit, I had told Paramhans Ramchander Das in 1984 and thereafter also I had discussion with him about these dohas several times. I had certainly told Shri Ashok Singhal also about these dohas 15-20 years back and told him subsequently also several times. About the cases of Ayodhya, Paramhans Ramchander Dass had told me in 1985 i.e. after the Ram Janam Bhoomi Trust was constituted. About the Ram Janam Bhoomi Trust, I know only what Paramhans Ramchander Das told me. I did not go deep into that trust. The Ram Janam Bhoomi Trust was constituted under the Chairmanship of the then Ramanandacharya Shivramacharya – who was my previous Ramanandacharya. After taking charge of the office of Ramanandacharya, I did not accept the President ship of the Trust – nor did I take part in the meetings of the above Trust. I am very well acquainted with the members of the Trust, namely – Swami Shantanand Saraswati Ji Maharaj, Mahant Avidya Nath Ji Maharaj, Prabhu Datt Ji Brahmchari, Vishnu Hari Dalmia and Nritya Gopal Dass. However, I do not know Ram Kewal Dass and Dau Dayal Khanna-though I have heard their names. I had discussion on the above-mentioned dohas with above known persons.

No such discussion was held with the above-mentioned persons or with others as to whether or not any suit is to be filed regarding the disputed building. The function in which I was made the Ramanandacharya in the year 1988, in that function, all those known to me except

Prabhu Datt Brahmchari were present. Similarly, all these people were present in the 1989 Prayag Kumbh, where I got the support for being bestowed the office of Ramanandacharya. On both these occasions, meetings were held in which I have gone for religious sermons both in Sanskrit and Hindi. In those sermons, there was mention of Lord Rama and not of Janam Bhoomi. Besides this, every year, my religious sermons keep taking place in which there is discussion about the Ram Janam Bhoomi and discussion is held about the dohas of Shri Tulsi Doha Shatak mentioned in my affidavit. Besides me, other Dharamacharyas have discussed about the dohas of the Tulsi Doha Shatak. In my religious sermons, I have been discussing the said Tulsi Doha Shatak since 1990 since when the agitation of Ram Janam Bhoomi has gained momentum. I do not remember that the agitation of the Ram Janam Bhoomi started in 1983-84 when the yatra from Sitamarhi had started. I so, however, remember that all the saints had taken a vow on the bank of the Saryu River to get the Ram Janam Bhoomi free and at that time, this agitation had already started. I was also among those saints and at that time, my name was Rambhadra Das only. In all the sermons that I delivered since 1984, the dohas of Shri Tulsi Doha Shatak were discussed time to time. My sermons, besides being held in foreign countries have been held in about 150 cities of India. At Ayodhya and Faizabad, there would be about 50 sermons of this kind that I delivered. I have certainly been making use of these dohas in all my sermons at Ayodhya, Faizabad where the number of people used to be fifty thousand or more.

The suit for which I have been summoned as a witness in the court – what all is written in the plaint of that suit- I have never discussed that with anybody. About three

– four months back, Triloki Nath Pandey requested me to give evidence in this case saying that the case related to Ram Janam Bhoomi- and I agreed. I have been to Lucknow several times prior to this also – my religious sermons have been taking place here. In my sermons at Lucknow also, I have discussed the Dohas of Shri Tulsi Doha Shatak. I have been coming to Lucknow since 1980 for giving sermons. In connection with this case, I had never come to Lucknow prior to 2003. I had met Advocate Shri Ved Prakesh and Shri Ajay Pandey in connection with this case and the meetings had taken place at Chitrakoot, Lucknow and Delhi. In my very first meeting with these advocate, I had made mention of these dohas but I did not show them 'Shri Tulsi Doha Shatak' book because I did not have it with me at that time. They did not read out the plaint to me nor did I have any curiosity – all I was told was the case regarding Ram Janam Bhoomi. The above-mentioned advocates had told me that in the said case 13-14 witnesses had already appeared on behalf of the Plaintiff. The names of those witnesses were not mentioned to me. To my knowledge, none of those witnesses is known to me. The affidavit filed by me in this case was dictated by me only. At the end of my affidavit, there is a verification clause where it has been correctly mentioned that the statements made by me from Para 1 to Para 27 of my affidavit are true to my knowledge and belief. In Para 25 of my affidavit, whatever has been written about the Skand Puran, all of them have been got written by reading from the book. I do not remember them. In addition to the books mentioned in Para 26, I have brought with me all the four Vedas, Shrimad Bhagwat Gita, Bhagwat Mahapuran, Puran Tulsi Granthawali, Bhaktmal, both the volumes of my research work and the greatest epic in Sanskrit of this century written by me 'Shri Bhargave Raghviyam; 'Ram

Stavraj' and the 'Arundhati' epic' written by me.

As I have mentioned in Para 27 of my affidavit, in the Yajurveda, it has been mentioned that Lord Rama was born at Ayodhya. No place in particular has been mentioned therein. Similarly, in Para 26 of my affidavit also the book named 'Ramtapuniyopanished' also dose not mention any particular place of the birth of Lord Rama. In Atharvaveda, where that particular place has been mentioned – but I can tell this by seeing the book. However, I do remember that Mantra which is as under:

Ashtachakra navdwara dewanan punyodhya,
Tasyam hirnayay kosh swargojyotishavrat.

The witness had the book seen and read and told the mantra number, which is dasham kand, second anuvak – mantra No.31. The meaning of that mantra is as follows:- The place, which has eight charkas, nine doors, is the Ayodhyapuri of Lord Rama. In that Ayodhyapuri, there is that golden treasure house where Lord Rama immersed in divine light was born.

In this Mantra, the words 'Hirnayaya kosh swarg' clearly indicates the birthplace of Lord Rama. There is this much indication because Atharvaveda is Apourusheya. The meaning is that in Ayodhya, there is a building with golden domes where Lord Rama was born. It is on the basis of the above words that I have come to the conclusion that it is the disputed site only which is the birthplace of Lord Rama and the disputed structure at the disputed site – was the same building with golden domes which was demolished on 6th December 1992. According to me, the disputed building was the same building of which mention has been made in the Atharvaveda as the building with golden domes. In my opinion, the disputed building was got constructed by King Dashrath in memory of Lord Rama and it was got renovated

by Kush, the elder son of Lord Rama and then by King Vikramaditya in Samvat 01. The disputed building had been continuing like this since Samvat 01 after which it was dismantled in 1528 and by demolishing the temple, a mosque like structure was built. The building which was got constructed by Vikramaditya in Samvat 01, the same was demolished in 1528 and then a mosque -like structure was built thereon which was demolished on 6th December 1992. The building which was demolished on 6th December 1992 was done so considering that the temple had been wrongly built. From 1528 to 6th December 1992, the disputed building remained a temple but not in a temple-like shape. However, this is a fact that from 1528 to 6th December 1992, the idol of Lord Rama was there inside the disputed building at the disputed site. I am saying this on the basis of my knowledge. I do not agree with this view of the Plaintiff that on the night of 22/23rd December 1949, idol of lord Rama was lifted from Ram Chabutra and placed inside the disputed building.

