

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

O.O.S.NO.4 OF 1989

(R.S. NO.12-61)

THE SUNNI CENTRAL BOARD
OF WAQFS, U.P. AND
OTHERSPLAINTIFFS

VERSUS

GOPAL SINGH VISHARAD
AND OTHERS DEFENDENTS

STATEMENT OF P.W.13
SHRI SURESH CHAND MISHRA

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

O.O.S.NO.4 OF 1989

(R.S. NO.12-61)

THE SUNNI CENTRAL BOARD OF
WAQFS, U.P. AND
OTHERS PLAINTIFFS

VERSUS

GOPAL SINGH VISHARAD
AND OTHERS DEFENDENTS

STATEMENT OF P.W.13
SHRI SURESH CHAND MISHRA

Suresh Chandra Mishra S/o Shri Jagdish Prasad
Profession- Reader, aged 50 years, R/o 264, SFS, DDA
Flats, Mukherji Nagar, Delhi 110009 solemnly affirm on
oath as under:-

I am working in University of Delhi, Satyawati Co-
educational College as a Reader. I am teaching History. I
have got this post by way of promotion. I joined this
organization as Lecturer of History in 1973. My
specialization is in Ancient History. I offered "Evolution of
Kotilya's Arthashastra An Inscriptional Approach" as
subject for Ph.D. I got the Degree in Ph.D. from Delhi
University in 1985. I am a bonafide residence of
Allahabad.

I made intensive study about Babri Masjid after the beginning of the dispute. From the study it was revealed that this Masjid was constructed by Mir Baqi and no demolition was done while constructing it. In my study, no proof of the existence of any temple is found.

I have read the Skanda Purana also. According to Skanda Purana, the birth place of Bhagwan Rama does not appear be on the place of Babri Masjid. I had presented a paper on it in the Indian History Congress Session. An important book on history of Babar is Babar Nama only. This is the only timely book yet the Historians have written other books also.

I had also presented a paper on International Archaeologist level. An international conference in this regard was held in Krosia in May, 1998. A separate session for Ayodhya Chapter was held in this conference. No resolution was passed by it. But 4 years before this, a conference on this issue was held in Delhi in which a resolution was passed. On this issue a resolution was passed that this subject should not be discussed at all.

I had been to Ayodhya. I had been there even before 1992. On the basis of Corbon Dating, the opinion which has emerged is that the period of habitation in Ayodhya goes back to 4th Century B.C. The habitation started from 4th Century B.C. That means habitation of human being commenced from 4th century B.C. On the basis of survey and on the basis of studies. Prof. R.S.Sharma, Prof. D.N.Jha. Prof. Suraj bhan had given a report to the Government of India, their fourth colleague was Prof. Atahar Ali. I have read that report Atahar Ali Sahab has recently expired.

Archaeology is a science. There are rules for its further promotion. The exploration made through the excavation at the disputed site by Dr.Prof. B.B.Lal was the last exploration which was done according to rules. It was done in 1976 and a report on this to Indian Archaeology was submitted in 1977.

(Cross-examination of behalf of Respondent No.3, Nirmohi Akhara by Ranjit Lal Verma, Advocate).

Puratatva is called Archaeology in English. This word is a mixture of two words. Archaeo means old and logy mean a science. Both these are the illation words and not Unani words. I am not the student of Latin. Therefore I cannot say whether Latin word has come from word logas and the meaning of logas is knowledge and science. It can be accepted that for archaeological knowledge the credit goes to Rome and Unan. Because this area come under the scope of my study. Therefore, I have no inhibition in accepting it.

I got my high school education from Allahabad and I scored first division. I did my Inter in Arts. I did not offer History in that examination. I scored 2nd division, I did my B.A. from Allahabad University. I offered History, Philosophy and Sanskrit subjects in B.A. in Inter also, Sanskrit was one of my subjects. The subjects of history in B.A. were Ancient History, culture and Archaeology. In philosophy. I have studied Vedant also. I have also studied the culture of Boudh Dharma, In B.A. I scored 2nd Division.

I did my M.A. in Ancient History culture and Archaeology subject from University of Allahabad, I passed it in 1970. My Head of Department in M.A. at that time was

Prof. G.R.Sharma Prof. G.R. Sharma used to teach us ancient history. He has expired now. In addition to Dr.Ishwari Prasad, other Professor from Allahabad University, who have written books on history are Prof. B.N.S. Yadav, Prof. Shivesh Bhattacharya, Dr.Sandhya Mukherjee. Prof. G.R.Sharma, Late Dr. Tara Chand, Prof. Radhy Shyam etc., The name of the book which Dr.G.R. Sharma has written, is Agriculture in Ancient India or it may be any other name similar to it. I have read that book. This book was first published about 12-13 year ago. I have got education from Prof. G.R.Sharma. It is wrong to say that the name of the book which I have told with reference to Prof. G.R. Sharma, is not a book but his thesis only. He was not a doctor, hence he did not write any thesis. It was the book of his research and studies.

Ancient Indian history means the history started from the period when the human being came down to the earth from primitive period and it is limited upto 750 (AD). This history in today's world is based on the observations of two scholars.

I am a man of scientific temperament. I do not believe in idol worship.

Question : Are you theist or atheist?

Answer : I do not accept both these concepts.

I consider Vedas as the source of history. Otherwise there is no such things as faith in them. Mainly Vedas are said to be four but many more Vedas have also written. The four main Vedas, which have been read also by me are Rigveda. Yajurveda, Sarnaveda, Aarthveda. In addition to this, there is Dhanurved, which is said to be written by Sants. Vedas are not written by anybody. It is a collection

only of Shrotas whose composers were the saints. Rigveda is the oldest one. These Vedas were composed between 1500 B.C. and 1000 A.D. Vedas are the description of way of life of Aryans of one time and were composed by different Rishis. First Sutra of Rigveda is Adi Sutra. It is not necessary that we may be knowing the first Sutra by heart. In Rigveda there are deities and not the idols. As far as I understand, in Rigveda the deity has no image i.e., there is no idol there. All Sutras contain the name of one or the other Rishi.

The Scholars recognize the Vedic period from 1750 to 1000 B.C. It is wrong that the Vedas were supposed to be 4000 B.C. There are mainly 18 Puranas. In my opinion there is no such thing as Pouranic Era. Volunteer: upto 18th century something or the other has been added to the Puranas. I have read the Matasya Purana. It is about the water. In Skanda Purana, it is written about Skanda Devta. This Skanda is known as the incarnation of Kartikey. In it imagination of Bhagwan Shankar has also been made. His initial image is of Rudra. It is said in Matasya Purana that Bhagwan Vishnu incarnated and provided security to four Vedas. There were 14 incarnatin of Vishnu Bhagwan. Mayasya Avtar is one of them. Words "Vishnu" has come I Pranas and not "Bhagvan Vishnu".

Rama was also the Avtar of "Vishnu". That what is written after hearing is called "Shruti". Shruti means which may pass on from one person to other and from 2nd to 3rd person with the passage of time. Kalantar word is unnecessary. Shruti can be current also. I understand there is no power other than the man in the world. Libenitaj is not a subject but is name of a Philosopher. I have studied him. He speaks of a power. This theory is Munetas (Munetas means Chidan).

I have read Quran Shrief, not the whole Quran Shrief. It is a revelation which was compiled later on. It was compiled by the followers of Hazrat. I shall not be able to tell who compiled it. Some khuda is discussed in it but I do not recognize any Khuda.

I am a married person and was married under the Vedic customs. The marriage was celebrated through the chanting of hymens of paraskar Grih Sootras. I have children but their Yaggyopavit Sanakar (Sacred thread wearing ceremony) has not taken place.

After doing M.A. from Allahabad University in 1970, I did teaching work for one year in Allahabad Degree College, It is very old college. It had two branches, one is in city near the Ajanta cinema and the other at Keerganj. I had to attend both.

It was a degree college then and I used to teach B.A. Classes. It was affiliated to Allahabad University. I was working on adhoc/ temporary basis. The principal there was Prof. Dr.Prabhakar Thakur, who was a specialist in History. He was the scholar of ancient history. Thereafter I joined S.R.K. P.G. College Firozabad for teaching work. There also I worked for one year. There too I was on ad-hoc service. Thereafter I went to Delhi I went to Delhi in 1973 and I was selected through a selection committee. That selection committee is constituted by Delhi University. I had not completed my doctorate by then. I was appointed on the post of Reader in 1985-86.

After ancient history there comes early phase of mediabile History and thereafter mediabile history of India. Mughal period will be counted in mediabile history of India

and not in early phase. There have been many Emperors in the name of Chandra Gupta. I have read about Emperior Bindusar. I know about that Emperor Chandra Gupta whose minister was Kautilya. He was in 324/322 B.C. of the Indian History which is called an ancient period. I have studied the Arthashatra of Kautilya in original. It is in Sanskrit. I have read the whole manuscript of Kautilya's Arthashartra which is in different scripts. These scripts are Devanagari, Malayali and Kutila. Except in these scripts. I did not read Kautilya's Arthashastra in any other script. There was no impact of Boadh Dharma on Emperor Chandra Gupta and Chankya. It is correct that the publicity of Budhism at the time of Bhagwan Budha, took place in Pali language. This publicity took place after the death of Budh Bhagwan. I understand Pali, I have read it also. I do not agree that Kautilya's original Arthashastra was in Pali language.

I did not read Budhism Philosophy by Acharya Narendra Dev. It is wrong that the Pali is a simple form of Sanskrit.

Rule of Chandra Gupta continued for 28 years. The boundary of Hindustan has been increasing and decreasing from time to time. The empire of Chandra Gupta was spread from Area Arakoshia, Paironishday and Zedroshia in the west to Tamralipi in east and Kashmir in north to Kurnool district in south. From today's point of view the areas of west are from Kabul, Kandhar, Heart to Calcutta and nearby areas in east and Karnool which is the district of Karnataka. The subject of my research was that how the Arthashastra of Kautilya emanated. I have not studied the subjects, as asked by the learned Advocate which related to different castes, different religions, their dress as well as standard of living, as the question had no relation with my

research work. The capital of Chandra Gupta was Patliputra. Kaushalam and Magadha were included in it. Saket was the part of Kaushalam. Today's Ayodhya and Faizabad were also in Kaushalam. The subject matter of my research was that as to which time the use of Arthashastra of Kautilya was related to. The subject matter of my research was to determine its period. In the Arthashastra of Kautilya, the use of diplomacy has also been suggested as one of the methods for politics and running the administration. It included Sam Dam Dand and Bheda but these are not discussed there in a detailed manner. In book 3 of Arthashastra, there is a mention of social dealings also. He based his social dealings on caste system. But I do not accept that the intention was to base it on Manuvad (ideology of Manu). I know about both Varna and Ashram. At that time four castes were recognised. Their names were Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudras. The judicial system in Kautilya's Arthashastra advocates Brahmanism. The lower classes were treated with discrimination.

Mahabharata is not included in 18 puranas. I have studied the Vidur Policy.

The Arthashastra of Kautilya is not based on the policy of Vidur, it is another thing that there are many similarities between the two. The Arthashastra of Kautilya basically covers the Maurya period (thereafter some additions were made in it from time to time i.e. some of chapters have been added between the period 125 to 150 B.C. and the major portion of the book depicts the factual position of 5th and 6th century. Because of the popularity of the book its supplementary edition was brought out and that enlargement took place in 10th and 11th century B.C.) For my research, first of all I laid my hand upon the

original books, then I read the books pertaining to manuscripts and on the basis of substance drawn from all the books. I wrote my research papers. I have given the names of all the books, alongwith the names of their authors, which I have studied, as per the requirements, in my research work. I started my research work in 1975. After completion, I handed it over to the university in 1984-85. With the inscriptional approach, I mean the old records, which are inscribed on stones, walls, papers or written on various places. We did not check the stones by going to all the places of inscriptions, rather we studied them from the books. It is wrong to say that the policy of Vidur is prevailing even today, it is equally wrong to say that the Arthashastra of kautilya is full of perverscity or has become redundant now.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chand Mishra

13.7.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this case for further cross-examination on 14.7.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-

13.7.98

14.7.98 (In continuation of 13.7.1998 the statement of Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra, P.W.13 begins on oath).

In my opinion, we can divide the period of Kautilya in four parts. With Kautilya I mean the Arthashastra of Kautilya. Kautilya was the contemporary of Chandra Gupta Maurya. It is called Mauryan dynasty. It was the period of 324-322 B.C. It is wrong to say that there was Rule of Skandha Gupta or Vikramaditya before Chandra Gupta Maurya. The Gupta dynasty in India started in 320 AD and continued upto 550 AD. The founder of this dynasty was Shri Gupta. Thereafter the other Rulers of the dynasty were Raja Ghatotkach, Chandra Gupta I, Chander Gupta II, Samudra Gupta. Skandh Gupta. Kumar Gupta etc., The Rule of Raja Skandh Gupta referred here, was before 440 AD. It is wrong to say that this Raja Skandha Gupta was also known as Vikramaditya. We determine the period of Skanda Gupta on the basis of historical records. These inscriptions have been found in Junagarh. These are rock edit inscriptions. These are written one. On them are written three dated i.e. 436,437,438. In addition to this the period of this Kingdom has been calculated by making comparisons with other Kings. The Capital of Skandha Gupta was Patliputra. At that time also the State of Kausal was part of the Rule of Skandha Gupta.

Emperor Ashoka himself was from the Maurya Dynasty. His period was 271-269 B.C. I do not agree with the contention that the historical proofs of the period preceding Ashoka, were not available or the historical proof started becoming available from Ashoka's region onward.

In order to know history, the conclusions can be drawn by the sum total of all kinds of facts. Such as literary evidences, the narratives of foreign tourists, records, coins, archaeological memorials and various kinds of archaeological residues which includes earthen pots, seal etc. These basis are mainly four Literary, evidence, The narratives of the foreign travelers (again said) main sources are more than four as I have told earlier. It is not necessary that four main sources such as 1) archaeology, 2) literary sources, old records, and coinology, only are required to know history. For knowing history, these four sources are of course necessary but there may be more also.

It is correct that his history based only on archaeology may be doubtful also. The literary sources of Ashoka period i.e. Buddhist literature, Jain literature, Bahamani literature, are available, both in written and verbal form. In the written Buddhist literature are Deep Vanash. Mahavansh, Samant Pasadika, Sumanglam Vilasini etc.,

Buddhism came into being in India after the death of Mahatma Budh, (again said) though some of his contemporary followers were there during his period also. It is correct that the founder of Buddhism was Mahatma Budh and the birth of Buddhism in India took place during his period only. Gautam Budha was in 486 B.C. and the religion was founded after him. The Monasteries were set up by his followers. Thereafter this religion spread to such an extent that it became predominant (again said)-it did not become predominant but it spread greatly.

I have heard the name of Adi-Shankracharya. Adi Shankaracharya remained from 780 AD to 820 AD. Adi Shankaracharya propagated monism. At that time the

budhism had started declining and it declined also. It is said about Adi Shankaracharya that he was a latent Boudh, means hidden boudh. Immediately after him there came the period of Ramanujacharya. It is wrong to say that Ramanand had come between Ramanujacharya and Shankracharya.

Ramanand was the Guru of Kabir. He was a social reformer. He became famous because of Kabir. He might be having philosophy of his own but we could not lay hand upon any of his work. I did not see any theory of Ramanand on philosophy. Ramanand's period was 15th-16th Century and that was the period of Kabir as well.

The period of Ramananda Charya was around 1000 A.D., In this way he was there for four five hundred years before Ramanand. It is correct that Ramanand had set up his own seat, which is known as Ramanandi or Bairagi seat even today. It is wrong to say that any historian would call Ramanand and Ramanujacharya one and the same person. It is also absolutely wrong that any historian would call them contemporary to each other. The principle disciple of Ramanand was Kabir. If there is also some one else in addition to him, I have not made any specific study about that.

If we believe upon Anu Shruti, Kabir became the disciple of Ramanand in 15th century. Ramanand preached Kabir to say Ram Ram. He became his disciple on the bank of Ganga but I cannot say, if this incident took place in Banaras or at some other place. Kabir wanted to become the disciple of Ramanand. He lied on his way, on the stairs of Ghat. In the darkness Ramanand stepped over Kabir and as penance, he uttered Ram-Ram his mouth. Ramanand sect had faith in Ram. They also had faith in God Rama.

Ramanandi had faith in Shiva also. I cannot say whether or not they used to worship bhagwan Krishna.

It is wrong to say that there were only two thoughts Vaishnav and Shaiv, mainly prevailing in India at the time of appearance of Adi Shankaracharya. In the beginning there was no difference between Sanyasies and Bairagies in the matter of living and ways of worship. The difference cropped up later. This is not correct with reference to Sanyasies that they have also set up monastries as like Budhists, though it may be correct, so far as Bairagies are concerned.

In North, West, South and East, there are four Monastries of religious heads and not of the Sanyasies. These four Maths or Monastries are in North Badrikashram which is called Badri Nathji, in south Sringeri, the name of the west is not coming to mind at present, in south there is yet another Math i.e., Remeshwaram and similarly there is one more in east also which is also not known to me at present. It is correct that the Math in West is popularly known by the name of Dwarikadhish (again said) it is not Dwarikadhish and is popularly known as Dwarka. It is correct that the management of the Maths, which includes the appointment of Shankaracharya also, is run on a democratic pattern. It is correct that this democratic pattern is evolved by the Group of Sanyasies. I do not have any knowledge that Ramanujacharya or Ramanand have set up thousand of such Maths after these four Maths. When I was a student at Allahabad I had been coming and going to Ayodhya off and on. I also had been to Hanumangarhi which is located in Ayodhya. My visits to Ayodhya are quite frequent and only a fifteen days ago I had come back from Ayodhya. I acquired lot of information about Hanumangarhi and similarly about Nirmohi Akhara

(again said) I did not gather information about Nirmohi Akhara. I have heard that there are seven Ramanandi Akharas in Ayodhya but since heard that there are seven Ramanadi Akharas in Ayodhya but since it was not my subject, therefore, I did not make any probe about them. I have not read that the management of Ramanandi Akharas was run on democratic pattern.

The Rule of Bhakhtiar Khilaji in India was in 13th Century. It is wrong to say that during the period of Bhakhityar khilagi, Kabir was there.

The literary composition during the period of Emperior Ashok of which I have made the mention earlier, such as Deep Varish, Mahavansh in fact are compilations, which were composed by his disciples at a later stage. Of the main authors of Ashoka period, I know the names of Upgupt and Nigrodh. I cannot tell the name of any of their compositions. I know about Shakespeare. He was during 16th century. I have also read about Kalidasa. He was Indian, I have read Raghuvansh also written by him. It is wrong to say that Kakidasa and Shakespeare were contemporary. In Raghuvansha. There is mention about Rama. I have heard the name of First ever poet Valmiki. Ramayana is his famous composition. It is not that Valmiki had recited the Ramayana to his disciples and had written after creaming them up by heart, at a later stage. The Ramayana was composed 4th century B.C. Initially this book was written 4th Century B.C. but some of its parts were included later upto 9th Century A.D. On the basis of Anushruti and Parvati Grantha Valmiki started writing this book on Tamsa river. Some people call Tamsa as Tomas. It is little far from Ayodhya on its southern side. The period of Valmiki is not certain but it appears from his Ramayana that when he wrote that, there was population of human

beings in Ayodhya. Ramayana is a voluminous book. But we can use it as a source of history. I have read Ramayana. In this book mention is made off and on of the people of that time, their clothing, their living, their social obligations and about their fairs and festivals. The principle character of Ramayana is Rama which starts from the episode of Ayodhya historically and runs upto Uttara Kand. (again said) (instead of word "historical" it may be read as word "Puranik"). It can be said that this story remained concentrated most of the time, with Ayodhya only.

I have studied that myth logically there are four ages (Yugas) and these are Satyug, Treta, Dwapar and Kaliyug. I have heard about yugat. Treta Yug is considered to have come before Dwapar yug. I have not seen anything in Valmiki Ramayana where it is mentioned that Ramayana was related to Treta Yug. In my capacity as historian I would say that the Yuga of Valmiki Ramayana is illusory. The story, which is mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana may be related to some earlier incident. The mention of Ayodhya in Valmiki Ramayana has been made as Kaushal also. But the Kaushal was the name of a very vast area. History though is silent in the matter yet it can be mythological recognized that the descendant of Ayodhya Kings were Ikshvakoo. Dynasty is not based on mythology. It may be called historical. But we can say on mythology point of view that this dynasty was called Raghuvansha and King Dashratha also belonged to this dynasty. According to discription made in Ramayana, Ayodhya was the capial of Kaushal. After Ishakvakoo, Raghu, Dilip, Aaj, Dashrath and Rama were born. Such a mention has been made. As per the mention, it is correct that from Ishvakoo downward to Rama, Ayodhya was the capital of Kaushal but historically no proof of this is available. There is a difference of opinion regarding the date of composition of Balmiki Ramayana

amongst the Historians but broadly the time drawn for it has already been told by me. It appears to be 4th Century B.C., to 9th century B.C. which has been amended thrice (R.L.Braklinton). No such thing like the statue/idol etc., of Rama which is described by Balmiki as a person holding bow, was found or described before the beginning of Buddhism. Also no such inscription either, is found before Budha. In Balmiki Ramayana, mention of Saryu river has been made. It flows on the northern side of Ayodhya. It is adjacent to Ayodhya, In Balmiki Ramayana no mention has been made about the banks of Saryu river. But the mention of Guptar Ghat has been made and that ghat is still existing. In Raghuvansha of Kalidasa, the mention of Guptar Ghat has not been made with reference to the context that Bhagwan Rama had immersed here. The places which have been geographically mentioned in Balmiki Ramayana are still in existence but their identity is not proved. Most of the places which have been shown in this Ramayana, are still in place. Such as today also in south of Ayodhya there is Tamsa River. Ganga, Rameshwaram and Lanka are also there. Lanka is still in south but it is Sri Lanka. It cannot be said whether or not it is lanka connected with Ramayana.

The Ramayana written by Goswami Tulsi Das, which is called Ramacharit Manas was written in 16th century. Abdul Rahim Khan Khana was one of the 9 Ratnas of Akbar. He was not in the period of Goswami Tulsi Das but came afterwards. Akbarnama was written during the period of Akbar. I have read some of its parts. It is wrong to say that there is no book known as Akabaranama. I have heard about the book named Ai ne Akbari and I have read it also. It was written by Abdul Fazal. He was also one of the 9 Ratnas of Akbar. Ai ne Akbari was written in 16th century. There may be mentioned of Ayodhya in Ai-ne-Akbari but I

did not see that so carefully and from this point of view. I have read Ram Charit Manas. There is a difference with regard to the birth of greatest Hero Ram as shown in Valmiki Ramayana and Ram Chait Manas. In Manas, his birth is recognized as an Avtar whereas there is no such mention in Valmiki Ramayana. It is correct that according to Valmiki Ramayana, he was born whereas according to Ram Charit Manas he appeared i.e., his Avtar took place. The locality, city, village where one is born, that place is known as Janambhoomi (birthplace) of that person. None of Great Men, attains popularity during his life time. One in fact attains popularity after his death. If he attains popularity during life time then the place where if he was born, become a place of Faith. As per Valmiki Ramayana, the birthplace of Rama uttered by Rama himself, which is by the name of Janambhoomi but that may be an extension done during later years. I have faith in fair and festivals and I take part and celebrate them also. When I went to Ayodhya, I saw that as an historian. I had seen it as a mosque. I had not gone there, considering it a mosque. I had seen an inscription of a mosque there. Had there not been the inscription then also it was a mosque.

I had gone on the disputed site first of all with my parents. At that time I was the student of 12th class. Probably it was sometime between. 1966 and 1968 my parents had gone to see Ram Mandir at Ayodhya (again said) they had gone to have Darshan also of Ram Mandir. It is correct that they offered sweets and flowers there as per their faith and had Darshan also. I had the curiosity to know about the disputed site at that time also. My curiosity had been there right from the beginning. The curiosity to know it, had been created in me around 1960. I had read the katha of Ramayana at that time I got an inkling not from reading books between 1960 to 1968 but from hearing that

there was some dispute between the two communities about this place and it was whether the place was of a temple or of a mosque. In 1968 when I had darshan first time, the idols were there under the dome. A chowki type platform and not something like a throne was there. I came out of the gate and did not go upto the chowki. My parents had gone upto the chowki to offer prasad. Probably it was some fair or festival and the season was something like rainy season. There was lot of crowd outside and people were going inside also to have Darshan.

From 5-7 years after 1968, I went to the spot again. I had gone to meet somebody at the temple. He was my great uncle but I am not able to remember his name to whom I had gone to meet (Again said) he was my distant great uncle. He was not the priest in the temple. I have not studied Pharsi. When I went there 2nd time I did not see it, taking it as a mosque rather I saw a mosque in itself. The inscription there was written in Pharsi but I knew about that even earlier. But this inscription alone was not the basis for my assumption. The form of that building was of a mosque because there was dome on it. I saw that area from all the sides and had it investigated. (again said) Not investigated but had a look only. The main gate of this building was facing North-East. This direction can be called Poovottar. There were many gates. Three four doors were there. But I did not count them. There was only one door to gain entry inside the courtyard and only one main gate. The door of the courtyard was on North East Direction. I do not remember now whether or not there was a Lion or something else constructed on the entrance. After entering into the courtyard we were told that it was Rasoi of Sita and Ram Chabootra. We had seen them.

Thereafter when there started our intensive study, perusal and survey, we went on the spot. The dates are not known to me but I might have gone there for 8 to 10 times. I had gone at my sweet will and to at the instance of others. I have studied Epigraphy and also teach it to the students of M.A. in Delhi.

I cannot understand what the touchstone is. But I saw the pillars of basalt, which were many in counting. These may be 14 in numbers. It is wrong to say that all such things would be included in archaeology the manufacturer and consumer of which is the man. The stone of the pillars including the door would be around 7-8 feet. These were black in colour. Engraving had been made on these black stones. In fact there were pictures made by engraving. On the base of pillars the pitchers were constructed. There were figures of doorkeeper (Dwarpals) also on it. It is obvious that the doorkeepers have the human figures. The creepers and flowers were also made on them. But there was no lotus on them. The figure of woman was also engraved on it. The structure and clothing of those figures appeared to be of 10th and 11th Century. The stones on these pillars were of the middle ages and not of the stone ages. These were not even of the middle stone ages. I do not know if or not any of the historian or some other persons have written or said any thing about the installation of these stones after the movement of 1857 and between our reaching there for making intensive study. I have heard and also read that in 1885 a prosecution case was filed on this issue between Mahant Raghubir Das and Asgar Ali. The reference of this mosque has been made in Babarnama. The Urdu translation done by A.S. Bewrie of its inscription, as given in Babarnama has been read by me. Except that inscription no other reference of this mosque has been given in Babarnama. The Rule of the

Muslims remained in India from 1000 A.D. to 1750 A.D. The first Muslim Ruler was Mehmood Gazanavi. He was a victorious and not a plunderer. He Rules some of the parts. Thereafter came Mohd. Gauri but I do not think that he was ever a plunderer. I mean to say that attaining victory was the rule during those days. I do not remember the date correctly but Babar fought the battle of Khanwa in 1528. The inscription which was translated by A.S.Bewriej was from Turki language into Urdu. That inscription dats back to 1528 when the mosque was built. Before Khanwa Babar had fought the battle of Panipat. I do not recollect who was the Nawab of Avadh at that time. It was not that the Nawab of Awadh had fought the battle of Khanwa against Babar in league with Marathas or Rana Sanga. I have not read in any book of history that babar ever came to Ayodhya.

I have never heard reference of an author Mirja Jon, therefore, cannot say if any person would have written a book namely Hadiqe Shahida. I do not know about the book "Gumashte Halat Ayodhya" by Maulavi Abdul Qreem Immam Sahib. The name of book "Tareekha Avadh" which is stated to have been written by Alma Mehmood Nijamul Gani Khan Sahab, is being heard by me first time.

I have read the Encyclopedia of Ayodhya which has been published by the Government in Gazette. It has been written by Nevil and E.B.Joshi. But I have not read the Encyclopedia written by Sarjent Adward Balpol.

The book written by H.R. Nevil referred to above may contain reference about Nirmohi Akhara but I do not remember it now. The Archaeological Survey of India was set up in 1934. I do not know if after surveying Ayodhya they might have installed stones to identify various

historical and religious places. (again said) These stones, if any, were not found on the spot.

(At this point, at the instance of learned Advocate, the witness was shown the coloured photo from the Album prepared by Uttar Pradesh Archaeological organization). I have inspected the Album shown, which bear No.44-45. No such word or language has been written on it, showing it as Janambhoomi, I have read the history written by P.Karneji, I do not remember the date of its writing. He was the commissioner of Faizabad Division. I do not know if the entry of this book in the first settlement of Ayodhya was made or not. It is correct that the full name of this book is "A Historical Sketch of Tehsil Faizabad, Distt. Faizabad including Pargana Haveli Avadh and Paschim road with old capital Ayodhya and Faizabad, by P.Karneji". In that book the entry of those temples, mosques and gurudwaras has been made, which were in place, at that time.

There are also more famous historical mosques in Ayodhya but the contents of my subject pertained to mosque of this prosecution case only. I have not read any such note which had been written by the then D.M. of Faizabad Shri Hoje. There might be a mosque built by Aurangzab in Ayodhya but I did not pay attention towards that.

On seeing the mosque at the disputed site and also the record in Pharsi, I concluded that it was a mosque.

I know about Islam. The introducer of it was Hajrat Mohd. Saheb, Islam was born about 1400 years ago. It happened around 622 A.D. I have not read in any of the books of Islam about the out line and form that a mosque should take.(again said) of course I have studied about the

Masjid in books relating to Architecture. It is wrong to say that there is no special outlines given for a temple building in Hindu Shastras. In fact a special outline and a method has been suggested. The meaning of temple can be taken for a house also but in the technical sense temple is a legal entity.

Question : If there is a place for going round, Jagmohan in front and Thakurji installed, will it become a temple? What do you say in the matter?

Answer It is not correct. Alongwith the idol it is essential to have the structure also of the temple, jagmohan maybe its organ.

The most important thing for a temple is the idol and the structure. There should be a Conch shaped top, an Amluk and its construction should be comical. There should be a Garbhgrih, a place for sitting the audience. But its shape goes on changing from place to place. Conch shaped (Shankhwakar) mean it should be more wide from lower side and comical (thin) from upper side. There is no dome on it.

It is wrong to say that in Raghuvansh of Kalidasa, Sita Rasoi has been shown at this place. It is also wrong to say that the composition of Raghuvansh took place 1500 years ago from today.

If historian happens to be the servant of the Govt. of that time, his attitude could be partial, but even then he cannot be overlooked all together. We considered B.B. Lal a good Archaeologist and an excavator but we do not consider him now. There are many archaeologists in the world. I have heard the name of Prof. A.K.Narayan. He can also be called Ideologist as well as Archeologist, Prof.

A.K.Narayan has undertaken excavation work in Ayodhya. As a measure of survey, he had made Trenches. He did so in the year 1967-68 Shri B.B.Lal did the excavation in 1977-78. Prof. B.B.Lal had made the Trenches at Sita Rasoi Adjacent to disputed site and at the southern side adjacent to Masjid. The disputed site and the structure were on height. Now it is ups and down. The place the trenches were put was a part of hillock. Carbon dating of four quotes was done, one of which is of Thermouniration and is done through the pottery.

It is wrong to say that I am giving a wrong statement out of prejudice.

(The cross-examination by R.L.Verma on behalf of Nirmohi Akhara concluded).

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chand Mishra

14.7.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us .In continuation of this case for further cross-examination on 15.7.1998.

Witness be present.

Sd/-

14.7.98

15.7.98 (In continuation of 14.7.1998, the Cross-examination of Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra P.W.13, on behalf of Shri Dharam Das by Shri Ved Prakash, Advocate, begins on oath).

I do not hate the communist ideology. I agree with the good things i.e., ideas, which are scientific. From economics point of view, in communist ideology, man becomes materialistic. Communist people are not inspired by the religion. Because of materialistic approach, the communists though understand the religion yet they do not believe upon it. (Again said) they believe upon the religion on the basis of evidence but they do not follow it blindly. (again said). They understand the religion but do not believe upon it. These people understand the nature of religion, is revaluation and the dimension

Question :Do the communist people believe upon all that what you said above or not?

Answer : They understand by analyzing the process of evolution, development and the dimension of religion and they believe I the process in which the religion has developed but they do not follow it blindly.

I am not ready to agree that these people discriminate the society o the basis of Hindu, Muslim and Christian. They are above these narrow considerations of communality. Being the student of history, I have studied the communist literature, though very little I am not the member of the Communist party.

It is correct that most of Hindus believe upon Ishwar and Muslim on Khuda. It may that Hindus have faith in Madhir and Muslims in Masjid. I do have the knowledge

about this, it is correct that Hindus go to temple for worship, thinking that Ishwar is there. And similarly Muslims go to Masjid for Ibadat thinking that Khuda is present there also. I personally do not go for worship anywhere but the people of both these communities go for Pooja and Ibadat to their respective places and for that I do not have any objection. If they have faith in Pooja and Ibadat in this manner. I have no objection.

About this prosecution I first of all came to know when I got the court notice for giving evidence. I do not know, which of the parties had got this notice issued for me for standing as witness in this case. It is correct that I came to know first time that I was to give evidence in this case only when I got the summon from the court. Before receiving the notice from the High Court, I had not talked to anybody regarding the evidence. Before getting summon from the court I had gone to the spot 2-3 years before. I went there suo-moto. At that time the building in question was not there. Before that also I had gone there before the demolition. After demolition also I had gone, I had gone 2-3 months earlier before demolition. But it is wrong to say that I had gone there only first time for the purpose of study. In fact I had been going there for study earlier also. I went there for study purposes first time in 1990. I study the history and also teach the history and if it is considered essential with reference to the context then I make mention of all the cities like Ayodhya in my lecture. We do not teach the subject in dispute as a special case.

I met the learned Advocate Shri Jilani only in this court. After receiving the summon from the court I did not make any enquiry from him that how the summon had come to me from the court. I did not ask him as from which of the side of the parties I was to give evidence. It was clear

from my summon about which case I was required to give my evidence. It was self explanatory. It is wrong to say that in the list of witnesses my name was written after enquiring from me. I do not know if this list of witnesses was filed in 1996. In my summon which I received from Distt. Judge Delhi, it was written that I was to give evidence with regard to Ayodhya. That summon is at my home, I didn't bring it here. I can bring it and file it in the court. The summon that was issued to me from the court over here, contained only the case No. etc. on that. But on the notice which was enclosed with it and which was sent from the court in Delhi to me, on my office address, it was mentioned that I was to give evidence about Ayodhya case. The Notice which I received from Delhi Court is also with me at home and I can produce it.

After coming to the court, I first of all met my friend and colleague Dr. Jafari, Reader in the Dept. of History, in Delhi University. I didn't say any such as that I had no faith either in a Mandir or in a Masjid and I would not stand witness to Jilani Sahab.

I started taking interest in this dispute only when the dispute erupted and particularly in the recent years. When I started taking interest, I was engaged in the teaching work and was a student as well and I am even today is a student and shall remain further also. Before passing M.A. I had no interest in this dispute.

I had gone to the disputed site particularly for study. When I went there, the structure was there, courtyard was there and Masjid was intact. Inside the building, there were walls, roof and some idols installed. May be many other things which would have lost sight of.

I have got opportunity to see many Masjids in India. I had been to those Masjids for both the purposes in view i.e. for seeing them and for studying them. I do not know that in Islam the pig is considered as dirty. I never saw in any part of the Masjid, a picture of a pig. I never saw foot prints in any Masjid. I never saw the hearth, Chakla and Belaan constructed in any Masjid. I never saw the pictures of any animal i.e animals and birds.

In the disputed structure no Rasoi had been in place. I didn't see any foot prints also there. I saw a Belan and a Chakla kept there, which seemed to have been kept recently, we didn't try to enquire as by whom and when these were kept there but I could understand with my sixth sense i.e. common sense as how these things were kept. With the common sense one can understand the things in general. I had presented a paper in this regard in the session of Indian History Congress Delhi. These happened around 1990.

(At this stage the learned Advocate invited the attention of the witness toward an album of coloured pictures of the disputed site prepared by the U.P. Archaeological Dept. The witness saw the pictures.)

These photos i.e. 14,15 & 16, which have been shown to me from the Album, are of the disputed site. But these are of the outer wall of this building. But these are not in the same state in which I had seen them on the spot. There is some distortion in them. I have already told that the picture of things shown here, have not been seen by me in any other Masjid.

I do not know if or not lotus is found in Arab countries. The other Masjids, which I have seen, have the

pictures of leaves of lotus. These pictures of the leaves were seen on the outer part of the Masjid. At some places these were on outside of the domes. I had seen one such Masjid recently in Haryana where I had gone in connection with the funeral but I do not know the name of that town or village. That was the only Masjid, which could be quoted as an example of this Masjid.

I do not know if or not lotus is found in Arab countries. The other masjids, which I have seen, the pictures of leaves of lotus. These pictures of the leaves were seen on the outer part of the Masjid. At some places these were on outer side of the domes. I had seen one such Masjid recently in Haryana where I had gone in connection with the funeral but I do not know the name of that town or village. That was the only Masjid, which could be quoted as an example of this Masjid.

I have also seen the domes of the disputed site and also the pictures on them. On the highest place of the dome where there is its top, extra layer of cement in a round shape had been constructed but it cannot be called something like leaves of lotus. I have also seen Jama Masjid. I did not pay attention to see that on the Domes of Jama Masjid crescent made of brass is constructed or moon is constructed. I have seen the Jama Masjid of Delhi. I had gone there out of curiosity as well as for study purposes. I studied its layout, its structure, its radius, and its shape and get up. I saw the Minarets there.

It is wrong to say that I have given some wrong statement or have spoken lie about the disputed site. It is also wrong to say that my statement in this case, purported to have been prepared after maintaining the contact with the Plaintiff before going to the court. It is also wrong to

say that I am giving false statement in league with the Plaintiff or hiding some facts after meeting them.