Verified the statement after hearing
Thumb Impression
Jagadgur Ramanandacharya
Swami Rambhadracharya
16.07.2003

Cross- examination by Advocate Shri Ranjit Lal Verma on behalf of Defendant No.3 concluded.

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this, be present on 17.07.2003 for further cross-examination.

Sd/-
16.07.2003

Date: 17.7.2003

O.P.W.16

Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya

(In continuation of 16.07.2003 before the Hon'ble Full Bench the statement on oath of O.P.W.16 Jagadgur Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya)

Cross-examination by Advocate Shri Zaffaryab Jilani on behalf of Defendant No.4 Sunni Central Board of Wakf, Uttar Pradesh:-

It is wrong to suggest that on page 39 of my statement, the translation given by me of Mantra 31 of Chapter 10 is wrong and that its translation is as under: Aath chakra nav dwar waali devtaoon kee Ayodhya nagri hai. That has been completely covered by the divine Hiranmay light. No authentic translation of the Atharveda is available till now nor is there any commentary of the said Veda either in Hindi or in Sanskrit. The book of all the four Vedas published by the Chaukhamba Prakashan, Varanasi- I consider this to be authentic. The book on the literature and life of Tulsidas written by Acharya Ramchander Shukl, Dr. Nagendra Nath, Acharya Vishwnaath Prasad Mishra, Dr. Hazari Prasad Dwivedi-also I consider to be authentic. Acharya Ram Chander Shukl has written a book titled "History of Hindi literature" which I consider to be more authentic. It is true in this book of his he has written that 12 granthas (books) written by Goswami Tulsidas are famous. The names of those famous books are: Dohawali, Kavitt Ramayana, Geetawali, Ramcharitmanas, Vinay Patrika, Ramlala Nahchhu, Parvati Mangal, Janaki Mangal, Barvai Ramayan, Vairagya Sandeepni, Krishna Geetawali and Ramagya Prashnawali. The most famous book is 'Hanuman

Chaaleesa' which is considered to be the work of Tulsi Dass both within the country and abroad. This book has not been mentioned among the famous books of Tulsidas ji by Acharya Ram Chander Shukla. There is a lot of difference between 'Hanuman Chaaleesa' and 'Hanumanbahuk'. The latter has been considered to be a part of Kavitt Ramayana. In Hanuman Chaaleesa there are 44-45 chhands covered in 3-4 pages but its meaning is very deep and serious. As a book, Hanuman Chaaleesa has been published about 300 years. Besides the above books, there are certain other books of Tulsidas, which can be put in the category of famous books. In his book 'Hindi Sahitya Kaa Itihas', the ten books viz: Ram Satsai, Sankat mocahn, Hanumat Bahuk, Ramsalaka, Chhandawali, Chhappay Ramayan, Karkha Ramayan, Golaramayan, Jhoolnaramayan, Kundaliya Ramayan which Acharya Ram Chander Shukla by giving the reference of Shiv Singh Saroj has said that all of these have been written by Tulsidas, but have not been written by Tulsidas according to my opinion except of course Ramsalaka. There is dispute about the above books having written by Tulsidas. Tulsidas has written two Barvai Ramayanas- one is 'Laghu Barvai Ramayana' and the other is 'Vrihad Barvai Ramayana'. Laghu Barvai Ramayana has similes Metaphors etc. while Vrihad Ramayana is a complete narrative of Lord Rama. It is not an authentic statement that it was at the instance of Adburrahim Khaukhana that Tulsidas had written Barvai Ramayana. However, I do agree that Adburrahim Khaukhana was contemporary of Tulsidas and was his friend. It is true that Adburrahim Khanhana was one of the Navratnas in the court of Akbar. It is true that in the book named 'Hindi Sahitya Ka Itihas' written by Ramchander Shukla those dohas have not been mentioned of which I have made a mention in Para 21 of my affidavit by the name of Shri Tulsi

Doha Shatak. It will be wrong to say that the book named 'Triveni' is a compilation of the critical essays of Acharya Ramchander Shukla. According to me, it is a book written by him. The book title 'Triveni' of which I made a mention in my statement yesterday, is a compilation of the three critical essays of Acharya Ramchander Shukla which has been published by the Nagri Pracharini Sabha. The term essay here is intended to mean article. There are three articles in this book, one on Malik Mohammed Jayasi, another on that great poet Surdas and the third one on Goswami Tulsidas. In line 5th and 6th of the first Paragraph at page 35 of my statement of yesterday, what I have stated (to which the attention of the witness was drawn and on hearing which the witness said) is intended to mean the book titled 'Triveni' only. It is true that yesterday, I had given a statement in this court to the effect that in this very book Triveni, there is mention of Dohas of Shri Tulsi Doha Shatak. The attention of the witness was drawn towards this book and the learned advocate asked the witness where in that book where all the dohas of Tulsi Doha Shatak to which the witness replied that the eight of which he had made a mention in his affidavit were not there in that book. However, the other dohas of the Tulsi Doha Shatak were there in that book which he did not remember then. It is true that in this book, there is no mention of the 'Tulsi Doha Shatak' but there are several such 'dohas' in this book, which can be found in the Tulsi Doha Shatak. It is true that they would not have been mentioned in the context of Tulsi Doha Shatak. At this point of time, I do not remember any Doha of 'Tulsi Doha Shatak', which is mentioned in this book titled 'Triveni'.

Question:- Can you, by getting read out and after hearing the article written on Goswami Tulsidas in

'Triveni', tell us at to which dohas mentioned in this article have been taken from 'Tulsi Doha Shatak'.

Answer:- For this Purpose, I need at least fifteen days for getting the book 'Tulsi Doha Shatak' – however, I cannot say anything today.

There is no mention anywhere of 'Tulsi Doha Shatak' in another book titled 'Tulsi Kee Shabd Sadhna' written by Acharya Vishwanath Prasad of which a mention has been made on page 35 of my statement of yesterday. Nor is there any mention of those dohas, which have been quoted in Para 2 of my affidavit. It is also a fact that there is no mention of any dohas in that book in the context of 'Tulsi Doha Shatak'. I will not be able to tell at this point of time as to which of the dohas in this book are from 'Tulsi Doha Shatak'. This is so because 'Tulsi Doha Shatak' book is not available at present. I have not heard of Dr. Ramchander Tiwari. I, of course, have heard the name of the Hindi Sansthan of Uttar Pradesh. In my opinion, it is a recognized and authentic publication. It is only after seeing the books published by this institution that I will be able to say whether this is an authentic institute or not. I have not heard about the book titled 'Goswami Tulsidas' written by Ram Chander Tiwari and published by this institution. There is an institution of the Government of India named 'Sahitya Academy'. The books etc. published by this institution are also authentic. I have not heard of the book written by Ramchander Tiwari and published by this institution with the title 'Bhartiya Sahitya Ke Nirmata Goswami Tulsidas'.