(On behalf of Dharam Das, Respondent No.13, the cross-examination by Shri Ved Prakash, advocate, concluded).

(On behalf of Shri Umesh Chand Pandey Respondent No.22. The cross examination of P.W.13 by Shri Vireshwar Dewedi, Advocate on oath begins).

xxx xxx xxx xxx

Question :As you have said in your statement, you are neither Atheist nor Theist?

Answer:I am an individual, an intellectualist.

The intellectualists accept only such a thing, which is correct, which is logical, which is judicial and is acceptable on merits. The logical means, to analyse a thing properly by due application of mind and arrive at a proper conclusion. Judicial means, which is appropriate and which is correct. I have undergone the mental exercise and duly considered whether or not there is a reality of God. I have arrived at the conclusion that there is no reality of God because I have not met him in person. While undergoing this mental exercise, I went through many books. The books I have read in this connection are "What is living and dead in Indian Philosophy". First two books are written by Prof. D.P.Chattopadhyay. In addition to them other books which I have read are "Outline of Indian Philosophy by M. Hiriyana, Western Philosophy by Thilli etc. The Philosophy of Dr.Radhakrishnan is his own analysis and I agree with some of his thoughts. Dr.Radhakrishnan has accepted the existence of God. I do not agree with his this idea. To see the God in person is essential for his existence. I accept

this fact only with reference to God and not with reference to anything else. I am in agreement with the works of famous Scientist Listeen. I am in agreement with his theory in which he has shown the theory of Relievity. He was a scientist. He was a Scientist of International fame. He was believer of God. Accepted the reality of God. I agree with his this opinion. I have heard the name of Allah Tala.

Question: Do you accept the reality of Allah Tala?

Answer: Allah Tala was a historical person, therefore I accept his reality. His perception is as a historical person.

I have not met him but he is an historical person and record of his living time and period has been mentioned in historical documents and there is no dispute about him hence I accept his reality. I have also read about it, to some extent, in the books. The books are, History of Arab, Foundation of Muslim Rule in India. The author of the first book was shri Hitti and of the 2nd Shri Mohd. Habib. I shall not be able to tell you properly his date of birth and date of death.

The area of my study as a student and as a teacher has been the "Ancient Indian History Culture and Archaeology". The time, from which the human being has come on his earth to 750 A.D., is considered the period of Ancient History. The culture, which I have studied and teaching, is also of the same period.

Archaeology also pertains to the same period. My study of the subsequent period was for curiosity sake and I also teach that.

My intense curiosity in respect of disputed site and disputed building arose in 1989-90. But I knew about the dispute from earlier days. I came to know about this dispute sometime in 1968. It was sometime 1964 for around that when I went to the disputed site along with my parents. I was stopped to go up to the idols hence I did not go inside alongwith my parents. As I was stopped, my parents passed by the side and went ahead of me, I did not know where. I, however, came out from there. (On this point at the instance of learned Advocate, the yesterday's statement of the witness from page 17-18 was read out to him. After hearing the statement, the witness replied) this statement is correct which is read out to me but the dome word is extra in it. It may be that the word either would have been spoken by me by mistake or the court might have mistakenly written that. I had signed my statement. My statement was read out to me in the court but probably the word "Gumbad" was not heard by me.

It is wrong to say that I am taking shelter of lie in giving evidence on oath and the statement given by me in the court is wrong, because my parents had come back after having Darshan of Devies and Devtas and doing their parikrama. At that time my age would be 16-17 years as my date of birth is 14th November, 1949. I was waiting for my parents while standing outside the gate.

Indian History Congress has the membership and this membership is open for those who are history teacher by profession and doing research in history. There is a membership fee for this but I won't be able to tell, how much, although it was settled during Bangalore session. There was membership fee even before Bangalore session and I am its life member. I had presented a paper in it during Delhi session probably in 1992. I being the member, I myself read the paper after submission. I had sent my

paper, that was accepted, and on that basis I presented it. At that time its organizational Sectional President was Prof. N.N. Bhattacharya. There was no Secretary in it. I had sent my paper to the Secretary Indian History Congress and I got information regarding acceptance from him. I do not know, who was the Secretary then. The caption of my paper was "Location of the Ram Janambhoomi according to Skandh Puran". In addition to the Skandh Purana, other ancillary books, original granths and secondary works were also used for my paper.

As per the Hindu Shastras, we consider the puranas the collection of a myth, traditional tales and legends. The categorization of Vedic literature has been made. This literature has been divided in four categories with the category of Vedic literature I mean how many Vedas are there and as I have told you, there are four Vedas. This is their categorization and this is the Vedic literature. We consider the Brahaman Granths as appendix of Vedic literature. Therefore, in history these are included in Vedic literature. There are Aranyak Granths also. There are the supplementaries of Vedic literature. We also call Upnishads as supplementary to Vedic literature. "Sutra" does not come under the definition of Vedic literature. In "Sutra" literature, there is also Parashar Grih Sutra. I have accepted that my carriage took place according to the rules contained in Paraskar Grih Sutra. Dharam Sutra Sahitya is outside the Vedic Sahitya. The jurisdiction of Dharam Shastra is very wide; Vedic Sahitya is a part of that. Smarities also come under the Dharam Shastra. In these smarities are included Manu Smarity and many other smarities as well. Mahakavya does not come under Vedic Sahitya. Puranas are not included in the category of Mahakavya.

Mahapurana and up Puranas are also included in Hindu Dharma Shastra. Shandha Purana is also one of the Maha Puranas. I Skanda Purana, Ayodhya Mahatmya is a part of one volume. In ancient Indian History mention has been made about sacred places and little less sacred places. I am not agreed with the saying that the English translation of Up Thirthas has been made as Holy sites. It can be said that such of the places as are related to the Hiros/Avtars of Hindu religion, whether any building is there or not, may be called holy sites but it is not that necessary. There is no public acceptance for this. We call a public acceptance when the majority of scholars recognize that concept and exercise that concept.

A place around Prayag (Allahabad) has been heard where Anusuiya had given preaching to Sitaji. (Again said) that place is related to Anusuiya but I do not know if she had given some preaching to Sitaji or not. I have not gone there. I do not remember if any such thing has been read by me in any book that the Hindus were treating the said palce as sacred place. In Allahabad district, there is concept of a place, or there is a place where Ganga flows and as per the tales. Sri Rama had corssed Ganga from that place. This place is also treated as sacred place by Hindus. Hidu people also treat the Guptarghat as sacred place where from Ram had disappeared. As per the books it is stated that Shri Ram was born in Ayodhya but more than the birth it is stated that Rama died on Guptar Ghat in Ayodhya. But I do not agree with the saying of birth and death. It is wrong that I took about 10 minutes time to Answer the question and arrive at the conclusion. In fact I replied the question before expiry of 10 minutes. I had spent time in under standing the question and answering it but it took me less than 10 minutes. I know the word "Historicity". Any thing certified by historical facts is called

historicity. I have tried to know about the birth place of God of Hindu Dharama Bhagwan Sri Ram and that process is still going on . This process I started in 1989. This dispute erupted in 1989 and every history is contemporary history, and from this point of view I tried to know the facts. I have come to know where his birth place is. This place falls between Abrahamkund and Rinmochan Ghat in Ayodhya. My entire statement and the conclusions have been given by reading the books, conducting the surveys, doing the investigations and making the enquires.

In Ayodhya Mahatm chapter of Skandh Purana, there is reference of those places also where people go with some notion, considering that they would get some award for that visit. I have no objection for the people going there with the notion that they would get some reward (Puniya) or they go there because they treat those places as sacred places. I have read the complete volume of Ayodhya Mahatmya of Skandh Purana. It is correct that reference of different religious places has come in this volume. In addition to this I studied other puranas as well as other secondary sources. In this regard I studied original book of Valmiki Ramayana, Mahabharata and other secondary works. In secondary works I have studied History of Vaishnavism by R.G.Bhandarkar, Development of Vaishnavism in India by Dr.Subeera Jaiswal, a book about Rama namely Righteous of Rama by E.Banerjee, Agastya Sahinta Uttartapniyopanishad by Brakinton, other three editions the manuscripts received from varindavan, Research Institute on Ayodhya Mahatmya and editions from Badliyan library, London, and the editions of Ramnarayan Das which beautifully classify the places and signs in Ayodhya connected with Rama and successive increase in them. Yet another very important book I have read on Ayodhya is Ayodhya by Hans Baker of Gronigain University

(Neitherland). This last book was published before 1990 and the remaining books, separately from time to time.

Skandh Puran, which I read, was published by Khem Raj Prakashn Bombay in 1910. All these books, except manuscript were published in 20th century. Skandh Puran the manuscript of which I have read, was written on "TAR PATRA". It was in Nagri script and in Sanskrit language. It was in Nagri script and not in Dev Nagri script.

It is correct that there had been an Astrain author whose name was Tyfentherlor. But I cannot say whether he belonged to Astria or some where else. But I have heard about him. He was an Isai Padri. (Again said). He was Isai but I do not know if or not he was a Padri also. He came to travel India during the last years of 18th century. He remained in India for six seven years. He did write a book but I cannot say that the name of that book was Description Historic and at Geopgrahic Ondate. I have read the excerpts of this book which are called extracts also. Probably it was the same book, the name of which was suggested by the learned Advocate. I have read this book in English language. My purpose was not to know the original language of this book. I study anything with some aim and extract out from it, which concerns me. During my intensive study I did not read in any of the book or in any Granth that the Masjid was constructed on the birth place of Shri Rama in Ayodhya. The author from Neitherland Sri Baker, Whose reference was made, had also come to Ayodhya. He came in India 2-3 years before 1990. I did not hear the name of Shri Coenrod Alst. I have read the extracts of the book "Ayodhya and after". I do not remember the name of the author of this book. A book entitled "Ram Janambhoomi versus Babri Masjid A critical study, has been seen by me. But I did not read this book. I

have read somewhere the name of the author of this book but I do not remember it now.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chand Mishra

15.7.1998

Typed by the Stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. For further cross-examination on 16.7.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-

15.7.1998

16.7.98 (In continuation of dated 15.7.1998 P.W.13, Shri Suresh Chand Mishra cross examination on oath begins).

I read, write and understand Hindi, English and Sanskrit. I do not know Urdu Language but I can understand that when in discussion. I also know Pali language but I do not know Malyali. Kutila is a not a language but a script. I read that and understand that. The manuscript which is called Pandulipi, is a hand written text whereas original book may be its editions and are based on old things. Main book is an original book.

Skandh Puran has been read by me in Sanskrit language. I have seen apper No.107 C-1/75, of suit No.5, which is a page of Skandh Puran. It is part of Ayodhya Mahatmya. But it does not contain full lines (Again said) only be written that the Shloka number is shown from page 18 to 22 in this page and that has been added in 18th Century.

Question: What is the Hindi translation of Shloka No.15?
Similarly phase till Hindi translation of Shloka No.16.?

Answer: After taking bath in the water of Saryu River, PINDARKA. Which created love and wisdom amongst the sinners should be worshiped. This (Sacred) Devta should be visited during Navraties. The Vighnesh i.e., Ganesha in its western direction should essentially be worshipped. I feel these Shlokas have been changed. If these Sholkas are tallied with the original Shlokas, a copy of which is available

with me, it is found that some words have been substituted.

Question: What is Pindarak?

Answer: In Ayodhya Mahatmya it is also called one of the Devtas.

Word Pindarak mean holy Devta. Its mention has been made in Ayodhya Mahatmya?

Question: What would be Hindi Translation of Shloka No.17 and 20?

Answer: The Vighnesh whose Darshan removes the slightest fear amongst the people and which fulfils their all their desires, such a Vighnesh, should be worshiped.

On the north east side of that place there falls the Rama Birth place. This birth place has been called the place which gives the fruit of Moksha etc., The birth place is located in the east of Vighnesh and north of Vasishth.

Just by having Darshna, the man gets emancipation without giving Alms, without doing Penance, without visiting Holy places, without performing Yagna.

Question:What is the meaning of Parmo mune Pindarak Vakatha?

Answer: A Great Munni Pindarak is there. Parmo Mune is used for addressing the Great Munni.

I have told earlier that I read the Skandra Purana written by Khem Raj, which had been published around 1910. It is correct that his 2nd name is Shri Krishan Das Khan Raj Shreshthit. Kshemraj and Khem Raj is one and

the same name. In addition to this I have read yet another Skandh Purana which had been reprinted by Nag publishers. The doubt I have expressed above had come to my mind because of reading different philosophocphical notes or Ayodhya Mahatmya. (Again said) that is the basis of my doubt. Three versions of Ayodhya Mahatmya the Mss. received from Vrindavan Research Institute, Vrindavan, the compilation of which is in Hans Baker's book, the Mss. Received from Bodina Library and the versions of Ram Narayan Das on Ayodhya Mahatmya, have consistently been found varied and different and are separate to each other. These were written during 17th and 18th centuries. In additions to this the doubt gets strengthen on the basis of on the spot directions, on the basis of Surveys and the situation of the so called Ram Janambhoomi, Rinmochan Ghat on the bank of Saryu River and Hill top on Braham Kund. (Question was asked from the witness as to what was basis of his doubt about the shlokas link with the 17th and 18th century).

I have read the English translation of Babarnama. I have red the translation done be A.S.Bewriej. Except that I did not read any other translation. I have studied that intensively with reference to this problem. This translation though in 2 volumes yet I used its reprint which is in single volume only. I do not know at present the year of its editions or the year of its reprint. I have seen the paper No.107 C-1/71 in original suit No.5. Its title page shows that it was written by A.S.Bewriej. A.S.Bewriej was a woman but I was not interested in knowing her citizenship. After turning the title page, on the first printed page, the page number is given as 656. Two pages, thereafter, are blank. The pages ahead, are some printed and some blank which have been stuck to each other. These printed pages are the parts of translation of Babarnama. These are the

pages of the book of this Bewriej Sahiba. The full name of Babar was Jahir udd in Mohd. Babar. The Babarnama is called in English as Memoir of Jahir udd in Mohd. Babar. I do not know that before Mrs. Bewriej the English translation of Babarnama was done or not by Jo'n Liden and Willium Erskin. In addition to this I have read some secondary sources about the life of Babar. Babarnama is a sort of diary of Babar. What Babar used to do he would enter that into the diary but that is not complete. Many events in its are missing. Some pages are missing in it. I do not agree that what Babar did not do that Had not been written in it. That what he did not do, he did not write that in this diary. Those important work he did not do, he did not make reference of them I this diary. Those unimportant works, he did not do, he did not make reference of them also in this diary.

Ramayana and Mahabhartar are clearly Mahakavyas. Mahabhartar does not come in the category of Purana. Ramayana too does not come under the category of Purana. If the meaning of Pauranik is purana (old) then these can be called pouranik Granthas otherwise these have their own categorizations from historical point of view. If the Pauranik is linked to the Purana then these books are not Pauranik. In the category of Pauranik books only Purana are included. The difference between Puran and Pauranik Granth, I have already explained. There are many other Puranas, in addition to 18 puranas. In addition to 18 Puranas, there are Periya Puruans, Brahmavaivartaya Purana, Bhavishya Uttar Purana etc. etc., Others are not remembered . (Again said). Narada Puran has also been compiled. Puranas have been compiled everyday. Brihannaridya Purana has also been compiled. As per my knowledge no purana was compiled during the later part of 20th century. The puranas were compiled during the first

part of 20th century (Again said) I have no knowledge that in the beginning of 20th century Puranas were compiled. But in the 20th century the mention of the rule of Victoria has been added in Bhavishya Uttar Purana.

Question: Is any new Purana written in 20th century?

Answer: To my information no such thing happened.

It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie in this regard. Brihannardiya Puran is an Up Puran but it comes in the category of Puranas only. Periya Puran is an Up Puran but it also comes under the category of Puranas. Of the Braham Vaivart Puran, Bhavishyottar Puran and Narad Puran, one or two may come in the category of Mahapurana. Such as Havishyottar Puran can come in the category of Mahapurans. I have read these three Puranas. In Bhraham Vaivart Puran, the origination of Braham, its changes, social description and religion, etc., have been discussed. This is mainly its contents. It is wrong to say that I have not studied it properly or I am not able to tell about this properly.

I have studied the Arthashastra of Kautilya with humility. It is a subject matter of my research. My research subject was Inscriptional Approach to the study of kautilya's Arthashastra. Its original book is in Sanskrit language. Its manuscripts were in separate scripts and at separate places. Instead of Manuscripts the original book is considered to be more authentic. I also consider so but from historical point of view the manuscripts are not less important.

In Kautilya's Arthashastra the reference of the books written before it has been made but these books are not available to us. The contents of the Arthashastras quoted

by Kautilya has not been mentioned anywhere. I have also read the English translation of Kautilya's Arthashastra. In this Arthashastra, Kautilya describes the ideas of Acharyas, given in the old Arthashastras. If he agrees then he expresses his concurrence otherwise he refutes them and gives his own opinion. All subjects such as economic system, political system, social system and judicial system etc., etc., comes under it. Kautilya in his Arthashastra has not discussed as to how the witness speak lie and what punishment should he get for speaking lie. (the witness Volunteer:) that Kautilya has also written that nothing should be over stated or understated about the State Administration.

My Statement written on page 5 dated 13.7.1998 is true that Skand was the incarnation of Kartikey. It is wrong to say that Kartikey and Skand was the name of one particular person. Kartikey was the son of Rudra. Rudra is also called Shiva. It is wrong that Skand was also the son of Shiva.

The purpose of my research was to stratify of this book. With stratification (Starikaran) I mean, to determine its date. Culture is the synonym of culture and the Historian treats this as the subject of Development of different areas of human life, If is the subject matter of his studies. In culture, matters relating to religion are also included. I, alongwith Ancient History, have specifically and clearly studied about the status of Dharam from pre historic period i.e. when the human being came into existence to 750 AD. Dravida and Aryan were two separate cultures. Some of the Historians of today are trying to accept them to some extent. The Hindi translation of the English word race I Prajati. The basis of their difference was not racial. This difference was based on the technology they possess their

physique, language and the way of living etc. etc. I do not agree with the contention that the difference between them was only on the basis of language. Dravida used to live mostly in south India. They were locals there. Aryas were not the residents of North India. They came from central Asia and settled down first of all in Punjab area. Then they started moving further. They then increased their area in North India but they did not spread.

In Hindu Dharama Bhakti Dhara also came. It can be correctly said that it originated from South India and came down to North India. It came in 5th century from South India (Again said) It came during the period of Andal from South India during 5th-6th century, He was its preacher.

Question: What do you mean by Bhakti Dhara?

Answer Bhakti means devotion, attachment, dedication, towards some one.

In Hindu Dharma, Bhakti Dhara was "Shaivite" i.e. they profess, Shiva Dharama, which started from South. All those people who had faith in Shiva, the Historians, called them "Shaiv". In 5th-6th century there were yet another people whose faith was in Vishnu. So far as the incarnation of Rama and Krishna of Vishnu, is concerned it came much later. Rama and Krishna was incarnation of Vishnu. Those people who were devotees of Vishnu, they were called Vaishnav, in south India, there has also been a Sant Alwar. He was the worshiper of Shiva and was a Shaiv. He had his followers as well. Alwar was in 4th or 5th Century. It may be 6th century as well. (again said) (These Andal and Nayanar were the contemporaries). Vishnu is also called Narayana. I cannot say (again said) that the Nayanar were the worshiper of Vishnu or Narayana or were they Vaishnav, Nayanar were shaiv. I have read in the History of India that

Nayanar and Alwar were Shaiv. It is Volume I and published from Penguin. It has been written by Prof. Romila Thapar. Prof. Romila Thapar is still alive and working in Jawahar Lal Nehru University. Prof. Suveera Jaiswal is also working in the same University. It is correct that Prof. Romila Thapar, Prof. Suveera Jaiswal and some of their other colleague's scholar have issued a pamphlet in 1989 in which they had expressed their view point in respect of this disputed site. But I do not remember exactly whether all their other colleague writers were the teachers in Jawahar Lal Nehru University.

In my last statement I had referred the name of Prof. R.S.Sharma, D.N.Jhan, Atahar Ali and Prof. Suryabhan. They had given their one report about this very place to the Government of India, this statement is correct, It is wrong to say that I have given a false statement. I cannot say whether the Government of India had sought some report from them or not but it is wrong to say that they had not given some report to the Government of India. This report was written in 1990 that may be 1989 or may be 1991 also. I have done my Ph.D. under the guidance of this Dr.D.N.Jha. I know him as my supervisor as well as a senior Prof. Of History Department. I know him very closely. I have no knowledge that he is a cadre holder of the Communist Party. It is not correct to say that the theory of the communist party is against the existence of God. I have not studied the communist ideology adequately. I know the fundamental of their theory. The fundamental theory of communist party has been stated by Marx. He gave call to the labourers of the world to unite this is only their fundamental theory. The basic theory of communist ideology is "to one according to his need" and not "to one according to his capacity. The theory of communist

ideology is that what is direct is only reality and what is not seen, all such things are illusion and unbelievable.

I am a man of scientific temperament. For believing a thing, I see the matter and also see many things, which are extraneous and are related to that thing. I see those facts, I analyse them and then only I arrive at the conclusion. Other than this I do not believe in other unbelievable things. Other than these things I examine them on the basis of relativity. It is not that because of my such like thinking process, there is no importance of the morality.

Ramanandji propagated the Vaishnav Dhara of Bhakti. This Vaishnav Dhara came from south. Vaishnav Dhara was the enhanced form of Bhakti. It is wrong to say that Ramananji initiated this Vaishnav Bhakti Dhara from south only. It is also not that the Vaishnav Bhakti Dhara started in competition to the Shaiv Bhakti Dhara in south. The popularity of Ramanand became more when he became Guru of Kabir. He was recognized amongst his contemporaries even before he became Guru of kabir. I have not where read it that he told Kabir that he (Kabir) should make him (Ramanandji) his Guru so that the number of his followers would increase. I also did not read anywhere that Kabir had told him to become his Guru and that would increase his popularity and his followers. I have also not read that Kabir had offered to become his disciple and Ramanadji had refused. I have read it in a book and it may be a rumour, that Kabirji made efforts to become the disciple of Ramanandji. It is correct that the number of followers of Ramanand sect. Is less than the number of followers of Kabir sect even today. I had given the statement yesterday also that the reason for the more popularity of Ramanandji was because he became the Guru of Kabir. Ramanandji was the Bhakt and worshiper of

incarnation of Vishnu, Sri Ramji. It is wrong to say that I have said in order to hurt the sentiments of Ram Bhaktas that Ramanandji became more popular because of his becoming Guru of Kabir. Rather I said so because when the popularity of a disciple surpasses his Guru or even what it becomes his parallel, the Guru's fame enhances.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

17.6.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this case for further cross-examination on 17.7.1998.

Sd/-

17.6.98

17.7.1998

(In continuation of 16.7.1998, the statement of P.W.13 Shri Suresh Chand Mishra begins on Oath).

The Stream started from South was mainly spearheaded by Smt. Andal, Alawar Sant and Nayanar. Andal was a Shaiv. She was a woman, Alawar was also a Shiva and Nayanar too a Shaiv. We do not know about any Vaishnav who rose to the occasion from there at that time. I did not hear the name of some Sant Nawalwar or Namberwar. Shaivities have Bhajans in the memory of their Adorable, which have been composed by them. Dr Romila Thapar has referred about the compilation of Bhajans in her book History of India Volume I". I have seen in the temples in south that the Images of these sants are installed on the walls and the prayer has also been written on them. It is wrong to say that there was no particular person in the name of Nayanar. It is also wrong to say that I am speaking lie. It is correct that Shaivites are called Nayanar (again said) they were their followers also therefore they are called Nayanar. It is wrong to say that I have spoken lie that Alwar was a sant and a Shaivite. I have spoken true to the best of my information. I do not agree that the followers of Vaishnav sect are called Alwar. I did not know about a Devta called Upper. I also do not know about such a Sant, however, I know about Ayappa.

I have heard the name of Sant Nambalwar. He was a Shaivite. I do not know if he was a Vaishnavite. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie. I do not know a Sant called by the name Manikkavasagar. I did not hear his name. Had he been popular, I must have known him. He was not popular. When I do not know him, I cannot reply whether he wrote any Bhajan or Prayer.

I did not hear about some Tinumrari Prabandh. But have heard the name of Naleer Prabhandhan. The first suggestion appears to be distortion. Instead of Tirmurari, it would be Tirumalai. In the process of my intensive study, I have read and consulted History of India by Romila Thapar. It is correct that Romila Thapar in her book has written that the Aryans of North India took their culture to South India. Along with Aryans culture, the Vedic traditions in a developed form, was also taken to south. I know about Saka, Hoon and Kushan communities. It is wrong to say that Aryan people who went from North to South, called these communities i.e. Sake, Kushan and Hoon the Malechchh. At this stage the learned Advocate drew the attention of the witness towards page 183 to 187, of the reprinted book of the History of India (Volume I) 1967 by Romila Thapar. This book has been published by Painguin Prakashan. What ever is written in these pages, it has been written by Romila Thapar and these are only her ideas. In addition to Romila Thaper, I have read the book written by R.N.Nandi the title of which is not remembered to me now. It has only one volume containing 200-250 pages. What ever is written on above four pages by Romila Thapar that all is correct. Volunteer: But the period and perspective with reference to the Answer of our question is different.

Adi Shankaracharya was born in 780 A.D. and died in 820 A.D. In between he propagated his religion. He started the propagation of his religion in 800 A.D. onward. According to Anushruties Ramanand was born in Banaras. The old name of Banras was Kashi. He did the propagation of his religion near the place of his birth. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie on this subject. It is not that Ramanand was born in Prayag and he did his propagation work in Kashi. If there are rumours about somebody's birth,

before believing, we make investigation first. The rumour, which came to us about the birth of Ramanandji, we did not make any investigation for the same. The historian makes investigations for selective subjects only and Ramanand was not the subject matter of our investigation, therefore, we did not investigate about his birth place. The birth place of Adi Shankaracharya was not our selective subject but we enquired about that during the studies. Babar was my selective subject. The father of Babar was not my selective subject. The father of Babar was not my selective subject but I know that who was the father of Babar and where was Babar born. The name of Babar's father was Omar Shiekh Mirja and Babar was born at some place in Phargana. I know a little bit about Islam. I have heard that there are Shia and Sunni sects in Muslim religion. These are not the sects but 2 categories. It is not low category or equal category but a category only. I am not the expert to tell that Shias are called Shiekh and Sunnies are not called so. I did not enquire whether Babar was Shia or Sunni. Babar came in India as a King. He was a King even before he came to India.

The pre-medieval period after ancient period in Indian History, started from 750 A.D. and gone upto 11th, 12th Century. Thereafter it started medieval period. I have referred the books Deepvansh and Mahavansh and I consider them of Buddhist literature. It is correct that none of these books was written during the period of Ashoka. These were written after him (again said). But this deals with the Maurya period and history of Ashoka.

These books were brought out after the Rule of Emperor Ashoka. These were Edited later on. There is difference between editing and compilation to put together, In English it can be called compilation. Sampadan is called

in Hindi, Edit in English. While editing, some changes can take place so as to keep the work in proper place (the witness himself saying) but doing compilation also some variation maybe resorted to establish proper coordination. It can be accepted that Deepvansh was brought out in 4th or 5th Century (the witness Volunteer: that it could be ear about it). With near about I mean it could be upto 100 years before. The publication of Mahavanash could be taken little late than 5th Century. With late I mean late by about 100 years or so. This work cannot be of earlier period than this. It is wrong to say that I have spoken lie in this regard.

During Emperor Ashoka's rule, some parts of book Mahabodhi Vansh were written. I cannot say with certainty whether these were beginning parts or the later parts.

I have said in my statement on 13.7.1998 which is at page No.6 that I have read all the manuscripts, which are in different scripts, of Arthashastra of Kautilya. These scripts are Nagri, Maliyali, Kutila (Volunteer: something is missing in it). In fact I have read the complete manuscripts written in Sanskrit, I Devanagri Lipi.

The literature which I have read about Islam is History of Arab by Philp K.Hitti. Also read other books but the names are not known. In History of Arab, fro the birth of Islam to the situation of subsequent periods, has been discussed.

The word revelation means to reveal to uncover. I do not know if the origination of Islam took place through revelations. The Paigambars propagated the origination of this religion. Four paigambars were born in Islam. The revelation is before the paigambars. I do not have the time to read these revelations. It is wrong to say that I am

speaking lie on this subject, The book namely History of Arab, read by me, does not contain anything to reveal as to what should be the form of a mosque. The other books, which I read on Islam and the names of which I do not know now, explain about the type and form, the mosque should be of. The oldest book on Islam, amongst the books I have read, whether I know their names or not is Muslim Rule in India by Prof. Habib. I do not remember now the year of publication of this book. It was published in 20th century only. But I do not remember in which decade of this century, it was published. This book was published in the later part of this century. This book is written both on Historical and Political subjects. This Habib Sahab is the same person who has been the professor in Aligarh Muslim University. Volunteer: that he is no more alive. Theology means Dharam Shastra. It is wrong to say that these books do not contain at all a reference on Islam. There is a reference in those book as to how the Islam was being propagated in India. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie on the subject.

As I have said revelation means to reveal, to originate. I did not make any investigation whether Islam was result of origination or revelation. Because of common acceptance of majority of people as well as scholars, I accepted that Islam came through revelations. After reading the books mentioned above, I came to the conclusion that as per the opinion of the scholars, the revelation of Islam took place.

I do not remember if any of the scholars, have written in these books that he had himself seen the revelation taking place. It is wrong to say that I speak lie in the matter. It is also wrong to say that I speak lie in the matter out of prejudice. It is wrong to infer that when I came to

stand as witness in the case, I had premonition to give my evidence against the temple and in favour of mosque, even if it is false.

I did not read Quran Sharief. I did not read anywhere what revelation happened. I also did not read as to what was the process of revelation.

In Hindu religion, in addition to Shaiv, Vaishnav and Boudh, there are many other sects. I consider Sikh religion also a part of Hindu religion. During my studies, I also tried to know about Sikh religion, though a little bit only. Being an historian I consider the origin of Sikh religion from 16th-17th century. Its founder was Guru Nanak Dev. I do not know correctly. What the disciples or followers of Guru Nanak Devji were called. His followers are not called Nanak Panthis. It is wrong to say that the Nanak Panth, which started by Guru Nanak Dev, was given the name of Sikh religion by the 10th Guru Gobind Singh. Path means way but the meaning of Panth is not way. It can be accepted that word Sikh is a corrupt form of Sishya. I cannot say with certainty that Nanak Panth might be based on Satyam Shivam Sundaram I also do not know if in his language he would have called it Sat Shri Akal.

My father has expired. He was a Shivite as well as Vaishnavite. He used to worship all Devi Devtas. My wife also shares the same view as were of my father. My wife worships Krishanji's idol. She also worships Bhagwan Ram. My wife neither worships me nor I want her to worship me. My wife does not criticize me, that much I can say. I praise the virtues of my wife. Pooja means worship Ibadat. In the context of Pooja, the appreciation of something of somebody's virtues is also included. My wife appreciates

me, she finds virtues in me. I do not have any allergy from the word worship (Pooja).

As an Historian I have tried to know, what religion is? On the basis of my research and the studies I give the religion two definitions. One is sublime and clear cut and the 2nd is parochial sublime category advocates that the society or system should be run in such a manner as no discrimination is felt anywhere. Some body's doctrine, sect., way of living and faith should not be hurt. From parochial means sectarian ideology, which promotes only a particular sect and have ill will towards the followers of other sects. There is also a 3rd definition of religion. To maintain a system to do one's duties. I accept the sublime and clear cut category of religion." *Mein ayam nizamparo vetiti ganna laghu chetsam .Udar charitanatu pu vasudhaav kutumbksn* " It meaning is It is mine and it is of others, is the thinking of small hearted people. Those who are large hearted people, entire world is their family.

I consider my son only my son and not of others. I did not consider the son of others as my son but consider him just like my son. I do not consider the wife of others just like my wife.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

17.7.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us . For further cross-examination on 3.8.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-

17.7.98

Dated 3.8.1998(In continuation of dated 17.7.1998 P.W.13 Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra's statement on oath begins).

In Vedic literature we count Vedas, Upanishada's, Brahmin Granth's and Aranyak's but we keep sutras literature outside the jurisdiction of it. Some sutras can be considered religions. Some of the parts of samritis can be counted under religion. Hindu shastra is a very big subject and religions interpretation is a detailed subject- " dharmo vishvasth Jagat pratishtam prajya uparapati " which means religion is the main bases of the world and welfare of the public can be ensured by sticking to it. According to hindu shastras religion helps in establishing security and coordination. Different components of the society are adjusted in religion. We do not treat Smariti in religions books because social rules are also discussed in it. Welfare of the society is discussed in Smariti. But the welfare of specific category of the society in aristocracy. It is wrong to say that I am making a false statement about the same.

Mahakavya and Purana's does not form part of religious books. Mahabharata and Ramayana come under the category of Mahakavya. In these books reference also of Dharma comes off and on. The remaining parts of these books can be called, Tales Myths and Legends. Legend means to tell story of something. Sometime these are related to religion also.

Puranas are also divided into two categories i.e. Up Puran and Maha Puran. In puranas the reference is made about Sagra, Pratisarga, genealogy and at some places social and economic syste,s. in puranas Sarga comes first in sequence, which is called creation in English. There after it comes Pratisarga, which is the creation after the universal destruction. The 3rd is Manvantrea i.e. determination of period by the then man. In that the genealogy of Kings is given. From critical angle, I give

historical importance to the genealogy of the kings. It is correct that in Purana, Smriti material has been profusely used and in all the Shastras the exchange of subject of such smarities has taken place. There is also a material pertaining to Holy places (tirtha). I have also studied the material pertaining to Tirtha a little bit critically. The names of main Tirthas, which I have read, are Guptartirath, Agnitrath etc. in these, also comes the name of Prayag. From guptar I mean that part of the river, which is very narrow and animal cross the river from that point. In later tales the people have given the interpretation that Hari had disappeared from here. We have read in the Skandh Purana that his birth place is also a Tirath but this was added in the Skandh Purana in around 18th century. It has been added by the Purohits of Ayodhya. But their names and address could not be found. It appeared to me through the studies that it would have been added by the Purohits of Ayodhya later. But this part was added by the Purohits located in the place like Kashi and Prayag, Vrindavan etc. I have read this in the book written by Hans Bekar as well as in many other original books connected with the subject. The original book read by me about the Skandh Purana is 'Vaishnav Khand Ka Ayodhya Mahatmay.' I am not making any false statement in this matter. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie in the matter out of prejudice.

Dan, Shradh and Arthavyavstha (Economy) have also been discussed in Puranas. We come across the mention about these at different places. I have studied these Puranas critically. Ki Garuud Puran I have read about Shadh. So far as Dan is concerned, its mention is found in most of the Puranas from place to place, Similarly reference about society as well as the economy comes almost in all the Puranas from place to place.

The genealogy of Kings in Puranas contains the name of one trival king Ikshavaku. He was in North India. The name of the son of Ikshavaku is not remembered by me. The name of his grandson is also not known to me. But I can remember, if it is mentioned. Similarly the name of the son of his great-great grandson is also not remembered but can be remembered if mentioned by some one. The names of the sons in further genealogy is not known. I have heard the name of Ram. There had been many Ram in History. There had been yet another Ram to whom superstitious people (again said) I will call them superstitious – call Bhagwan Ram also. The name of his father was Dashrath. The name of the father of Dashrath was Aaj. The name of Aaj's father is not remembered, perhaps it was Dalip or Sagar. The name of Aaj's father is not remembered but the name of one of their ancestor Raghu is remembered. The name of Raghu's father is not known and it is not essential also. The relation of these, Ram and Raghu, dates back to Ikshvaku, which is called to be belonging to Raghuvansh and Ikshvaku Vansh. It is wrong to say that I took unduly long time to Answer this question. It is wrong to say that there is any allergy to me from this Ram or his Vansh. I have no allergy from the existing Hindu religion. I have no allergy from Islam either.

I have read about Gahadwal Vansh in History. It was also a RajVansh. I do not remember the name of first King of this Vansh. This Vansh started from 11th century and there had been Raja Chandra Dev, Govind Chand etc., Kings of this dynasty. The rule of this dynasty started from the later half of 11th century and lasted upto 12th century. They were in India only. The boundary of their Rule was from Kashi to Delhi. Their boundary was from Nepal in north to Vindhya Range in South. Chandrawati thoughts light on the copper Plate inscriptions Vansha. No inscriptions were

traceable about this kingdom. In addition to that there is a book on secondary works known as History of Gahadwal, which is written by Prof. Rima Niyogi. It is the study of that period of rule, which was written later on. During this period a poet Bhati Laxmidhar was popular. He has written a book namely Kritya Kalparu which contains the extracts of all other books. This book has many chapters. It can be said that each chapter compiled is an independent booklet. One of these books is a Dan Kand. One is Shradh Kand and also one a Tirath Vivechan Kand. I have read Tirath Vivechan kand and studied it from critical angle. The name of Ayodhya comes in this book. But no reference has been made about the birth place of Rama in this book. The main sacred places appeared to me in this book were Guptar Ghat, Swarga Dwar, Saryu Ghaghara Sangam etc. Name of Hanuman Garhi didn't appear in those books. This book was written during the middle of Rule of Raja Govind Chandra and Raja Chandra Dev. In those book there is no mention of any king having come to Ayodhya.

I have not heard any book in the name of Lat Melak. It is not known amongst the Historians as well. Lat mean hair, It may be lock of hair, and the meaning of Melak is to join. I cannot accept this that the meaning of Melak may be conference of Rascals. When I did not read this book, I did not hear about it, then I cannot Answer that what detailed interpretation is that of rascals (Dhoorat). I do not know that in this book a person standing as a false witness is kept in the category of rascals i.e. those giving false evidence on oath are called rascals.

The capital of Gahadwal dynasty was Kashi. It may be possible (againsaid) it is correct that their capital was Kanauj, which was called Gadhipur. It is wrong to say that my first statement that their capital was kashi was false. It is correct that in their rule Ayodhya was known as Kaushal, which was a big area.