Of all the books written by Tulsidas, the most

important is 'Shri Ramcharitmanas'. Shri Ramcharitmanas published by Geeta Press is authentic. I have by heart memorized this book, beside the sermons of Lord Rama, there is mention of other things also. In addition to the narrative of Lord Rama, one finds details of all the tenets of Indian culture. In this book, there is the concluding part of the book titled 'Uttarkand'. I remember the fifth line of the 4th Doha in the Uttarkand relating to the Janam Bhoomi which goes like this – 'Janam Bhoomi Mam Puri Suhavan Uttar Disi Bah Sarju Pavani (Manas 7/4/5). The meaning of the above doha is – In my pleasant City is situated Janam Bhoomi Sthal to the north of which flows the Saryu river. It is wrong to suggest that there is no mention of the Janam Bhoomi in this couplet. As a matter of fact, it has been said that this pleasant city is my birthplace, which in turn, means that in my pleasant city is the Janam Bhoomi site. The term 'bhumi' indicates the site and there is no difference in meaning between the two. It is wrong to suggest that in this couplet, the term city does not stand for any particular site-but for the whole city. In the fifth couplet, which starts with the word 'Janam Bhoomi', the word city stands for the whole city and not for any particular site and the same thing has been mentioned by the word 'ihan' in the 7th couplet and the same very thing in couplet No. 4 has been described as 'Awadhpuri. It is wrong to suggest that in all these three couplets, the word 'puri' has been used in the sense of Janam Bhoomi. It is correct that in Ramcharitmanas, except this couplet, there is no mention of Ram Janam Bhoomi elsewhere. It is true that there is mention of Ayodhya and Awadhpuri at various places in Ramcharitmanas. In Shri Ramcharitmanas, there is no mention of the emergence of or habitation in Ayodhya. However, in the Valmiki Ramayana – in the 'Balkand' fifth section – one does find mention to this effect. I have not

come across the name of the person responsible for habituating Ayodhya city either in the Vedas or in the Puranas.

It is true to suggest that in Ramcharitmanas, there is mention of the date of birth of Lord Rama and of Ayodhya where he was born. I remember the couplet relating to the date of birth written in the Baalkand, which is as under.

‘Noumi tithi madhumas puneeta,
Shukl paksh abhijeet hari preeta.’ (Manas Baalkand 191-1)

Besides this, in Manas Baalkand, 34-5 – there is mention of the date of birth. The couplet is as under:

‘Noumi bhoum vaar madhu maasa,
Awadhpuri yeh charit prakasa’

‘Jeheen din Ram janam shruti Gavheen
Teerath sakal tahaan chali aavheen’. (Baalkand –34-6)

The date when Ramcharitmanas was written is the same as that of the birth of Lord Rama of which there is mention in Manas Baalkand of 34-4. In dohas 34-6, there is mention to the effect that on the birth date of Lord Rama, all the shrines lead to Ayodhya. This couplet begins with ‘Jehin dini’. Dohas 34(5) ‘Awadhpuri yeh charit prakasa’ means that I started writing Ramcharitmanas on the Charit Ramnavmi day at Ayodhya Puri. There is no reference of the birth of Lord Rama in this couplet. Doha 34 (7 and 8) means that Tulsi wrote Ramcharitmanas on a day when it is the birthday of Lord Rama and when all the Gods-goddesses, Kinner nad Naag come for the Shri Ram Janma Mahotsav and serve him. In the couplets of this No.34 doha

– Awadh-puri has been mentioned as the Janam Bhoomi city of Lord Rama. The Ayodhya, which has been described in the above couplets of Ramcharitmanas, the same reference is found in the fifth section of Valmiki Ramayana. This is not true that the Ayodhya Puri, which has been mentioned in the fifth section of Valmiki Ramayana was inhabited by King Dashrath. On the contrary, it is true in the sixth shloka of the fifth section of the Baalkaand of Valmiki Ramayana that this city is timeless but in the beginning of Treta on the Kartik Shukla Navmi Manvendra Manu prescribed its boundaries. 'Manuna manvedren ye Puri nirmita swayam' means the king Manu himself determined its boundary and within these boundaries, King Dashrath got it adorned and inhabited. At the time of determining the boundaries Ayodhya Nagri existed in the form of city since immemorial. I am saying this on the basis of the sixth shloka of the fifth section of the Balkaand of Valmiki Ramayana and on the basis of the 22nd shloka of the same very fifth section. I have said that King Dashrath had got this Ayodhya Puri adorned and inhabited again. The era of king Dashrath dates back to one crore twenty lakh eighty thousand years and that of King Manu crores of years prior to that. The Manu who, according to the sixth sholka of the fifth section of the Valmiki Ramayana laid down the boundaries of Ayodhya Nagri – he was the seventh Manu. The meaning of the 6th shloka of the fifth section of the 'Baalkaand' of Valmiki Ramayana does not mean hat King himself got Ayodhya city built and inhabited but, as I have said above, he determined its boundary. I do not agree with the Hindi translation of the 6th shloka of the fifth section of Document No. 261C-1 of Valmiki Ramayana. According to this sixth shloka, the King Manu mentioned therein is, according to the shastras exists even today. As per the belief of the Puranas, the era of every Manu is 71 Chaturyugs and one

Chaturyug spans about 32 lakh years. In this way, the era of each Manu is crores of years. In my opinion, no Manu got Ayodhya Puri constructed because according to Manu, Ayodhya is timeless and it does not get destroyed even at the time of devastation (Pralay/dooms day). The rest of the world has been created by Brahma. Similarly, King Manu was created by Brahma. Lord Rama was born was during the period of the seventh Manu and he himself was the incarnation of god. To say that Lord Rama was the incarnation of Lord Vishnu is wholly incorrect. As a matter of fact, Lord Rama was himself God incarnate. Among the incarnations of Lord Rama are the Matsya Avtar, Kachhpa Avtar, Varah Avtar, Narsimha Avter and Vaman Avtar etc. The above incarnations of Lord Rama are not the incarnations of Lord Vishnu but the manifestations of Lord Vishnu. Vishnu is the incarnation of Lord Rama because Lord Rama is known as Mahavishnu. In the seventh shloka of the fifth section of the Baalkaand of Valmiki Ramayan, the 12 yojan long. and 3 yojan wide boundaries of Awadhपुरी, which have been described therein – were determined by the seventh Manu only. During the period of King Dashrath, the dimensions were the same. Even today, the boundaries, the length and the breadth of Ayodhya are the same, which were there during Manu's time. One yojan is equivalent to eight miles, i.e. 12kms. According to the boundary allocation, the 7th shloks, the length of Ayodhya Puri is about 144 kms. While it's breadth is 36 kms. It was the same very Ayodhya which was got adorned and inhabited by King Dashratha. The beauty of Ayodhya has been described further in the whole section. In the 15th shloka of the same section, it is mentioned that King Dashrath got a variety of palaces constructed and got them embellished with various types of diamonds. By diamonds, I mean those diamonds, which include gems and rubies etc.

the height of those palaces has been compared to the mountains. According to me in the 16th shloks – there is no mention of gold plating of the palaces. However, there is mention of the Ashtapad shape. The shape of the palaces of Ayodhya was like that of Ashtaped.

In the 13th shloka of the fifth section of the Baalkaand of Valmiki Ramayana, it is rightly written that on all the four side of Ayodhya, a deep ditch was dug and crossing which was very difficult. The Ayodhya mentioned in the fifth section is the same which is continuing till date and in my opinion, it never became desolate or deserted. The Uttarkaand of Valmiki Ramayana has been considered to be disputed and several ancient and modern scholars have accepted it as included afterwards. Therefore none of the extracts written therein will be acceptable to me. This means that the Uttarkaand has been added to the original Valmiki Ramayana subsequently. About the controversy of this chapter (kaand), I have mentioned it in details in my book 'Sita Nirvasan Nahin' and I have mentioned several reasons there in this context. Barring Uttarkaand, all the Kaands of Valmiki Ramayana are acceptable to me and I hold them in reverence. The last Kaand in Valmiki Ramayana is the Yudh Kaand and this view of mine is similar to that many other scholars. It is true that according to Valmiki Ramayana, King Dashrath ruled for 60,025 years and thereafter the reign of Lord Rama lasted for more than 33 thousand years. According to Valmiki Ramayana, Lord Rama did not vanish in the Saryu River. As a matter of fact, after handing over the reins of Government at Ayodhya to Kush and the remaining kingdoms of the country to Lav and 7 nephews, Lord Rama vanished in the Pramod Van forest. It is not correct to suggest that all the subjects (Prajā) of Ayodhya had gone to heaven along with Lord Rama. The

fact of the matter is that the followers of Lord Rama went with him and Kush-Lav etc. their servants and Purohita Guru Vashishtha remained at Ayodhya. This view of some people that after the departure of Lord Rama to heaven, Ayodhya became desolate and deserted is wrong. As a matter of fact, the same Ayodhya is continuing as it was. The whole of India was in the empire of Kusha there- the capital of which was Ayodhya. The other 7 brothers of Kush were his savants and used to rule in separate territories of India. The length and breadth of Ayodhya is the same as was determined during the reign of King Manu and King Dashrath, i.e. 12 yojan long and 3 yojan broad. The 12 yojan length should be considered from north to south and the width of 3 yojan should be considered from east to west. all my knowledge is based on Shastras. I cannot say as to which point the length of 12 yojan goes towards the river Saryu. However, Saryu River does come within the purview of Ayodhya. The palaces, which have been mentioned in the fifth section of the Valmiki Ramayana- those building do not exist today because buildings do get demolished or wear out with the passage of time. I cannot say whether or not the traces of those buildings are there at Ayodhya today – excavations alone can help in this direction. Similarly, no traces of the ditch around Ayodhya of which mention has made above exist today. It is true that some buildings mentioned in the Valmiki Ramayana, viz: Kaushalya Bhawan, Dashrath Bhawan, Kaikaiyee Bhawan are known by the same names. Dashrath Bhawan and Kaikaiyee Bhawan, were got built by Vikramaditya. These buildings were built about 2000 years back. I cannot say whether or not the Hanumangarhi Bhawan at Ayodhya was built by King Vikramaditya. Sitakoot which is situated to the east of the disputed site was got built by King Rama and it continues status quo till date. The place known by

the name of Swarg Dwar at Ayodhya dates back to the period of Lord Rama and it was from place that the followers of lord Rama had set out for heavens. All the above things find mention in the Ayodhya Mahatmaya of the Sknd Puran of the Shastras. I have not read about the above things regarding Ayodhya in any other book. In Ramcharitmanas also, one does not find mention of the above things because that pertains to the narrative of Lord Rama (Leelakatha).

I have not got any book in English pertaining to Ayodhya and Lord Rama read out to me from anybody. I have not heard the name of any book pertaining to Ayodhya written by Hayens Baker. The enclosure of Skand Puran, which I have filed with my affidavit, relates to the Ram Janam Bhoomi and I have given reference of that Para 25 in my affidavit. There is no mention of these buildings in Skand Puran, which today are known as Kaushalya Bhawan, Kaikaiyee Bhawan, Dashrath Bhawan and Sumitra Bhawan. As per knowledge, there is no edition of Skand Puran prior to 1966 is available. It is the publication of Shri Benkateshwar Stream Press, Mumbai. The B.C. of Samavat 1966 would have been the year 1909. This Skand Puran has been written by Shrikrishandwapayan Vedvyas. The era of Vedvyas is 28th Dwapar era while that Lord Rama is known as Treta era Vedvyas belongs to the era subsequent to that of Lord Rama. The era of Vedvyas pertains to 5000 years ago. It is wholly wrong to suggest that Ayodhya Mahatmaya was added to Skand Puran subsequently. In the Ayodhya Mahatmaya, some boundaries of the Janambhoomi have been given of which I have not taken any measurement. I do not know the distance between the disputed site and Vighneshwar. The place which has been mentioned as Janambhoomi in Skand Puran, the same very

place in today's language is known as the disputed site and I cannot tell the distance from this disputed site to Vighneshwar mentioned in the Skand Puran. Neither in Skand Puran nor in Ayodhya Mahatamya – the distance of any other place from the birthplace has been mentioned. In Ayodhya Mahatamya, the boundaries of the Janambhoomi have been given which I do not remember now and which have been mentioned in the enclosure to the affidavit. I can tell them after they are read out to me. At this stage, the enclosure to the affidavit was read out to the witness to which the witness replied that to the north of the Janambhoomi is the Mattgajendra. To the west of the Janambhoomi is the place named Pindarak and to the west of Pindarak is the temple of Lord Vighneshwar. To the north-east of the Vighneshwar temple is the birth place of Lord Rama which is known as Janmasthan. To the east of Vighneshwar, to the north of Vashisht Kund and to the west of Lomush Kund is the birthplace. The above boundaries have been mentioned as the boundaries of Janmasthan on the basis of the Ayodhya Mahatamya. There is no mention of the distance of those places, the names of which I have mentioned above. According to Ayodhya Mahatmaya, the ashram of Lomush Rishi is to the east of the Janmasthan. Vashisht Kund is to the south of the disputed site and Vighneshwar is in the west of the Janambhoomi/disputed site. I have not had darshans of all the above places but I have visited Vashisht Kund. I do not have personal knowledge as to in which direction is Mattgajendra from the disputed site and that in which directions are the Pindarak, Vighneshwar, Lomush and Vighneshwar temple. I do know about Vashist Kund, which is to the south of the disputed site. It is wrong to suggest that Vashisht Kund is to the west of the disputed site. According to the shastras and as per my knowledge, Vashisht Kund has always been to the

south of the disputed site. I cannot say that there is just one Vashisht Kund at Ayodhya. Lomush Ashram has been named after Lomush Rishi. I have not visited the Lomush Rishi Ashram so far. I have not heard from anybody about the status of this Ashram. I cannot say that there is no Ashram by the name of Lomush Ashram at Ayodhya. Vighneshwar is the other name of Lord Ganesha and the Vighneshwar temple has been named after him. About this Vighneshwar temple, I have not discussed with anybody nor do I know about its situation. However, I do know that there is a temple by the name of Vighneshwar at Ayodhya. Pindarak is the name of a place but whether or not there is temple there – I cannot say. The temple named Matgajendra Nath is the temple of Lord Shanker as I have mentioned above. I did not have the fortune of visiting that temple also nor did I make any efforts to go there.