The kings of Gupta dynasty were the worshipers of Vishnu and were also worshipping other Devi, Devtas. It is correct that there is a faith in Hindu Dharma that the son of Dashratha Shri Rama was the incarnation of Vishnu Bhagwan. But this faith is of recent origin. This faith is continuing for four five hundred years.

Question :Is the faith that Sri Ram Bhagwan was the incarnation of Vishnu originated before the year 1520 or after that?

Answer: This faith, in a mild way though was from many centuries but its propagation and spread increased manifold between 16th and 17th centuries.

This recognition was continuing in a mild way since 6th, 7th century, after Gupta period, its clear cut shape was promoted during 16th-17th centuries by the propagandist of Bhakti movement. It is correct that it could be the same period in 16th century when Babar came to India, I mean to say it is the period after the attack of Babar. This period continued upto the period of Emperor Aurangzeb.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-
Suresh Chandra Mishra
3.8.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us . For futher cross examination on 4.8.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-
3.8.98

Dated 4.8.1998

(In continuation of 3.8.1998 P.W.13 Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra's statement on oath begins).

In Gahadwal dnasty there had been a king chandra Dev also. There was also King Govind Chandra but that Kind came after King Chandra Dev. In addition to the books there are about 70 or 76 records available to know the history of this dynasty. No idol of that period is available. The temple of that period do exist but it is not known if some inscription/engravings are available or not.

There is a place known a Garhwa is Allahabad. It has its historical importance. No idol with a bow with arrow was found there. I never went to Garhwa. Now existence of idols, is known to me only through the books. No such idol was seen in any Museum as well. Its reference did not come in any index list. Raja Chandra Dev had gone to Ayodhya. He had gone to Guptar Ghat in Ayodhya. With Guptar Ghat I mean swaragdwar. It is wrong to say that my knowledge on this subject is based only on the booklet brought out by S/Shri R.S.Sharma, Prof. Atahar Ali, Prof. Suraj Bhan and Prof. D.N.Jha. I on the basis of my investigation and research, examine the opinion of others. The above mentioned booklet is a sort of report which, as per my earlier statement, was given to the Govt. of India. The name of that report is "A Historian report to the Nation". But in this report letter 'A' had not been used. I do not know about the fact whether this report was not requisitioned by the Govt. of India from them or the report was given by these authors to the Govt. themselves. I cannot say with certainty that the report was given on 13th May, 1991.

I have sent the copy of report annexed with file of the court and paper No.117/C-1/96, case No.5, in the first page after the title, page the date for submission of the report has been mentioned as 13th May,1991. I do not know if the talk between Vishwa Hindu parishad and babri Action committee had been over by 26th January, 1991. But it is certain that the talk had been over before submission of this report. I cannot say with certainty whether this talk was continuing through the Govt. of India. That Govt. had fallen by 13th May,1991 or declaration for holding fresh elections had been made. I consider as correct, what ever is written in introductory pages no.3,4 and 5, in this booklet. I have read it.

Question : After reading page No.5, and para No.3,4 and annexed with it, did you arrive at the conclusion that this report was written for the Government of India or for bringing it to the notice of Public?

Answer: As per my understanding this report was submitted to the Government of India also and after its publication it was meant for intellectuals, Historians and general public, it is meant for the international world.

The book was got published by Shri Sita Ram Dewedi, Advocate, High Court. In this connection I have also read the report of B.B.Lal I do not remember if or not any reference about the report of B.B.Lal has appeared in this book let. But it is certain that his views about Ayodhya excavation have been contested.

Shri B.B. Lal had dug pits at many places for excavation in Ayodhya. One of such pit was near the existing structure only four Mtrs. Away on right side. One

pit was dug at Kuber Tila. The pits were dug at many places, which I do not remember now. The Kuber Tila is on the western side of disputed structure. I have read the report of Shri B.B.Lal, published from time to time. I agree with his views published before 1990 in Manthan but I do not agree with the views published in this magazine subsequently. They did to say anything on pillars bases in their earlier expressed opinion but subsequently they spoke about the pillar bases and their link with the outer walls of the mosque as well as of four levels in sequence.

One magazine is brought out in the name of Indian Archaeology A review. On the basis of request made by the learned Advocate the attention of the witness was drawn towards the file, suit No.5/1989 and the papers No.197-C-1/62-63. The witness went through both the pages).

Question : Are the pages you have seen, are the pages No.52 and 53 of the Indian Archaeology 1976-77 A review, which are paper No.62 and 63 of the court?

Answer It is correct.

Question : Is is told about the excavation of Ayodhya on page No.53?

Answer: Everything is O.K. But I have objection for two things. The report Early Historic period and late medieval period take one to the opposite directions from what they want to say. Both these words are misnomer i.e., wrong for any student of history in this context.

I have not read any book namely History versus casuistry. I have read the excavation report published in this magazine by Banaras Hindu University before 1989,

and that excavation work was about the far off places from the disputed site at Ayodhya itself. But I did not read any report about the excavation of disputed site, published before 1989.

As per my studies Babar had passed through Avadh. This incident pertains to around 1528. I shall not be able to tell its Hijri year. The disputed structure was constructed in 1528. It is also said as on which date in 1528 the construction was completed but, that is not remembered by me now. It is written in the appendix of a document. With reference to the disputed site, the importance of 935 Hijri was read by me somewhere, but I do not remember that at present. I had made on the spot study also about the disputed site. From historical point of view, the important thing I saw was the dome of the structure. The leaves of flowers, triangle, its courtyard, the tiger on the outer wall and the lower portion of the mosque, a Muslim glazed were all were engraved on it, which proved that the structure was a mosque.

Question :In addition to the things quoted above did you or did you not find any important thing or sign on the structure from the point of view of an historian?

Answer: The things mainly seen by me, have already been discussed. There was no other important thing or sign available.

I have heard the word Gaji. It means a liberal person. I have also heard the word Kalandar but I do not know its exact meaning. I have not tried so far to know the meaning of this word but I will do so in future.

I have read the book written by Ms. Bewriej Memoirs of Babar. I do not remember if word Kalandar had been used in that book, in the context of disputed site.

(The attention of the witness was drawn towards page 656 of the above mentioned book which is a paper No.107-C-1/71 in the suite file No.5/89 at the instance of Learned Advocate).

I have read page no.656 of Babarnama which is written by Ms. Bewriej. I agree with its main contents but I did not agree with its footnote, because that is the result of writer's illusion. I have read this whole book. I have also read the next page of this very book (the Inscriptions of Babars Mosque in Ayodhya (Avadh). It is shown as page 77 in Roman. I have also read the next page, which in Roman is page 78. Whatever is written in it, is related to the disputed site but its footnote is the own assumption of the auther. I have also read its next page 79 (in roman). Whatever is written at page 79 is related to the outside of the disputed site. It has nor relation with the disputed structure. (Again said the document shown at page 78 are also referred at page 79, which are related to the disputed structure). Earlier I had wrongly understood it for outside the Mosque. At roman page 77 of this book there is mention of the disputed structure. In it there is no mention of inscriptions in the disputed structure. The inscription shown by the author in it, were on the top of the mosque, on the building, which was part of the building . When I went on the spot, I considered he inceptions also important. But these were in Arbi, because it is an additional and reliable information so I am telling it. In earlier told important signs and things, I had not made the mention of these. I had though got this additional reliable information much earlier, I did not make mention of it in my earlier statement but, it is

made in today's statement. These transcripts were in Arabic and I do not know Arabic. It is not that I habitually speak lie. I gave my statement in this court on 14.7.1998. In that I had got recorded this sentence "The inscription available there was in Pharsi but I already knew about it". But my today's statement is correct that the transcript was written in Arabic. In fact it was not the inscription, it was transcript. My earlier statement that it was in Pharsi, was wrong. It happened so because of error in understanding it. Reason being that neither I know Pharsi nor I know arbi. I do not know Latin language also. As it had no connection with Latin language, hence I did not get it written in Latin language.

I have gone through roman marked pages 77,78,79 of the above mentioned book. I have studied them. To read and to study is one and the same thing. I did not know the meanings of word Kalandar hence before. But the meaning of Kalandar word have been given at page 79. The use of this word has been made for Babar. On this page the meaning of Kalandar has been given as perfect devotee. I do not know if the meaning of word Gaji is Victorious Invader. I was not told by any one that the meaning of Gaji was liberal hearted and humble but I had assumed so by myself for the reason that this word was used on Mazaras where Hindus and Muslims all used to go so I assumed it like that. I, being an historian, assumed so because at my place of residence, there is a village nearby known as Sikandra where people from both the communities keep coming and going on the Mazar of Gaji.

I have not read any book of Nigrodh about whom I had referred in my statement given on 14.7.1998. I do not know the name of his father. It is correct that he was a Bhikshu Acharya. I do not know that he was the son of Suman. The

brother of Emperor Ashoka. It is a rumour that Ashoka had killed his brother Suman. I do not know if Nigordh had become Bhikshu at the age of 7-8 years. Monastery mean a Math or Vihar or Aram, where live Boadh Bikshu. It is wrong to say that I spoke lie in this matter that the Monasteries were set up by the follower of Gautam Budha. It is wrong to say that these were set up by Gautam Budha himself for the stay of Bhikshus. I have read it in different books and may be that it is mentioned by Prof. Romila Thapar in her book History of India. I Yunan there was one dynasty Yurtriskan. I cannot say with certainty that the period of this dynasty remained from 8th century B.C. to 5th century B.C. I did not read the book Ram Katha Kosh stated to be edited by Shri Bhagwati Prasad singh. I have no knowledge about the period of above mentioned dynasty. It is wrong to say that some pictures of Ram, Lakshaman and sita were found engraved o the potteries of their time. It is also wrong that the potteries of that period were found on which two monkeys were shown fighting with each other and one person with bow and arrow in hand standing behind the tree. It is wrong that the Muslim period in India remained from 1206 to 1765.

Archaeological survey of India which in brief in ASI was constituted at the ending part of 18th century. The first Director of this was Allexander Cuningum. I, in my statement on 14.7.1998, had wrongly stated the year of setting up of the Archaeological survey of India as 1934.

Question: Can you tell some reason of this mistake as well as that of mis-statement?

Answer: I would not have understood the context at that time.

It is wrong to say that I am habitual in making false statement to the Court even on oath or habitual in making statement on oath without thinking from all angles. I am not certain in myself that the ASI would have been constituted in 1861-62. 18th century ended by the end of 1799.

The Aine Akbari has also passed through my eyes and I have used that as well. I have studied it also. I do not remember if any mention of Ramkot or Ayodhya had come in it. I never saw any govt. Gazette i.e. Raj Patra about the disputed structure. As the Raj Patras pertain to much later date, they do not throw any light on this issue, hence to see them was not considered necessary. I have seen Gazettes. In respect of Ayodhya Faizabad. The oldest Gazetteer was of Newil. Before this it was of Hunter which was consulted by me but now I do not remember. I do not remember the year or Samvat of Hunter's Gazetteers but its title was something like Imperial. I cannot tell on the basis of date that the Nevil's Gazetteer was prepared in 1905. We do not know if Nevil had brought out a Gazetteer in 1928 also.

(On this point the attention of the witness was invited towards paper No.197-C-1/42 annexed with suit file No.5/1989 which clearly was a Faizabad Gazetteer Volume 43, prepared by Nevil).

I have studied page No.172,173,174 of Nevil's Gazetteer 1905. I do not agree with the facts mentioned in it. The reason of my not agreeing with it is that the Britishers wrote such a history with a view to divide Hindus and Muslims and 2ndly in the translation a comment has been given i.e. they have created and given recognition to such like history.

Question :Is there a book, the reasons for your disagreement?

Answer. There are many books.

As a book written by Vinsaint Smith. The name of his book is History of India but it is not remembered as in which century this book was written. The 2nd book is written by Tenpool. I cannot till the date of this also.

I have read the latest book also. The other names of the Ancient books, which I have studied with reference to it are not coming to my memory. The book written by Vinsaint Smith is not in the course for the student (against aid We do not suggest such kind of books for the students because the students are of very tender mind therefore, we do suggest them to follow a particular theory).

Question : Are the students of Post Graduate classes too are of tender mind?

Answer Comparatively they are mature.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

4.8.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. For further cross-examination on 5.8.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-

4.8.98

Dated 5.8.1998.

(In continuation of 4.8.1998 the statement of P.W.13 Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra start on oath).

I have read "Meaning of Quran" written by Piqthal. I have read only the introductory part of this book. I do not remember properly that the beginning of Quran Shrief has taken place from Laiheh Ul Allah Mohd. Rasool Allah. In this introductory part the author has made reference of Allah. I understood not from Allah but from Rasool Allah that it is name of Mohammad Sahab. I have not read the introductory completely. I have read in it how was Hajrat Paigambar Sahab born. I read about his geneology. I read about the circumstances in which he was born, the background of Mecca at that time, his religions differences thereafter and how was he able to proceed further. I have given my earlier statement correctly that I have read the extracts of Quran Shrief and to the complete book. The book I named today, is a newly book that I have read. I read this book after 15 July 1998. Keeping inview that I had committed some mistake, though I was not told about that by any one yet on my own I feet that I had committed mistake so I studied this new book.

The process I adopted for the intensive study of this Mosque was its structural get up, transcription, Muslim glazed wares, it's courtyard etc. etc., I had read a book on the construction style of the mosque. The name of that book is Indian Architecture Volume 2 by Parsi brawan. In this regard it is not an original but a secondary work, which is considered to be adequately reliable. There comes the reference of construction style of a mosque in the book History of Arabas also. I do not remember if I have read in that book that how. Why and where the mosque should be constructed. I did not read any such thing in that book as

where the mosque should not be constructed. Constructing a mosque means to do Ibadat. I only know this meaning and none else. The main features of the mosque are that there should be its structure i.e., its courtyard should be towards east, there should be dome on it. Later on minarets also started to be built. There should also be a pulpit on it. These are only the main features, maybe a few more. It has not come to my knowledge that there could be a mosque without structure also. The Minars were started from Mughal period (again said). The Minaras in large number were started to be built from Mughal period but Minars used to be there even before. The beginning of Mughal period started from Babar when he came to India. I have not read any more books on Islam.

I understand Urdu language a little bit but I do not know Urdu. During my research when I saw inscriptions there first of all, I did not call anybody to read them for me. I did not make a copy of those inscriptions on the paper. I did not take any photograph also. I had taken the book along. I had taken the book of Bewriej only along. It is the same book the reference of which has come in my statement several times. These are the same inscriptions, which were shown at roman page 77 to 79 of the book shown to me yesterday. I tallied these inscriptions in the book with inscription on the spot and arrived at the conclusion that this was the same Masjid. These happenings are of the year 1989 or 1990 but I shall not be able to tell the exact date. I had gone on this spot several times earlier also but in connection with the research I went there only first time in 1989 when its disputes had already arisen. I do not remember the date and month of arisen of this dispute, therefore I cannot say whether or not it started in the end of October or in the beginning of November. But it is confirmed that I went to the spot for

doing research only after the dispute had arisen. I did the inspection of this disputed building from all the four sides. I remained there for about an hour. It is wrong to say that I speak lie in the matter. It is wrong to say that there was some prohibitory order or ban or some kind of restriction to go on the spot from the Govt., after arising out the dispute. (again said). When I went for research, I kept all my belongings outside the complex and went inside it only empty handed and I took back my belongings when I came out. I had kept all my belongings including one book, with my colleague outside the complex at a place where the police was conducting check. The name of my that colleague was Maharandin Patel. Now he has died. The Police had set up their checking point but at a place adjacent to the road, at a distance of 15-20 meters from the boundary of the complex on the eastern side where my colleague had stopped. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie in the matter.

Question. Did you compare the style and script of inscriptions given in the book kept outside the complex with that of the inscriptions inside building after you came out?

Answer. I did the tally work after coming out. I made myself fully conversant before I went inside.

Before going inside I recorded in my mind the inscriptions the style and script given in the book and after going inside the building I compared them with the inscriptions available inside the building and similarly the inscriptions and their style and script installed in the building I recorded in my mind and compared with the inscription given in the book after coming out.

Question: Is the style, for the research of this kind in laid or not for an Historian Researcher?

Answer: In addition to the laid down procedure, for understanding the factual position the Historian is free to adopt this unique style here and there.

It is wrong to say that I speak lie in the matter. I did not say in my earlier statement that the Rule of Ashok remained from 271 B.C. to 269 B.C. In fact his rule, starting from 269 BC or 273 B.C., remained for 24 or 28 years. My statement of dated 14.7.1998, which is written on page 9 of para 2 of this court i.e. 271-269 is correct. His four years Rule is under dispute. This disputed period is from 273 to 259 B.C. My statement of today is correct my statement of 14.7.1998 is correct because the scholars have different opinion in this regard. I do not agree that the rule of Emperor Ashok remained from 271 B.C. to 232 B.C. Coronation and Accession to the throne is one and the same thing. There is no difference in them. It takes place at the same time, though there is a difference. It is wrong to say that Ashoka's accession to throne took place in 271 B.C. His coronation took place in 269 B.C.

I have read in History of Arabs and meaning of Quran by Pikthal that the compilation of Revelations, which came down to Hazrat Mohd. Sahab, was prepared by his followers. I do not remember the names of those followers who prepared the compilation. The reference of Paigambers was also read by me in these books. The History of Arabas commands reliability amongst Historians. It is considered authentic.

According to Anushruties the compilation of Ramayana was done on river Tamsa, which flows I south of Ayodhya. There are other opinions for different places

also. As per my opinion it could not be established historically as to where the compilation took place. According to one of the opinion the place where compilation took place is also known as Tons. Tons is the name of a river. In my opinion Tamsa and Tons are two different rivers. But some people treat them one river only. I have not read that Valmiki had compiled his Ramayana at the confluence of two rivers (again said) At present I do not remember If I have read it. I do not remember it that Valmiki had written Ramayana at the confluence of two rivers Ghaghra and Tons. My statement given on 14.7.1998, that as per Anushtuti and old books Valmiki had compiled this book on Tamsa river, is correct statement. I have read many old books but I do not remember their name. I had read all these books and at present I remember the name only of Adhyatam Ramayana and the rest I am not able to locate i.e., these are not coming to my memory at present. The name of the author of Adhyatam Ramayana is not being recollected by me at present. It was compiled around 13th or 14th century. I have read Valmiki Ramayana. It is originally written in Sanskrit language, I have read that in Sanskrit language. There is a mention of Ayodhya in this Ramayana. There is a mention of Rama. I do not remember at present if the mention of death of Rama has made or not. According to this book Rama was born in Kaushal. It is correct that Valmiki in his Ramayana has made the mention of Ayodhya at many places but when it came to the birth of Rama, he used the word Kaushal. In my opinion the birth place of Rama could be Ayodhya (again said though it is a matter of dispute as to which Ayodhya that was). It is correct that it took some time to Answer the question but it happened so because it is a disputed matter. To my knowledge, Babri Masjid too is a matter of dispute, here in the court (again said but it was a Masjid in fact). Astitva means existence. It is not that I drew my conclusion about

the Masjid just by seeing the situation. It appeared a Masjid prime facie and later on after examining the record and other materials, I made up my opinion that it was a Masjid. It is wrong to say that I, in order to make up my opinion, used the unique style, which I have referred in my earlier statement (again said) that unique style alone was not the only basis of forming the opinion. In addition to the in unique style, the basis was also the opinion of the scholars in general.

I have studied Vendant. The philosophy of Vendant is that it speaks of God, it speaks of universe, it speaks of creation. I do not remember at present so I am not able to Answer this question that in vendant the word God was to used. Which word has been used in its place, is also not remembered by me (again said) perhaps Brahm or Brahman word has been used. The word universe has been used by me which in Hindi is called jagat. As far as I remember in Vedant the word jagat has been used in place of universe. In the philosophy of Vendant I did not red word Brahmand anywhere. In place of word creation, in Vedant word Jeev has been used. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie on the subject, out of prejudice. In my knowledge there is no book in the name of Vendant, Vedant is a Philosophy about which many books have been written. I do not remember now that in which book the philosophy of Vendant is available, (again said) I do not remember in which original books it is available. I do not teach philosophy rather I teach history, therefore, I do not remember every thing, but I have definitely read it. I remember only the important things which I have read and the rest are to remembered. It is correct that it was not necessary to remember the name of different books on Vedant philosophy, hence I do not remember the names Veda is a collection of hymns (Mantras) of the people of the time (again said of Rishies).

In veda, the word Richa has been used. Richa means Mantra. I have read Veda also. I have read Veda from historical point of view. Vedas are in number. Broadly the compilation period of Rigveda is 1500 B.C. to 1000 B.C. It can broadly be said between 1700 B.C. to 1000 B.C. My opinion is based on the study of various books in Sanskrit. Maxmular is a German Scholar who invented Vedas. He has expressed his opinion on the creation period of Rigveda. According to him the Rigveda was created before 1700 B.C. I would not be able to tell correctly at present that how old this creation period would be Bhasha Shashtra is called linguistic. I am unaware of a linguist namely Prof. S.S. Mishra. The Vedas are in the old Sanskrit language. There was an Eminent Scholar of Sanskrit namely Panini. In my knowledge he did not determine any compilation period for Rigveda. The main subjects of Rigveda is the prayer of Devtas. Simultaneously it thoughts light also on other social and economic matters. Rigveda is divided into 10 Mandals. It is correct that the contents of the first mandal is related to the natural elements of mankind. In the natural elements, sun. Air and water etc. are included. I do not remember properly that its 2nd Mandal is related to the tradition of Yaggyas. I do not remember if there is any subject invoking nature in this mandal. Its third Mandal relates to the trade or not, is not known to me. I understand that these are regarding the prayer of Sutras and Devtas. I cannot say (again said) I do not agree that 4th Mandal, pertain to Raja, Praja, Brahaman, Yaggya, Dan, Cow, Ashwa, Krishi etc, Out of these, reference may come of Brahman, Dan, Cow, Ashwa and things relating to Agriculture. I cannot say with certainty that 5th Mandal could be related to the relations between the man and God. May be in 6th Mandal reference of things other than the mankind, such as idols etc. is discussed.

After going through above 6 Mandals of Rigveda. I found inclusion of Political, Social Religions and Economic Elements, as a source material for History but the main elements is regarding the prayer Devtas. I found this book mainly a religions book but other elements in it were only secondary.

The meaning of English word Deity is Devta. It s synonym is Dev and its reference in Veda has come several times. The reference of all Devtas has come Indra, Vayu and Varun, Agni, Surya, have been described as Devtas. In Rigveda the process of invoking them has been recommended through Yaggya. Their prayer is also given. The compilation of Rigveda was not accomplished under the regime of a King because there were no Regimes at that time.

The Ayatas in Quran Shrief come through revelation. The mention of descending is not there. In Regveda, the descending of Richas through Rishies is jnot mentioned, their appearance is also not mentioned. We the historian include the Rigveda in Pre vedic period. We include other Vedas in post vedic period. We see Upnishdas from all angles. We treat them religious political, social philosophical and relating to economic also. Upnishdas are very many but mainly these are called 108 or 111. But mainly these are said to be 11. Barring the main Upnishads, in the remaining 100 upnishads there is included Allah ho panishad also. I do not remember the name of its comiler but it was written during the period of Mughal. I think it was written during the period around Akbar. May be it is written during the regime of Babar or Jahangir. It was not written during the regime of Humanayu. I did not read Allah ho Panishad but have seen

the mention of it. I cannot say what are the contents of this Upanishad. I have not seen the size of this book. It is wrong to say that I am giving this statement to hurt the sentiments of some particular community. It is also wrong to say that I am giving this statement in order to do sycophancy of some particular community. (Again said) In my capacity as Historian, neither I praise somebody nor I unnecessarily criticize any body.

Question: Being a specialist historian you are giving wrong statement on oath, in respect of that book which you have neither seen or read. You do not know its contents either?

Answer: It is not correct to say that I did not read it (again said). It is wrong to say that I did not read its reference.

I had given the statement in this court some time back that I am a man of scientific temperament. I also had said that I make up my opinion after due consideration and studying the matter alongwith its secondary sources. It is correct that I have given the statement on the basis of only secondary sources on oath without examining of this book Allah ho Panishad.

I have also read Kathopnished. It is counted in 11 original upnishads as well as in the remaining 100 upnishads (Againsaid) I count it in 11 original upnishadas and not in the remaining 100 upnishadas. It indirectly and to directly refers to the conduct of human beings. It is wrong to say that I Kathopnishad, there is a reference of anymatrimonial relations. It is also wrong to say that it contains the reference regarding the duties and integrity of wife towards her husband. It is also wrong to say that it

contains the reference about how and why the child be produced. There maybe some indirect reference regarding what should be the general behaviors of man but such a reference regarding what should be the general behaviors of ma but such a reference is not there directly. It means the things are discussed there indirectly and not directly. The main subject of this is achievements for the other world and in this world and the Bhakti towards the God. God mean Brahaaman. Brahamaan and Braham are separate words. Their meaning is the same. The name of both became Bhagwan later on. Universe means Jagat. It can also be called Bramhand. It is correct that t6he evolution of word Bramhand took place from Bramh.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

5.8.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us . For further cross-examination on 6.8.1998 .Witness be present.

Sd/-

5.8.98

Dated 5.8.1998

(In continuation of 5.8.1998, the statement of P.W.13 Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra on oath begins).

The main aim of 11 upnishdas amongst the upnishdas, is to make search for the knowledge and with the medium of them to know about the universe and the supreme reality which is an ultimate reality. It was the thinking of people of those days. I do not agree with these ideas. Being an historian I use them as sources. In these 11 upnishdas, first name is of Kathopnishad and not that of Ishopnishad. I did not read ishopnishad. I did not read Mundkopunished completely but read its excerpts only.

Question :Do you agree or not with the ideas given in the excerpts of Mundkhopnishda?

Answer: I accept them as a source material of history.

(On this point the learned Advocate drew the attention of the witness towards Shloka no.6 of Mundkopnishad. The witness studied the book and read the Shloka).

I agree with first two lines of the Shloka in which it is written that-“ Satyamev jayati natratam, satyem pantha vitto devyan” Its meaning is the truth only wins and not the falsehood. The sacred people follow the path of truthfulness. It is wrong to say that I have not told the meanings of these two lines correctly. The simple meaning of is “Sacred people go on”. This Shloka is not acceptable as a source of history rather it can be an acceptable in human conduct. I myself accept this as human conduct.

The first Shlok of Ishopnishada is-

“Isha vasyamid sarvam yatkinch jagatya jagat
Ten tyakten munjiya ma gutha kasya swidhanam”

I have read the shloka from the book obtained from the learned Advocate. (This book was given to the witness for reading). I do to subscribe to the theory given in the shlok. The word “Jagatya jagat “ which has come in it, does not mean here “Jagat and beyond jagat i.e. universe and beyond universe”. The meaning of this shlok in simple language is All the things or creatures should be used with abandonment but without any attachment for them because there is no ownership right on them of any one . “Isha vasya idam sarvam “ is not a correct line. In fact it should be “ Ishavasyamidam sarvam “ It means that Ishavasya in the biggest part of upnishada. It is wrong to say that the way I am telling the meanings of shlokas, I do not possess the knowledge of Sanskrit. There are o two opinion that by adjoining “ Ishavasyam idam sarvam” it has become “Ishavasyamidam sarvam “ but it is wrong to say that its meaning would be - “Ishwar yahan sab kuch chizo mein vyapta hai”(The God is present here in all the things).

I have studied Rigveda. It also has Purush Sukta.

Question :Whether or not there is description of Monotheism in above Purusk Sukta?

Answer: In this Purush Sukta, which was added at a later stage, the concept of monotheism can be accepted.

Question: I didn't ask here whether that concept can be accepted or not, my question is whether there is description of it or not?

Answer. It is correct that its description is there.

I cannot say that whether the episode of adding, which I have stated, took place before 1528 or after 1528 (again said). This episode took place after 1528 B.C. It happened before 1528 A.D. (Volunteer: it happened in post Vedic period). I shall not be able to tell the year, decade or century of this episode. It is correct that the Monism of Adi Shankaracharya was Monotheism. He did not have any other theory. The theory of his monism was that Atman and Bramh is one only. I have studied, though little bit, about Adi Shankaracharya and his monism. I give intensive reading only to some selected matters only, and not all and that is not possible also. I have some view point, some direction and some aim and therefore, I read only, that which is useful for me. My efforts with regard to the prosecution connected with this disputed structure and site is the keeping in view my aim, I should make intensive study. With my aim means the content of the case. It is wrong to say that that I did not go to the disputed site or place or I do not know anything about that, do not possess any knowledge of its topography and otherwise also I make false statements. It is wrong to say that I said something wrong that I had gone in 1966 or 1968 to that place alongwith my parents. It is also wrong to say that I made the false statement that when my parents went inside, I remained standing outside. It is correct that in 1966 and in 1968 there was lock on the outer main door of the disputed complex and no body could go inside.

It is wrong to say that I had made this false statement yesterday that when in 1989-90. I went to the disputed complex, I had to leave my belongings, which included one book also, outside, because, there was a police check post on the eastern side of the complex. It is wrong to say that this check post was on North East side of the disputed

complex. It is also wrong to say that I had spoken something wrong regarding the excavation done by B.B.Lal, which I stated, was done on southern side of the complex.

Ramanujacharya had come 100 or 50 years after Adi Shankracharya (again said) perhaps he came after more than 100 years). He propagates the theory of Monism. Vishistadwaitwad is also a theory. I have also read both these theories. Ramanujacharya was also the propagator of Vishishtadwaitwad. I cannot say if he was also the exponent of it. I cannot remember at this time as to who was its exponent. I did have read it. I had read it much earlier, therefore, I cannot tell what the theory of Vishishtadwaitwad is. I have also given by statement correct that Ramanujacharya had brought the theory of Dwaitwad.

I have heard the name of Madhwacharyaji. I had read that but it is not remembered now. In fact his name was Madhwacharya.

Madhwacharyaji also talk about Dwaitwad. He was talks about Adi Shankaracharya. He also talks about his theories. In Dwaitwad there are two separate ideologies One is of Bramhan and 2nd of individual – of creature.

Question :All the three theories i.e. Advaitwad, Vishishtadwaitwad and Dwaitwad talk about only Atma and Bramh and in which no person is included?

Answer I accept this considering Atma as Synonym of a person.

I have not investigated the issue that till such time man remains alive, his weight remains light and after death

the weight of his dead body increases. I cannot tell why it happens so. I never tried to know it.

The appearance of Adi Shankaracharya remained from 780 AD to 820 AD. Though I have read about him but cannot tell where from he belonged to. I cannot say what was his geneology. I have already stated that I had read the geneology of Hajrat Mohd. Sahab. But I did not read that for the reason that it might be helpful in the investigation of the dispute of this prosecution. In fact I read that for my knowledge and also studied that, considering that it had the relevance with this issue and not in connection with my teaching work.

Question :Except Hajrat Mohd. Sahab the geneology of how many great persons you read other than pertaining to your subject?

Answer: I have read the geneology of Jawahar Lal Nehru, Mahatma Gandhi and many others.

I do not remember the name of grandfather i.e., father's father of Jawajar lal Nehru and it is not essential to keep it remember. It is wrong to say that I speak lie. It is also wrong to say that I am habitually a liar. It is also wrong to say that I am giving this statement at the instance of some vested interests.

(At this stage the learned Advocate invited the attention of the witness towards his statement on 167.7.1998 at page No.53, the witness read the statement. Similarly the attention of the witness was drawn towards his statement on the same day at page No.52, which also was read by the witness).

I accept this that I had said in my statement on 17.7.1998 that the History of India Volume I written by Prof. Romila Thapar, was reprinted in 1976. I agree with its page No.183 to 187. I had also said that what ever is written on these 4 pages is correct. (At this point the learned Advocate drew the attention of the witness towards page 184 of the book referred to above. The witness read that page).

I have read page 184 of the book shown to me. The Writer in the last para of the page had written that they were Shake, Kushan and later on Hoon Mallechchh. I have also said in my earlier statement and I say it to day also that they were not Mallechchh. I had given completely correct statement and I agree with Romila Thaper with what she had written at page No.183 to 187 and what ever she has written, it all is correct only. I have read page No.185 again today. Similarly I have again read page no.186 and 187. I remember that I had got written at apge 52on 17.7.1998 that Alwar was also a Shaiv. After studying the History of Romila Thapar I feel that my statement was wrong that Alwar was also a Shaiv. Since the Bhakti movement was proceeding ahead fast, therefore I could not assess the clear difference. I am not so conversant with regard to Tamil Shrotas.

According to my information I had given correct statement the other day that 'It is wrong to say that I had spoken lie that Alwar was a Sant and Shaivite. I have spoken true to the best of my information. Even now I shall not be able to say with certainty that Alwar are called Shaivite Sants or Vaishnavite Sant. (Volunteer: that in the beginning phase of the Bhakti movement this difference was not clear but later o when Alwar Sant were established, they might be called the vaishnavite. However,

I do not contest the opinion expressed by Prof. Romila Thapar). I had given the statement on 17.7.1998". that we do not know about any Vaishnav who would have emerged from there. I did not hear the name of any Nambalawar or Navalwar. But perhaps the reference at that time was different and I might have given my statement in that context. But I have given the interpretation of my statement the same day. I had also given the statement that " I had heard the name of Nambalwar Sant, he was Shaiv, I do not know if he was Vaishnava. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie". It is correct that Prof. Romila Thapar has written at the end of page 186 to the beginning of page 187, in her above book that Alwar were Vaishnavite Sants. It is correct that on page No.187 itself Prof. Romila Thapar has also written that Nambalwar had prayed Vishnu and they had prayed Vishnu as a woman.

I had also given a statement on 17.7.1998 that "I did not hear about any Tripurari Prabandh". I also gave the statement that" in the process of my intensive study I have read and consulted the book "History of India" by Romila Thapar. I have seen page No.187 today again, in which Prof. Romila Thapar has written about the Trimurari Prabandh. And on the same page she had also referred about Upper. Prof. Romila Thapar has written on this very page that amongst the Shaiv Sants, Most popular were the Upper (it is said about them that they converted the religion of Raja Mahendra Varman). On this page and in the same sentence the author has also referred Sant Mannika Sagar. What ever she has written in bracket, that is an important thing and I would like to tell that it is important because it is a rumour. I had given absolutely correct statement on 17.7.1998 that "I do not know any Sant in the name of Mannika Sagar. I did not hear his name and had he been so popular, I should have known

him, he was not popular". I confirm this statement even today. On that day I had also said that " I do not know any Devta called as Upper. I do not know about any such Sant as well. However I do not know about Ayyappa".

Question : I understand that you did not study intensively the book History of India, particularly pages 183 to 187, by Prof. Romila Thapar?

Answer: It is wrong to understand so became it is not necessary that what ever I have studied, should be learnt by me by heart. My intensive study did not relate to this issue directly.

It is wrong to say that I while making my statement on oath have said carefully, in a casual manner, without understanding it properly, that I have studied intensively the book written by Prof. Romila Thapar.

Question : May it not be so that in above 4 pages i.e. page No.184 to 187, Prof. Romila Thapar, in order to contain the Vedic traditions and to keep it alive and also to strengthen it, has referred the religious movement started by the Brahmnas in the book "A History of India"?

Answer. It is true that Prof. Thapar in her book has written about going to South India by the Brahmanas, the so called guardians of the Vedic Traditions of Aryans, but I consider this process as the work both of coordination and development.

In these pages Prof. Thapar has referred about the appearance of Adi Shankaracharya.

Ramanandji came after Ramanujacharya but I am not able to recall, after how much time he came. Since I do not want

to apply guess, hence I cannot say as after how many years, decades or centuries, Ramanandji, came after Ramanujacharya. In the course of my intensive study, I have read that Adi Snakracharya propagated his theories and ideas by visiting North India. He went there from South. I did not know properly whether or not he went to the Eastern and Western parts of the country. Except Sant Kabir I did not know about any other disciples of Ramanandji. I have heard the name of Sant Ravidas. He is called as Sant Raidas as well. I might have read something about Sant Raidas but it is not remembers to me at present. It is a matter of dispute if or not sant Raidas was also the disciple of Ramanadji. I know that in any dispute, there are at least two parties. I did not know any such Historian who calls Sant Raidas his disciple. I do not know the names of those scholar Historians who say that Sant Raidas was not the disciple of Ramanand. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie in the matter. I have read about Sant Raidas. But I do not remember where from he belonged to I have also read about Ramanandji. He hailed from North India. He hailed from the Antar Vedi of Ganga and Yamuna. That land is called antar Vedi which lie between the tract of two rivers. I cannot say definitely, which place or city was his birth place.

His headquarter was at Kashi. He used to do the work of propagation and development of his math and, therefore, he had opened his headquarter. I have no knowledge about his representatives. I have no where read that Adi Shankracharya and Raidas had debated on the scriptures. I have not read it any where that Sant Raidas i.e. Sant RaviDas had himself gone to Ramanandji and requested him to make him his disciple. The panth of Ramanadji started by his name, Panth is called sect in English. This Panth was social and religious. It was more a

socil than religious. These people were against the evil practices of that time. They were against the discrimination of low and high but they recognized their religious sect and propagate that also. They were Vaishnavites. Adi Shankracharya used to recognize Nirgun Bramha. Prof. Romila Thapar in her book "History of India" would have told where would Adi Shankaracharya hailed from but I do not remember it now. I have not tried myself to know about it so far but I will do that now. I study allthe books in this regard. I have read in many books about the birth place of Adi Shankarachayra but I am not able to locate which book that was or in which particular book the reference about his birth palce has been made. It has never been my intention to hide the material facts deliberately.

When Adi Shankaracharya came to North India, he set up Bardikashram. I have no knowledge that he had tried to bring coordination between Shaivites and Vaishnavites. It is heard that Adi Shankaracharya had a Math in Kamkothi also. In Rameshwaram also there is a Math but I do not know if or not that was set up by Adi Shankracharya. I have given statement earlier that I have traveled South India and seen all the temples. I go right inside the temples and Garbha Griha and talke prasad. I accept whatever prasad, I am given. I talke that prasad with my sweet will. I talek that prasad just for eating. By taking prasad neither I shower faith I the idols installed I the temples nor I feel like doing some sacred act. I take estables there and examine the structure of the temples and the idols and see and understand their beauty.