Those temples of Ayodhya where I went to offer prayers, are: Shri Ram Janam Bhoomi, Kanak Bhawan, Hanumangarhi, Vashisht Kund, Maniram Chhavni, Badi Chhavni, Badi Jagah etc. There are four Mahants of all the four dwars of Hanumangarhi and there is a senior Mahant whose name is Gyandass. I do not remember the names of the Mahants of the Bari Chhavni. The Mahant of the Chhoti Chhavni is Nrityagopal Dass, the name of the Mahant of Digambar Akhara is Param Hans Ramchander Dass. The Kanak Bhawan is run according to the tradition of the king of Tikamgarh. Kanak Bhawan has no Mahant. It has a Manager whose name I do not remember. For the management of every temple, there is a Mahant/Manager who makes arrangement for the prayers etc. I do not know the name of the Mahant of the disputed site – which I call the Janambhoomi and those of the Muslim community call mosque. This is so because I had gone there when I was a

boy. Since from 1957 to 1992, there was a controversy/ dispute going on at the disputed site, there was no Mahant over there and the affairs there were being managed by the Receiver. I never met the Receiver. Since Ram Janam Bhoomi is the pilgrim center of the Hindus, there is no need of appointing any Mahant over there. This is the reason why the name of the Mahant of Janambhoomi site is not mentioned in any Shastra or Puran because at places of eternal worship, Mahants are not needed. Among such places of worship are included: Rmeshwaram, Jagnnath, Dwarikadham and Badrinath where there are no Mahants. There is no Mahant either at Srikrishna birthplace at Mathura. Mahants are required in individual temples. I cannot say whether or not the Hanumangarhi temple is individual. At Kanak Bhawan, a Manager is appointed as per the royal tradition.

According to the Shastras, the three – domed building was the Ram Janam Bhoomi Bhawan and I have no knowledge about any other building in that premises except the Ram Janam Bhoomi Bhawan and nor does one find mention of any other building in the Shastras. This bhawan has been there as an independent building for thousands of years. It is true that according to the Shashtra, Dashrath Mahal is near the Kaushalya Bhawan. I cannot say how far is Kaushalya Bhawan from the disputed site. I cannot tell this also whether or not there are any other buildings between the disputed site and Kaushalya Bhawan. I have stayed at Manas Bhawan also. Pilgrims come and stay there. To the west of the Manas Bhawan is the disputed building. The distance between the Manas Bhawan and the disputed site would be 100-150 feet I cannot say whether or not Kaushalya Bhawan is situated to the north-east of the Manas Bhawan. I cannot tell this also whether or not there

is Dashrath Mahal to the east of Manas Bhawan. I do not know this also as to what is the distance between the temples where I went for offering prayers etc. I remain engrossed in the wave of the Shastras and there was no need to pay attention to these things.

Verified the statement after hearing

Thumb Impression

Jagadgur Ramanandacharya

Swami Rambhadracharya

17.07.2003

Typed by the Stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this, for further cross-examination on 18.07.2003. Witness be present.

Sd/-

17.07.2003

Dated 18.08.2003O.P.W.16Jagadgur Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya

(In continuation of 17.07.2003 before the Hon'ble Full Bench the statement on oath of O.P.W.16 Jagadguru Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya)

Cross-examination by Advocate Shri Zaffaryab Jilani on behalf of Defendant No.4 Sunni Central Board of Wakf, Uttar Pradesh continues.

Pindaraak is not to the north – east of the disputed site – it is to its west as I have stated earlier. Similarly, Vighneshwar is not to the south but to the west of Pindarak as I have already said in my statement. It is wrong to suggest that the disputed site is to the west of Vighneshwar – as a matter of fact, it is to the north – east of the disputed site. According to my knowledge, there is no Lomush Chabutra as such – but it is Lomush Ashram.

In the last line of the couplet of Tulsidas in Para 22 of my affidavit, the term 'Maseet' means the shape of a mosque. The literal meaning of the word 'Maseet' is mosque. What I want to say is that the mosque like structure that was at the disputed site for that only Tulsidas has used the word 'Maseet' in the last line of his verse (Saraiya). Tulsidas was such a staunch devotee of Lord Rama that he used to go and sleep at the Ram Janam Bhoomi. He used to sleep in this very mosque – shaped building. To me it does not appear that Tulsidas has word Maseet in this Savviya by way of irony. There is no historical authenticity in this that the Ramcharitmanas which Tulsidas wrote, people wanted to grab it – it is just a saying. The brief life history of Tulsidas, which Hanuman

Prasad Poddar has written – I do not consider that to be authentic. In that book, it is written that when Tulsidas wrote this book, several Pandits got jealous and they started protesting and started criticizing this book-this is wrong.

This is also wrong to suggest that thieves were deployed to steal this book and for fear that it may not be stolen – tulsidas had this book at Todarmal's place. In Para 3 of my affidavit, I have extract of a shloka of Valmiki Ramayana, which lends authenticity to the Janambhoomi sthal. It is wrong to suggest that this shloka has nothing to do with the Janambhoomi. The term 'Sarvloknamaskritam' in this shloka is with reference to Ram Janam Bhoomi. The word in its proper context means that the place where time immemorial people have been coming and paying obeisance at that place where Kaushalya gave birth to Lord Rama. The word 'Namaskritam' means where obeisance has been paid. 'Sarvalok' also means the place which the Surya, Mangal, Shani, Shukra, Brahaspati Grace with their looks. The first line of the sholka in Para 23 of my affidavit 'Tato yagyey samaptey tu' after the conclusion of the Yagya when seasons were over – the second line of this sholka refers to the ninth day of the Chait of the twelve month. The third and the fourth line means that when Punarvasu Nakshatras presented themselves at their exalted 5 stars came to upper place and in the Karka Lagna- Brahaspati came with the moon. In two lines it is mentioned the time when Lord Rama was born. This is wrong to suggest that the last two lines of the extract of the shloka mentioned in Para 23 of my affidavit refer to the time when Lord Rama was born. In the foregoing lines, there is mention of time while in the last lines is mentioned the birthplace, otherwise there would be repetition. It is wrong to suggest that the

mention of the Sarvalokas paying obeisance to that moment has been made in the last two lines and that the extracts of the shlokas mentioned in Para 23 of my affidavit have nothing to do with Janmasthan or Janambhoomi.