The Alok Shankari temple in Prayag where I hail from, has not been seen by me. I do have gone to Alopri Bagh. It is not that I being an atheist fro the very beginning. I did not go to that temple. Except the disputed Masjid I have never seen an idol of a Dwarpal in any other mosque and I

did not see any Dwarpal in the disputed mosque also. When I went into the disputed complex. I did not find any public convenience place. I did not see any well or tap for washing hands etc., there. I did not see any special marks or design or lines on the surface of the floor inside the mosque. My statement in this regard is quite correct.

There is an Amuluk constructed in a temple. It is right below the summit and there is nothing in between. Word Amluk is evolved from Amvla. Ambla is a fruit but it is wrong to say that Amluk is in the shape of half cut Amvla fruit. It is in the shape of complete Amvla. In fact it is a pressed, spread and flat shaped Ambla. I have seen such an Amluk in the temple of Pandleshwar Nath. This temple is situated in Allahabad itself. It is found in most of the temples in North India. The pandleshwar infact is not in Allahabad city rather it is in this district in a town. Its name could be Pandeshwar or Pandla. I cannot tell its police station or Tehsil but it is located at a distance 2-1/2-3 kms in north east side of Phaphamau station. One can go there both by rail or by road. That road goes to the side of Phoolpur from Allahabad via phaphamau. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie in this matter also. In fact I am saying correctly as per my memory.

I have not seen Mankameshwar temple situated at Allahabad. I have not seen any temple in Ayodhya where by just like pressing a complete Amvla a flat shaped Amluck has been constructed. It is correct that the construction of a temple is completed whenby constructing an Amluk, it is installed on the summit. (Volunteer: that these features are only for the temples in North India). The temples of this style, with these features, are not available in East, West or South India.

I have also gone to Kashi. I have seen the temples there. But many of the things are not remembered. It is not that my memory has failed in respect of temples of Hindus, Saints, Devi and Devta. In north India nothing sort of jagmohan is found in temples. Jagmohan is a part, a chamber. In Temple Garbhgrih is a very vital part. There is a main entrance in a temple. The place in between the garbhgrih and main entrance is called Mukh Mandap. If that part is not covered from the above by the floor then it would not be called much mandap. Rather that would be called clear sky. It is wrong to say that the place between main entrance and Garbhgrih is called Jagmohan. In addition to these main features and elements there is another necessity for the temples in North India and that necessity is the place where the people. In addition to this there should be idols in a temple. There is a finial of the shape of a picture that is placed above the amvta. Amvta means amluck. There should be building also. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie in the matter.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

6.8.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. For further cross-examination on 7.8.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-

6.8.98

7.8.1998

(In continuation of 6.8.1998 P.W. 13, Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra's statement on oath begins.)

The Pindeshwar temple which I have referred, the main deity there is that of Shankar. It is called Shankarji. I am not particular to suffixji with him.

(At this stage the learned Advocate drew the attention towards paper number 118 C-1/35 which is in case file no.5/1989. The witness inspected the same.)

I have understood the paper shown to me carefully. This paper is in a pamphlet form. I have seen its page no.7 and the figures drawn on it. These two pictures are big in size and in addition to this another one is a small in size. I do not agree that the bigger size picture shown in the upper side and which is yellow coloured, cannot be of an amluck. It appears to me a copy of something having leaves. I do not keep magnifying glass all the time with me. It is not with me even at present. I have seen the big figure which is a black coloured and on the same page. On its structure, on the upper side something like the part of an amluck appears, as I see it.

(At this stage the learned Advocate gave him a magnifying glass with the help of which the witness saw it and examined the black figure).

On seeing with the help of magnifying glass there appears a picture that of the shape of an amluck on the upper part of it. Seeing the picture by the magnifying glass in addition to the above mentioned amluck, there appear another four figures of the shape of amluck. After seeing these four, these are not appearing like the shape of

pressed Amvala. I have also seen the picture made lengthwise on page No.8 of this booklet on right side in a black shade with a magnifying glass, but it cannot be said with certainty that it is the picture of a pillar made of stone. It is appearing the figure of an illusory type of a temple. In place of illusory, the word illusion can also be used. Volunteer: that with the body of a temple, a thin line is going up to the top and there is a design of flowers made on it. On the lower portion of this picture there is one figure and it appears to be a figure of a man, but I cannot say clearly what this figure is. I cannot say with the help of a magnifying glass whether or not it is a figure of a man, but it can also be called a figure of man. It is wrong to say that I am completely hesitating in speaking truth on the point. I have examined both the figures on page 10 of this booklet with the magnifying glass. Both these pictures are made on a piece of a rock. On its right hand picture, the figure of man is engraved inside the stone. This figure can be a devine and can also be a semi devine. With engraving means it is dug on the stone, but its features appear like a human figure. I have examined the picture made on the left hand side on this page carefully. On its lower portion there is a man like figure. It cannot be said categorically that immediate above on this picture and up to the end, the tiny figures appear to be of some celestial maidens (Dev Kanya) and faires (Apsaras).

I have not seen in any of the temples of Hidus, the picture as told on page 10 above. I have not seen such pictures in mosques also. Not even seen in any Church or Gurudwara. Did not see such pictures in any Buddhist Monestry as well. I did not see such engraved picture on the stones in any religious place. It is not essential that (Gate keepers) are engraved on the main gates of Hindu temples. It is also not essential that the pictures of celestial maidens

in different poses or in dancing poses are engraved on the main gates. I did not see the pictures shown as it is inside the disputed building. I did not see such pictures on the main gate also of the disputed building. I did not see any dwarfpal engraved in the mosque. I did not see any dwarfpal made on the mosque.

My meaning with the complex of mosque in question, is with the mosque and its outer walls. The entire complex in between that wall is considered by me as the complex of the mosque. I have said in my statement before that I saw in the mosque pillars made of basalt. Basalt a granite stone, which is of black colour. It is also in green colour(again said that I have not seen the basalt stone in green colour but I have heard only). I would have read somewhere in some book. I have got the opportunity to read about it some authentic book but since it was not my subject, hence I did not try to know whether the basalt stone in green colour is there or not. I had seen the basalt stones in black colour in the disputed building. These were the pillars of stone. There is no Hindi word for Basalt. (May there be a Hindi word, but I do not know). I have also read books in Hindi on Ancient Indian History and Archaeology. I have read many books written in Hindi I had read these books between 1968 and 1970 and now also we keep reading here and there. I have read the book Ancient Indian History written by Dr. Vimal Chand Pandey about this Book Pracheen Bharat written by Prof. R.S.Sharma and Puratatva Vimarsh by Dr. Jai Narayan Panda, have been read by me. I have not read any book written by Netra Pande on this subject. As far as I remember in these books. I did not find the mention of Kasauti Pathar I did not find any mention of word Kasauti stone in any of the books read in English Language. I have heard the names of S/Shri Y.D.Sharma, S.P.Gupta, K.P. Nautiyal and Devendra

Swaroop Agarwal. But I agree with it that they all are the experts and scholars of Ancient Indian History. Out of this S/Shri K.M.Srivastava and Y.D.Sharma can be considered as the knowledgeable persons of Archaeology but they are not the scholars.

Question :Do you or do you not consider K.M.Srivastava and Y.D.Sharma in the category of scholars of Archaeology?

Answer As an excavator, I know both of them, but I do not consider them as scholars.

Question: Do you or do you not consider S.P.Gupta, Devendra Swaroop Agarwal and K.P.Nautiyal in the category of Scholars of Archaeology?

Answer: I do not consider Shri Devendra Swaroop Agarwal, Shri K.P.Nautiyal as scholars of history, at all. So far as S.P.Gupta is concerned, he has of course written some books but the view point developed by him on the subject of History and Archaeology, put question mark on his learning. Hence I am not prepared to accept him as a scholar.

Question :Have you heard the name of Sudha Mallaiya?

Answer: I have heard that name.

Question :Do you know what is she doing? Where does she live?

Answer: I have only heard that she know Art History but during recent year her image in my mind is that of a person who is damaging the history and archaeology. Though I am not aware of the publication of any of her book.

I have read Epigraphy a little bit (again said not a little bit but I have read it).

Question :Upto which class have you read Epigraphy?

Answer: I have read in M.A. and still I am reading.

Question If it is said that Dr.Sudha Mallaiya is an expert of Epigraphy, will it be correct or wrong?

Answer: With humility I accept myself as the person knowing Epigrpahy.

Question. The question put to you was, and I want to know also is. Whether or not you consider yourself an Expert of Epigraphy?

Answer: If it is not considered self praise then I humbly submit that you can put me in that category.

Question. Which is the language and script used in Gaharwal Regime?

Answer:. Sanskrit, in nagri Lipi.

Question During Gaharwal Rule do you get or do you not get any Rock Adics, Copper plate, Inscription, Shilalekh or Abhilekh?

Answer:. Neither we got any Rock Adicts nor any stone inscription. Copper plate inscription has been found.

Question: Tell the name of any King of Gaharwal Rule, upon whose copper plate inscriptions. You have done the work?

Answer: I have not done any work, I have only read it.

Question Some body else did the work and you read it?

Answer:. It is correct, I have read only.

Question: Did you also do the work on any inscription?

Answer: My complete thesis is on inscriptional study.

Question: Is your study relate to the Arthashastra of Kotilya?

Answer: It is related to the Arthashastra of Kotilya.

Question: Have you heard the name of Shardendhu Mukerjee?

Answer: I have heard.

Question: Is it related to or not to the Anciant Indian History?

Answer: It is not related to both these subjects. Both these subject are outside the their scope.

(At this stage the attention of the learned Advocate was drawn towards paper no.118 C-1/152, No. 152 to 156. This paper is attached to the case file No.589. The witness examined these pages).

Question: Have you seen and examine the list which is on page No.152 to 156 and shown to you just now?

Answer: I have seen it and also examine it.

Question: Of the list shown above, do you or do you not consider any person the experts of the Archaeology?

Answer: Some of these people are the experts of Archaeology (again said conversant with archaeology).

Question: Conversant mean knowledgable?

Answer:. Yes it is.

Question: Please tell after seeing the list again, to whom you consider the knowledgeable person in Archaeology?

Answer: Prof. R.N. Mehta, Prof. S.R.Rao,, Prof. S.N.Ray, like some eminent persons.

Question: Do not you want to tell the names of other persons or are you not able to read other people's name?

Answer: I can read and can tell also.

Question: Can you narrate any reason why did you not tell that so far?

Answer: I have told you some important names because they were closely relatedto Archaeology where as some people in my knowledge are not related to that extent.

Question: To what extent you give them the importance?

Answer: I give the importance to that extent to which they command respect amongst the people. Particularly the scholars.

Question: Are the persons whose names appear at S.No.1 in the list commands the importance amongst the scholars or not?

Answer: Prof. K.V.Raman, Prof. Of Ancient Indian History Culture and Archaeology. Since I do not have adequate knowledge about their works, therefore, I do not keep him in that category.

Question: See the name at Sl.No.2 of this list?

Answer: I have seen it.

Question: Do you keep them in the list of eminent persons or not?

Answer: A very obscure name is of Prof. A Saunder, Karntaka University. Dharvar. In the filed of archaeology, nothing substantial has come to the notice, so far as his contribution toward archaeology is concerned.

Question: Do you consider, Prof. Ajay Mitra Shastri Head of the Ancient Indian History Culture and Archaeology, Nagpur University, Nagpur at Sl.No.6 of this list in the eminent category or not?

Answer: He can be considered keeping in view his earlier contribution but during recent years his tendency towards history and archaeology has been unscientific and against the code of conduct, it is thus regretted to say that now I do not categorise him so.

Question: Do you keep Prof. Syam Kumar Pandey, Sagar University, Sagar M.P. at S.No.7 of this list, in this category or not?

Answer: I do not keep him in that category but I humbly submit that such like analyses by me would only help in going the people belonging to this discipline against me, hence my evidence be kept limited to the contents of the matter above.

Question: Do you or do you not keep Shri R.C.Agarwal former Director of Archaeology, Got. Of Rajasthan at Sl.No.10 of this list, in the eminent list?

Answer: He can be recognized as Art Historian.

Question: Do you or do you not keep Prof. D.P.Sinha, former Head of the department of Ancient History and Archaeology, Patna University, listed at S.No.14 of this list in eminent category?

Answer: In my opinion all the persons mentioned in this list have a contribution here and there.

Question: Have you seen or read any remarkable work of Prof. Harsha Narayan, Former Prof. Department of Philosophy Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, listed at Sl.No.19 in this list, on this subject?

Answer: As per my information he has no concern with history and archaeology, therefore, I cannot say any thing about it.

Question: Does Prof. T.P.Verma, Reader, Ancient Indian History culture and Archaeology Department Banaras Hindu University, Varansi listed at Sl.No.15 of this list, come I the eminent category?

Answer: No.

Question: Is Prof. K.S.Lal,. Former Head of the History Department Central University Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, listed at Sl.No.21 in this list, recognized in the eminent category or not?

Answer: No sir,

Question: Was Shri S.P.Gupta, whose reference had come earlier, the Director of Allahabad Museum.

Answer: . I have heard that he had been the Director.

Question: Do you know where does he live these days?

Answer: I have no information about this. No upto date information.

Question: You had told that you are the life member of an organization concerning History. Would you please tell its name?

Answer: Its name is Indian History Congress.

Question: Do you know or not that Shri S.P.Gupta is also the life member of the same Indian History Congress?

Answer: As far I remember, he is not its member.

Question: Do you know that above mentioned S.P.Gupta was being invited in the International History Congress?

Answer: As per my information there is no congress such as international History Congress so, the question going there does not arise.

Question: Have you attended any International Congress of history or not?

Answer: I attended World Archaeological Congress in Delhi.

Question: Was S.P.Gupta also there in that Conference?

Answer: Probably he was

(At this stage the learned Advocate drew the attention of witness towards the Album of coloured photographs of disputed complex and site, prepared by U.P.Archaeological Department. This Album was shown to the witness).

Question: Have you seen the picture No.39 and 40 of this Album with the ordinary eyes and with the help of magnifying glass?

Answer: Yes I have seen.

Question: Are both these photographs of the disputed building?

Answer: I cannot say categorically.

Question: Have you given this statement earlier or not that the Lions were installed on the main gate of the disputed building?

Answer: I have given this statement.

Question: Have you seen any or how many masjids so far where on the main gate or on any part of it, the lions are made?

Answer: I do not remember any.

Question: In the research or study of Archaeology, have you read in respect of any such mosque, where on the main or on any other part lions are constructed?

Answer: I do not remember any such thing.

Question: Have you seen the picture No.91,92,93 of this Album from simple eyes and with the help of magnifying glass carefully?

Answer: Yes I have seen but the picture is dim.

Question: Do you see any part of these three photographs on which some thing is written?

Answer: Some thing is written but it is not seen clearly.

Question: Could you guess in which script it is written if at all it is written?

Answer: It appears like the letters of Pharsi.

Question: Should I take it that it is written in Pharsi script?

Answer: It may be written but cannot say categorically.

Question: Do you feel it is Nagri Script?

Answer: No, Sir.

Question: Does it appear to you the English script?

Answer: No.Sir.

Question: Does it appear to you Brahmi or Kharoshithi script?

Answer: No, Sir.

Question: You being Researcher in history, may I tell you that there is no script as Persian, is it correct or not?

Answer: It may be so.

Question: Please see photograph 92,93 one again. In both these photograph, there is a specific place, where it appears that something is written there?

Answer: It is not clearly seen in photo No.92 but on photo No.93, it appears that something is written.

Question: Is the writing shown I these photographs and that writing which you saw on the spot and which you imprineted in your mind, appear to be the same?

Answer: I have already said that both these pictures are very dim.

Question: Are you not able to compare the space of writing of script in these photographs with the script seen on the spot and imprinted in your mind?

Answer: Because of photographs being unclear and dim. I am not able to make the comparison.

Question: Will you be able to tell that the writing which you saw on the spot and imprinted in your mind was in rectangular shape, flat shape or round shape?

Answer: To my understanding it was rectangular.

Question: Was this rectangular form horizontal or vertical?

Answer: My Answer is that I am not understanding the question and your intention?

Question: My question is that the rectangle was from top to down ward, in length or lying left to right in length?

Answer: It was lying lengthwise.

Question: Could you tell while lying how much would its length from right to left and what would be its width from top to bottom?

Answer: I shall not be able to tell clearly.

Question: Have you any fade memory?

Answer: I shall not say anything with that fade memory.

Question: Please see photo No.104 to 125 of the Album carefully.

Answer: I have seen all these photos.

Question Except phot No.116 and 117, all other photos are of some pillars?

Answer: Yes sir (again said) Except phot No.104,105,110,111, remaining all are of pillars.

Question: In photo No.117 and similarly in photo No.116, do you see. In some part, any pillar?

Answer: Pillar penetrated I the wall is seen.

Question Are all the pillars seen by you, appears directly to be of the black stone?

Answer: It cannot be said clearly that all these pillars appear to be of black colour. These maybe Ochrous, green, black and white etc., and there is a coating also at places.

Question: In the pillar shown in photo No.120 and 12, do you see in any part of it, any figure?

Answer: In photo No.120 it looks like a leaf of a flower, in the side pillar on its other phase, there is one rectangular figure and on the lower side one improvised base i.e., a figure of an earthen pot is seen.

Similarly in photo No.121, leaf of a flower is seen, on the side a lying pattern outside the rectangular shaped figure and on the lower portion of the pillar something like a reused earthen pot is seen.

Question The figure of earthen pot seen by you is called Kalash by Hindus?

Answer: Not necessary that they call it Kalash.

Question: Can you or can you not tell that what is engraved on the lower side of the pillars is called Kalash in Hindu religion?

Answer: No.

Question: Is there anything known as Kalash which is used in religious ceremonies of Hindus?

Answer: It might be.

Question: You have given the statement that your marriage took place according to Paraskar Grih Sootra?

Answer: Yes I have given.

Question: Did you and your wife performed Pooja of Kalash in the religious ceremony at the time of your marriage or not?

Answer: I do not remember presently.

Question: Try to remember if pooja of some earthen pot was performed or not?

Answer: I do not remember at present.

Question: Did you chant Saptapadi or not in that ceremony?

Answer: No, Sir Panditji might have chanted but I did not speak anything.

Question: Did you and your wife walk round on the edge around the fire?

Answer: I submit that it is totally a personal question I might have performed this kind of process I do not remember now.

Question: Did you give some word to your wife in that ceremony by keeping the fire as witness?

Answer: We did not give any words.

Question: Should I consider that your marriage did not take place according to Paraskar Grih Sootra?

Answer: You should not take it like that.

Question: Did you perform the wedding ritual with your wife during your marriage ceremony or not?

Answer: Yes it was done.

Question: I am to say that you are hesitating in speaking complete truth on this point?

Answer: It is not so.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

7.8.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us . In continuation for further cross- examination on 7.9.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-

7.8.1998

7.9.1998 (In continuation of 7.8.1998, the statement on oath of P.W.13 Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra, begins).

I do not know Bangla language and its script. I did not study the manuscript of Ayodhya Mahatm I Vrindavan Research Institute, Vrindavan. I have read the book written by Hans Baker on Ayodhya and from that I came to know that there is some material on Ayodhya Mahatm in Vrindavan Research Institute, Vrindavan. I have thoroughly studied Arthashastra of Kautilya. That was the subject of my research. I have read the Arthashastra of Kautilya in original thoroughly which means from beginning to the end and with complete intensity.

Question. Has Kautilya written in his Arthashastra by way of warning that no body should follow Ravana

and Duryodhana because that leads to the destructio of man?

Answer: The reference of above persons does come in Arthashastra of Kautilya but as this book was written for Kings and their Raj Kumaras, hence what is said in this reference is useful and applicable only upon them. Kautilya has said so only in their reference.

Question. Should it be understood that this book of Kautilya is written only for kings and their sons, and it has nothing to do with the general public?

Answer: The main purpose of writing this book was to educate the Kings and their sons, in conducting the affairs of the Govt., and hence such books were not popular amongst the general public, but if general public wanted to use it or read it, they could do it.

Question: Did Kautilya write this book for one particular King and Raj Kumaras or for all?

Answer: Kautilya wrote this book mainly for his contemporary Kings. But with the passage of time other Kings also used this book for centuries for running the administration.

Question: Did you, in the course of your archaeological studies, read or hear at any point of time the word "Shringat"?

Answer: If the meaning of Shringat is Unicorn i.e., animal with one horn, then I have read it and if it means something else, then I cannot say anything unless I know its background.

In Archaeological studies I have also read Vastu Shastra: I have not come across the word "Shringat" anywhere in Vastu Shastra.

Question According to Vastu Shasta, some particular part of the Fort is called Shringat, is it correct to say so or not?

Answer: No.

Idols pertaining to Gahadwal period are found but the idols of Gahadwals did not become available to me. There may be temples of the Gahadwal period. (again said). The temples of that period are found I have heard that there also is a place known as Gadhwa in our Allahabad. I did not see any temple over there. I did not do any study about the so called place Kandwa in Varanasi i.e., Banaras Distt. I have heard the name of Koshambi. But neither I read nor heard about a place called Mevahar in Koshambi. I do not agree with the contention that there are temples of Gahadwal or there are idols of Bhagwan Vishnu or those idols are in the form of a bowman at all these places. It may be so that in Gandhwa Village there is an idol of Vishnu with bow. Except the Gadhwa I did not read during my studies the names of any other place as stated. Gadhwa is a prominent place from archaeological point of view but I cannot say if idols for the Gupta period are found there are not. But I do not remember it clearly whether the records of Gupta period are available there or not. But some story about the record pertaining to as place can be there. I did not consider the necessity to go to a place namely Gadhwa for my studies relating to archaeology. It is wrong to say that I am will fully hiding fact of my knowledge.

I did not try to obtain information about the Christianity during my intensive study of ancient history. I

did not try to study about the impact Christianity made on the Ancient Indian History because we did not feel any particular impact in this area.

The Christians worship and adore the Jesus Christ. It is wrong to say I am speaking any lie in this regard. It is correct that the Christians worship "God" and do prayer to him. Both my answers are correct. Jesus Christ was a great man. I did not read more about him. Therefore, I cannot say whether he had some relation with the God.

I did not read anything about the Sikhs while studying the Indian Culture i.e., I did not do any study about the Sikh Sect. I have read a little bit about Guru Nanak. I recognize his contribution as a social Reformer. I cannot say if he gave any sect to the society or not. I also cannot say if he told the society or not any method of worship. I cannot say if he had advocated the method of worship of a particular God, or particular shape or form or a thing.

I in my statement have told the meaning of Word Gaji as liberal person because I have seen both Hindus and Muslims visiting the Mazar of Gaji and therefore, this concept went into my head that the meaning of Word Gaji is liberal person. I saw the Mazar of Sikandara in Sikandara fair. I heard the people were visiting his Mazar. I myself did not see his Mazar. I cannot say if he was the resident of that place or had come there from outside or was he brought there. This Sikandara is not that of Agra, rather it is in Allahabad. I hail from Allahabad, I have heard about a Sohbatlabagh, which is a place there. I do not have the information that a fair after Gaji Mian is organized here. I do not know if fair after Gaji Mian is organized in Banaras. I do not know if the fair after Saiyad Salar Masood Gaji is organized or not in Behraish. I also do not know if the fair

of Behraich is celebrated according to solar calender or it is not celebrated according to the lunar calender.

I have heard the Sanskrit word "Balarak". But I have not read this word anywhere. It means the early mornig sun. As per my knowledge, there is no Balark temple in Bahraich. Therefore, I have no knowledge about the said Gaji fair being organized after the name of sai dtemple. I do not think Hindus and Muslims go to Baharaich for attending this fair for the reason that there is also a Balark Mandir (Sun temple) apart froma Mazar of Gaji Mian. (The witness Volunteer: I have heard about the fair of Baharaich that the fair of Gaji Mian is held there) I cannot say anya thing here that the word Gaji is envolved from Gajawa. I do not know the meaning of Gajawa also. I am not aware if the meaning of Gajwa is "to cut the heads of Qafirs". It is wrong to say that one who achieve victory over the Qafirs or cut their heads is called Gaji.

I have not heard the name of a historian named Bhagawati Prasad Singh. I did not hear the name also of such a writer. I also did not hear the name of an one author named K.Raghawachari. In my knowledge the figures and writings of Ancient Indian culture were ot found in Itali. I had read the history of Utskanas. It was a Ruling family. I have heard the name of Archaeological Survey of India, Janpath, New Delhi and I also know that organization, I cannot say with certainlity that from which to which date the Rule of the above mentioned Royal Family continued. I had read about them a long time back. I was the student of B.A. at that time when I read about the subject of World Civilisation in the context of Ancient History, and about this Dynasty.I did not hear the name of so called author Remond Block. I did not hear the name of

author Remond Branch either. I did not hear about one author namely Heden.

With reference of history I did not read any book, the name of which is "The Breed people". I do not accept that figures or other things related to Ramayana were found in fifth or sixth century B.C. in Itali. It is correct that the coins "Ramasiya" were issued during the period of Emperor Akbar but I accept them not as coins of Ramsiya rather I accept them as coins in the name of Ram and Sita. I do not remember if I have seen those coins. I am not remembering clearly if Ramsiya is in Nagri written or not on those coins. However, something is definitely written on those coins. What is written and in which script it is written is not remembered (Again said) I remember now something is written on one side of those coins in Arabci. Every coin has the other part also and it is correct that on the other side of these coins there are the figures of Ram and Sita.

Question Can you tell the name of any other Muslim Ruler, apart from Emperor Akbar, in whose rule some such coins were issued on which any sign of Indian culture or any figure or reference of history is printed?

Answer: I do not remember the name of any Ruler in whose period such like coins would have been issued.

Question: Is it so that you knew the name of some Ruler earlier but you do not remember it now?

Answer: No such things is there.

But it might not be understood that I possess no knowledge in this regard. It is also not that I am willfully hiding something on this subject.

I have heard the name of Misar which is called Egypt. Its history is also very old. Their history has cultural aspect also. The Historians have been conducting comparative studies of Indian culture, Egyptian culture, Mesopotamian culture and also continued studying their contemporary relations also. In the history of western Asia, there comes the reference of Mitani Dynasty also. It was the dynasty around 15th and 16th century B.C. Mitani dynasty was not the Egyptian dynasty. It was in some parts of Iran and Persian countries of Western Asia. I cannot say definitely that fourteen fifteen hundred years B.C. whether or not was there any country in the name of Iran, but the land was there which was one of the part of Mesopotamia Empire. But it is wrong to say that there would come any reference of King Ram or King Dasharath during their rule. It is wrong to say that the geographical area of Mesopotamia was present Iran. In fact that was a very wide area and present Iran was also one of its parts.

Cuneiform is an English word. Its Hindi synonym is Keelakashar. In Egypt country the place called Tel Ul Amarana is not there. This place is situated other part of Western Asia. It is correct that work relating to archaeological excavation has taken place there. It is true to say that some document has been procured from that excavation which appears to have been written by King Dasharath. It is also wrong to say that in the so called document the name of King Dashratha had been engraved as Tushrat. It is also wrong that in the so called document the name of Devata Raman is written. In the study of Ancient Indian History, I do not remember if the word Raman has come across while reading. I did not write the book on history by V.C. Shukla. I have read the book on history written by V.C. Pandey. I did not hear the name of

any such book which is called The Earliest Inscription of Rama Worship. I did not read any such article also.

I have heard the name of Historian Bhagwan Singh. I did not hear the name of some Shri R.D.Chaudhari. I know Shri Bhagwan Singh as a writer. I do not know if the so called Shri R.D.Chaudhari had been or is the Director of Assam Museum. I did not read Studies in Indian History and culture published by Ramanad Vidya Bhawan.

I have heard the name of Jaikobi as a Historian. I have read his ideologies. His ideology is that Devta Ram is an old fact (again said) he did not sue the word Devta rather he expressed the idea that Rama, a person in Ramayana in an old fact.

Question: The above mentioned Jaikobi has written that another fact which proves the ancientness of popular Devta Ram is that like ancient period, the names of many people in the Vedic period were kept after him. Do you agree with his opinion or not? Or did he not write that.

Answer: I do not remember if the suggested article is of Jaikobi or not. When I do not know that it is his ideology, I do not want to make any assumption on this subject.

Question Do you agree or not with the ideas expressed in this extract?

Answer: I agree with the ideology. It can be accepted.

The full name of this Jaikobi was Harman Jaikobi and he hailed from Germany. The name of his book can be "Das Ramayana" but I do not remember. I cannot say with certainty if that book was translated into English. The book, related to Ramayana, read by me is called

“Righteous Rama”. It has been written by R.L.Brakiton. I read this four five years before now for a specific purpose (again said) two three years before now. I have told the name both of author and the book, as correct. It is wrong that I have made some misstatement. It is wrong to say that the name of that author was J.C.Brokenton. In addition to this I might have read many other books, which are not remembered by me. I have gone to Ayodhya many times but I did not see any place called Singar Hat. I have seen Hanumangarhi The track from Hanumagarhi goes upto the disputed site. The disputed place is known as Ayodhya Kote. The meaning of the kote is small forte. There is a road on north of Ayodhya Kote and that is in North east. There are some buildings in south. These buildings are of different kind. There are some residential houses and some are the temples also. On the west side there is a plain ground, which is lying desert. On the eastern side also there are some buildings, some of which are residential and some are the temples. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie in the matter, In fact I am speaking truth to the best of my knowledge. The Ayodhya Kote from Hanumagarh is about 100 yards away. In addition to Hanumangarhi I have seen many other religious places such as Bramhkund I Ayodhya where I had gone Bramhkund falls on the west of Hanumangarhi. I reached there after lot of traveling. I covered lot of ground. This distance would at least be one to one and half a mile. I went to the Nirmochan Ghat. There also I reached after covering lot of ground. I had to cover lot of distance. I also visited Guptar Ghat, which is on the western end of Ayodhya. It would be at a distance of one or one and half a mile from Hanumangarhi. It is wrong to say that I am speaking something wrong on the subject.

I had gone to visit the above mentioned places from historical point of view. Nirmochan Ghat has a historical importance. It is linked to the stories of Lomash. Lomash

was a Rishi, as is told in the stories. As it is adjoining Saryu River and there had been hillocks, therefore I surveyed that place also. This good work I did around 1990.

I had gone to Chakratola. That is also a historical place. Ayodhya Mahatmya refers to all such places and I had read it. The previous name of this place was chakratirath and in Ayodhya Mahatmya the reference in the name of Chakrath and not chakratola comes because this name is of recent evolution. I did not have any difficulty in calling it Chakratirath but its name these days is Chakratola therefore, I have made use of this name. There is reference to Rina Mochan Ghat in Ayodhya which by corruption is called now as Nirmochan Ghat, Chakratirath would be $3/4^{\text{th}}$ Km. On the western side from Hanumangarhi (again said) at $3/4^{\text{th}}$ mile's difference.

I did not have any urge to visit any locality pertaining to Muslims. In addition to the places mentioned above, I saw many non mentionable things, the description of which would be given at the appropriate time. I do not want to say anything irrelevant. I consider Guptar Ghat and Chakratirath relevant in respect of this dispute.

Question: What is the relevancy of Chakratirath in regard to this dispute, please tell?

Answer: A person namely Vishnu Sharma a Brahmana is cited to have gone on that place and if we analyse the story of Ayodhya Mahatmya, it is revealed that, that place became popular after the name of Vishnu since the day he went there. It would be proved in the time to come how place connected with Vaishnav had been founded after the name of persons, through the medium of these stories.

If you consider Rama as the incarnation of Vishnu then the transplantation of this story would have taken place like other Vaishnav Centre. Vishnu is also called Hari.

Question: The presumption of Saptahari has been made in Hindu Dharma is it correct to say so?

Answer: The presumption is also available in Ayodhya Mahatmya.

In Ayodhya there is a place of Dharam Hari and I have gone there. That place is located in the east and west side of Hanumangarhi, at a distance of one furlong. I saw the temple there. I did not conduct any research about its foundation. But I tried to establish its identity with the stories in Ayodhya Mahatmya. The story tells that a person named Dharam goes to that place and set up an idol there and that place becomes popular as Dharam Vishnu after the name of that man Dharam Vishnu.

I have also heard the name of Billavhari. I did not go to this place. The story of Billavhari was not found in Ayodhya Mahatmya. I cannot say with certainty whether or not I have read the name of Billavhari in Ayodhya Mahatmya. But I did not read that as a center of Vaishnavite. But there is no such thing that the word Hari which is suffixed with Bilav, has no importance for Vaishnavite sect.

I had gone to Guptahari also. That place is situated at a distance of about one mile from Hanumangarhi on the western side. I did not enquire from there as I which direction and how far Billavhari is from Ayodhya or Hanumangarhi.

In Indian culture and religion, Hari is called by the name of Narayan also. The Laxmi is known as the wife of Narayan. I have given this reply after due consideration. But it is not that I reply other questions without due consideration.

I also know about the Mahabharata Granth. Such a reference has also come in that book that Krishna had given some teaching to Arjuna. There is a mention of his teachings in Geeta but I would not accept that mention as eternal. In Mahabharata and Gita the words Nar and Narain have essentially been used (againsaid) this has been mentioned in Mahabharata but not in Geeta It may be so that Nar and Narayan might have been used simultaneously. I cannot say about Gita but in Mahabharata, under Vishnu Sahastra, in palce of word Narayan, word Purushotam has been used. I might have read it but it is not remembered now. Rama has also been addressed as Purushotam, but it has happened so with the passage of time. In my opinion it started after the Ramayana of Go Swami Tulsi Das. The nameof this book is Ram Charit Manas. I have read many books of Tulsi Das, such as Kavitavali, Hanuman Bahuk, Barve Ramana and Janki Mangal etc., The contents of Kavitavali is related to Rama. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie about this.

I have studied Geeta also. I am fully aware of the contents of that book. The focal contents of Geeta's teachings is to do one's duty. It includes philosophy also. In addition to this there may be many things which also comprise philosophy. The philosophy of Geeta is that Krishna says who so ever comes to me for refuge, I will protect him socially. It is totally wrong to say that I have not studied Geeta or I am speaking lie. It has never been my intention to hide the truth to disregard Hidu Dharma or to isult it. I have already stated that I study the books with a

purpose in view and take out from them what is useful for me. But it is wrong to say that I have studied these books with the intention to give false evidence in favour of Muslims and against the Hindus and to hide the truth.

I have heard the name of Saiyyad Salar Masood Gaji many times. I would have read about him but I do not remember. I have read the book written by Hans Baker on this subject. The name of the book is Ayodhya. In this book, detailed discussion on different points about Ayodhya, has been made (Volunteer : that has been done by making Ayodhya Mahatmya as the basis). It is correct to say that there is a complete separate chapter on Ayodhya Mahatmya in this book. It is correct that there are scores of other chapters also in it. One Chapter out of these is History of Saket/Ayodhya from 500 B.C to 1000 A.D. I have read this book from beginning to the end. Obviously I might have read this chapter also. It may be written in that book that the Saiyyad Salar Masood Gaji had resorted to assault on Hindus. I do not remember if such a movement had been given the name of Marauding Expedition by the author.

I would have heard the name of Abdul Rahaman Chishti but it is not remembered now. I cannot say clearly about writing any book by him in which he would have described the above facts. I agree with the facts highlighted by Hans Baker in his book but there are many areas of research where he, under the influence of particular persons, has not examined the facts intensively and taken recourse to rumours, traditions and worn out legends as historical conclusions. I do not agree with them at all. Whatever Hans Baker has written about Saiyyad Salar Masood Gaji, I did not try to have the information about that and, therefore, I cannot say anything either to agree or not to agree with him. This was outside my subject contents.

Question: If we ask you that you did not obtain information about this, because it was outside the scope of your work and was of no use for you?

Answer: It is correct to say so because it was outside the scope of my work.

In the book of Hans Baker I got many things of my use i.e., the reference of Mahatmya Literature, availability of its variant texts, the increasing sequence of Rama's worship, a planned effort with regard to that, no matter, there may be inclusion, here and there of many things which are out side purview of history.

My study was also planned but I was not suffering from any prejudice.

Question: In the above book of Hans Baker, is there a chapter namely Origin of Ayodhya in it or not?

Answer: I cannot say definitely that the above chapter similar in all respects, is available in that book, but the description has been made while discussing origin and development of the history of Aydhya in it. According to Hans Baker, the origin of Ayodhya, took palce seventh century B.C.

Verified the statement after hearing
Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra
7.9.98

Typed by the stenographer in the open Court as dictated by us. In continuation of this, for further cross examination on 8.9.1998.

Witness be present .

Sd/-
Dated 7.9.1998

Dated 8.9.1998 (In continuation of dated 7.9.1998, the statement of P.W. 13 Suresh Chandra Mishra start on oath).

I do not agree with the opinion expressed by Hans Baker regarding the origin and development of Ayodhya. (Again said) do not agree completely. I do not agree with the conclusions drawn by him about the dispute of Masjid and Mandir at the disputed site. (At this stage the learned Advocate drew the attention of the witness towards case No.5/1989) paper No.107-C-1/136,. Whcihwas seen by the witness). I have examined the paper shown to me completely. I have read it and these papers are from Hans Baker's book Ayodhya, Volume I, chapter 8 page No.129 and 130. I do not agree with the conclusions drawn him. The reasons of my disagreement is not one but many. The basis for my dis agreement is ot the study of a particular book, that particular book I have not seen also, but I do not recall the name of a book in which something against the conclusions of Hans Baker has been written. (Volunteer: that in the book Historians Report to the Nation published by People's Publishing House, the determiation of date by Baker has been contested and it is my intuition (again said) not my intuition but it is my research). It is not the fact that People's Publication House publish the literature pertaining to communist ideology only. I certainly consider the authors of "A Historians Report to the Nation" more important. (Volunteer: that they are the highest category Historians of the country). This report has been published in the name of four persons. It may be so that there may be more people involved inthis report but the names have been published only of four. It is not that another book written by others has been published in addition to this report and published in the name sof these four people. These four persons are S/Shri R.S.Sharma, M.Athar Ali,

D.N.Jha and Surajbhan. They all are Professors, Prof. M.Athar Ali has since expired. Out of these, Prof. R.S.Sharma has written his research book on Ayodhya. This research book has been published around 1990 or 1991. I do not recall where from this book was published, therefore, I cannot reply this question whether or not this publication too is published by People's Publishing House. I do not recall the full name of this book, perhaps it can be communal History of Ayodhya or Communal History of Ramas Ayodhya. I do not recollect completely whether this book was published first or "A Historical Report to the nation: was published first. As far as I remember "Communal History of Ayodhya" was published first. I had read this book at that time. After this book I read the book of Hans Baker. I cannot say categorically that the opinion of Hans Baker has been contested in this book I had ensured before I read the book "A communal History of Ayodhya that this book had been written by Prof. R.S.Sharma. He has expressed thanks of all persons in this book whose help he got. I did not extend any help in this book. I did not see the editions of this book. I read that book in its first edition. The meaning of edition is Sanakaran. It is not the fact the books A Communal History of Ramas Ayodhya and Historian Report to the Nation were written or published after getting inspiration from the communist ideology, for propaganda sake. Communal History of Ramas Ayodhya is a monograph i.e., a small booklet which would be about 40-50 pages. It is of the size of an ordinary book.

Hans Baker's book is in one volume but there are 3 parts. This book is of more than 500 pages. This book is now also placed before me. The main structure of the book is in 741 pages and in addition to this, 15 pages for preface, contents table, examples, including background. The book

is a large sized. It contains examples and diagrams as also all other detail. (At this stage the learned Advocate drew the attention of the witness towards the court case No.5/1989- paper on file paper No.107-C-1/149-150. The witness examined them and studied them). I have carefully seen and understood also the papers shown to me. Some diagrams are made on paper No.149. The building and places shown in this diagrams have been described. The descriptions given are of Ayodhya Mahatmya according to different versions and not of the topography. These are according to the pictures mentioned in versions. I do not agree with the given topography and the description of places shown. I do not agree with what is written in the paragraph starting from the last line of this page which ends on the next page.

The reason for my disagreement is not the research conducted by R.S.Sharma rather it is my own understanding, my on the spot inspections and large scale internal paradox in entire Ayodhya Mahatm, the incoherence, the inhibitions in interpolations and missing of clarity in interpolation. In addition to this, considerable increase in the signs pertaining to Rama in various texts of Ayodhya Mahatm, the existence of only 11% signs pertaining to Rama in Skandh Puruans in making description of Ayodhya Mahatm, and in Vrindavan text. All these are the proofs of the fact that there is no coordination between the evidences and the factual position.(this statement was narrated by the witness himself) I have carefully read paper No.107 C-1/150 page____ para 3. I totally disagree with that, the reason for this disagreement, apart from the basis told earlier, is also that they have accredit it on the hear say only. I have myself made research on it. For my research I myself read the book of Hans Baker, studied the different Variant Text of Ayodhya

Mahatm and studied the Skandh Purana, saw all the secondary works and conducted inspections by making on the spot visits. All these are the basis of my research. During the research I had written one paper also. I had also read that paper. I had read that between the period 1990 to 1992. My research work is still continuing. The research already done has not yet been published.

Bow (Dhanush) is a measurement of range as is given in Ayodhya Mahatm. I cannot say anything in the context of today's measurement system as what could be the length and range of a Dhanush. Otherwise also it depends upon the size and kind of Dhanush. I have felt the necessity of conducting the research also on the measurement of length or range of Dhanush. I have also conducted research on it. After research I arrive at the conclusion that the length of a Dhanush is about 4-1/2. I do not agree with the suggestion that it stands proved after research that the length of a Dhanush is 6. It is correct that Hans Baker inpage 149, has indicated the range of a Dhanush. The places referred in this paper were searched by me. I searched for a place namely Binesh but I did not find any such place. I could not find Bidhyeshwar temple also on the spot. I did not find Kekayi Bhawan as well. The same was the case of Sumitra Bhawan. I could not get Vashistha Kund. Some people stated about a place related to the Vashishtha Kundbut I was not satisfied because those were the extra modern buildings, In one building I found a Kund also. People told me that, that Kund was the Vashishtha Kund. In fact it was not a Kund but a building I which there were many kinds of idols. There was a place indepth a basement which was called that Kund. This place was situated at a distance of 2-3 furlong on the south west side. The buildings not found there are considered by me as not, washed out but disappeared or non existing. For seeing Kekeyi Bhawan I

saw the place on the north side adjacent to the disputed complex. I could not find Kekeyi Bhawan there. With the disputed complex I mean the outer wall of the Masjid, the outer part adjacent to it, i.e., little far.

I searched for the place Lomash at a difference of 5-7 metres from the walls of disputed site, on the eastern side. There was a ultra modern cottage which was constructed by Lakhori Bricks. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie in the matter.

Many spcial festivals are organized in Ayodhya. Ram Navami is one of them. I tried to know why the people in Ayodhya celebrate Ram Navami. There I came to know that the festival of Ram Navami is celebrated as the birth day of Rama to remember Him. In fact I knew this before. I obtained this information in Ayodhya to know which place could be the place of worship or to pay him reference in Ayodhya. This had been my curiosity and I tried also to find out the place at which Rama had born. People told me that at such and such place i.e., at the disputed place Sri Ram had born. But this palce did not suit my historical wisdom. With the historical wisdom I mean my insight which is based on the study of all evidences, for and against cross-examination and on the inspections etc. which is the skillof an historian. I started this skill in 1989-90. I did this work in 1990. It is wrong to say that I am speaking ornamental lie in this matter. When I went for site inspection, there were restrictions for going there. But despite that the people allowed me to go there. I do not remember the month or seaon when I went for the spot inspection. I visited the spot in the eveningtime. But I cannot tell the definite time. I cannot say precisely whether I went there before or after the sun set. I cannot say precisely whether I went there before or after the sun set. I cannot say if that time was for

having Darshan of god or not. Eight years have elapsed since then. I went inside from the road falling on east end of the road of the complex. It is wrong to say that I speak white lie on the subject. It is wrong to say that there was complete restriction in entering the complex from eastern side in 1990. Despite restrictions I went inside after seeking permission. I had taken permission from the police people sitting there and other people were also going and I went alongwith them. It is wrong to say that I speak lie on the subject.

That is a Swargadwar in Ayodhya and I had gone there but now I do not remember. I definitely remember to have gone to the Swargadwar but what were the contours, I do not remember. The Swargadwar on which I had gone, falls in Faizabad. There is a Swargadwar in Ayodhya. I had gone there also. I have seen the location of Swargadwar. The location is as has been described in Ayodhya Mahatm. I do not recall if I had seen some Masjid also or not at the Swargadwar of Ayodhya. I saw a temple of the Swargadwar. But I do not remember its name at this point of time.

I had seen Chandrakhari place in Ayodhya but I did not see Chandrakhari temple there. The Swargadwar at Ayodhya is located at about 2 furlong on the north side of Hanumangarhi and adjacent to the river. The location of Chandrakhari is also at north of Hanumangarhi and its distance too would be about 2 furlong. But I cannot say with certainty whether Chandrakhari and Swargadwar are adjoining each other or not. There is definitely a distance between the two but I cannot say that even on estimate basis. It is wrong to say that I am lying in the matter.

I have read in the history that there is a Swargadwar, and Chandrahari places as well as a temple in Ayodhya (agaisaid) I have read that in the book of Hans Baker only. I do not remember if I have read it in any where else. Infact I have read so many books in respect of Ayodhya. I did not read it anywhere that Aurangzeb had got a mosque built by demolishing chandrahari temple. It is wrong to say that today also there is a mosque in place of a temple. I have heard the name of Chandra Dev Gaharwar. I have also heard Chandrwati Tamrapatra. It has been written in Tamrapatra that King Chandra Dev Gaharwar, after taking bath in Swargadwar. Which is in Ayodhya, installed an idol or an idol of Hari. With Hari, I mean Vasudev. It is correct that Vasudev is also a name of Vishnu. (Volunteer: that who is related to Krishna's sect). The Vaishnavite people accept Rama the incarnation of Vishnu. The sect. To be in vogue after the name of Rama was called Vaishnavite Sect.

I have heard the name of Jai Chand Gaharwar. There is no mention in history that Jai Chand Gaharwar had a Vishnu temple constructed there. There is no mention in history that Aurangzeb had the so called temple demolished.

I know Kutub Minar in Delhi but it is wrong to say that it was constructed after demolishing many temples. I have visited Kutub Minar. I did not see any inscription there which states that the Minar was built after demolishing temples.

Question: As a Historian did you read anywhere or did it come to your knowledge that any mosque was built at any time by demolishing any temple at any time in India?

Answer: I have not come across any such mention.

It is wrong to say that I gave this Answer out of prejudice. In fact I have not made any investigation on this subject. I did not consider it essential. It was not my project. My project was related to the dispute and the allied things. Except the dispute over the disputed temple and mosque, I have no knowledge or information about the temple or mosque at any other place. I have no knowledge about the dispute of Krishna Birth place. I have heard and seen that Krishna birth place is at Mathura. I did not hear about any dispute about the so called Gyanvapi mosque of Varansi. The reference has come in the history about the dispute of Somnath temple. I have not started any project regarding its study and research.

No economic help was given to my project for the research relating to the dispute continuing in this case from any other quarter. I have conducted it at my own expenses, I have done it in order to increase my own knowledge. I have done this for my own happiness. With my research my knowledge increased and I got satisfaction from that. I am neither Theist nor Atheist nor spiritual. It would be wrong to say that I got only physical contentment with this research, rather I got mental contentment.

Question Have you ever interviewed your mind?

Answer: With the manas, if it means mental alertness then I experience that every day and also get inspiration from it but if manas mean spiritualism, then I do not have much attachment with it. I have not interviewed mind but I have experienced it. That provides inspiration.

I have experienced manas withal my nerves. I do not call a foot a nerve. I have experienced my manas with my tongue, ear and nose. It is wrong to say that I am forcibly speaking lie. It is also wrong to say that I am speaking lie out of prejudice.

In the research work of this disputed problem, I might have spent rupees fifteen thousand to twenty thousand. It is wrong that I hate Hindu Dharma. It is wrong to say that I might not have ceremonised my marriage with proper manners. I did not register my marriage anywhere. At present I do not know if I might not have taken seven rounds at the time of my marriage. Not have performed the ceremony of Saptapadi (circumambulations of the sacred sacrificial fire as an integral part of the Hindu wedding process) and promises would not have been given to my wife. The statement given earlier about the performance and method of my marriage is correct and I accept it even today. I have already told about the ceremonies performed at the time of my marriage. It is wrong to say that my marriage might not have taken place as per the Hindu religious traditions. It is correct that in Hindu religion, it is essential at the time of marriage to perform saptapadi and to take seven rounds (Phere) by the man and woman. Similarly it is essential for the man to make promise with his would be wife, as per the Shastras. If it is stated that I am spending my married life without a system then that would be the biggest allegation against me. It is also wrong to say that by doing so I am cheating my society. It is also wrong to say that I have given a false statement.

(On behalf of Respondent No.22, Shri Umesh Chandra Pande the cross-examination by Shri Vireshwar Devedi, Advocate, over).

(Cross-examination on behalf of Hindu Mahasbha, Respondent No.10 and Shri Ramesh Chandra Tripathi, Respondent No.17, by Shri Hari Shankar Jain, Advocate).

xxx xxx xxx xxx

I am the only person working on the post of Reader of Ancient Indian History in a collage where I am doing teching work. There is no perso on the post of professor in this department of our college. In our college there is no separate Department of Ancient Indian History and it is included with the subject of history and accordingly there is a collective history department of which Shri K.Bhagya Rao is the Head of Department. Our services are connected with the University of Delhi and are also governed by them. In other words I am an employee of Delhi University. In Delhi University, there is collective seniority list of the department of History. It is not a separate one for Ancient Indian History. It is correct that in that seniority list, the seniority of Professors, Reader and other teaching staff of University of Delhiu as well as its connected all the colleges, has been shown. I have never tried to know as at what point my name comes in the seniority list. In the seniority of Readers, there may be four five or there could be more also, senijor to me. Out of them, Dr.B.B. Sahu, Dr.Atrey Vishwas, Shri P.S.Dewedi etc., are senior to me. Allthe three are the readers of Ancient History. It is correct that the post of professor is higher than that of the reader. In Delhi University, there are four professors of Ancient History.

My research i.e., Doctorate is imited to the Artha Shastra of Kotilya which is inclusive of study of records. It is correct that this study of record is also limited to Artha Shastra of Kotilya.

I teach the students of B.A. and also of M.A. final. I only teach Ancient History. In Ancient History, we teach history from the availability of evidence of the person who appeared first of all on this earth upto 750-800 A.D. in the context of India. But it is not that we teach history in respect of India only. We also give detail about the contacts India had at that point of time, with different other countries.

Question: Which special incidence of special year upto 750-800 A.D., you count for the time limit of Ancient History?

Answer: We consider the year 750 A.D. as the outer limit for the Ancient History. Feudal system extend further from there onward.

In 750 A.D. India was in dis integration state. There were many centers of small states and they were in competition with each other to prove each one's supremacy over the other. In those states, the poll people were in Bengal and Bihar, Gurjar Pratihara in West and after the down fall of Chalukyas in south, the Rashtrakoot were in the race of competition for capturing power. The position was also bad in north and turmoil was going on for capturing power of Kannauj in Central India. At that time there was no Ruler in Delhi. Even otherwise it was not considered as the capital. In 750 A.D. Delhi was under the domain of Gurjars but I do not know the name of the then Ruler. Now I remember, the Tomars were the local rulers at that time.

There are many sources for knowing Indian History. Broadly there are literary resources, the descriptions of the visitors from abroad, records, coins, memorials,

archaeology etc. There are certain traditions verbal as well as written. For knowing the initial history, the source is archaeology. With the initial means the earliest most period. The earliest period is known as Stone Age in history. It is also called Pashan age. Thereafter comes the Calicolithis period in which mixture of copper and stone is found. It is followed by Iron Age culture. Thereafter the duly written proofs of history starts becoming available. The period of Iron Age start from 800 B.C. In fact that period begins with that and then it goes on. The Iron age as mentioned above continues for 800-700 B.C.

Verified the Statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

8.9.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this case for next further cross-examination on 9.9.1998.

Sd/-

8.9.1998

Dated 9.9.1998

(In continuatio of 8.9.1998, the statement of P.W.13 Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra on oath starts).

Iron age, i.e., when the use of iron began, continued from 1000-800 B.C. there is no era in the name of Iron age, inf act it is about the use of iron, and iron is being used even today. There was the Era of Stone age. That started lacs of years ago, it continued for thirty thousand years. The Stone Age ended in 8000 B.C. or 6000 B.C. In Indian context the period of Stone age can be taken around 1,20,000 B.C. means the counting before the Jesus Christ. The calendar of B.C. is before the birth of Jesus Christ, the calendar, thereafter, is called A.D. and in it there is dispute of six years. I do not know clearly and I cannot recollect that when Jesus Christ was born which calendar started at that time and which was in use then. The birth of Jesus Christ saheb took palce in 1998 years before today. During the period of birth of Jesus Christ Vikrami Sambat Calendar and Jain Nirvan Era calendars were in use in India the Budhist Era Calendar was also there. Apart from these, there were other calendars also. We study the history not in Vikrami Sambat but in A.D. and B.C. because this calculation is universally accepted. If there comes the reference of Vikrami Sambat or some other Sambat we convert that into B.C. and A.D.

For converting A.D. or B.C. into Vikrami Sambat, we add 58 in the number of Vikrami Sambat and that would givbe us the knowledge of A.D. and B.C. (after thinking for sometime the witness againsaid). This number of 58 would be deducted from the number of Vikrami Smabat (again said 0 58 would be deducted from the given number of Vikrami Sambat and the number arrived at after deduction would be B.C. or A.D. These days the Vikrami Sambat is

2056. There may be difference of 1-2 years (again said) upward or down ward in it. It is wrong to say that the number mentioned above wouyld be 57 and not 58. The Vikrami Sambat started in 58 B.C. I do not remember from which month or day the year Vikrami Sambat start. I am recalling now from which month or date the Vikrami Sambat is ending. There are 12 months in a year of Vikrami Sambat. The names of these twelve months are Chatra, Baisakh, Jyeshtha, Ashadh, Shravana, Bhadrapad, Kwar, Kartika, Agrahana, Posh, Magha, Phalguna.

Question: According to Vikrami Sambat Calendar, when was the book of any religion in India found first time?

Answer: I do not recall if on the basis of Vikrami Sambat any book about any Dharam was found by me.

The Era which came after iron Era in called urbanization Era. It started from 6th or 7th B.C. For the calculation of Vikrami Sambat, 58 years can be added in the century. The ancestor of man called primates, appeared in Prati Nootan period but the modern man to whom we call Homosepheyen or which is called fully developed human being, appeared in Holocin Era 10,000 years before today. It is written in all the books. The names of these books are the Pre history of the world by From Graham Clark. What happended in History by B.Garden, Child Social Evolution by B.Garden Child, History of mankind in Three volumes Unesco publications. All these books have been written by non Indians.

The period of Mohan Jodaro civilisati is recognized from 2250 to 1750 B.C. with Mohan Jodaro we mean the civilisatio of harappa and Sindhus Ghati. After Sindu Vedic period. The beginning of Vedic period is 1700 B.C. and it

goes upto 700 B.C. During vedic period four Vedas were compiled their names are 1 Rig Veda, 2. Samyaveda, 3. Yajurveda 4. Alharveda. Purana were not compild in Vedic period. It should be understood that no purana was written in vedic period. It may be another thing that the reference of the situation at that time might be made in ay Purana. The time of writing Smarities is not one. No time is determined. The Smarities started becoming available between second century B.C. Second Century A.D. The first available Purana became available in third century A.D. In my opinion the Puranas were written upto thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth century and the work of amendments and alteration of some of the Puranas took place upto Pre modern period. With pre modern I mean 18th century.

The very first Purana which became available was Vishnu Puran the accepted date of which is third century A.D. There are eighteen Mahapuranas. I do not remember the dates on which these became available but broadly it can be said that the five six main Puranas can be of the period between Gupta and harsha Vardhna. These main Puranas are:-

(1) Vishnu Puran (2) Matsya Puran (3) Vayu Purana
(4) Brahma Puran.

There starts the 2nd phase of urbanization after the Vedic period. It ended in Gupta period. It was the year 4-5 century A.D.

To my information there have been written many Ramayans such as Valmiki Ramayan, Bhusundi Ramayan, Kamban Ramayan etc. The compilation of Valmiki Ramayan took place in forth century B.C. which is recognized by some people as 2nd Century B.C. also.

(The learned Advocate at this stage drew the attention of the witness towards couplet No.5 of fifth canto (Doha 5 Sarga Pancham) The witness perused the book.

Question: It is mentioned in couplet 5. canto 5 of the book shown to you in Balkand that there is big inhabited Janpad namely Kaushal on the bank of Saryu. What do you say in this regard?

Answer: It is correct that these things are written in the book mentioned above.

In sixth couplet of the same canto it is also written that there is an Aayodhya city in Kaushal Janpad which was built and inhabited by Manu Maharaj himself. I have seen the couplet No.26, canto No. 16 of Balkand of this book. It is written herein that Raja Dashratha made Kaushlya to eat kheer (sweetened preparatio of rice and milk boiled together) for fulfillment of his desire to have a son. In couplets 8.9 and 10 of canto eighteenth of Balkand. The dates and Nakshtra relating to the birth of Sri Rama have been completely described. In couplet No.11 of the same canto. Sri Rama has been stated to be the incarnatio of Bhagwan Vishnu who belonged to Ikashvaku dynasty.

In couplet no.2 of 50th canto (Ayodhya kand) of Valmiki Ramayana, Rama has sought permission from residents of Ayodhya before going to jungle. It is written in this very Ayodhya Kand, in canto No.49, couplet No.11 that Sri Rama crossed Gomati river after covering lot of ground. It is written in fifteenth couplet of the same can to that he expressed his desire to do hunting of deer in the forest full of flowers situated at the proximity of saryu, after returining from jungle. (At this stage the witness Volunteer: that the couplets mentioned above though are there in Valmiki Ramayana but the book is a Mahakavya and because of

this, plots, characters and the descriptions, not necessarily, are historical. These may be assumed also. 2ndly the Balkand which comes in the beginning, as like other old Granths, seems to have been added afterward and the determination of date of Ayodhya kand too has been done by Brakinton.

We feel that the Balkand in Valmiki Ramayana was added around 12th century. The basis for this is that in all old books, the first and last parts have been added. It generally happens so and I think so on the basis of research conducted by me on Ramayana also. The latest work on it, to my information, is that of Brakinton. This research is of the recent years i.e. of the last 10 years. This writer is a British citizen. The name of his book is The righteous rama the book Sanskrit Epic and Epitome which was stated to have been published in 1978 has not been written by him. It is also not called in Hindi as Ramayana and Ramapakhyan. The author of any such book is not Shri J.A.L. Brakinton. Brakinton, whom I am referring as far as I remember, his name in R.L. Brakinton. Jaikobi has written A.B. Venter Nets has also written on Valmiki Ramayana. These books have been written earlier but it is not remembered correctly in which year. These books are reliable. Indian Scholars recognize the scholarly skill of these authors and also quote them. (The learned Advocate put a question to the witness that the names of such scholars be told who recognize their scholarly skill and have quoted them in their books. The witness avoided the Answer for a pretty long time and Answered thereafter) such as Prof. Romila Thapar, Prof. R.S. Sharma, Prof. B.N.S. Yadav, Prof. M.G.S. Narayan but I cannot tell at this time about the books and articles of these scholars where they have recognized and quoted the scholarly work of above said foreign authors.

Question Which is the Ramayana recognized by all the people and there is no dispute over that?

Answer: Valmiki Ramayan is authentic one. It is accepted as authentic but there may be some difference of opinion about the character, the contents determining the date etc., In my opinion there is no book related to Ramayan which is recognised by all and there is no dispute over the same.

I did not read any Ramayan written by Mahatma Budh. The book written by him Ramakiyen i.e. Ramakirti has not been read byt me, rather I would say that no such book of Mahatma Budh is there. I have studied Boudh Granths. I did not read any book under this name is Boudh Granths also.

Kamban Ramayan was compiled after tenth or eleventh century. I do not know the specific period of its writing. The author of Kamban Ramayan was Kamban. I do not remember when did he born and when did he die. I did not read this book. In addition to Valmiki Ramayan I had read Bhusundi Ramayan, read Ramcharit Manas. That way I have read these Ramayans and some have been consulted also. Bhusundi Ramayan was written in fourteenth century. It is other than the Valmiki Ramayan. It has been written in Sanskrit. The main difference between both the books is that in Valmiki Ramayan there is description of old things and the language also is an old one wheres in Bhusundi Ramayan. There comes some description of current Era here and there. It is correct that the Valmiki Ramayan shown to me in the court today, is prevalent for the last 1000 years, barring some parts. Barring interpolation in it, this book in original form is prevalent for the last 1000 years. Its original ingredients

were found in forth second B.C. In Gupta period interpolation had taken place but I shall not be able to tell which were those interpolations. Thereafter the interpolation took place in ninth century, but I do not remember which those interpolations were and lastly the interpolations took place in eleventh twelfth century A.D. and I do not remember those also. This book is continuing in the same condition since eleventh twelfth century. This Valmiki Ramayan which I saw today in the court, It is told that it was published in Sambat 2054 from Geet press Gorakhpur. This book has been published in two parts (the learned Advocate filed both the parts of this book in the court today).

No such record is available on the basis of which it could be said as to where from and when Lord Ram originated. I did not study Maha Ramayana. In my opinion no such Ramayana is available also.

Question: The meaning of word Rama is

Answer: It could be the word meaning.

I have read the Padma Puran a little bit. I have read its extracts. I have not studied it completely. I have read the major portion of Skandha Puran. The interpolations have taken place in Skandha Puran from time to time. I have told about them. I have not examined/investigated Padma Puran hence I cannot tell more about its position. I feel that interpolation in Skandha Puran took place last of all in around 1750 A.D. It may be upto 1857 also. It was one interpolation through which efforts were made to link and clarify the position of Rama Janambhoomi with Ayodhya Mahatm. Apart from this the Bundi devi, which is accepted as Devi of Jail, Shitala Devi and Chutaki Devi were included in this period around in Ayodhya Mahatm. I have

also seen the original Skandha Purana. I have stated about interpolation only on the basis of reading it. I read this book of Skandha Puran in original. From the library of Archaeological survey of India which is located in Delhi and reprinted by National Museum and Nag Publishers. I studied this in 1990. If felt necessary, we consult it even now. Last time I saw this book in that Library in 1989-90. The photocopy pertaining to Ayodhya Mahatm was taken from this book at that time and the same is with me.

The photocopy of original Shandh Purana obtained by me, is not a certified copy. I do not remember if I paid some fee or not for processing the copy, I did not study Kurma Purana. I may have seen its references. I would not be able tell the specificf year or Sambat of its writing but probably. It is after the 10th century, It could be written any time after that. But it is not written in Nineteenth century. It could be from 10th to any century upto fourteenth century. There is no period known as Ramayana period. Those who have faith in Ved puran, Upnishda and Ramayana etc. they studythem and recognize them. I did not make any survey to know who are the people who have faith in them and which part of the world they live in. Such people could be the followers of any religion. Since the date these books have come into existence and have become popular, those having faith in them, are recognizing them. It is correct that people having faith in these books are residing in India. But it is not essential that they may be called Hindfus. Non Hindu people too read them and praise what ever they find good things in them but it is not necessary that they follow them. Some non Hindu people follow these granths and have faith in them. People outside India also have faith in these books and they recognize them. These people are not very many but only a few.

Word Hindu is a mixture. All kinds of people, whose ancestors, even belonged to outside, are assimilated into it. No one was Hindu originally. It is a lateral concept. It started sometime in fourth or third B.C. the witness Volunteer: that Hidoo, Gadar, Shatagu were the small Matreo states, which were located adjoining Sindh and because of this reason they were called Hidoo, and later on, but I cannot say, how long after, this term Hidoo, was converted into Hindu). It is correct that word Hindu is not a religion or caste based term rather it is a geographical term. (The witness again said that it was the term earlier but at a later stage it became a caste based word when all kinds of people joined together in a particular group and assimilated with each other). If, with the passage of time, turned into a caste based term in the medieval period, but I cannot say in which century precisely that happened so. The people who followed other religions; they were also called Hindu, such as Jain, Buddhist and Shaivads. I can only tell this much at present. Such a mixture was obvious because it generally happens with the exchange of different cultures. There is no such thing, as Sanatan Dharam, Christianity and Muslim come very late. These people are not included in Hindus. I cannot say if some Prasi have converted into Hinduism, and Brahmanism but Parsis are not included in Hindu term. Similarly Yahudies too are not included in Hindu term.

Sindu civilization continued from 2250 B.C. to 1750 B.C. At that time its contemporary civilizations were Mesopotamia and Egyptian and none else. If it were, I do not know. Sindhu civilization was geographically spread from Manda (Kashmir) on the North to Daimabad in south and in Pakistan from Sutkanadadoor to Alamgirpur and Shartughai in Afghanistan. Alamgir is in eastern side which I have told earlier. My idea is that it falls somewhere on U.P. Border. It

is wrong to say that the name of Sindhu civilization with the passage of time became after the nation Bharatvarsh. The concept of Bharatvarsh has been told in Puranas and it came after Gupta period. It came after hundred to two hundred years of Gupta period. Gupta period remained from 320 B.C. to 550 A.D.

I have not studied the Jain Shastras completely. I tried to know it by making enquiries here and there. I have read Parishisht Parvan. I have read Kashin Kalin Charia, Kharpatra, Patravali, some sootras some examples of Acharangia sootra and Bhadrabahu Charitra. Jain Shastras in India were written first time after 8th century A.D. Their beginning took place between 8th to 10th Century A.D. in my opinion there had been 22 or 23 Jain Tirthan. I do not remember now who was the first Thirthankar. I shall not be able to tell in which B.C., Sambat, century they were there. The last Thirthakar was Mahavirji. He was in 6th century B.C. I do not remember now whether the reference of Rama had come in the books or extracts which I read about Jain literature. These books contained the material about the provincial states, their kind and that was all. It is not that I just managed with the ordinary knowledge for studying literature and history of Jain literature. (Volunteer: that wherever necessary. I intensively studied the Jain literature). I also intensively studied about the suit relating to this dispute. I studied in this regard the book of Jain literature Trishashti Shrilaka Purush Charitum. And also read many more books but I do not remember now. The book I have told, was written in fourteenth A.D. It was written by some Jain Acharya whose name is not remembered.

I have studied Boadh literature also. As per the necessity, I have read this also intensively. The books I have read are, "Deeghanakay, Deepvarish, Mahavansh,

Jatak". I do not remember the names of the rest of the books at this time. Some of these books are of 2nd Sadi B.C. whereas some are 7th, 8th century A.D. Jatak book is of 2nd century B.C. Mahavansh, Deepvansh etc. granths are of 7th or 8th A.D. The foundation of Boadh Dharma took place after the salvation of Bhagwan Budh. Salvation of Bhagwan Budh took place around 486 B.C.

I did not read Sikh history at all, (again said). Not extensively but have little bit. The foundation of Sikh religion started from Guru Nanakji. I shall not be able to tell the place and time of his birth and death at this time, as I am not recalling it. I do not consider it possible to estimate the century of birth and death. I do not remember as to who was the last Guru of Sikh Dharma. The appearance of Guru Nanak Dev took place around 1500 A.D. The study I made about Ayodhya is an intensive study as well as research. Before doing this I did not feel the necessity to seek permission from any one. With regard to my research, neither I submitted my research papers to any one nor I got any degree in this regard and I did not do this research work for getting any degree either (again said I would get this material published later on at some stage). I started this research work from 1989-90. It has not yet been over, my study is still going on. For the study of this research work, I do my table work and also go to Ayodhya for doing the field work. In 1989-90 the subject matter of this dispute for the historian was a burning topic, therefore, I started the research work. Basically I did this work on my own at my will and inspiration. I did this research work for acquiring knowledge relating to this dispute and to arrive at some conclusion. I have concluded my research work on this particular issue. It was concluded about 4-6 years before from today. I concluded it in 1994. Still there are things to be done which have come to the mind after

conducting study. I am pondering over them now, I note down the result of my research on documents. My final report is not yet ready. As soon as the new things come to the notice. These will have to be considered. In the Indian History Congress which met perhaps in 1992. I read my research paper and it attracted lot of discussion. That paper is filed there and the references of that paper are available in books pertaining to Ayodhya.

I do know that after demolishing the disputed structure in December 1992, some inscriptions and records were found, which are kept with the Government of India themselves and the circumstances in which they were found. I do not give them any credence. I had gone to see those inscriptions but I did not find any but I have studied them. Factually, on the basis of material found in the articles written by other scholars on those so called inscriptions. I conducted my study by reading them I had gone to Ayodhya to see these inscriptions. I went to see these inscriptions and other related matters, to Ayodhya in 1992 after the demolition of the disputed structure I went to March, 1992, February 1992. In February 1992, sooner or later during these months. There after I went there in the month of May the year but I could not see the records. I could not see the inscriptions either. I might have gone to Ayodhya between May 1992 and May 1998 but I do not remember now. I after going there tried to know about the place where these inscriptions were kept. Now in May 1998, I came to know that I cannot see those inscriptions without the permission of commissioner Faizabad. Before this I did not know about taking permission from the Commissioner I myself rang up to the Commissioner but I did not submit any application for seeking permission. I did not submit any application to the Hon'ble Commissioner. It is wrong to say that I did not make any concrete efforts to see the inscriptions.

Question: For seeing the inscriptions you did not submit any application to Hon'ble Commissioner, then what concrete steps you took?

Answer: I wanted to do the needful after contacting the commissioner and also wanted to inspect those inscriptions through him but when I was told that these were available in the custody of an officer of District Administration, I went to contact him at the above site. But they also told that without permission from the commissioner that would not be possible and thereafter, I did not go ever, any where.

I could not have any pass made for going to Manas Bhawan. I reached there straight because I had spoken to the officers. I cannot say how far it is correct that no one can go to Manas Bhawan without obtaining pass. However I reached directly. The Police asked me to come and I reached there. I do not remember whether it was Police or CRPF. It is wrong to say that I did not reach Manas Bhawan at all. From entry point of Manas Bhawan, I saw police only once but I do not remember now whether or not there was any barricade. The distance from entry point to Manas Bhawan would be 15-20 steps. It is wrong to say that there would at least be four barricades from entry point of Manas Bhawan. However, this distance would not be 150 steps. It may be above 15-20 steps.

Verified the statement after hearing
Sd/-
Suresh Chandra Mishra
9.9.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this for further cross-examination on 10.9.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-
9.9.98

10.9.1998

(In continuation of 9.9.1998) the statement of P.W.13, Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra on oath begins.

It is a matter of May 1998 I contacted the commissioner on telephone for obtaining permission from District Administration for studying the inscription. I made this telephone call from Ayodhya. I do not know the name of the then commissioner to whom I contacted on telephone. At this point of time I did not remember his telephone number also. For seeing the so called inscriptions I went to the person of the Distt. Admn. Who was having the custody of those inscriptions. These inscriptions were under him as was told to me. I do not know the designation and name of that officer. I met him in Manas Bhawan where it was his office or the residence or there may be residence cum office. But it could not happen so that I instead of meeting the officer, would have met his subordinate. When that officer refused me to show the inscriptions, I did not take any other action. I had given that officer my introduction. I cannot say whether he wanted to confirm my bonafides, but I understand that he was quite satisfied as to who I was. Even if I had seen the inscriptions, that would not have made any difference to my thinking.

The paper which I read, was prepared with the help of all the available books. Texts of Skandh Puran, different versions of Ayodhya Mahatma, Kritya Kalpataru, the books written in the name of Totara Nand, brought out by Ganga oriental series and all other original texts on the subject, were studied by me. These original texts comprised of Avtar Soukhya, Pratishtha Soukhya, Tirath Soukhya. The names of the remaining books are not being recollected by me. I did take help from veda and upnishdas, in fact any number of religious books which I could procure and any

material pertaining to my subject which was found in these books was studied by me. But I do not remember the names of those books or Granthas. But I did not study all the 18 Puranas on this subject. I read Vishnu Puran, I also studied Bramh Vaivart Purana, Agni Purana, Matsya Purana, Vishnu Dharma Uttar Purana etc., the names of others are not remembered (At this stage the learned Advocate drew the attention of the witness towards Vishnu Puran). Seeing that the witness said (The book shown to me is not a vishnu Puran rather it is some extract on which Vishnu Puran is written by hand and I do not remember if or not the extract shown is of Vishnu Puran. This extract has been shown in a book the title of which is "The voice of Conscientious" and which has been written by K.M.Pandey. (A copy of this extract was produced by the learned Advocate in the court).

I have seen the original version of Vishnu Maha Purana. But I do not remember at present that where I had seen that. I had seen the extracts of Devi Bhagwat Maha Purana at intervals. Which I saw was, Shrimat Bhagwat Devi Mahapurana. (The learned Advocate drew attention to the extracts given in the book mentioned above, seeing the same, the witness said) The extract shown is not the extract of Shrimat Bhagwat Purana rather it is Devi Bhagwat Purana.

I am not recalling, If I have read in Padampurana about Ram's greatness, his birth, his period of Rule, Ashwamedh Yagya. Ayodhya Nagri was rehabilitated by Devtas themselves, or not, but I have definitely consulted this book. /To consult means I have inspected it to know about its sources. I have read all the Puranas in original and their authorized versions but I do not remember now which purana has been studied in which library. After reading all

these books, which include Puranas also, I have arrived at the conclusion that Ayodhya is also a religious city. In these Puranas, it has been mentioned in some and also not mentioned in the others, that Bhagwan Vishnu had taken birth in Ayodhya as Ram. It is correct that some people accept it and worship Rama as God Since centuries but such people are Vaishnavite or Ram Bhakt. It is also correct that these people go to Ayodhya at different places for pilgrimage. Of all the assumptions one assumption of some people could be that God (Bhagwan) had taken birth in Ayodhya, that is why it is a pilgrimage place.

Question: The people who worship Rama, do they accept Ayodhya as his birth place?

Answer: It is correct.

No special incident took place in the year 750 A.D. Between the 700 to 750 A.D. taking place of any special historical event is not remembered by me. In the year 710 A.D a commercial contract between Arab people and Indian had taken place. It can be called a war also. (Again said that). There had taken place a war in 710 A.D. But we cannot say that the warriors were the followers of Islam Religion. (Again said that we cannot say so categorically that these warriors were the followers of Islam) The names of thodar warriors are not remembered by me. I did not hear the name of Mohd. Bin Wasim. I do not remember if he ever had waged war against India or not.

I have heard the name of Ahmad Shah Abdali. I do not remember of which country he belonged to. He had attacked India. I do not remember when did he do that. I do not remember if somebody had attacked India in 707 A.D. I have not heard the name of King Dahir. I did not conduct

any survey to know that when and where in India first mosque was built.

Question: Who was the 2nd attacker of India, who followed Islam. When did he attack India?

Answer: I *do not* remember it clearly at this point of time.

I have heard the name of Mahmood Gazanavi. He was the follower of Islam. I do not remember presently in which year or date did he attack India. Nevertheless this attack took place in around 1000 A.D. I do not remember now which of the kings in India, he had defeated. Only I know is that he had won the war. I do not remember properly as, far how long he ruled here. I do not remember if he had got a mosque built in India and if built, then why did he built.

Question: Did Mahmood Gazanavi break any temple in India or not. If he broke, which was the temple?

Answer: The kings used to attack the temples for looting the money accumulated there. Therefore, Mahmood Gazanavi attacked the temple for collecting money. In the process, the breaking of temple could also take place.

(Since the witness did not Answer the question of the learned Advocate therefore he put the question again).

Question: Did Mahmood Gazanavi break the temples or not in the process of looting money?

Answer: In my knowledge one temple got broken in an attack for looting money.

The broken temple is called Somnath temple. At that time Somnath temple was situated in Gujarat.