The literal meaning of the word 'Dham' – I have given in line one of page No.8 of my affidavit. It is wrong to suggest that I have not given the literal meaning of the word 'Dham' in my affidavit. As a matter of fact, I have given the meaning of the word 'Dham' in the first line of page 8 of my affidavit. It is wrong to say that the literal meaning of the word 'Dham' is 'home' or 'Place'. There is a word 'Vaikunth Dhaam'- but Vaikunth Dhaam is not the birthplace of anybody. The word 'Dhaam' used with 'Vaikunth' means home. Among the several meaning of the word 'Dhaam' – one meaning is 'Home' also. In the second line of page 8 of my affidavit, the extract of the shloka that I have mentioned is from 'Bahvarth Mala Kosh'. I had seen its manuscript in the Saraswati Bhawan, Sampooranad Sanskrit Vishwavidyalaya in 1976. It has not been published. I do not have information regarding this after 1976. Its writer is Agnimitra and it was written in the 6th century. That manuscript is a dictionary and the use of this shloka in the dictionary has been done to explain the word 'Dhaam'. Agnimitra has written the dictionary in the form of shlokas. It is wrong to suggest that in this shloka, the meaning of only the 'Dhaam' word has been explained and that the use of the word 'Janambhoomi' in this shloka has nothing to do with the disputed site.

The scholars who opine that the Uttarkaand of Valmiki Ramayana is controversial or who say that it was added subsequently are as under:

The first and foremost commentator of Valmiki Govind Raj. 2. Late Dr. Ram Kumar Verma. 3. Rajendra Mishra Abhiraj, Chancellor, Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishwavidyalaya 4. Kamta Prasad Tripathi, Reader and Head of the Department, Sanskrit Department, Khairagarh Vishwavidyalaya, Chhatisgarh 5. Dr. Shiv Ji Upadhyaya, former Head of the Department of Literature, Sampurnanand Vishwavidyalaya.

In Hindu philosophy and Ramanand Sect, the words 'Eishwar' and 'Bhagwan' are synonyms. Both the words are used for Lord Rama. The word 'Brahm' is different from the word 'Brahma'. Brahma is the creator of the entire universe and 'Brahm' is the creator, the preserver and the destroyer – all the three. 'Brahm' is eternal.

Manu-Smriti is an authentic book for religious books. All that has been mentioned in the Manu-Smriti is authentic for religious texts. It is correct that in Manu-Smriti, chronology has been given and the chronology of the different eras given in Manu-Smriti is correct. In Manu-Smriti, the period of Satyuga has been mentioned as 17 lakh and thousand years, which is correct. In Manu-Smriti, after the Satyuga, Treta Yuga starts and the period of Treta Yuga in Manu-Smriti has been mentioned as 12 lakhs and 96 thousand years. After Treta Yuga – starts the Dwapar Yuga, the period of which in Manu-Smriti has been mentioned as 8 lakh and 64 thousand years. After the Dwapar Yuga, starts the Kaliyuga, the period of which has been mentioned as 4 lakh and 32 thousand years in Manu-Smriti. At present, we are going through the Kaliyuga and it has been going on for last five thousand and 92 years.

The era of Vedvays is the initial period of Dwapar era, which would have been about 8 lakh years ago.

At this time, the 28th Kaliyuga is going on, i.e. several Kaliyugas have gone by Lord Rama was born in the 24th Treta Yuga.

On 6th December 1992, I was called on the roof of the Ramkatha Kunj but I did not go there. I do not remember which prominent people were sitting there at that time. My University Jagadguru Rambhadracharya Vikland Vishwavidyalaya, Chitrakoot, Uttar Pradesh does not get any grant from the Government. My school for the blind, which is run by Tulsi Peeth, is getting Rs. 12 lakh per annum by way of grant from the Central Government. The Tulsi Pragyachakshu Higher Secondary School was established in August 1996.

Whether or not to the north of the disputed site across the road, there is any temple by the name of Janmasthan, I do not know. I do not remember whether or not I have gone to any temple to the north of the disputed building across the road. Nor have I read about the said Janmasthan temple either in any shastra or in any other book. I do not know whether any such temple is known by the name of Gudartal temple or not. I have heard about the Chabutra near the Ram Janmasthan. I have not heard about the Chabutra named Janmasthan. I do know whether in 1885, there was any Chabutra, prayers etc. are held/performed, on that Chabutra it have a Mahant because it is in the case of a temple that we have a Mahant. I have heard that there used to be prayers etc. at the disputed building prior to 1949. This was told to me by my father. I have not read in the shastras that prior to 1949 in the disputed three-domed building, there used to be prayers because this is not a subject matter of the shastras, but of faith. Faith can be

based both on the shastras and traditions. What we have been hearing about prayers etc. from 1528 to 1949 has been based on traditions and this tradition is based on what we have been hearing every now and then. About the above tradition, I heard from my ancestors and I believe that my ancestors must have been told about this by their ancestors. Tradition is the other name of what we hear from people every now and then.

It is wrong to suggest that the 'Tulsi Doha Shatak' of which I have made a mention in my affidavit does not exist and that it was not written by Tulsidas. It is also wrong to say that the Dohas I have mentioned in Para 21 of my affidavit have not written by Tulsidas.

It is far from truth that Valmiki Ramayana is not a historical scripture. It is also not correct to suggest that the disputed site was at one time not the Ram Janam Bhoomi and that since 1528, it was being used as a mosque. It is also wrong to say that there were no idols in the disputed building till 22nd December 1949.

(Cross-examination by Advocate Zaffaryab Jillani on behalf of Defendant No.4 – Sunni Central Board of Wakf concluded)

(Cross-examination on behalf of Defendant No.5 – begins by Advocate Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqui)

XXX

XXX

XXX

XXX

As I have stated in Para 2 of my affidavit, my family name was Giridhar Mishra, which I changed to Rambhadracharya in 1983 as I have got written in Para 9.

Swami Ramcharan Das was my guru who had become a recluse – what I mean to say is that in 1983 I separated from my family and got attached to my guru. My father is hale and hearty at present. My name is Rambhadracharya and the name of my position (office) is Jagadguru Rambhadracharya. At present, there are only four Jagadguru Ramanandacharya in India. Jagadguru is dictated by Kashi Vidwat Parishad and Ramanandiya Ani Akhara and the four Sects. Till October 1988, there was just one post of Ramanandacharya and subsequently, they were increased to four. The four post were created by the Ani Akharas. In June 1988 itself Kashi Vidwat Parihad had done my Abhisheka and after October 1988 in the Prayag Kumbh, I was supported unanimously – Ani Akhara created the four posts with the consent of the Kashi Vidwat Parishad. Besides me, there are more Jagadguru Ramanandacharya whose names are Haryacharya, Rajivlochanacharya and Rameshwaranandacharya. The concept of Jagadguru Ramanandacharya has been there for past 700 years. The Vaishnav community, whose revered god is Lord Rama, was indicated by Adya Ramanandacharya, in the Vaishnava Sect, besides the devotees of Lord Rama, there are the devotees of Lord Krishna and Narayana also. They have five more Sects (Sampradayas). Lord Shri Ram is Mahavishnu and Krishna and Narayana are his manifestations. All the manifestations of God are that of Rama.

In Para 6 of my affidavit, the literature that is read out to me, in that the Tulsi literature are as follows – Shri Ramcharitmanas, Kavitavali, Hanumanbahuk, Hanumanchaaleesa, Ramgeetavali, Krishnageetavali, Janaki Mangal, Parvati Mangal, Vairagya Sandipni, Laghu Barvai, Ramagya, Vrihad Barvai Ramayan, Ramgya

Prashan, Dohavali, Tulsi Doha Shatak and Vinay Patrika.