It is correct that Mahmood Gazanavi was greedy for money and was an imperialist and for that he resorted to Lootpat. I have no such information that Mahmood Gazanavi got the religion of Hindus converted and included them in Islam.

After Mahmood Gazanavi, the next attack was of Mohd. Gauri. It happened in 11th century, Mohd. Gauri attacked India several times (again said) mainly attacked twice. I do not remember if or not the number of his total attacks, was seventeen. I do not remember properly, against which king or the kingdom he waged his first attack in India. I also do not remember properly if first of his attacks had remained unsuccessful. He won his last battle in twelvth centry. He defeated Prithvi Raj Chauhan. Mohd. Gauri was the follower of Islam Prithvi Raj Chauhan was the king of Gazani or adjoining areas.(again said he was not the King of Gazani but of Delhi and Ray Pithoura).

I have heard the name of Jai Chand.

Question: Were Prithvi Raj Chauhan and Jai Chand Hindus?

Answer: (The witness replied after consideration.

Answer: Yes can be said.

We do not accept that there had been some enmity between Prithvi Raj Chauhan and Jai Chand.(again said the competition to increase the boundaries of Kingdom was of course there). It is just a rumour and therefore, not correct that Jai chand had helped Maohd. Gauri against Prithvi Raj Chauhan. Jai Chand did not stand also by Prithvi Raj Chauhan. When Prithvi Raj Chauhan and mohd. Gauri fought with each other,, Jai Chand remained neutral. It is not that Jai Chand is considered as rebellion or Hindu

adversary in history. It may be the thinking of some persons but it is not correct to consider Jai Chand as traitor from historical view point. It is wrong to say that Hindus have been calling Jai Chand as traitor even today. It is not in my knowledge that whosoever commit treachery with some one Hindu people call him Jai Chand.

Question: If you are called Jai Chand, would you mind that?

Answer: I do not want to say anything in the matter.

It is wrong to say that after winning the war Mohd Gauri got both the eyes of prithvi Raj Chauhan, extracted and thereafter cut his head. In fact this is only a cock and bull story of Hindu Natinalist. I am not talking about Hindu Natinalist of today, I am talking of a period when a battle between Mohd. Gauri and Prithvi Raj Chauhan was fought. When this battle was fought, there was Hindu ideology in India. It can be a inspiring element that all Hindus got together to fight King Mohd. Gauri. I feel that they came together intheir own interest. I am not able to recollect properly as to when and for how many years Mohd. Gauri Ruled here. It was a period of many years, when he ruled but I cannot make any estimate of the same. I do not remember if Mohd. Gauri built or not built any mosque in India and if build then how many. I do not remember if or not he broke any Hindu temple. If he broke the temples then how many. It is also not in my knowledge that during his rule how many Hindus coverted their religion. The Mulsim Ruler of India after Mohd. Gauri was Kutubdin Aibak. Kutubdin Aibak constructed Kutu Minar (again said) I do not remember for how many years this King rued. I do not remember if or not any mosque was constructed during the regime of Kutubddin Aibak in India. After Kutubddin Aibak the next Muslim Ruler was Iltutmish. Thereafter it

was Balban and then Razia Sultan. No such record is available which proves that Iltutmish was a fanatic Muslim ruler or he got killed Hindus in great number or converted their religion or got the temple broken or in this manner he would have promoted Islam.

Bhadshah Balban was a staunch follower of his religion. He was Muslim but he did not resort to any general massacre or breaking temple. Raziya Sultan was also a Ruler, no such thing can be said about her.

It is correct that all these Rulers were known Rulers of Das Dynasty. Kutubddin Aibak was the slave of Mohd. Gauri. The Rule of slave dynasty continued from 12th Century to Just before 14th century. I do not remember now as to what were the boundaries of the Empire of these Rulers. The capital of these Rulers was in Delhi. I feel that Avadh Pradesh also was under the jurisdiction of their empire. It is wrong to say that it was separate from the boundary of their empire. It is correct to state that today's entire Uttar Pradesh was inside the boundary of their empire. Today's Punjab Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh were also in the jurisdiction of their empire. But I cannot say anything about Jammu and Kashmir. Today's Bengal and Bihar were also under their polity. I cannot say with certainty whether or not Gujarat and today's Maharashtra were under their Rule. Similarly I cannot say anything about today's Madhya Pradesh. Today's Pakistan, Inclusive of Sindh Pradesh and Peshawar, was under the Rule of slave dynasty. Except the part of Kashmir, entire Pakistan was under the jurisdiction of slave dynasty. Today's Assam, Mizoram and Nagaland etc., were not included in the jurisdiction of their Kingdom. I do not remember if Kabul also was under their jurisdiction or not. A greater part of today's India and old India, were under their jurisdiction. The tropic of cancer which passes

through India, can be taken to be the boundary of the Rule of that dynasty. The Tropic of cancer, in India, passes through Gujarat and going via Madhya Pradesh, encircling Uttar Pradesh, goes upto Bengal including Bihar.

After slave dynasty there came Tuglaw dynasty in India. The Tuglaqs were also the followers of Islam Religion. Allauddin Khilaji became the Emperor of India in 13th Century. He was not the ruler of slave dynasty. In fact after slave dynasty there came the rule of Khilaji Rulers and because I do not remember the dates properly. Therefore, the nearby dates can be taken for their rule.

Question You told just now that the Rule of slave dynasty continued from 12th century to around 14th century and thereafter Tuglaw dynasty came to power. Now you say that in 13th century there was a Rule of Khilaji dynasty which one is correct of these.

Answer: Khilaji came first and then came Tuglaqs.

Allauddin Khilaji was a fanatic victorious king who also followed Islam. Delhi was his capital and the boundaries of slave dynasty were under his Rule.

His Rule remained for about 30-40 years. It is not that propagation of Islam increased greatly during his regime. I did not read it anywhere that he enforced Quranic law in the jurisdiction of his Empire. It is wrong to say that he got many temples demolished and many mosques built. It is not that he made people converted, particularly Hindu Ladies, to Islam. I do not remember that during his Rule story of one Queen Padmini had taken place. It is not in my knowledge that Allauddin Khilaji had kept Rani Padmini in his Harem after kidnapping her. I do not remember if during the regime of Allauddin Khilaji there were Hindu Law for Hindus and Islamic Law for Muslims. It is not in my

knowledge that during his regime tax was imposed on pilgrimage places of Hindus. I have heard the name of Jajia Tax. I do not remember in whose rule and at what time Jajia tax was imposed. I do not remember now when and why was it imposed. I do not remember that Jajia tax was imposed only on Hindus.

After Khilaji dynasty there came Tuglaw dynasty in India. The main Rulers of this period were Mohd. Bin Tuglaw, Firozshah Tuglaq. Their capital was also Delhi. But the boundaries of this kingdom were limited. I am not recollecting properly but there may not be some provinces under them. The Tuglaq people were also the followers of Islam. How many mosques were built during their regime is not remembered by me. As far as I know it is wrong to say that during their rule conversion of religion of Hindu was got done and temples got broken. I disagree with the contention that these people had also been fanatics or they resorted to cruelty against Hindus in order to promote Islam.

I have come from Delhi to Lucknow to have my evidence recorded in this case. I never came by air but the return journey from Lucknow to Delhi, I performed by air, twice. Today also I want to go by air. It is correct that my hand bag is kept in the court at present and on it many tags (agaisaid) one each and in total 2 tags of Indian Airlines and Sahara Air Lines are stucked to it.

I do not know when Taimoor Lung attacked India. Changez Khan had attacked India and at that time it was Rule of Khilaji dynasty but I do not remember the year of that attack. I did not read too much about the religious thinking of both. I, therefore cannot say if one of them or both were the followers of Islam or not. I do not remember from which country changez khan had come to India to

attack here or of which country he hailed from. He had attacked India. I do not know much about the so called lootpat committed by him. I do not have the information that when Changez Khan went back from India, he took along lot of diamond jewellery through lott. I do not remember at present whether he or some other, if other, who is that other who had taken, by loot that diamond of Kohinoor from here. Changez Khan did not rule over here. After attack he had gone back. He had taken alonglot many things from here. How did he get those things is not known to me. With lot many things, I mean gold, silver, diamond and jewellery. It is wrong to say that he massacred many people, particularly Hindus here in the nameof Islam. I have to say that he killed so many people but in them were the people irrespective of religion. It has not come to my notice that he had attacked temples or lotted them.

I do not know which was the country of Taimoor lung. I know a little bit about Nadir Shah. But I am not able to remember thatdate on which Nadir Shah attacked India. I do not remember at present of which country he hailed from. He was the follower of Islam. He did not stay put in India for a long time.I do not remember if or not he ruled India. He collected lot of money here and he did all that forcibly, as the victorious does.

I know a king of Kashmir namely Shankar or some thing like Shankar Verman, who broke and looted temples of Hindus and desecrated them and he had appointed one offier also for this work whose name was Devo Patan Nayak.

It was the practice in that era. This incident took place around 10th century. I have read this in the book of D.D. Kaushambi. I do not remember at present I which year this book was published and when did I read it or when was it written. There are many books of that writer but I do not remember in which of his books and at what place I have

read it. I am not able to remember it properly as to where had I read the book of Shankar Verman but a book edited by A.J.Saiyyad and published by Bombay University, the name of which is not being remembered, or "Exasperating Essays" by D.D. Koushambi or 3-4 different Text Book on Indian History by him, such things are written. Wherever they have written so, they have quoted the source. At present no other example is coming to my mind where any Hindu King had resorted to such a lootpat, after victory but such things have definitely happened. No records is found any where. It is not completely true that the attacks on India after 6th century were mostly resorted to by the Arabs. Apart from the Arab countries, the attack on India after 6th century were also waged by Gurjers who had come from central Asia. Except them others were Arabs only.

Islam was born in Mecca, Arab. But I shall not be able to tell the exact Isvi or Sambat when Islam was born. I do not know if Mohd. Saheb was born in Mecca or his area of work was in Mecca.

This area of work was at many places in Arab. It is correct that appearance of Islam took place and spread with him.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

10.9.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this case for further cross-examination on 12.10.1998.

Sd/-

10.9.98

12.10.1998

(In continuation of 10.9.1998 the statement of P.W.13 Shri Sursh Chandra Mishra on oath begins).

Islam was born in 7th century. It was born through Mohd. Sahab. I do not know clearly as to what was the way of worship in Arab countries before the birth of Islam or to whom did they worship. I cannot tell clearly that before the appearance of Islam, which religion the people of Arab followed. Before Hajrat Mohd. Saheb, may be there the idol worship in arab countries. The idol worship is prohibited in Islam. I do not know if idols existing in arab countries, after the advent of Islam, were all broken. I do not know confirmly that a Shivling exists in Mecca Shrief. I cannot say also that the so called Shivling has some how been covered. I do not understand the meaning of Taboot nor that of Sange Asbad. So I cannot say if with the help of these, the so called Shivling was covered.

I know that the Muslims go to Mecca Shrief for Haj every year. I do not know their such a practice that they kiss a stone there.

I cannot say clearly as to which religion the people of Iran followed before the advent of Islam. I do not know clearly, when did Iran become Islamik country. I cannot say that before the advent of Islam, the people of Iran were the worshiper of Parsi religion or were they also be doing idol worship. I cannot say also that the follower of Islam religion, at the point of sword spread Islam in entire Iram country. I also cannot say that Iran was the first country to be made Islamic at a point of sword. No such trend comes to the notice as may clarify that when ever the Invadors, the followers of Islam, from Arab countries came to India,

they would have broken the idols and compelled the public here to convert to Islam.

I have heard that word Qafir has been used in Quran Shrief but I did not hear about the use of word 'Mushariq'. I do not know in the concept of Quran Shrief what does the word Qafir means in my concept the word Qafir means-"One who is not the follower of one particular system" I have read some extracts of Quran Shrief. I did not find any such thing which advocates that those who do not follow Islam, be killed or those who do idol worship be liquidated.

I have read the English book "The Meaning of Holy Quran". I have read only a few excerpts of this book.

After the appearance of Mohd. Saheb, the first mosque was built in Mecca but I cannot say with certainty that when was it constructed. Thereafter the mosque was constructed at Cairo but I shall not be able to tell the time of this also. I did not want to resort to any guess work in the matter. After the mosques started to be built in India, the first one could be "Dhayi Din Ka Jhopra". Or some mosques in Sindh area. "Dhayi Din Ka Jhopra" mosque is in Rajasthan. It may be in Ajmer or at its surroundings. I do not remember the time of its construction. This mosque was constructed during the rule of Kutubddin Aibak. I do not remember in whose Rule the mosques in Sindh were constructed. It may be possible that the mosques which were built during the regime of Kutubddin Aibak, their style be different from the mosques in Arab countries. The mosques constructed after Kutubddin Aibak are the mosque constructed by Babar in Panipat, the Moti Masjid which in Delhi. Then the mosque in Delhi was constructed. But it is not necessary that the chain of construction remained continued like this. After this Atala mosque

Jounpur was constructed. Then many mosques in Bengal were constructed.

The speciality of Dhayi DinKi Masjid is that there is an impact of Sarsenik and Salajook (a name of caste) on it. This can be called as having been irregularly constructed mosque which is different from the construction style of Arab countries. This mosque was constructed by the people over here and therefore, there could be the impact of Indian style on it. But it cannot be accepted that the mosque which were constructed afterwards before the Mughals came, the construction style was the same. Mughals came with Babar. I didn't have the opportunity to see "Dhai Din Ka Jhopra" masjid. I do not agree with the contention that a temple would have been demolished for constructing this mosque or its construction time would have been the regime of Mohd. Gauri and not the regime of Kutubddin Aibak. It is correct that Kutubddin Aibak was the Senapati of Mohd. Gauri. I do not know about any such record where from it could be revealed that some inscription is installed there and it is written on the so called inscription that the Masjid in question was constructed after demolishing a Hindu temple.

The mosque of Panipat was got built by Babar. I do not remember the date of construction of that mosque. The mosque was constructed before the disputed building was constructed. But I cannot say with conformity as to how much time before the disputed building, the mosque at Panipat, was constructed. It is certain the mosque at Panipat was constructed after 1526, but I cannot say if it was constructed before 1528. It is correct that there is difference in construction style of both the mosques i.e. Mosque at Panipat and the disputed mosque but I do not accept that this difference is that wide. There were 14

pillars in the disputed building which were added later on. (again said that these 14 pillars were the part of that structure.) there were no pillars in the mosque at Panipat. The structure at Ayodhya was more beautiful and neat and clean. The craftsmanship and the style of its structure was better and because of the pillars its beauty was manifold enhanced. I do not recollect properly now that whether or not there was some more difference except those two things as told above. In the mosque at Panipat there is no such inscription or record in which it is written that the place in question was for descending of angles or by constructing that the land was made sacred. I do not remember at this point of time whether there were some flowers or leaves etc. constructed on the mosque of Panipat but it is correct that there were no deities or man and woman or birds or flowers or sign of Kalash etc. constructed on the building. It is also correct that no sign of the figure of a lion or pig, Baraha is found on the building in the construction. I do not remember now whether any inscription is available on that Masjid or not.

I cannot say with certainty that from 1526 to which date Babar ruled over India. I cannot tell basically the period for which Babar ruled over India.

Question: Cannot you tell whether Babar remained in India for one year or ten years?

Answer:.. He lived in India.

(At this stage the witness sought permission from court saying that he wanted to calculate the time and he was helped by giving him paper and pencil).

I have calculated it and on the basis of it I can say that he lived in india from 1526 to 1530. keeping in today's geography, the rule of Babar was from Bengal to Lahore.

During the regime of Babar, the mosques particularly constructed were, mosque of Panipat, Ayodhya, Sambal and Jaunpur of Atala. These names are particularly remembered by me at present. Nevertheless many more masjids were also constructed. I do not remember in which year Babar expired. I do not remember his place of death also. I cannot tell either whether he died in India or outside India. (again said) now I remember the mosque of Jaunpur had been constructed before Babar.

I didn't see ever the masjid of Sambal. I have only read about it. I cannot say whether, the masjid at Sambal was constructed earlier or the disputed structure at Ayodha was constructed earlier. A book namely Indo – Islamic Architecture (again said) Indian Architecture Islamic Period Part –II which was written by Parsi Brown revealed that the Masjid at Sambal was constructed during the regime of Babar. I do not remember the year of publication of this book but this construction was done by Taraporwala. I have not read any such thing that there are chains and bell on the Masjid at Sambal and these are there even today. I didn't read this even in the book referred above. I didn't read the structural style of Masjid at Sambal and the disputed building at Ayodhya from comparison point of view. Therefore I cannot say anything so far as their comparison is concerned.

I didn't read about any inscription in the mosque of Sambal. I didn't read about any flower – leaves, animals, birds, human being, deities figures constructed in Sambal's Masjid. Similarly I did not read about any pitcher (Kalash) being there. I did not read about the existence or non existence of pillars there.

The disputed building had been fully completed during the regime of Babar. Its construction would have taken place between 1528-29. The 14 pillars in the disputed building were made of basalt. I cannot say clearly whether or not the artisans of Ayodhya Faizabad were adept in fashioning the touch stone, but they were very adept in installing them in building. These fourteen pillars did not appear to be local product rather it appeared that they were installed here by procuring them from abroad. It appears, rather it is correct, that these 14 pillars were made available to the artisans of that place in a readymade state and they installed them in the building there.

I have read the extracts of Babarnama and not the complete book. Babarnama has been originally written in Turki language. I have a copy of it kept in my hotel. The copy of it is in my possession and is a translated copy in English. I am staying in Birlington Hotel and this book is kept there only. I cannot say correctly where the original Babarnama is kept but many of the manuscript are available in London. It may be mentioned somewhere in my copy as where the original Babarnama might be kept. But I do not know. The book which is with me, is a complete translation of Babarnama rather some notes are also written there. This translation has been done by Mrs. Bevir. She has translated it from Turkish Language. The translation of Babarnama was also made in Persian. I cannot say if or not. Mrs. Bevir utilized the Persian translation also, I do not remember if Mrs. Bevir has made any reference in her translation that she had seen and read the original Babarnama or not or she did the translation of Babarnama in Persian language has been done by some scholar of the Mughal period but I do not remember his name. I cannot say in which Emperor's regime this scholar

was there. Or during whose rule the translation of Babarnama was done from Turki to Persian.

The Babarnama which I have read, contained the name of Meer Baqi in its appendix. There could be the reference of Meer Baqi in the main Babarnama (again said). The reference of Meer Baqi has come in the context of Senapati of Babar and also in the context of constructing a mosque at the disputed place. As far as I remember, no reference exists in Babarnama as where and which of the particular mosque was got constructed by Babar. I do not remember if or not there is any mention in Babarnama about the construction of a mosque in Ayodhya by him or during his period. The reference in Babarnama is of Meer Baqi and not that of "Baqi". There could be a use of word "Baqi" in Babarnama but that use is not with reference to a person. Whenever a reference has been made of some person, the word Meer Baqi only has been used. That means when the reference of Meer Baqi comes, his full name has been written. The statement which I have given before, and in which Meer Baqi has been referred as a Senapati of Babar and also with reference to the construction of mosque at the disputed site, is correct. Similarly my statement that where and which of the particular mosque was got constructed by Babar is also correct. My contention is that Mrs. Bevriej has stated in the appendix contained with the translation of Babarnama that the construction of mosque in Ayodhya was done by Meer Baqi, the Senapati of Babar. It is correct that the appendix written by Bevriej is her own contention, which is not the part of Babarnama.

I do not remember at this time whether the mention of "Baqi Tashkandi" and "Baqisadwal" has been made in

Babarnama or not. If such a reference has come then it could be for Meer Baqi, his Senapati.

I do not remember, if a place for Vazu has been kept in the mosque at Sambal and in the mosque at Panipat.

I do not remember if or not I have read somewhere about the arrangement of water for Vazu in both the mosques in disputed building, which I call a mosque, there was an inscription. This inscription probably was on a stone in which the reference of constructing the mosque was made. This inscription was in Persian language. I do not know Persian language. Since I cannot read Persian, therefore, I cannot tell what had been written there (Volunteer: that I read about that inscription at many places). On that place, except the inscription in Persian. No other inscription in Urdu, Arbi or Turki was there. On that site i.e., in that building, there was only one inscription, which I have already discussed.

I do not know if in 1934, this building had sustained some damage. I did not read it anywhere that in 1934, there had taken place a serious riot and the upper part of the building had been demolished. It is wrong to say that after the demolition of upper portion in 1934. The Britishers had restored it by giving a form of a mosque. It is wrong to say that the record of Persian language would have been installed after the riots of 1934.

It is correct that Kashi, Ayodhya and Mathura had been considered as Pilgrimage places of Hindus for centuries. In Kashi there is a temple of Vishwanath Bhagwan Shankar which Hindus have been worshipping for a long time. But I do not accept if they have been worshipping it for centuries. Nevertheless that temple could

be hundreds of years old. Meaning there by that it could be one or a half century old. In my opinion that temple cannot be more than 100 years old. As per my information there was no Vishwanath temple in Kashi 100 years before. I have not seen Gyan Vapi Masjid. But I have heard that a Masjid of this name is there at Kashi. I do not remember when was the construction of this Masjid took place. I do not agree that the construction of Gyan Vapi Masjid was made by demolishing half a portion of Vishwanath temple. I also do not agree that the so called construction was got made by Aurangzeb. It is wrong to say that Aurangzeb got Gyan Vapi Masjid constructed by demolishing half portion of kashi Vishwanath Temple.

I did not read Alamgirnama. I have heard the name of this book. I shall not be able to tell when this book was written. Legend is that Bhagwan Krishna (I do not consider him Bhagwan) was born in Mathura. It is said that a beautiful temple was constructed at a place told by him and that temple is still there. I have not read it anywhere that during the rule of Aurangzeb a mosque was constructed there by demolishing some portion of that temple. It is not that the Mughals, after the victory and I order to inflict mental torture and religious torture to Hindus got built mosques in Kashi. Mathua and Ayodhya by demolishing temples. It is wrong to say that Mughals had converted the places under their domain in the world as Islamic states and created hindrance in the method of worship of non Muslims. I have never been to any Arab country. I have gone to Kashmir. There are many Hindu temples in Kashmir. It has not come to my notice that Muslim fanatics have broken any temple for the last 10 years. I do not tell that the Sikh Dharma was born in opposition to the atrocities of Islam. (the witness Volunteer:

that it took place in order to maintain their position in indigenous politics).

I remember that in the literature of Gurunank Dev the word "Malachchh" has been used for Muslims. To my knowledge, the word "Malachchh" has not been used in Gurugranth Sahib. It is correct that during the rule of Aurangzeb, the Sikhs struggled a lot against his atrocities (again said that not against atrocities, struggled against Aurangzeb). It is not in my knowledge that the heads of Sikhs were ripped apart with saw or they were brick laid in the walls or Gurudwaras constructed at such places.

I did not ever hear the name of so called intelligence agency ISI of Pakistan. I have no knowledge that ISI has spread a net work in this country. I have no knowledge that the aim of ISI is to set up an Islamic state in India or they are using lot of money for this purpose. I do not know that those Hindus who are advocating the cause of Muslim interest, are getting huge money from ISI. It is wrong to say that whenever I come to Lucknow for giving my evidence in this prosecution, I get Rupees one and a half to two lakh per hearing every time. I never came by air, for giving the evidence I spend the money either from my own pocket or I spend the money which I get from the court. I come by train and get my reservation confirmed both ways.

I travel by 2nd A.C. which is my entitlement. It is correct that last time I had told the court that I returned to Delhi twice only by air.

I have heard about the Babri Action Committee. I do not get money from them. (Volunteer: I have nothing to do with them). Both these allegations are wrong that the evidence given by me so far is in my own individual self interest or for the sake of money. It is wrong to say that I

have deliberately given false evidence. It is also wrong to say that I have pretended to say that a particular fact is not remembered by me to hide the truth. It is wrong to say that I am a purchased witness. In fact nobody can purchase me.

(On behalf of Hindu Mahasabha, Respondent No.10 and Shri Ramesh Chand Tripathi, Respondent No.17, the cross-examination by Shri Hari Shankar, Advocate concluded).

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

12.10.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. For further cross-examination on 13.10.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-

12.10.1998

13.10.1998

(Cross-examination on behalf of Param Hans Ram Chandra Das Respondent No.2 by Shri Madan Mohan Pandey, Advocate).

xxx xxx xxx xxx

(The statement of Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra P.W.13 on oath begins).

In my initial statement in reply to a question I had told that an International conference on International Archaeologist level, was held in May 1998 in Krotia. I did not participate in that. I could not submit my paper in that. It is correct that the papers to be submitted in such like conferences are first submitted to the organiser, duly prepared. I did not send my paper to the organizer. It is correct that after acceptance of the paper so submitted, the author gets the permission to participate in that conference. The information is sent to those whose papers are accepted and are told that they would come to the conference. I have the knowledge that there are some such popular or knowledgeable scholars as are invited even without submitting these papers. The publicity of the conference was made and even otherwise I remain in the company of academicians and thus speaking to the people I came to know about the conference. It is not necessary that after the conference is over, all the papers accepted. Should be published. The resolutions were passed at this conference held in Krotia and I have information about them. I came to know about this from my colleagues, who participated in the conference. He was Prof. K.M.Shrimali, I came to know from him only. But the information about the paper on Ayodhya was available to me even before I got it from Prof. Shrimali. This information became available through the publicity in the Newspapers. In addition to this I

knew it from the discussion in library. I do not know if the accepted papers of this conference have been published or not. I know some of the people who participated in the conference from India. The knowledge I gained about the Ayodhya Chapter in the conference, the basis of the same is the information published in the News papers and the discussion took place in Library. My discussion I this regard took place with Dr. Shrimali. The persons who had gone from India in this conference, one of them was Prof. K.M. Shrimali. The names of other people who had gone to participate, are not remembered at this time. As per my information S/Shri Makhan Lal, B.B. Lal., Prof. Ajay Mitra Shastri, Prof. B.R. Grover and Devendra Swaroop had also gone to the conference. I do not know about the going or not going of Dr. S.P. Gupta, Dr. Sudha Maleyya, Ms. Amrita Grower. I also do not have the information as to how many people from India had gone to that conference. I also do not know as how many in addition to these people had sent their papers for acceptance. It is not essential that the to and fro expenditure of those people was born by the conference whose papers were accepted. Membership fee has to be paid for participating in the conference. I did know about the fee for participating in the conference but I do not remember now.

In this conference in addition to the papers of Prof. Shrimali and Prof. R.S. Sharma many other papers were read on Ayodhya Chapter. I have the knowledge about that. I would like to make reference in particular of Prof. Ajay Mitra Shastri and then Prof. B.B. Lal. I do not know about the papers and subjects of other scholars. My resolution came and passed also in respect of Ayodhya. I had given the statement in this very Court that no resolution about Ayodhya Chapter was passed in the conference. That statement of mine was wrong rather the resolution had been passed and this statement of mine is correct. (the

witness Volunteer: I had given the statement with the view that at the previous world conference held in Delhi, a resolution was brought and that was not passed. The conference at Krotia was held between 3rd and 7th May, 1998, and that resolution might have been passed there only.

I had also prepared a paper for Krotia conference which I did not send (Volunteer: that I did not send that paper there for not getting financial help). For sending the paper, except postal charges, no other expenditure is involved. I was in search of an agency which would help me financially for sending the paper. I tried to approach the agencies, which are the academic bodies and extend help for this kind of conferences. They are not private. The name was Indian Council of Historical Research, Indian Council of Cultural relations. I had only approached these too. (Again said) I had also approached UGS. I did not send my that paper to any of these agencies, which I wanted to send to Krotia. I did not send my any written application to them, rather I enquired myself by going on the spot. It is not necessary that before giving financial help to any one these agencies like to see that article or the paper of the scholar. I have no information that the people who had gone to the conference at Krotia, were helped financially or not by any of these three agencies. The paper I prepared, had not been published anywhere.

It is wrong to say that neither I prepared any paper for the Krotia conference nor I sought any financial help from any agency. However, it is correct that I had no invitation for that conference. (the witness Volunteer: Nevertheless it was enjoined upon the conference that they would also give me the information because I was already the member there. It is correct that the opinion of the scholars on

papers which were presented there on Ayodhya Chapter, were contradictory. Since I did not go there, I have no information about the papers and the resolution. (Againsaid) I possess complete information about the papers (again said) I possess information about some papers and do not possess information about the others. I have information about the papers of Prof. K.M.Shrimali and Prof. R.S.Sharma, In addition to this I have the complete information of other two whose names are Prof. Ajay Mitra Shastri and Prof. B.B. Lal.

Question The opinion of Prof. K.M.Shrimali and Prof. R.S.Sharma is the same i.e., against the Ram Janambhoomi where as the opinion of allother scholars was in favour of Ram Janambhoomi. What do you say in the matter. Is this fact correct or not correct?

Answer:. Which ever papers I studied on the basis of that I can say that Prof. R.S.Sharma and Prof. K.M.Shrimali do not subscribe to the opinion that the mosque was constructed by demolishing any temple there. Both of them do not accept that it was Ram Janambhoomi site, and accept its foundation of a very late period, where as Prof. Ajay Mitra Shastri and Prof. B.B.Lal on the basis of their worn out ideas in their papers accept that the claim of there being Ram Janambhoomi and a temple, is tenable. Except these four, the opinion of other scholars is not know to me. I cannot say whether they were in favour of Ram Janambhoomi or against it. I have no information in that regard. I do not remember at present the title of the paper of any of these 4 scholars, whom I know, completely. This Prof. R.S.Sharma is the same person, who had written

foreword of my thesis. Prof. R.S.Sharma is also included amongst the authors of the report 'A Historians Report to the Nation', about which I had made the mention in my earlier statement. Prof. K.M.Shrimali is the same particular person who extended me cooperation in writing my thesis. I have made mention about them in my book.

The title of my paper which I prepared for the Kortia conference was " History and Archaeology of Ayodhya". Such like many conferences on world level had been taking place before May 1998 also. But I do not possess specific information about them. I also do not possess information to the effect as to how many and where such conferences were held and also whether held or not held, between 1990 to May 1998. It was not necessary for me to attend or not to attend any conference between 1990 to May 1998. nevertheless I did not attend any. None of my papers, was published in such like conferences held between 1990 and May 1998.

I know Prof. B.B. Lal He has recently been connected with the Indian Council of Historical Research. He never was the Director General of this Institution. There is department known as Archaeological survey of India, of the Govt. of India. I possess information about this Prof. B.B.Lal was the Director General of this department once.

I know Prof. Ajay Mitra Shastri. In my opinion he is now a retired professor. Once upon a time he was head of department of Ancient Indian History in Nagpur University. Epigraphy has also been his subject. To my information, in Indian Council of Research, there is no separate department for Epigraphy. To my knowledge, no commijtee

was constituted by this Institution about Epigraphy or Prof. Ajay Shastri was associated with the so called committee for the last 20 years.

The subject of my teaching and study is mainly the Ancient Indian History. The subject matter of prosecution under dispute relates to the History of medieval period. The subject matter of my research is "Kautilya Ka Arthashastra". The period of the "Kautilya Ka Arthashastra" can be recognized as 3rd B.C. to 10th century A.D. The main subject matter of the Kautilya Ka Arthashastra relates to the training of Kings and Raj Kumars, the administrative system, the judicial system of the state, increasing boundaries of state and to protect them etc. It does not contain anything about reducing the boundaries. Its manuscript has been found in Sanskrit language. It has been translated also. Its first translation was done in 1905 by R.Sharma Shastri I have read the original manuscript and also studied the translation. The 2nd translation was done by T.D.Ganpati Shastri. I do not remember properly the year of this translation. Later on Prof. Kangle also has done its translation. In Kautilya Ka Arthashastra the use of Rajasv term, has been profusely made. In that Rajasv term has been widely used about land records. But it is not that these relate only to the ownership of land. The use of term has been made for the usage such as who would procure Rajasv, procurement be made at what level, where should it be deposited and from whom should it be procured etc. According to Kautilya the procurement of Rajasv should also be made from the cultivator as well as the owner of the land. The other detail mentioned about the owner of the land, in that book, is not remembered at present. There is detail in that book regarding decision relating to determining the right of ownership of land. There is a chapter in the book with the title Bhoomi seems Vivad. For

determining the ownership on land, the occupancy of that land was the main criterion. But it has not been categorically written there whether the occupancy should be actual and physical or could it be in record. There was provision for preparing land ownership records. The accounts certificate were prepared for that. The particular name of certificate of land ownership right has not been given in Kautilya's Arthashastra. I have no knowledge if land ownership record was kept before writing Kautilya's Arthashastra. I do not remember, if or not such like records were kept between 12th century to 17th century. There was lot of impact of Kautilya's Arthashastra on 12th Century kings. We did not examine it from the point of view of its impact on Delhi Kingdom. The subject matter of my research has no relation with this dispute. It (dispute) has no relation with Kautilya's Arthashastra.

Ai-ne-Akbari is a name of a book. It has been written by Abbul Fazal. I have read that, In that book also the use of term Rajasv has been made. I cannot say with certainty that the words Khasara, Khatouni and Khewat have been used or not. I do not remember as to which of the special term or word has been used for 'Swamitva'. There is no coordination between the terminology of Kautilya's Arthashastra and Ai-ne-Akbari, Particularly with regard to Milkiyat (ownership).

In my view there is no revenue record available about the disputed land in Ayodhya. During my intensive study also, I could not get the information about the so called revenue record. I did not make any efforts also to procure such an information, (again said) I had made the efforts. I wanted to utilize all sources in my command to understand the things. I had no source to gather knowledge about the Revenue terminology. I possess knowledge about the

revenue records. Khasra, Khatauni and Khewat named documents are considered the ownership documents. But it was not so before. Rather the copper charts plats were issued for the land rights. Khasra, Khatauni and Khewat words are continuing since Mughal period. It is continuing since 16th century. I tried to obtain khasa, Khatuani and Khewat about the land in dispute but I did not get any such document. I tried to get it but I came to know that no such documents were prepared about the land in dispute, at least I could not get these documents. I tried to find out these documents in books and Gazetteers. These are the same books which I have referred earlier. I did not try to find out these documents in Ayodhya or Faizabad.

I have the knowledge that the record of revenue in villages is kept by the department of Revenue. The disputed site come under the jurisdiction of Mouja Kot Ramchandra since around 19th century. Before this it was called Ayodhya Kot. Reference of this I got from Bhushandi Ramayan that it was called Ayodhya Kot. I do not remember now that where have I read it or seen somewhere that since 19th century the name of this Mauja instead of Ayodhya Kot has become Ramchandra Kot. I do not remember whether or not the reference to this effect that the name of that Mauja has been changed from Ayodhya to Kot Ram Chandra, made in the book of Prof. Romila Thapar or not (Again said) The book of Prof. Romila Thaper referred earlier does not contain the reference that the name of this Mouja was changed from Ayodhya to Kot Ram Chandra in around 19th century. Perhaps Hans Baker has made some reference about this. But I cannot say categorically whether Hans Baker has referred the time of this change in name around 19th century.

I have scanned through some drawings/maps of the department of Revenue which have bearings upon this disputed building. But I do not remember now which those maps were or where from or where did I see them. I remember there was no mention of Janambhoomi or Janam Sthan in that map. But I do not remember now whether that map was of Revenue Department or of Faizabad Development Authority. I also do not remember that the map in question was prepared by some particular officer. That map was after the 19th century, I did not understand the revenue settlement. The map I saw was may be settlement map because that contained plot No. and also had the seal on it. But I do not remember of which department, officer or particular individual that was. I do not remember about which particular number and plot that map had been.

I do not agree with what Hans Baker has written about Ayodhya Mahatm and Ayodhya in his book. I have no knowledge that some Review of Hans Baker's book was published between the period 1986 to 1992 or not. I, in the beginning, had read an article of Prof. R.S.Sharma namely "Communal History of Rama's Ayodhya". I do not remember the date of its publication, therefore, cannot say if the article was published between 1990 to 1992. I do not remember clearly whether or not he referred to Babarnama in that article or not. In Babarnama, there comes the reference of Baqi Tashkandi but I cannot tell whether this reference came or not that when in 1529, he was at Jaunpur, his Senapati Baqi Tashkandi, had met him along with his sena. Babar made Baqi tashkandi the Administrator of Avadh. It is not clear to me whether or not Baqi Tashkandi was the same person who is known as Meer.Baqi. Possibility is that Baqi Tashkandi and Meer Baqi are the two names of the same person. I cannot say this with

certainty. It is only a possibility that both the names were of one person only.

Regarding Inscriptions a Journal *Epigraphica Indica* has been published I have read that. It is a journal and is published I have read that. It is journal and is published every year. An inscription has been published in one of its editions. There is one article in it which refers to the records available in Babri Masjid. It has mentioned about 3 inscriptions. I had given the statement in this court yesterday that there was only one inscription there. In fact my statement was due to slip of tongue. It happened so under the impression that, may be the mention of some fake inscription was being made.

I do not know about the so called book "Archaeology of Babri Masjid and Babar" by Mrs. Surinder Kaur and Sher Singh. I have neither seen this book nor read it.

When I inspected the disputed building I saw there two inscriptions. Before inspection I didn't know if there were three inscriptions. I knew only about two. That there were three inscriptions. I came to know only around 1990 – 91. knowing that there were three inscriptions I didn't get time to inspect them and even otherwise I had got the satisfaction after reading that there were three inscriptions and my curiosity too had been satisfied. Before inspecting the inscriptions I had come to know about what was written on them.

I am in Delhi since 1973. there is one mosque namely Kuvtul Islam. There might also be an inscription but is not remembered. It is absolutely wrong to say that there is an inscription on which it is written that this mosque was constructed by demolishing 27 temples of Hindu and Jain

religions. I do not remember in which language that inscription is. when I have doubt about the existence of the inscription itself how can I tell whether it is in Arabi or in other.