Besides my father and grand-father among the other relatives are my elder sister Dr. Ms. Geeta Devi Mishra, my younger brother Chandra Kant Mani Mishra etc. All of them used to read out the literature to me. I have by-heart memorized the Ramcharitmanas while the rest of the Tulsi literature, I remember by heart in piece-meal. Tulsi literature also includes Ramlala Nahchhu book but I have not heard and learnt it because it contains some unnecessary portions. That literature is not in the form of Chaupai or Doha – but in Sohar Chhand. Among the Hindus when a boy is born, mother sings those Chhandas. Ramcharitmanas literature has been written in Choupai, Doha, Sortha, Chhand and Shlokas. From beginning to the end, the same procedure continued while writing Ramcharitmanas. Tulsidas was not a prose-writer. All his writings are in the form of verses. Krishnageetavali written by Tulsidas is a poem of 61 songs. In songs, there are sthai and Antarayen and Krishnageetavali has been written in that style.

The Ramcharitmanas which my grandfather had got me memorized – was got published by Vyankateshwar Press, which was about 100 years old. 'Ramcharitmanas' was written in 1631, which is similarly mentioned in all other books. The Chaupais of 'Maanas' are never changed and I have said this on the basis of my reading of books. The fourth line of 34th Doha of the Baalkaand of every volume of Ramcharitmanas is where the year of the writing of the Maanas is mentioned. In only three of the writing of Goswami Ji, there is a mention of the year of its writing and they are – Ramcharitmanas, Parvati Mangal and Tulsi Doha Shatak. The period of the writing of the Parvati Mangal is

probably mentioned in the first 6th line. This is a Geetmaala. Apart from these three there is no mention of the period of writing in any other book of Tulsidas. The period of the writing of the Tulsi Doha Shatak is found mentioned in the last Dohas, which I remember and which is as under.

‘Samvat muni shruti guhjanani hari navmi madumaas.
Pramudit yeh Doha shatak virachyo Tulsidas.’

This is the 101st Dohas, i.e. in the year 1647 – on the Chaitra Shukl Navmi day, Tulsidas, in a cheerful frame of mind wrote Doha Shatak. In Sanskrit, the figures are counted from the left side and accordingly, Muni stands for 7, Shruti for 4, Guhjanani for 6 and Hari for 1, i.e. 1647. This is the last doha of this Shatak. As I have said before 100 dohas of Doha Shatak are those of principles and this is Phalshruti, i.e. the concluding doha or the conclusion. Besides the above 101 dohas, there is no doha in the Doha Shatak. At present, I remember 9 dohas of this book, of which 8, I have mentioned in my affidavit and the ninth doha is the one which I have mentioned above.

The ‘Hanumananbahuk’ scripture is neither in the form of Doha and nor in the form of Chaupai. It is Jhoolna, Kavitt, Chhappay, Mattgayand Ghanakshri etc. The language of the literature of Tulsidas is Awadhi and Brij, which are the Variants of Hindi language. No literature of Tulsidas except the Manglacharan of Ramcharitmanas and Dandak of Vinay Patrika is in Sanskrit. I had not counted the pages of Tulsi Doha Shatak – I had counted the dohas only. I do not remember the size of the book.

‘Vairagya Sandeepni’ written by Tulsidas is in both Doha and Chaupai and is in Awadhi and Brij languages. The

number of couplets in this book is 63, but I cannot say about the number of pages. In 'Vairagya Sanddeepni', Tulsidas has described the saint by qualities, the glory of Lord Rama and the peace. From the point of view of critical analysis, it will not be correct to say that the writing of Tulsidas is based on devotion and faith alone. It is based on the philosophy of action, devotion and knowledge. In all his books, the above three characteristics can be seen. Compassion in Tulsidas is not to be found separately in Tulsidas- it is an integral part of Bhaktivad. satires in Tulsidas writings is negligible.

Similarly, in Tulsi Doha Shatak also, all the above three characteristics can be seen. Compassion also is likewise assimilated in the Bhakti principle. Satire is also for the name sake only. In Doha Shatak, there is no satire. The 8 Dohas of Para 21 of my affidavit are assimilated in the philosophy of action (Karamvad). It is true that in India, lot of research work has been done on the literature of Tulsi Dass and several books have been written and that even now research is going on. The books written by the other literary persons on Tulsi – I have read a little but I have not read the book titled 'Tulsi Parisheelan' published by Chitrakoot Dhaam Karvi and nor do I have any knowledge about that. I have heard the name of Babu Lal Garg Shastri who is residing at Chitrakoot itself. I have had no discussion with him regarding the above-named book 'Tulsi Parisheelan'. I do not know this also whether or not he has edited the above- mentioned book.

In August 2001, the Governor of Uttar Pradesh has appointed me the life – time Chancellor of Jagadguru Rambhadracharya Viklang Vishwavidyalaya. Prior to the coming of the bill relating to this University, an ordinance

was issued. I was the founder of this University prior to its being established and it was on this basis that as per the Act, I was appointed the life- time Chancellor. I have a registered organization as the founder of this University which is known as Jagadguru Rambhadracharya Viklang Shikshan Sansthan. This Sansthan exists even today and it is this Sansthan only which has established this Vishwavidyalaya and it is I, who is the Chairman of this Sansthan. The head office of this Sansthan is at Chitrakoot.

In 'Shri Ramcharitmanas', the character of Lord Rama is that of the nationalist, Maryadavadi and according to the principles of social norms, it is not at all that of monarchy.

Verified the statement after hearing

Thumb Impression,

Jagadgur Ramanandacharya

Swami Rambhadracharya

18.07.2003

Typed by the Stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this, be present on 21.07.2003 for further cross-examination.

Sd/-

18.07.2003

Dated 21.07.2003

O.P.W.16

Jagadgur Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya

(In continuation of 18.07.2003 before the Hon'ble Full Bench the statement on oath of O.P.W.16 Jagadgur Ramanandacharya Swami Rambhadracharya)

Cross-examination by Advocate Shri Mushtaq Siddiqui Ahmed on behalf of Defendant No.5 continues.