In addition to the disputed site, I have gone on all the religious places at Ayodhya. Almost on all religious place. These religious places belong to people of all faiths viz Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians (again said except Christians). The place belonging to Sih Dharm and where I had gone, is called Brahm Kund. It can be said that this place is situated on north – west corner of the disputed site, on the bank of Saryu river. I didn't go to the Vashishtha Kund. Brahm Kund Gurudwara is not situated on Nirmochan Ghat. When we proceed from the Nirmochan Ghat to the western side by the shore of the river, there, on the Shore of Saryu River, the Brahm Kund falls. The distance in between would definitely be 2 –3 furlongs. My decision about Ram Janambhoomi is based on mainly on my study of Skandh Purana and all literature pertaining Thirthas which goes upto 17th century and also based on my surveys. I have tried to check the measurement given in the book. I didn't do the measurement on the spot, but assessed it with the help of naked eyes. I completed this work in 1989 –90. at that time there was road on the eastern side and across that were the buildings. In the southern side were some buildings and a vacant place on the south towards western – southern side. On the western side and a little far there was road and thereafter there were buildings. On the Northern and Eastern side, the buildings were there after crossing the road. I didn't conduct any study, as and when the road which was on North –East side, came to existence. But the road was already there as I saw if when ever I went there. There was a hillock on the south of disputed site. That hillock was on

south – west side. Its name was Kuber Tila. At the time when I inspected this building I found that this was constructed on the remains of the old building at a hillock type place. During my survey I was told that on the eastern side, little away from boundary wall, there was a Kutiya divided into two parts. It was told to be Lomash. There is a reference of Lomash in Skandh Purana.

I have heard the name of a monstress named Sursa. The reference of sursa comes in the Pathantras after Skandh Puran. I made some enquiry about that also. I did not find her place on the spot. The reference of Vighanesh and that of matgajendra also comes in Skandh Puran but there is no reference of their temples. None of these places could be located on the spot. The author of Skandh puran was confused on the matter whether Vighanesh and Vishnaeshwar was one entity or were separate. The palces shown on the spot could not testify their location from the angle of disputed site. Against this I was heading towards the river side.

What to talk of compilation of Valmiki Ramayana, whether it was written before coronation to the throne of Rama or after it, we do not get the historical evidence even of Rama becoming the king. According to Valmiki Ramayana, Dashrath was the king of Ayodhya and that much only I accept. There is also a mention in Valmiki Ramayana about the person who became King after King Dashrath. According to valmiki Ramayan, Bharat became King after King Dashrath. Bharat was the son of King Dashrath. After Bharat, reference of Rama the eldest son of King Dashrath, becoming the King has come. As per the description given in the Valmiki Ramayan, and as per the legend and references, the compilation period of this book is settled before the coronation of Rama.

I have also read Manu Smriti. The detail of castism as well as of punishment system is given in that. The duties and functions of all the castes are discussed in that book. The duty of Brahmana has been explained in that. That is to read, to write, to teach, to accept charity, these are Brahmanas main duties. It also includes the punishment system.

Question: According to my version it is also necessary for the Brahman in Manu Smriti that he should follow Sanatan Dharam, propage and develop Sanatan Dharm and not to do anything against Dharma. What would you say about this?

Answer: The initial two things are not know to us but there could be a mention of third one.

I do not agree with the version that in case of speaking lie, according to the system, the Brahman could be punished rather according to me for speaking all kinds of lie as per Manu Smriti, and all other Shastras. Brahman could not be punished.

I do not agree with the contention that as per the Shastras, the Brahman was only kept outside the purview of death punishment, and other punishments could be given to him as per his faults.

I did not hear the name of so called Rudryamal granth. No reference of the so called Granth came before me during my entire study period. I know Sanskrit language. I have done Prathma degree in Sanskrit. I do not accept it that Prathma is a certificate equivalent to Junior High School. I do not know that it is equivalent to which class or standard. Nevertheless it could be accepted as equivalent to 10th Standard. After Prathma the examination

for Madhyama and thereafter Shastri is conducted and the same is the sequence of their superiority. There is a Niti Shatak in Sanskrit literature. These were correct in the perspective of the period they were written. Many things of that period could be valid even today.

Question There is a Niti Shatak .Do you know the meaning of this. If so please tell?

Answer: I know its meaning. The person having no education, no asceticism, no charity, no sense, no character, no quality, no dedication towards one's work, such kind of person is just like animal. The meaning of Sheel is conduct, meaning of Tap is asceticism, the meaning of Dharm is duty. Some of the things in this Shlok are very good and I agree with them.

Question: There comes a couplet Please tell if you know the meaning of it?

Answer: I know its meaning is Despite one's being adorned with education, the wicked person should be abandoned. Is the snake adorned with jewel, not dreadful?

Question: You may perhaps not be able to give answer and correct meaning of this question. According to me the correct meaning is Wicked person, even if he is a highly educated scholar, should be abandoned because is the snake with jewel, not dreadful?

Answer: This translation is correct my translation is also correct there is no difference between them.

The first couplet was from the Niti Shatak of Bhartrihari but where from was the 2nd one, I cannot say

with certainty. I have consulted and read Shiv Puran. I do not know at present as to what are the contents of Shiv Puran. I am not certain if details of all the three Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh is given in it but it is correct that it contains the mention of Shiva. In my Prathma examination the Bhakti Kavya was not in the course. I did Prathma privately. I was the student of Shri Sangram Singh Higher School Ismailganj, Allahabad at that time. The examination of Pratham was conducted by Pardy of Distt. /Surat (Gujarat) and he awarded me the degree.

I have read Matasya Puran also. The contents of this book are the setting up of the Treasury of Kings, the setting up of the different wings of the Forts, the way of filling of the treasury again, the way of adverting poison by the king, to ensure security of the king by himself. The training of Princes and the tales of inundation are the main contents of this book. The rest all the things are not remembered by me. It is correct that the main contents of this Puan is Matasya Avtar of Bhagwan but I do not agree that in the Puran, the detail of Raja Ranti Dev to Mastya Avtar only is given. Along with Matasya there is detail of inundation.

I have read the scholarly works on Hindu Dharam, Sanatan Dharam. The name of main book on them is "History of Hindu Dharam Shastra" written by Bharat Rattan laste P.V.Kane. This book is available in 8 volumes.

Question: Have you read or not read anything about Hindu Dharam in Vedas and Puranas?

Answer: If the meaning of Hindu Dharama is Brahmanical order. I have studied that in old Granths. And if the meaning of Hindu Dharam is mixed nad composite life which have assimilated every thing in it, then also some excerpts of the some have been read.

In addition to my main work of studying and teaching. I have intensively studied the disputed problem. In addition

to this I have studied intensibly all other subjects as well. I make efforts for the same. Nevertheless I do not make intensive study of disputed matters. It is wrong to say that I never went to Ayodhya before 1992. It is also wrong to say that my first visit to Ayodhya took place 10-15 days before I went to this court for giving evidence. It is though correct that I had gone to Ayodhya after I got summon from the court for giving the evidence and before giving the evidence. It is a matter of May-June 1998. It is correct that no body could inspect the disputed site by taking along camera or readable material in 1989-90. It is wrong to say that before 1989-90 there was no road on the east of disputed site. But I do not have any idea if on those days for going inside the disputed site from eastern side, there had been any way out or not. It is correct that upto 1992, there had been a way from North East side for going to the disputed site. It is wrong to say that what I said about the Skand Puran regarding the location of places on the spot, was said wrongly without doing any survey, or without making any measurement. It is wrong to say that I give false evidence in vested interest.

(The cross-examination by Shri Madan Mohan Pandey, Advocate, on behalf of Param Hans Ram Chandra Das, Respondent No.2, over).

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

13.10.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this, case for further cross-examination on 14.10.1998.

Sd/-

13.10.1998

14.10.1998

(Cross-examination on behalf of Plaintiff No.3 Shri Devaki Nandan Aggarwal and other Plaintiffs in suit No.5/1989).

(Cross-examination of P.W.13 Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra on oath begins).

I have studied Mundkoupnishad. There is couplet in it agree with this part of the theory that truth only wings and not the falsehood. I do not agree with the 2nd part of the couplet, the meaning of which is devine community follow the path of truthfulness I did have given the statement I nthis court on 6.8.1998 that I agree with the above couplet in principle but since we have never seen the divine people coming and going, hence I feel that there is no reason to accept the 2nd part of this principle, There is no reason for this acceptance. My statement, given on 6.8.1998 was correct in its own sense. Because at that time the word was used in an ornamental fashion for good persons and not Devtas. Its word meaning of course is Divine with whom I never met. My statements during earlier two days were under oath of God. I was given the oath in the names of God. I have neither any knowledge abut the God nor have I ever met him. Hence neither I have loyalty nor disloyalty towards him. But it is wrong to say that I have not given my statement with loyalty. I have full loyalty towards the court and have given by statement with loyalty.

Question: When you took oath, accepting God as witness, why did you not tell the court at that time that you have no faith in God?

Answer: Because I am not conversant with the working system of the court hence with due defence to the court, I took oath without raising any

objection to the effect that I was giving my statement with complete loyalty.

Thereafter I took oath of allegiance to speak truth. I have also took oath that I would not speak lie. As far as I understand I have been called in this court to stand as witness, whether or not a mosque was constructed by demolishing a temple on the disputed land. I have given the statement that the disputed structure, according to me, was a mosque and no temple was demolished for constructing it.

Question: We went to know the meaning of mosque?

Answer: A place where people gather to perform Namaz regularly and do Ibadat (Worship) Ibadat of Allah. That place and building constructed on it shall be called mosque.

Whenever I went on the spot, I never saw any person performing Namaz or doing Ibadat there.

(At the stage Shri Devakinandan Agarwal drew the "attention of the witness towards a book" 'A dictionary of Islam' by Mr. Thomas Patric Huges (1960, the first edition of which was published in 1885, attention was drawn particularly towards page No.329 to 333, and provided the witness, a photocopy of the same, the witness studied that). I have studied the papers given to me on cursory basis. I do not agree with everything written in it. I did not read the book shown to me before this. About the definition of mosque, I have read a book written by Parsi Brown. In addition to this, I have also read a book- "Hisotry of the Arabs" by Hitti. The name of the Parsi Brown's book is "Indian Architecture volume II Islamic Period". It is wrong to say that the definition of mosque is not given in this book.

The definition of mosque also given in the above book written by Hitti. In addition to this I have also read "Comprehensive History of India Volume 5". I do not remember the name of the author of this book. I do not remember the name of its publisher either. It is wrong to say that Prof. B.R. Grover is one of the Editors of this book. In that book also the definition of mosque has been given. I have read many other books also, the names which are not coming to my mind at present. When I came to give my evidence here, I did not bring any book about the definition of mosque along. I had studied that already. But it is wrong to say that I did not bring these books along with me because these were not with me. These books are with me at my residence in Delhi. I have the books with me of Prasi Brown and Hitti. I studied these books around 1970. The shortcomings felt in the book shown to me are apart from my study of the books mentioned above and, my understanding about them and exchange of views with the scholars. This exchange of views took place in 1989-90 i.e. after the beginning of this dispute and when I started my research work. I cannot say whose Govt. was there in Uttar Pradesh at that time. Whether of Mulayam Singh Yadav or of somebody else. It is correct that I am the student of History but it is not necessary for me to learn by heart as to whose Govt. was formed in a particular state and on which date it was installed.

When I went to the disputed site, I went to its outer courtyard also. I do not remember now if there was any water tank for doing wazu by the Namazies or not. (Volunteer: there was a well in the outer compound) This well was outside the boundary wall of the disputed site. There no stone installed on that well. It is wrong to say that there was a stone installed there and on that Sita Koop was written. (Volunteer: it is another thing that somebody told

me that it was Sita Koop. That man asked me to take some water of that Koop. I drank the water and said it was not the Sita Koop). I on the basis my little understanding and seeing the structure of the well thought that the same cannot be Sita Koop. What was Sita Koop, what was its style, neither had I seen its photo nor read about it anywhere. I knew where was Sita Koop located and what it looked like. I could tell the location of Sita Koop. But I could do that before the demolition and not after that.

I have read the book of Hans Baker intensively. (At this stage Shri Devaki Nandan produced certain documents before the court in which a map was shown. According to him that map related to Ayodhya and was part is item 10(ii) of Hans Baker's book. The witness has seen the map. In that map Sita Koop has been shown at point 'A'. Shri Devaki Nandan drew the attention towards the Book of Hans Baker- Ayodhya part III, after the indexes and the maps of Ayodhya kept separately and towards the "Notes to maps", He placed that book on the record of the court as paper No.119 C-1. The map shown to the witness would hence forward be read as paper No.120 C-1. It is number 3 map annexed to that book. I have told the location of Sita Koop in the map at point 'A'. The location of Sita Koop which I saw on the spot, does not tally with this map. I found the Sita Koop on the spot on north east side of the disputed building. This Sita Koop is situated at a distance of 10-20 yards away from the boundary of the disputed site. I do not agree with it that Sita Koop was situated on the south side of disputed site. I also do not agree that the disputed construction was on south east side. It is correct that it could be on north east side. A road from the north side of disputed building is going towards Hanumangarhi. In the map shown, the Sita Koop was shown between the disputed building and this road. It was not outside the road. I do

not guess the distance of this well (koop) from the road. There might be many other things between the disputed building and Sita Koop, which now are not remembered by me. I had seen the Police Control Room adjacent to the road on the north side and it on the east side. It was adjacent to the road on the side of disputed site. The entrance in the disputed site was started from a street which goes upto the compound of disputed site. Since the well in question appeared to me to be recently built hence I do not accept that as well of Sita.

I had read about that Sita Koop which was mentioned in the Pathantras of Ayodhya Mahatm. It was mentioned in a much later Pathantra. When I saw the koop on the spot and found that the Koop could not be the Sita Koop. I did not see any other Koop thereafter. I can only tell the structure, style and location of the well, that I have seen. I cannot tell the construction style and location of any other koop. The main gate of the disputed site which I call mosque and those who cross examine me call that a Mandir, was on the north east side. This door was facing the north east corner. The main door was only one which passes through the middle. After entering the main gate we would reach in courtyard and after crossing the courtyard we entered into the disputed structure. After entering the courtyard and going to the disputed structure, there was a wall of iron rods. I do not remember whether there were doors in the wall of iron rods, and if so, how many were there. After entering the wall of iron rod and before entering the structure another courtyard was there. In the disputed structure there were big sized Arched passes. There were many passes but I cannot tell the counting because I did not count them, surely these were not less than three but these could be more also. I went inside from the middle pass. I had gone in the adjoining passes also.

After entering the structure. I saw that the last wall was closed. That rare wall would go from south to the east side. It would be wrong to say that, that wall would go from south to north. When we stood facing that wall, the south side would come in front of us. When we stood facing south, the west side would be on our right and east side would be on our left and on our back would be the north side.

The map shown to me of the book of Hans Baker, its photocopy is still before me. The Babri Mosque, in it has been shown at point 'B'. It has been shown adjacent to the road. (the witness Volunteer : factually on the spot it was little far from the road). In map No.2 of this very book, the sign of the mosque is shown on the left side of the map, on the indicated places. And the same sign in the map is shown of the Babri mosque. It is correct that the sign shown for the mosque in the map, has been shown by the draftsman but from my point of view, the mosque was not on that place but at a place little away from there. The Draftsman did not give any directions, anywhere above. Generally the basis for preparing the map is that on above is shown north, below the south, on right it is east and left it is west. What I saw on the spot and what I see on the map before me, there is lot of difference of the directions and that of the location. After inspecting the spot I never prepared any map. (Volunteer: I prepared the drafts). Before inspecting the site I procured as many maps as I could and studied all of them carefully. According to the text of Ayodhya Mahatma what could be the map, I prepared that i.e., I prepared its draft, then I inspected the spot and tried to understand the things and place them in order. Before going to the spot I had prepared some sketches and some sketches I prepared after coming back. I did nothing on the spot. I did not prepare any sketch. What I studied on the spot, I have written an article on that. I do not know if

or not my article was published any time before (againsaid) Yes Hindi version of my article has since been published. The article I prepared originally was in English. The Indian history Congress did not publish my article anywhere but they did acknowledge it. I have not come to the court by taking the copy of the article along. It is not that whatever I have narrated about the situation on the spot, has been narrated merely on the basis of my memory. In addition to my memory I have used my insight which is called another power of the body.

In the above referred map as shown to me, Swarg Dwar, has also been shown. In this map swarg Dwar is shown on upper side, immediately below the place, written as New Ghat, on the shape of something like stairs. The draftsman, while preparing the map has, for his convenience, shown some signs and small letters called symbols and abbreviations. In them in bold letters pilgrimage places in a sign like pillars have been shown. At certain places the map does not tally with the things seen by us on the spot. I had been to Brahm Kund. The position of Brahm kundas shown in the map, seems to be nearly correct, as per the situation on the spot. I had gone on Rin Mochan also. Its situation can also be considered more or less correct. Ram Durg shown in it is assumed one. There was no such Durg on the spot. The place shown as Ram Janamsthan, has been shown, as told by the people. I went there, I saw that place. Before demolition of the building, the shape of this place was different than its shape after the demolition. It is called make shift. We made the enquiries only first time and it was told that it was the same place. When we went there after demolition, I did not make any enquiry from any one but I came to know that it was make shift place. The fact of make shift had not come before demolition. Lomash has also been shown just on the

right side where Sita Koop is written. In my opinion, this situation as shown in the map is absolutely wrong. (The witness Volunteer: that the Hans Baker the writer of this book and mpa, also considers it wrong). It is wrong to say that I am giving this statement because Lomash is shown in the bracket. Samitra Bhawan's position, as shown in this map can be considered as nearly correct.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

14.10.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation for further cross-examination on 15.10.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-

14.10.1998

15.10.1998

(In continuation of 14.10.1998, the statement of Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra, P.W.13, on oath begins).

The position of Vashishtha Kund shown in map No.3 is also wrong, according to me. We had seen a structure in the name of Vashishtha, and not any Kund. I did not try to know the position of Vashishtha kund. I know that there is a Vashishtha kund in Ayodhya. (Again said) there is palce in the name of Vashishtha Kund, in Ayodhya but I do not know where that Kund is. In this map Hanumangarhi has been shown at one place, its position is correct. In this map a hillock namely "Mani Parvat" is also shown, which position seems almost correct but it cannot be called as totally correct. In this map, on the lower side a place known as Ranipal, shown in bold letters on the left side, seems to be positioned correctly but nothing can besaid with certainty with regard to the factual position. On the uppoer side along Saryu River, Saryu bridge has been shown, the position of which is correct. On its left direction 'Naya Ghat' has laso been shown.

(At this stage Shri Devki Nandan gave the witness a book namely "Indian Architecture- Islamic Period" by Prasi Brown and reuested him to study that book). I have already read the book of Parsi Brown. I have seen this book. I can reply the question asked on that. I have red the introductory part of parsi Brown's book. In it two paragraphs have been written about the mosque at page 3. I agree with many of the things written into paragraphs about the mosque. In fact I generally agree with the features told in it because no such special thing came init about which I would disagree. I have seen two photographs in this book between pages 4 and 5. First photographs relates to "Essential parts of an Indian Mosque" with which I agree. The 2nd photographs

"The Kutub Delhi" on which there is a copy right of Archaeological Survey of India. The position shown in it is acceptable to me.

At this stage Shri Vedki Nandan annexed the above mentioned book as paper No.121C, in the file of the Court.

It is wrong to say that only on the basis of seeing the building indispute I have taken the decision that it was a Masjid. In fact in addition to this book, I had used the book "History of the Arabs" by P.K.Hitti. In addition, I had talked to the experts of History of medieval period. I talked to the Namazies and on the basis of all these, I decided that it was a mosque. Apart from this I had taken the same decision by seeing all the structures. The expert with whom I interacted, was a Reader in Delhi University, whose name is not remembered by me. (The witness, after thinking said that his name is Mr.Jafari). I talked to him, Dr.Jafari wrote his name as Dr.Z.Jafari. I do not know the name of any other expert with whom I had the talk on this subject. I talked to the Namazies. After performing the Namaz they people went away and I could not ask their name. Can you believe it that I stood outside the Jama Masjid in Delhi and as soon as the Namazi came out after performing Namaz, I talked to them without asking their names. I went inside the Jama Masjid and saw it also from inside. The Jama Masjid of Delhi almost appear like the one shown in photo No.1, in the introduction part of above mentioned book of Parsi Brown. When I asked the Namazies, coming out of Jama Masjid, they told me that such things are there in a mosque (Again said that they had said that there were different features in the mosques at different places, whereas some of the features were similar to each other). I did not talk to them about the mosques built in Faizabad or Ayodhya.

It is correct that the Jama Masjid of Delhi is the construction of Mughal period. On the photograph on the upper side of the book of Parsi Brown, the minarets were also shown on the mosque and in between a water tank has also been shown. In the mosque of Ayodhya I did not see any Minaret. I did not see any tank for water there. (Volunteer: But I was told that there was arrangement for water in the courtyard, on the right side).

I cannot tell the names of those people who had told me that the arrangement for water was on the south side there. This was told in 1989 when I had gone on the spot there. No Muslim had gone on the spot with me. I did not inspect that place where the availability of water had been told. But I was told that the water was used for ablutions. This water was used not for Achman but for Vazu. Vazu is done before performing Namaz. Vazu means to clean hands etc. I feel such things were told to me by Hindus. I do not remember if they told about the arrangement for toilet there or not. When I inspected the building whether or not the arrangement for toilet was there, is not remembered at present.

In my opinion waqf means to do management i.e., to manage the property of Masjid. There is a Waqf for arrangement of Affairs of mosque. There is a Waqf Board Govt. also accept that.

Question Whether the Waqf Board have come into existence recently i.e., ten twenty or fifty years or were they there before since old time?

Answer: I understand that Waqf Board have come into existence only recently.

I do not remember when there were no Waqf Boards. Which individual or officer used to look after the arrangement of mosques.

(The witness said the arrangement of mosques was done by the Imams).

Question: The owner of every mosque in Allah. Every mosques is the property on Allah-Tala. What do you say about this?

Answer: The arrangement for the mosque is looked after by the Imam. He is all in all. The supreme reality according to them is the owner. I consider Imam as the owner. Imam is the owner of that.

With supreme reality I means those who manage the affairs of the mosque, recognize the Allah Tala as the supreme realtiy. I cannot say clearly if every person following the Muslim religion recognize Allah Tala as the owner of the mosque.

I have the knowledge about the temples. In temples Devi Devtas are worshiped.

Question: In temples, the person having faith worship Devi Devtas and with that Pooja they worship their diety. What do you say about this?

Answer: They people worship Devi and Devtas who are propounded there and they are their Dieties.

In 1966 or around it when I first time went to the disputed building alongwith my parents, they worshiped an idol propounded there, now I do not remember of which Devi or Devta that idol was or which of the God of their faith they worshiped. I have a very thin memory of that

time, therefore, I cannot say if they had worshiped a place or things called Sita Rasoi or called Chulha or something of a form of Chulha, after entering the main gate. May be, I do not know, the foot prints which would have been worshiped by my parents. The suggestion being given to me that my parents might have worshiped the foot prints or of Chulha in Sita Rasoi, is not remembered, hence I cannot say if it was wrong. My parents had gone to worship that place. They had not gone there to worship any idol (Again said Many devtas were propounded on that place, my parents worshiped them. I do not remember if the idol of Ram Lalla was there or not. When in 1989 I went there, the idol of Ram Lalla was there. But it may not be so, that the idol which was there in 1966, the same idol be there at present. I cannot say this with certainty that the idol of Ram Lalla, which was seen by me in 1989 there that was not installed there in 1966. Of course some guides were there with me. They had told me that it was not the idol of 1966. I do not know any Mohd. Hashim. The person by this name was not the guide with me. I have not seen Mohd. Hashim so far. I do not identify him also. I did not see him ever in the court. I do not know the name, address etc., of my Guide. May be my guides were the Pandas of that time. I did not give him any alms and donations (Dan-Dakshina). That Guide was not a Govt. servant. In fact he was not the guide. Some had met us just by chance. There were many people but I enquired from one of them and he told me that. No fee was fixed with the Guide by me. In fact I had no guide at all. He was a local man, some insider. I do not know how did he come there. He met me outside the building. I did not see him performing Pooja. Being a student of history, I had the curiosity to find out whether the idol on that day was the same or not, which was there in 1966. That person did not tell me that when the idol in question was installed there after 1966. I saw that idol there and did not make enquiries

to know as to when that idol was installed. The intention with which I had gone there, I had seen that and thus came back. After seeing the idol my curiosity had satiated that the idol was of later years. The idol was of recent make but I cannot tell how many years old that was. In my opinion that idol was just one or two years old and because there was shining in it hence it appeared new. Being an historian I did not consider it necessary to find out as to who make arrangements of worship of the idols. In my opinion priests (Pujaries) might be doing that as priests were present there. Though I knew it that in 1966 and also in 1989, the arrangement of Pooja was being looked after by the receiver appointed by the court, yet it is not clearly remembered. It was not the subject matter of my research to find out as to who looks after the arrangement for worship. In my research I also pursued the method of making enquiries from the people whom I met. In the course of my research, I did not consider it essential to inspect the record of revenue department. I did not make any enquiry from any Revenue Officer. I could not see the settlement record. I saw the map of the Development authority. In the map of the Development Authority, the existence of any Devi Devta on this place, was not exhibited.

Question: Irrespective of installation of idols there of any Devi or devta when your parents went for Pooja on that place did they go with the concept that Rama was there and this worship i.e., Bhagwan Rama's worship was to be done?

Answer: They had gone to see all the pilgrimage places of Ayodhya including this place and obviously they had faith in it. My parents had gone there for performing Pooja. But I cannot say if they

had gone there with the concept of performing Pooja of Bhagwan Rama.

I cannot tell if my parents faith had been that the place was the birth palce of Bhagwan Rama. I did not ask them about the faith with which they had gone there. Nevertheless they were believer in God. I cannot tell about the faith of other people who go there for Pooja. In 1989-90 when I went there in connection with my research, then also people used to comethere in large numbers. They might having some faith that is why they would be going there but I did not try to findout as to what their faith was or with which special faith they used to go there.

My parents had gone to Hanumangarhi also. I do not remember if they had gone to Kanak Bhawan. They took bath in Saryu River. I also took bath I saryu River. My parents visited many places. They performed Pooja also. I feel that wherever they performed Pooja, those places were temples only. One specific place that I remember was Hanumnagarhi. Rest are not remembered.

It is correct that the Vaishnavite when perform Pooja in some temple of some idol, they consider that idol as their Ishtadev. But I do not accept that the Vainavite see the so called God in that idol. Those who go for worshipping that idol, they worship that considering it everything. With everything I in a simple way means that they worship only that Deity, whose idol is installed there. It is not necessary that they worship that Deity, Considering it as God. Rama is considered as icarnation of Vishnu. Those who worship him, they worship him, taking him as Vishnu. Those who worship Bhagwan Srikrishna, also worship him, taking him as incarnation of Vishnu. Those who are Shivaite and go to Shivalaya for performing Pooja of Shivalinga, in their

concept, they worship God Shiva visibly. If Rama's idol is installed in the temple it is not necessary that the deity of the temple is considered as the owner of the temple. In my opinion the owner of that temple is one who manages the affairs of the temple.

Question: The disputed question in this prosecution, in which you have come to give the evidence, is whether Allah tala is the owner of or bhagwan Ramachandra exist in the disputed site?

Answer: As far as I understand, because the mosque was existing there and records were also available which gives the indication as whose place that was. Tulsi Das has recognized Rama as Maryada Purshotam. Had he been an historical person he would not have held such a trespassing as Valid.

(The witness was told to Answer the question instead of describing his philosophy. The witness said thereafter that)- I do not know about the dispute. In my opinion there is no direct link of the Arthashastra of Kautilya with the disputed site.

Question: Is there any indirect relation of both these subjects?

Answer: In my opinion it is not.

I can be called the expert of the Arthashastra of Kautilya and not of Arthashastra of today. It is correct that Karl Marx and Angles are known as the father of communist ideology. I do not remember correctly if their special theory was "Surplus value". It is correct that they introduced the theory of Dialectical Materialism. Their theories are scientific, therefore, I have faith in them. I do not understand Dialectical spiritualism. It is correct that I

believe in materialism, I accept only those things as true which I can see, touch and feel. Except this I do not accept any other things. I do recognize any such thing from which I get contentment. But I cannot say that I recognize only that. Money is also one such thing which gives contentment. We can do the desired activities with it. I have no faith in Ishwar and Allah. I have no faith particularly because I have not seen them.

I have heard the name of Mahatma Gandhi. We call him Father of the Nation. He used to say. It is wrong to say that in my opinion his such a faith was non sense. I absolutely do not agree that his faith was due to illusion. I did not say, so, that those who believe upon God are blind followers.

It is wrong to say that I have come to give evidence because of allurement for money, It is also wrong that I have come to give evidence for allurement of my promotion. It is wrong to say that there is no post of Reader in satyawati College where I am working. In fact reader is my post. I did not make any effort to go to any other college except this college. I did not feel any necessity of the same. My promotion in this college has taken place after due selection. This post is not advertised in any newspaper or any where else rather it is filled up by promotion through the selection committee. There is no such rule that if a person is not found unfit, he maybe promoted on the basis of seniority. My promotion has taken place in merit promotion scheme. There no scheme in the name of personal promotion. I want that the other university promote me in absentia without any application on a higher post (again said I want that I be appointed on higher post by the University in Delhi itself. Therefore, I never applied

anywhere. There are many universities in Delhi. So far none of the Universities have considered me in absentia.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh ChandraMishra

15.10.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of this appear for next hearing on 16.11.1998.

Sd/-

15.11.1998

16.11.1998

(In continuation of dated 15.10.1998 the statement of P.W.13 Shri Suresh Chand Mishra begin on oath).

I have already given the statement that I have read Hans Baker and I agree with some of its ideas and not with all. (At this stage Shri Devki Nandan drew the attention of the witness towards paper No.107/133 filed in the court which the witness did see). I have studied the paper shown. I totally disagree with the gist drawn out by the author. The pillars referred to in this paragraph were seen by me. I saw them in the disputed structure. I have seen similar type of pillars (again said not similar type) rather two pillars on the graveyard of Musa Ashikan also. I saw a pillar to be installed on the door and which is called door jamb, kept on the ground in one of the buildings on the north of road. The name of that building is not remembered. I have also read the description by Martin.He has also made reference of these pillars installed in the disuted structure. The pillars I had seen were of stone I black colour. Martin has also told that those stone were of black colour. I did not see the figures of girls on those stones. There was a pitcher (Kalash) in one or two stones about which I have already told. But I did not see any such Kalash on the stones installed on the graveyard of Moosa Ashikan. I had seen them very carefully but in my opinion there were no Kalash on them. I did not see any woman in Tribhang Mudra on the stones installed on the graveyard of Mosa Ashikan.On the pillars installed in the disputed structure also there was no picture of woman on tribhang Mudra. The pillars seen by me, which were kept in the building on the north side of the road, did have figure of human being made on them. There was a crown (Mukut) on the head of that statue but its right hand was not in a Vitark Mudra. There was no Trishul in its left hand. I cannot say if the statute had Dhoti on but was

Langoti. I.e. it has worn line cloth. We can call it line cloth. There was sort of beads (Mala) on neck and breast of that statue. I cannot say it that was a Van Mala. Curbing one's body in three parts is called Tribhang Mudra. That statue was of course curbed at some places, but I cannot say whether or not that was a Tribhnag Mudra. The hand and other poses of that statue were not that clear, therefore, I do not agree with the interpretation of Hans Bakar. There was no Shalbhanjika on it.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

16.11.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us . In continuation of this for further cross-examination on 17.11.1998.

Sd/-

16.11.1998

Dated 17.11.1998.

(In continuation of 16.11.1998, the statement of P.W.13 Suresh Chandra Mishra, on oath begins).

(Shri Devki Nandan drew the attention of Hans Baker's book paper No.120-C/1 page 46. This paper show photo plate No.7 given in the book). I have seen the photo plate No.7. This photo more or less resembles the pillar. I have seen o the graveyard of Musa Ashikan on the spot. Similarly I have seen photo No.8 on paper No.120 C/1/47 and this photo is of that door Jamb which I saw on the ground in a building situated on the north side of the road.

I had seen Kuber Tilla also near the disputed structure. The photo plate No.3 shown in this book on aper No.120C-1/42, is of that Tilla or not, I cannot say because there was lot of difference between position shown in this photograph and the position seen by me on the spot. It is not that whenI saw Kuber Tilla the beautification dirve would have been completed or plants of Boganbilia planted. The high hillock as shown in the photo was not there on the spot. Also there were no dense plants. The tree shown in it was also not there on the spot. I do not rmemeber now whether or not a dilapidated building shown in the photo. I do not remember also whether or not there was a path going to upper side as is being observed in the photo from the witness. I had seen it froma distance but I did not go o the upper side. I do not remember now about anything special seen by me on the spot.

I had gone to Mani Parvat but I do not remember it at present. I have seen Photo No.1 on the paper No.120-C/1/40 of this very book. Because I am not remembering myself having gone on Mani Parvat, therefore I cannot say if the photo is of that place or not.,

There comes the reference of Shah Madar Tilla but I don't remember if I had gone there or not. I do not remember at this time whether or not there was a temple on Mani Parvat. I cannot say if the photo plate No.2 in the paper No.120C/1/41 of this book is the photo of so called temple at Mani Parvat or not. The same is my Answer in respect of photo plate No.4 given in paper No.120-C/1/43 of this book. I did not see Shaha Juran Tilla. Therefore I cannot say if photo plate No.5 and 6, given in paper No.120-C/1/44-45 of this book were of Shah Juran Tilla or not.

I did not see the so called Shitla Devi temple at Faizabad. Since I did not see that temple hence I cannot say if Vishnu shown in photo plate No.9 in paper no.120C/1/48 of this book was there or not.

I have seen Danta Dhatwan math in Ayodhya but at present it is not coming to my memory. The Shri Vishnu Trivikram Statute on photo plate No.10 shown in this was not seen by me on the spot.

I did not see any holy place after the name of Vam Dev. Yes, I might have seen Ram Sabha temple but I do not remember it at present. I did not see photo plate No.11 and 12 given in paper No.120/C/1/49 in this book, on the spot. I do not remember at present if or not I had seen the dilapidated Govt. palace around Saryu river or looking towards it, from the spot. Therefore, I cannot say if the photo plate No.13 and 14 shown in paper No.120/C/1/50 and 51 of this book were of the so called palace or not.

I did not see any temple known as Durgeshwar in Ayodhya. Because I did not see the photo there, hence I

cannot say if the picture shown in photo plate no.15, given in paper No.120C-/142 of this book, was of a body part of the statue installed in the temple or not. There does exist a place known as Poora Bazar in faizabad but I have no idea of the Bilwabihari temple exist there or not. Hence I cannot say if photo plate No.16, of Shri Uma Mahesh, given in paper No.120-C-1/53 pertains to that temple are not. I did not ever see some so called village punhad or a pilgrimage place Punyahari located there. Therefore, I cannot say if photo plate No. 17 given in paper No.120-C-1/54 of this book, is the statue of Nag Devta or not.

Madrassa is a place but I never went there. Since I did not go there, hence I cannot say if photo plate No.18, given in paper No.120-C-1/55 of this book, is that of so called Surya SinHansan installed at Jata Kund or not.

(At this stage the attention of the witness was drawn towards the coloured phot album prepared by the U.P.Archaeological Department. The witness studied the Album).

Question Are the photos No.104 and 127 in the Album, shown to you, which are 24 in number the photos of the pillars installed in disputed structure or not?

Answer: In these photos, phot No.106,107,112,113, 116, 117, 122, 124 and 127, could be of the pillars installed in the disputed structure. About the remaining, I cannot say categorically whether or not these are of disputed structure.(Again said) the photos which I have said, could be of the pillars at disputed structure, in some of those pillars the picture of Kalash or some earthen pot at the bottom, are shown. However, I did not find so on the spot, where as it is very clearly visible in these pictures.

Question Photo No.136 to 141 in the album are the photos of those black pillars which were installed in the disputed structure. What have you to say in the matter?

Answer: I cannot say with certainty if or not the photos shown are of those 12 pillars which I had seen, on the spot. (Again said) some of these would be same pillars. The photo No.146 and 147, resemble the pillars installed at disputed structure but the pitcher made at the bottom of pillar did not come to my notice at that time. Because the ochrous coloured creeper made on photo No.146 and 147, I say that these stones could be of the disputed structure.

Question: Similarly whether photo No.157 to 167 shown in this album, are the black coloured pillars standing on the spot installed on the disputed structure or not? With on the spot means inside the disputed structure?

Answer: I cannot say if the photos No.157 to 167, are the photos of the pillars installed in the disputed structure or not (again said) these do not appear to be the pillars of the disputed structure. Photo No.166 and 167, shown in the paper, seems to be similar because their faces and Motifs resembles each other. With the motifs I mean the leaves shown on them. With the faces I mean its side.

Question: The photo no.176 to 200, shown in this album, are of the black pillars installed in this disputed structure. What do you say about this?

Answer: Out of the photos from 176 to 200 which are in the coloured album, photo

No.178,182,184,194,198 all other photos do not appear to be of the disputed structure. Some motifs of photo No.178,182,184,194 198 resemble the pillars of disputed structure, therefore, these can be of disputed structure.

I have the knowledge of Hindu Architecture. In photo 184, something shown towards the bottom is not a Trishul, rather it is a leaf. The design shown in the middle leaf cannot be called Ratan motif.

I do not agree with the first sentence of the introductory part of Hanss baker's book. In 1989-90, when I started my project in the matter, i.e. started my studies, my aim was to know the truthfulness of this dispute. The subject matter of my research was to know whether or not there was any temple in place of Babri Mosque or onits complex. I also wanted to know whether or not mosque was constructed there after demolishing the temple. The subject matter of my research also was whether Ram Janambhoomi Ayodhya was a pilgrimage place or not.

Question Was the so called Babri Masjid situated on the same place which once was popular for Ram Janambhoomi place?

Answer: The mosque is not constructed on that place.

Question: The palce on which the so called Babri Masjid was constructed, with which name was it popular?

Answer: That area was known by the name Babri Masjid Ram Janambhoomi. One place in Ayodhya was known by the Janam Sthan.

Some distance from Babri Masjid courtyard Ram Janambhoomi site was known. The subject matter of my research was, whether the place was a pilgrimage place or not. The subject matter of my research was not that the place where Babri Masjid has been constructed, was that a pilgrimage place earlier or not. (Again said). The subject matter of my research was whether or not there existed a religions structure under the Babri Masjid.