The day the lock of the disputed building was opened, I was already present there and on receiving information about the opening of the lock, I had gone there for darshan. I had no information to the effect that lock was about to be opened. Prior to the demolition of the disputed structure on 6th December 1992, I had reached Ayodhya on the day of the Ashtami, i.e. on 3rd December 1992 for Parikarma. I cannot say that the view that I have about the subject matter of the book 'Ramlala Nahuhhu' and which I have stated above, whether such views are those of any other scholar or not. In my affidavit, the languages, which I have mentioned that I know, – are those very languages, which have been adopted in the Constitution. The meaning of which the word 'Moksha' has in Hindi – the word 'Salvation' in English does not have that meaning 'Moksha' does not mean that the soul, which achieves Moksha, is not born again. The word 'Moksha' means to unshackle oneself from worldly bonds and live near God or to be attached to God. Moksha actually means what in Sanskrit we call Samipya, Sayujya, Salokaya and Sarupya. 'Nirvana' is the synonym of 'Moksha'. Lomush Rishi used to live at Ayodhya only during the reign of King Dashrath. After Dashrath's reign, he went and had his abode at Sumeru Mountain. It is wrong to suggest that there was some misunderstanding between

Lomush Rishi and Goswami Tulsidas. The question does not arise because the period of both of them are totally different. In Doha No. 110 (B) of the 'Uttarkaand' of Ramcharitmanas of Goswami Tulsidas, there is mention of Mahrishi Lomush. The said Doha which starts with 'Meru Shikhar' concludes with the words 'Atee Deen' has the following meaning – Lomush Rishi was perched in the shade of the Vativriksha on the peak of the Sumeru Mountain. I, i.e. Kagbhusundi paid obeisance at his feet and spoke in a very polite language.

The Hanumanchaaleesa of Tulsidas has had thousands of publications and in all the publications, the same thing has been mentioned. It is wrong to suggest that 'Hanumanchaaleesa' was written in the 20th century by some other Tulsidas who belonged to Gonda. This is wrong because in the 19th century, people of Indian origin went to Mauritius and they carried with them the 'Hanumanchaaleesa'. When I had gone to Mauritius, people there told me this.

I am conversant with the life history of Tulsidas. The most authentic book on the life of Tulsidas ji 'Mool Gosaincharit' whose writer is Beni Das Ji. According to that book, Tulsidas was born at Banda Rajapur in Vikrami Samvat 1554 Shravan Shukla Saptami. From his very childhood, Tulsidas appeared to be a prodigy.

The above-mentioned book 'Mool Gosaincharit' written by Beni Dass is an authentic work. In this book, it is the life of Goswami Tulsidas, which has been described, and not his literature. I have not read any such book, which described the entire literature of Goswami Tulsidas. I have not read the book written by George Grierson on Goswami

Tulsidas.

At Ayodhya, there is a temple named 'Badi Jagah' where I have offered prayers. There also Sita, Ram and Lakshman are seated. It is not known by the name of 'Bada Sthan Mandir' nor do I know any temple at Ayodhya by the name of 'Bada Sthan' (Para 3 of his affidavit was read out to the witness), whereupon the witness said- in this, there is no mention of Valmiki Ramayana. I do not agree with the book written by Shri Hanuman Prasad Poddar on the life of Goswami Tulsidas. Shri Ramcharitmanas is not based on Valmiki Ramayana, but it is the summary of hundred crore Ramayanas written prior to that. In the Chhappay No. 129 of 'Bhaktmal' scripture, Nabhaji himself says – Treta Kavya nibandh kariv sat koti Ramayan. Ik akshar udhreih brahmhatyadi Parayan. Ab bhaktni sukhden Bahuri leela bistari. Ramcharan ras matt ratat ahnisi vratdhari. Sansar apaar ke paar ko, sugam roop navka layo. Kali kutil jeev nistar hit valmiki 'Tulsi' bhayo. In my opinion, it was Valmiki who took manifestation as Tulsi because Tulsidas himself was the incarnation of Valmiki –he had memorized the gist of all the Ramayanas. Those hundred crore of Ramayans are not now available in the word.

Goswami Tulsidas was blessed with long age. He lived for 126 years and this fact is incontrovertible.

In my earlier statement, I have mentioned about the Phalshruti of the books pertaining to the principles of literature. This is normally written in figures and is in Kavya Granthas only and this principle so applicable to the verse form. In the 16th century also, this principle was in vogue. The poet can give indication of the period both through numbers and words – it is entirely his own discretion. Even

when such a thing is expressed through words, it can be counted in figures. It is not necessary that the poet should mention the period of the writings towards the end. It is upto the poet to decide whether he makes mention of the period of writing in the beginning, in the middle or at the end. I recall one couplet of the Dasham Skandh of 'Soorsagar' in which the numbers have been discussed in code words. Apart from Soorsagar, besides the three books of Goswami Tulsidas, I do not remember any such book in which the period of writing has been mentioned. Almost all the poets or writers mention the period of writing in their book. I recall the 'Mahabhartar' written by Sabal Singh Chauhan, who has made mention of the period of writing his book thus:

Samvat satrah sau choobeesa, navrang shah dilipati eesa.

As I said the principle of Phalshruti is in vogue in verse. According to this principle, figures are indicated through the medium of words, which is based on the principle of astrology. This principle was in vogue upto the time of Tulsidas. I am not saying that other poets have also been following this principle. In 'Soorsagar', the figures have been indicated through words as I have said above. I do not recall any other book or poet where the numbers have been indicated through words. In the Ramcharitmanas written by Tulsi Dass ji at one point, this procedure has been adopted. In the seventh line of the sixth Doha of the Kishkindhakaand of Ramcharitmanas, figure 12 has been indicated through the use of the word 'Maas'. The poet can indicate the period of writing in three different ways through words or through the Samvat of the work or by indicating figures through words. There is, however, no compulsion about whether a poet follows the principle of Phalshruti or

not.

Acharya Sitaram Chaturvedi is among my known persons. I have not read the book named of 'Goswami Tulsidas' written by him.

Jagadguru Rambhadracharya Viklang Shikshan Sansthan, Chitrakoot, Uttar Pradesh is a registered organization through which I have established Jagadguru Rambhadracharya Vikklang Vishwavidyalaya, Chitrakoot.

Shri Triloki Nath Ji is my old friend and I know him since long. I know him since 1980. The use of the word 'Awadh' is being made from ancient times in the same form. The meaning of it had in the past, it has the same even today. The literal meaning of the word 'Awadh' is where nobody is killed. In my opinion, the word 'Awadh' has only this meaning. I have never met Ram Raksha Tripathi, retired teacher, Ayodhya nor do I know him. It is wrong to suggest that during the period of Lord Rama, some people at Ayodhya were not his followers. It is wrong to suggest that 'Ram Jantralya Press' was not at Rai Bareilly since 1940 till date. It is wrong to suggest that what I have said about myself and my organization is far from truth. Is wrong to say that from 1528 to 1949, the disputed building has been used as a mosque. It is wrong to suggest that there is no book named 'Tulsi Doha Shatak'. It is also wrong to suggest that the Dohas of which I have made mention in Para 21 of my affidavit, have not been written by Tulsidas.

(Cross-examination by Advocate Shri Mushtaq Ahmed Siddiqui on behalf of Defendant No. 5 concluded)

On behalf of Defendant No. 26, Advocate Shri Syed Irfan

Ahmed accepted the cross-examination done by Defendant No. 4, 5 and 6.

On behalf of Defendant No. 6/1 and 6/2 – suit No. 3/1989 – Advocate Shri Fazle Alam accepted the cross-examination done by Defendant No. 4, 5 and 6.

Verified the statement after hearing

Thumb Impression

Jagadgur Ramanandacharya

Swami Rambhadracharya

21.07.2003

Cross-examination concluded on behalf of all the Defendants. Witness is discharged.

Sd/-

21.07.2003