Question: Which were the sources you used for your research? Please describe them?

Answer: All possible sources which could be used for this study, were used by me.

I used the literary evidence. Where ever considered necessary, I made use of Philology so as to analyse the literary evidence and ascertain the age.

For arriving at this fact I also studied Skandh Puran, Valmiki Ramayan and Ayodhya Mahatm which I did through philology. Hans Baker has used philology and has used it correctly.

It is correct that in addition to the philology, for the research work of this nature, apart from the filed work, it requires to collect topographical, Iconomgraphci and Archaeological data you have to proceed with Folk traditions. The descriptions of the foreign travelers are also made use of. Some written traditions too can be used. Similarly sources related to currency can also be there. Epigraphic, Mommental, Etymological soruces are also there. Hans Baker by using these sources, did not do a wrong thing rather he did a good thing but his conclusions at some places are based on traditions and rumours.

I have studied page 43 of Hans Baker's book, a copy of which filed in the court is paper No.120-C-1/10. Similarly, I have also studied page No.44, I did not subscribe to the ideas expressed by him in this book about the vaishnavism. I do not agree with the sources, he has referred to and the conclusions drawn by him. I do not agree with him with regard to the Vishnu temples as told by Rateansang (a foreign traveler).

(The attention of the witness was drawn towards page 143 of chapter 21 of Hans Baker's book. The witness studied the book (As far as the development beyond 17th century of Ramayik centers is concerned, it can be accepted).

I have studied chapter 3 a copy of which is paper No.120-C-1/11 in the court, I have studied page 54 and 55 which are in chapter 3, and I am not fully agreed with the conclusion drawn rather I fully disagree.

I did not ever read Banerji's article on Babar. The full name of Banerji Sahab is stated to be Shri S.K.Banerjee. I never read his above mentioned article. I have seen the article "Religious Policy of the Mughal Empire" by Shri Shriram Sharma, with seen means I have read it. I have been studying Encyclopaedia Britannica but I do not remember if I had studied that about Ayodhya or not. I have studied the book namely "Ayodhya Ka Itihas" by Lala Sita Ram, a little bit. I did not ever read the book, Shri Ram Janambhoomi (Sachitra Pramanit) Itihas, by Shri Radhey Syam Shukla, who is called doctor. I have not seen any book written by M.H.Fisher. In my view in the book "The Righteous Rama" by Mr.J.L. Browkinton, no such mention has been made that the mosque was constructed on the

place of a temple. I think there is no such mention either that the mosque was constructed after demolishing the temple. I mean to say that it is not revealed from the book anywhere that mosque was constructed after demolishing the temple. As far as I remember, no mention in that book comes about the construction of the Babri Masjid. Perhaps I made a reference of general books of Stainly Lane Pool in my statement and not of a particular book. The book, this writer has written on Babar, might have been seen by me but I do not remember the same at this time. The reference of Vinsaint Smith's book was made. It has many editions whjich have been published by Oxford University Press and not by Rama Nand Vidya Bhawan. I would not be able to say anything with certainty whether in the books of Vinsaint Smith and Stainly Lane Pool, there is reference of construction of Babri Masjid or not. At this time it is not coming to my mind if or not I have read the book "Medieval India Under Mohamdon rule". I do not remember properly if or not there is a mention of construction of Babri Masjid in the book written by Dr. Romila Thapar (againsaid) I think, there is no mention of the same in it.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

17.11.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In continuation of for futher cross-examination on 18.11.1998. Witness be present.

Sd/-

17.11.1998

18.11.1998

(In continuation of 17.11.1998, the statement of Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra on oath start).

It is correct that the correct name of author of the book "Righteous Rama" is Shri J.L. Browkinton. Inadvertently I had told that name as R.L. Browkinton. In original Babarnama, the translation of which has been read by me, no reference of the construction of Babri Masjid has been made. I have no knowledge about any 'will' made by Babar. I have read all the books written from the period of writing of Babarnama to 1989, about the construction of Babri Masjid. At present I do not remember the name of any such book. But I did read them. In the book namely Anti Activities (a word in between and then) statics of East India by Fensis Buchanon and edited by Mountgoomri, it has been written that the construction Babri Masjid is made without demolishing any temple and anything said other than this is, only as illusion. To say that mosque was constructed by demolishing a temple is an illusion. At present I do not possess the extract of that. A book of Barnal, written in French Language and its name starts from some Inde, it is written that it is illusion of Jentile (Hindu). I have read English translation of this book. (The witness was shown the English translation of a book written by Tiffinthrelar, which is marked as paper No. 107 -C-I page No. 97, item 26. the witness said that) - This translation of the French book is not correct translation. It is correct that it has not been mentioned in this doubtful translation that after demolishing a temple Babri Masjid was constructed but it is shown in the original book that it is the blind faith of Hindus. I do not know French Language but I have read its translation. I do not know the name of the translator. (The witness was showed the translation of this book in the court as paper No. CZ/154).

(The attention of the witness was drawn towards paper No. 107 C -1/107, annexed in the file, seeing that he said). This paper is also translated wrongly. Similarly the printed translation 107 C-1/ & 108 annexed to it, all is a wrong translation. Paper No. 107 C-1/108 is wrongly translated particularly 3rd & 4th para from the bottom were wrongly translated. I had asked Prof. Dr. Arvind Sinha, Professor of Hindi in University of Delhi who told me that the translation done by me was correct. I am saying with self knowledge that the translation filed in the court is correct.

I have read it in many books that the temple was not demolished in order to construct Babri Masjid but I do not remember the name of those books. It is wrong to say that I am speaking lie on that. I do not agree that "History of Arabs" which was written by Philip K. Hetti, is about the mosque of the Arab countries and their ideology may not be relevant to the mosques in India. At page 266 of this books, many of the points written therein are also relevant upon the mosques built in India but in between their evolution and development many new facts are included. I believe upon the book. A historian report to the nation which was prepared by Prof. R.S. Sharma and Prof. D.N. Jha etc. the two books the name of which are History versus..... And Ram Janambhoomi versus Babri Masjid and which were shown to me in the court today, have never come to my notice hence before, I never saw them. What ever is published on this subject, I have been looking for it. It is not that I have done this one sided research only. Konard Ails is a literacy figure, a scholar. I could not read any of his book. One can read only a book useful for him and I also felt the same as correct.

Question: Without knowing the ideas of Konard Ails without reading his books how did you conclude that his books were useless and not useful?

Answer: This book cannot adopt a particular ideology. The book of this author is quoted in Hans Baker's book. There from I got to know the ideology.

It is correct that Hans Baker has attached a list of all the books where from he has got the extracts. It is correct that there is no mention of any book of Konard Ails in the list given in Hans Baker's book of Bibliography. Hans Baker's book was published in 1986. It is correct that the first edition of Konard Ails book was published in 1990. I cannot say with certainty that Konard Ails has not written any book on Ayodhya before 1990. It is correct that any book written by him i.e. any book published before 1990, didn't come to my notice. I have heard the name of Arun Shorie who was the Chief Editor of Indian Express during 1989 -90. Perhaps he now a days is a Member of Parliament also. I do not know if he writes articles on abuse of history now a days or not. I do not know if he has written articles against Prof. R.S. Sharma and Prof. Irphan Habib or not. It is wrong to say that he writes the articles about the scholars of Indian Council of Research or the Scholars of Jawaharlal University. (At this stage Shri Devki Nandan showed the witness photocopies of five articles written by Arun Shourie which appeared to be published in different News papers. These are numbered as paper No. 260 C-I/1 TO 5). I have seen the articles shown to me first time. Before this I didn't read anywhere (At this stage Shri Devki Nandan also produced the original articles published in the News Papers).

I have heard the name of Dr. D.P. Dube. He is also present in the court today. I did not hear the name of the society of pilgrimage sleej of India ever before. I have no knowledge / information of their journal. It is not that I have not read any such literature and which is against the idelology of Sunni Waqf Board, the Plaintiff. I do not remember at this point of time which Literature having such an opposite ideology. I have read. It is wrong to say that I have not done an impartial analysis because I kept in mind the cross-examination of opposite ideology.

I am neither Athiest nor Thiest. I know what is religion. I have no tendency towards sectarian religion. Religion is a wider subject. Sectarian religion means communalism, nepotism. Some hindu people think that there is a Snatan Dharma. I do not think there is any Snatan Dharm. I feel that Snatan Dharma does come under the definition of sectarian Dharma. I do not know if my parents followed Snatan Dharma or not. They were polythesists. I have already corrected my statement that my parents were Shaiv, also Vaishnav and used to worship all the Devies and Devtas. But I do not worship any one of them. I follow the humanness. I follow the equity and consistency of society because it is also a Dharma. But the Dharma I follow, the principles there of are not written one. No book on principles is available in a written form. I do not know what Dharma my son follows, whether he follows or not and if follows, which one.

I know about stampages. Sanskrit language I know very well but I do not know the developed Nagri. The stampages of 11th & 12 th century Sanskrit language Nagri script I can read with the help of a plate. With the plate I mean the chart of letters.

(At this stage on the request of Devki Nandan the court opened seal cover sent by the Archaeological Survey of India, in which a stampage was found. Alongwith it, there was one more stampage. That is, two stampages were found. These stampages were placed before the witness. The witness saw both the stampages one by one) (At this stage Shri Z. Jilani on behalf of Sunni Waqf Board etc., objected to place these documents. On their objection, a detailed order was written on the order sheet). I cannot read these stampages instantly (again said). Without the help of plates and charts, I cannot read it. 118 C-I/187 paper cannot be called a plate. It can be called a plate but it is not the plate in the sense I understand it. I do not agree with it that in the stampage shown contain Nagri Lipi of 11th & 12th century. In my opinion this Lipi pertains to the period after 17th & 18th century.

My answer about the 2nd stampage taken out of the envelope is also the same i.e. that Nagri Lipi pertains to the period after 17th & 18th century and reading it requires plates and charts which have not been made available to me by court. I would take around 3 months to read this stampage and for that I require some facilities such as, - I would like to see the inscriptions. Take my own stampage for that and then I would tally this stampage with that. I would like to have the chart of letter development. (254 C/13, 14, 15 & 16 – file No. 05 No. 5/89, were shown to the witness), (After seeing that the witness said). These are not the letter charts, these are the individual tables.

I do not agree with the contention that Islam is a sectarian religion. The definition I give to the religion, the Islam does not fit in that. I do not consider the Sikh religion also as sectarian religion. The same is my concept about Jain religion also. I do not consider Jorashtrian

Dharma also as sectarian religion. I consider sectarian religion that religion which has malice against the other religion. I do not know if there is any sectarian religion in India as on today, which has malice against other religion. There may be sectarian elements in Hindu religion as well.

Question Is Hindu Religion sectarian or not?

Answer:. It includes many sectarian elements in it.

Question :In your opinion, is not any sectarian element included in Islam?

Answer:. I am not the interpretor of Islam Religion, hence I do not want to reply this question.

I have not testifid this thinking of Karl Marks in which he had said "Religion is the opium of the masses administered by the Bourgeois".

I cannot say categorically that the communist manifesto has been the article of faith and of the communism thinking.

What Dr. Karan Singh in his book "Essays on Hinduism" has written about Bhakti movement on page No. 20 onward, I agree with some of his sayings and do not agree with the others. Such as, I do not agree with his contention that the evolution or development of Bhakti Movement took place against the Muslim Rule or because of its reaction. I do not agree with his this contention that there had been some kind of hinderance by Muslim Rulers on the performance of religious ceremonies by Hindus or they were subjected to admonition. It is correct that the Muslim Rulers didn't admonish Hindus. Hence I do not agree with Dr. Karan Singh's concept that Muslim Rulers admonished Hindu.

To my information Aurangzeb didn't admonished Hindus. He didn't demolish any of their temple. Yes; he imposed Jajiya on them but that was the right of every Ruler upto 16th century. Except Somnath temple, no Muslim Ruler demolished Hindu temple, Lootpat was resorted to but temples were not broken. To my information no such incident took place between 16th to 18th century. I have no information about the reconstruction of the Somnath temple or about the fact of its reconstruction when Shri Jawahar Lal Nehru was india's Prime Minister. I know that first President of Indian Republic was Dr. Rajendra Prasad, I do not know that the inaguration of the newly constructed Somnath tempe was done by Dr. Rajendra Prasad.

I have given a correct statement about the factuality and existnce of Alla -ho-upnishad. It is not that I have inadvertently said Alla- ho- upnishad in place of Allo upnishad. But I do not possess any copy of Alla - ho-upnishad, I do not remember where and in which reference I had read it.

Verified the statement after hearing

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

18.11.98

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by me . In continuation for further cross-examination on 19.11.98.

Sd/-

18.11.98

Dated 19.11.98.

(In continuation of 18.11.98, statement of P.W. 13 Suresh Chandra Mishra begins on oath).

I could not prove that was Shri Ram Maryada Purushotam an historical person or not hence we could not arrive at the conclusion. Hindus also do not consider him as an historical person but it is correct that some of people of the Hindu Society consider him as the incarnation of Vishnu Bhagwan and it is their faith. Since I didn't do any survey hence I cannot say that the total number of persons having such kind of faith may be around 50 crores.

As per my thinking, the age of the earth is considered as seven and a half billion years. On this basis its survey has been conducted. I did have read that basis in the books. As per the evidence available from Archaeological Deptt. The age of Ayodhya i.e. its existence, is around 4-7 century B.C. Dr B.B. Lal an Historian and Archaeologist has no where said that the evidence of Rama period, may be available in 7th century B.C. It is correct that the new archaeological researches leads to the existence of new proofs. With communal history I mean when a particular community consider the other particular community, inferior to it or its way of living, or its religion consider itself as well as its own culture superior to other one, such an act is called ethnocentricity by me. It is the communal history. The person writing such like history is called communal by us. If somebody writes against Hindu community, against its way of living or write to hurt its religious feelings, and writes without any proof we shall call him communalist. Similarly if somebody writes against the way of living or religious feelings without a proof about the Muslim community, we will call him communalist. In both these situations jif the author writes something with proof then it

would not be communalist. It is not that the secular history is one in which there is no faith upon God. It is not that such a thing is called secular in our country as is against Hindu community and is in favour of Muslim community.

Question: Vedant and Upanishad are basic pillars of Hindu Religion. What do you?

Answer: We can call it an important basis.

It is correct that in Vedant and in Upanishad the concept of Brahm is supreme soul and formless. It is correct that he is supreme and formless and cannot be realized with man organ of sense. Since I am the person of scientific temperament hence I do not recognize its existence I know three sentences of essential truth enunciated in upnishada and I have no knowledge about the fourth. These three sentences of essential truth's are as under : I have no knowledge about the so called 4th sentence of essential truth. I shall not be able to tell at this point of time as in which special upnishada, these are given.

I agree with this definition of the Muslim who says that there is only one God (Allah) and Harjrat Maohd i.e. Raool Ullaha jonly is him Paigambar. It is correct that according to Islam also the Allah is Supreme and formless. That is their faith and I am not to take any thing from that. I do not have any faith in both of them.

I am little aware of the concept of Purshottam according to Hindu Religion. It means such as Existence which is set up as dignity i.e. as an Idealism. This super human quality has been added in that, that he is the cause of birth of every body, he is the creator, he is the one who tends all, he is protector. But no such thing is there that he

might also punish at all. But I have also reservation about his being the Creator.

Hindu people consider Manu Smariti as their religious book. I, in my statement at page No. 217, stated that "according to Manu Smariti and all other Shastras, even after committing all the sins no punishment can be given to the Brahman" is correct. I accept that. It is written against my statement at page 218 in the beginning that "I do not agree with the contention that according to Shastras the Brahman has been debared only from the death penalty or all other punishments can be given to him as per the guilt". In fact I do not remember if or not I had given that statement.

(At this stage the attention of the witness was invited toward statement at page 218 and the witness after seeing that said) he remember now that he had given that statement in the court.

I am a Brahman. It is wrong to state that due to this reason I give false statement in the court so fearlessly. I do not know what punishment is awarded under the Muslim Law for speaking lie. I know what is Adharma. I am completely resigned from it. I perform my actions myself. I do not accept that Shri Rishkesh is there in my heart or he is only performing all my actions.

It is wrong to say that I have deliberately spoken lie completely or in some portion of my statement. It is also wrong to say that I have given that statement or part of that statement out of allurement for money or for promotion. It is also wrong to say that I have given my statement out of prejudice or for favouring a particular party or against a particular party. (Volunteer: I cannot speak lie because of dedication towards my occupation). It is wrong to say that I

do not possess any knowledge of History. It is also wrong to say that I am not an historian, and neither I possess knowledge of archaeology nor I am an archaeological as also, I do not possess knowledge of Religion. It is also wrong to say that I only boast. It is wrong to say that neither did I any research on the disputed matter nor I procured any knowledge and all what I have done and said are fabricated things. I have written the conclusions about my research and also submitted a paper in the session of Indian History Congress Delhi. I did not file that paper in the court. My paper has published in a magazine. That paper was published in Hindustan weekly, which is part of Hindustan Times Group. In that paper, the findings of research have been given. It was published sometimes between 1990 to 1992. No copy of the same is available with me at present. It has not been filed in the court.

(The cross-examination by Shri Devki Nandan on his behalf as well as on behalf of Plaintiff No. 1 & 2, in the suit No. 5/1989, over).

(On behalf of case No. 1/89, the cross-examination by Shri R.L. Mishra, Advocate on behalf of Plaintiff Shri Rajendra Singh).

I have knowledge about the rules and regulations of survey, I think I read this subject in my M.A. class. I also read the field book. I think the field book was taught to me from 8th to 10th class. I conducted the survey of the disputed site. Survey report was prepared. That is lying at my house. At that time I had the map with me. I knew the settlement plot number of the disputed site but now I do not remember it. I do not remember the year of settlement on the map of which I had conducted the survey.

I didn't pay much attention to know as to how as to how many settlements had already taken place.

When I am not able to recollect the settlement plot number of the disputed site, I shall not be able to tell the settlement numbers of the surrounding plots on four sides. I didn't make any permanent point while conducting survey. I conducted the survey just in a simple manner. I didn't make any field book. I had seen the map of Mohalla Ramkot at that time. I shall not be able to tell as to what names are there of the Mohallas nearby Ramkot. I shall not be able to give categorical reply of the question that the boundary of Ramkot on eastern side stretches upto which point from the east of disputed site. Mohalla Ramkot ends along the western side boundary of the disputed site. It could be two to four metres, on this or that direction. I do not know about the northern side of this Mohalla. Similarly I do not have any knowledge of southern side. I had seen Kuber Tilla. That was on south west side from the disputed site. I did not measure the distance of in between. It may be 100-125 metres or more. I did not measure the height of Kuber Tilla. On an estimate it may be 25-30 from the ground level. From the north side this height would be 15-20. This height I am telling from the road. The road head from north to south. The road which heads from east to west, the hieght of disputed building from that side would be around 25-30. An old wall of 3-4 height from the west of disputed building, going upto Kuber Tilla was not there, that wall was behind the Masjid. This boundary wall was on the Tilla and not on the ground. This wall too was on 25 to 30 height from the ground level. I did not find any old wall the way while going to Kuber tilla from the back side of the disputed building. This tilla on which the disputed building was constructed was a tilla of wear and tear ruins. On the south of kuber Tilla I might have come across old Tillas but

I do not remember at present. I shall not be able to tell with certainty as to how many old tillas I might have found in Mohalla Ramkot. Kot means a small Fort (Durg). I have no idea about the length and breadth of mohalla Ramkot. I had the map for survey but at this time I cannot tell you on its basis the length and breadth of Mohalla Ramkot. The map which I had, was in all the languages English, Hindi and Urdu. The map with me was a photocopy of the certified copy. I do not remember of which year it was made in I cannot tell when this certified copy was issued. I shall also not be able to tell as to what was the scale of that map. I had an expert with me who had given me this map but the name and address of that expert is not known to me. This expert had come along with me from Deolhi. (again said he had come from Delhi separately and met me on the spot). I did not know him earlier. Later on when we met, we talked to each other. I asked for his name but not the address etc. I do not know where and what work he does. It is wrong to say that I did not go there, I did not meet anybody, no expert was there, no map was there and no map was seen by me.

Now I do not remember how many black stone pillars were there in the disputed building. (again said) there were 14 black coloured pillars in the building in question. The disputed building was not erected on the pillars. These 14 pillars were there in it, inside the walls. These pillars could be on the north side, on the south side, on the west side and could be on all the four sides but these were surely there on the entrance of the building. On the entrance there were 4-4 each side and total were 8. These 8 pillars were on the entrance of the structure to which I call a Masjid. These entrances were of the inside structure. The stones were installed in such a manner that one was from outside entrance and other was inside the entrance. I think out of

14 pillars, 12 pillars were on the entrance only inside the structure. The two pillars could be on the outer entrance of the site. I think there were three entrances inside and on each entrance there were 4 pillars installed.

The place where I had seen the idols installed was on west side of this building. The place where the worship was being performed was of the size of 5x5 or may be little big insize. At present I am not able to recollect that the place where Pooja was being performed, was there any black pillars existing or not. The place where pooja was being performed, a 50 dully constructed building was standing there on the northern side. In this constructed 50 building, the black coloured pillars had been installed but I do not remember their counting. Was there any pillar or not, on the north side portion of it, is not remembered. From the place of Pooja, on the south side also a dully constructed, a vacant building, also of the same size i.e., around 50' or little more was standing. At this point of time I do not remember exactly whether or not any pillar was there on the south side portion and if it were, how many were there. I do not remember if black stones were used in any pillar on the south side portion or not. The place where pooja was being performed was certainly more than both the above said places on the north south sides on which were the dully constructed two building of 50 each standing.

This the in between place of pooja was certainly 75 or it could be even more. This place of worship would be more than 40 in width. There were definitely four black coloured pillars on this place of worship, may be more also, but I did not remember at this point of time. I did not want to hazard any guess as to how many pillars, on both sides i.e. north south sides portions, of black colour were there.

Were these at all there or not and if so, how many were there.

It is wrong to say that I had not seen the disputed building or I am making unnecessary statement merely based on guess work.

In the in between portion where pooja was being performed no black stone was there. It is wrong to say that all around pooja, black stone were there. On the north and south side portion, the area of which I have told is around 50', there was no black stone. It is wrong to say that on the place where pooja was being performed, just on the front of it on the entrance only two stones were installed but I do not remember at present.

I had made enquires about those 14 black stones. I also knew their history and importance. All the 14 stones were incoherent. We can call these stones belonging to 10th or 11th century. The black stones at the entrance had the painting of flowers and leaves. This painting was on many pillars on the entrance but I did not remember the counting at this time. Some paintings were of figures made on the black stones but these were not clear. Therefore it cannot be said if these were the figures of human beings or Dieties. The paper which I had prepared, perhaps I did not write about the detail of these black stones on that. I did not write any thing in that paper that how many and on which portion of this building the black stones were found. It is wrong to say that I did not write about this because I had not seen the building.

Except Ramkot I did not see any other Kot for my study in India. For knowing the history of the Kot or Durg, its excavation may be required, but it is not necessary.

The history of the Durg can be found out with the help of inscriptions on it or potteries spread on the surface, the coins or any other memorial signs. I had taken some steps from them also to know the history of the disputed building. I tried to locate potteries. There was one transcription there, I saw that. These two steps mainly were taken. I did not resort to excavation. With the transcription. I mean the inscription in Babri Masjid. I located the potteries spread on the Tilla and I found it. I found some pottery spread over there which belonged to the 4th Century B.C. These were one to two pieces. These were found from the back portion of the Masjid. These were found on the surface.

I had gone at this site 8 to 10 times in connection with my research. When I went there with my father then my subject was not research. When I went there alongwith my father. I was studying in 10th or 12th class and my age would have been 16-17 years. Thereafter and before starting the research I might have gone there for once or twice. My uncle was with me. This matter would be between 1968 to 1971. When I went alongwith my parents it was probably rainy season and when I went with my uncle, I do not remember the season. I cannot say at which special occasion, we went there first time but 2nd time when I went there with my uncle, it was no special occasion. Now I do not remember that when I went alongwith my father there may be or may not be theseason of savan Jhoola. There was crowd at that time. The reason of that crowd could be some festival or people might have come otherwise also. The people who visit Ayodhya, they go to the temples for having DarsHans and also go to disputed site for DarsHans. On both these occasions when I went there. I saw coparatively large crowd on the disputed site. There was crowd on the bank of river also. With river I mean the bank of Saryu. It is correct that the people who visit

Ayodhya take bath in Saryu, have Darshans in temples and also have the Darshan of disputed site. They go on the disputed site and also on other historical places.

I had also studied that how many festivals are celebrated in Ayodhya. All are not known presently but the main are:-

Ram Navmi Festival, (2) Jhoola during rainy season, (3) Agarak Chaturthi, (4) Taking bath in saryu in the month of kartik, (5) ON the occasion of general festivals four five thousand people gather there, whereas on the occasion of main festival people to the tune of 20-25 thousand collect there. I consider this as an exaggeration of fact when it is said that lakhs of people get together here during Ramnavmi, Savan joola etc., festivals. I might have gone to Ayodhya on such special occasion during the period of my research work. But I do not remember now. May be that I had interviewed the pilgrims off and on, during the occasion of festival. I used to keep record of such an interview. I used to note down all the meaningful details. I did not make entry about the interview so taken in the paper that I prepared. I did not consider it necessary to write in the paper the detail such as how many people come here and why they come here during the special festivals. In connection with the local enquiries I did go to the disputed site. I went on Rinmochan Ghat, on the structure of so called Vashistha kund and places like Laxman Ghat, Pap Mochan Ghat, Chakratola. I read the then literature in this context., I have heard the name of Nandi Gram. According to legend, it is considered a place connected with Ramayana. I also went there. I also went on Bhardwaj Ashram. It is also connected with the story of Ramayana. I also went to Shringberpur. That too is related to Ramayana's story. As per the story of Ramayana, Shri

Ramchandraji crossed the river by boat from this place, while proceeding on exile. I did not have to Panchavati. Rameshwaram is also connected with the story of Rama and I had been to Rameshwaran also. Nandi Gram is at a distance of 3-4 kilometers from Ayodhya. I have gone to Bharatpur Kund but I am not recollecting its position at present. I shall not be able to tell the exact distance between Bharat Kund and Nandigram. From Ayodhya, Sringeripur is situated at 80 miles away and Bhardwaj Ashram 70 miles away.

I have studied those Dharmas Shastra the evolution of which is related to India. The names of those Dharmas are Vedic Dharma, Upanishada Dharma, Buddhism, Jainism, community of Ajivikas, Vaishnav Dharma. Shaiv Dharma, Sikh Dharma. I neither recognize Hindu Dharma nor the religious ceremonies (Karam kanda) I did intensive study of Hindu Dharma because teaching is my profession and I am the creature of this society. I might have studied other Dharmas in addition to Hindu dharma as well but not too analytically to know their reality. I never tried to know about various legends and illusions of other religions. I have conducted research also on them.

Question: You studied intensively only Hindu Dharma, what was your purpose behind it?

Answer: Firstly because of following teaching profession
2ndly being the social creature, because of living in this environment.

Question: You did not study other religions because you do not consider yourself as a part of them?

Answer: It is not so.

Question: Are you the teacher of History or also of Religion?

Answer: I am the teacher of history but we have to study about the religion of the society.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

19.11.1998

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by us. In Continuation for further cross-examination on 20.11.1998.

Sd/-

19.11.1998

20.11.1998

(In continuation of dated 19.11.1998 the statement Shri Suresh Chandra Mishra begins on oath).

I have studied Buddhism also. The books on Buddhism are available in Palli language. I understand Palli language. I learnt this language with the help of self study. I did not learn it from some school or a teacher. The books I have read are as under:-

(1) Jatak, (2) Deegh Nikay, (3) Aguttar Nikay, (4) Abhidhmma Pitak, (5) Sutta Pitak etc. etc., I shall not be able to give any extract of Jatak, at present similarly it is not possible to give any extracts from Aguttar. I cannot provide any extracts of others books as well. I did not do any comparative study of the philosophy of Hindu Dharma and Buddhism. I can tell the main difference between the two Buddhism was against the caste system,. Against the rituals, against yagyas, against the violence, against the descrimination of small and big. These were the main differences. Hindu religion was Sarveshvarwadi (all God) and Buddhism was Nirveshvarwadi (one God), it was the main difference. I shall not be able to tell whether there was one philosophy of both or not Brahm and jeev. I do not agree with it that in both the religions the basis thing was .

I have also studied Jain Dharma. The main books of Jainism are in Prakrit Language and at some places it is in Upbharanash also. Prakrit language, I had studied with Sanskrit in B.A. I had offered Sanskrit in B.A. in the course of B.A. there was no syllabus of Prakrit language.

The Jain Granths which I have read and are in Parakrit language are as under:-

(1) Achaia Sutra, (2) Uttradhyan Sootra, (3) Anuttar, (4) Gad Dasavo, (5) Trishashti Shalaka Purush Charit (6) Parshvanachariyu (7) Jinmavijaykrit, (7) Choornigranath (8) Khartargadyavali, (9) Abhividhanchintamani, (1) Kumar Pal Chairt etc. etc.

Acharag Sootra is not a religious book. I have seen in that the detail of social situation. As far as I remember, this book does not have anything relating to Dharma. The books in which there is mention about Dharma, their names are as follows Tri Shashti Shalaka Purush Charit Purush and Parshavanachariyu. The other books may have some mention about Dharma but I do not remember. I have not studied Trishashti Shalaka Purush Chairt and other books from the point of view of knowing whether they have philosophy, thinking etc. of Dharma. Therefore I cannot quote any example from the same. I cannot remember at this point of time that what the relation of Atma and Parmatma is. I have made comparative study of the same, but I cannot recall it now. I did not have comparative study of Hindu Dharm and Jainism from this point of view as to what is their concept about dualism and non dualism.

I have studied Sikh Dharma little bit. Books on Sikhism are available in their own Punjabi language and the script is Gurumukhi. I have not studied Punjabi language in Gurumukhi script. I have not studied the Granth. I have read in books as well as in articles. I have read them in English language also. I might have read in Hindi as well. At present I do not remember the name of any particular book. The religious matters written in history books have been read by me.

The Sikhism was founded by Guru Nanak Dev but I will not be able to tell its year or Sambat. It was founded in

15th and 16th century A.D. I think there have been 10 Gurus in Sikh Dharma. I have not studied it as to when and who was the 5th Guru. I also cannot tell the period and name of the 7th Guru. I do not know also the name and period of ninth Guru. But the 10th guru was Shri Guru Govind Singh. His period was 16th-17th century A.D. I do not know at this time as to who was the Ruler of India at that time. After Guru Govind Singh ji, the Guru tradition is still continuing but I do not know as to how it has been continuing. I cannot tell the fundamental principles of Sikh religion. There are many similarities between Sikh and Hindu religion.

I have also heard about Khalsa Panth. Sikh Dharma is the main Dharma where as Khalsa Panth is a sect, which is little different from it. I do not know when and by whom the Khalsa panth was founded. The person who founded the Khalsa Panth was to strengthen his social status, hence he founded it. It is wrong to say that Khalsa Panth was founded as a reaction and opposition against the atrocities committed by the Muslim Rulers towards Hindu such as large scale forcible conversion. (He said suo moto). The founder of the Khalsa Panth in order to strengthen his political position, he founded the Khalsa Panth. It is my opinion, which has been formed after intensive studies. It is not the thinking of other historian. I did read the history of Khalsa Panth but I shall not be able to tell, whether it has been written in Hindi, English or Gurumukhi. I cannot say with certainty that the Khalsa Panth was founded by Guru Govind Singh in 1699 A.D. at Anadpur Sahab. It is wrong to say that I have not read the medieval history of India. It is also wrong to say that it is because of this, I am not able to tell such important matter. I do not recall as to who was the ruler of India at Delhi in 1699 A.D. However, it is correct to

suggest that Aurangzeb was the ruler of India in the year 1699 A.D.

I am unable to recall at this time the name of the father of Guru Govind Singhji. I have heard the name of Guru Teg bahadur. I have not read about his said sacrifice anywhere. I have heard the name of Gurudwara Shish Ganj at Delhi and I have also been to that place. I do not know as to how that Gurudwara acquired this name. I do not know its history. This Gurudwara is situated at Chandni Chowk near the Fountain but I do not know the name of the Mohalla. It is in Delhi. There is no doubt that I have been living in Delhi for the last 25-30 years. To my knowledge there is neither any Shahidganj nor is there this Gurudwara. Neither I have read anywhere nor I know about this matter, the name of this Gurudwara is related to the sacrifice of Guru Tegh bahadur or he had refused to obey the order of the then ruler for conversion to Islam or because this reason only he had been beheaded.

I have seen Gurudwara Rakab Ganj of Delhi. I might have read somewhere, but I cannot remember that the final funeral rites of Guru Tegh Bahadur had been performed at Rakab Ganj. The tradition of holding of arms by the Sikhs started with the foundation of the Khasla Panth. I am totally unaware of it and I consider it as exaggeration of fact that during the reign of Aurangzeb, atrocities were inflicted upon the Kashmiri Pandits, and that their sacred threads were burnt, their braids were cut or they compelled for conversion of their religion. What ever history books I have read about the medieval period of India, no such mention was found in them. To my information there is no book titled as Dasham Granth, which is said to have been written by Shri Guru Govind Singh. I have not read the said book. I have not read any book where in the mention of atrocities

or the sacrifice of his father as mentioned by Guru Govind Singh, was made. I have read the works of the Sikh Historians, but I do not remember the names of the Historians and the books written by them. I do not recognize Khushwant Singh as an historian. I recognize him as a journalist. He has written about the history of the Sikhs, I have been reading whatever he writes, but I do not take him seriously. Shri khushwant singh might have written about the cruelties meted to Guru Teg bahadur or Guru Govind Singh or Sikh battles fought during their period, I might have read also but I do not know what he wrote and what I read because I do not take him seriously. I do not know if Khushwant Singh has written any book in the name of The History of Sikhs. There is no book in history, in which the mention of such excesses or conversion of religion of Hindus has been made. The foundation of Khasla panth against the policies of the Muslim rulers, the excesses on Hindus, the conversion of religion can be the historical facts (suo moto said) if proofs are found.

Jadu Nath Sarkar was an historian. He wrote many books. He has written many books on Mughal Empire. I do not recall if the so called atrocities committed on Hindus and Sikhs by the Mughal Rulers and particularly the atrocities committed by Aurangzeb, find mention in any of his books. As far as I remember, there is no such mention in his books in which the detail of the alleged excesses is given. It is wrong to say that I have not read the books of Jadu Nath sarkar. It is also wrong to say that I am deliberately trying to hide the facts in this regard.

Shri Ram Sharma has also been an historian. He has also written books on history. I have studied the books written by him. I am not recalling if or not I have studied the

book "Religious Policy of the Mughals" written by him. Maybe so, that he has written something against the excesses by Mughal Rulers on Hindus, but I do not remember.

I have heard the name of one Shri Ganda Singh as an historian. He might have written some books on history but I have not read them. The history of the Sikhs can be his important book but I did not read it. The name of Hari Ram Gupta also appears to be heard of by me. I cannot say he is known as an historian or not. I did not read the book entitled the history of Punjab. I do not know the name of the writer of the said book. I do not know if any historian named G.S.Nayyar, existed or not. Shri A.L.Shrivastava, has been an historian I have definitely read his books written on mediaval period, I have read his book "The Mughal Empire". In this book I did not read the chapter on above mentioned atrocities on Hindus.

I do not agree with the contention that there are two groups of Historians in Delhi or in one of the said group is Prof. Romila Thapar and B.N.Jha etc. or I have connections with them. It is not that when ever a seminar is held in Delhi, I deliver my lecture with the said group. It is wrong to say that I support only their ideology. It is not correct to say that Prof. K.M.Srimali and Prof. R.S.Sharma are the supporters of the same ideology which is enunciated by Prof. Romila Thapar and Prof. D.N.Jha.

I have not read anywhere that Guru Govind Singh had written a letter to Aurangzeb by the name jafarnama. We do not find any such things in the history wherein Guru Govind Singh had registered his objection to Aurangzeb in which committing of atrocities upon some people or group of people were highlighted- Excess would have been

condemned. To my knowledge, there is no historical fact for which Guru Govind singh would have condemned the excesses on Hidus, Brahamnas, and Sikhs by Aurangzeb. I have not read any such description in history where in the royal army of Mughals and the army raised by Guru Govind Singh had fought a battle between them. I do not remember if in any such battle two sons of Guru Govind singh would have died. I do not remember if I have read anywhere in the history that his 2 others sons would have been brick laid alive in the wall near Sirhind Nagar by the Muslim Rulers. I have not read any such books the name of which is Guru Sabha Sena Path, or which is written in 1708 or which is translated into English or which contained the detail of battles between Sikhs and Muslim Rulers.

I do not know Persian hence I did not find opportunity to read the books entitled Tarikhe Bahadur Shah. I do not know if or not this book has been translated into English, Hindi Urdu or any other language. I cannot say that the said book contains details of battles fought between Guru Govind Singh and the Mughals.

I have read the book "History of India" by the Historian Elliot and Dawson. I do not remember that his book contain the English translation of "Tarikhe Bahadur shahi" and in that translation the detail of battles fought between the armies of Mughals and Guru Govind Singh is described. This book of Elliot and Dawson has the recognition.

It is wrong to say that I avoided the Answers of the questions asked from me and which I did not want to answer by blaming my memory.

There was Maharaja Ranjit Singh amongst the Sikhs. I have read his history. The names of the Historians during his regime are not known to me. I shall not be able to tell the period of rule of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. I have not heard the names of one Sohan Lal Suri and Shri Mohiddin, the Historians. It is wrong to say that my knowledge about Ancient history or the mediaval history is zero. It is also wrong to say that my entire statement is based on vested interest.

(The cross- examination of the witness from all the apponent parties concludes).

Witness is discharge.

Verified the statement after hearing.

Sd/-

Suresh Chandra Mishra

20.11.1998

Typed by the stenographer in open court as dicated by us .

Sd/-

20.11.1998