

**8525**

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

**Other Original Suit No. 4/1989**

**Sunni Central Board of  
Waqfs, U.P and others----- Plaintiffs**

**VERSUS**

**Gopal Singh Visharad  
and others. ----- Defendants  
(now dead)**

**Clubbed together**

**Other Original Suit No. 1/89**

**Other Original Suit No. 3/89**

**Other Original Suit No. 5/89**

**STATEMENT OF D.W. 2/1/3  
MAHANT RAMVILAS DAS VEDANTI**

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

Other Original Suit No. 4/1989

Sunni Central Board of  
Waqfs, U.P and others----- Plaintiffs

VERSUS

Gopal Singh Visharad  
and others. ----- Defendants  
(now dead)

Clubbed together

Other Original Suit No. 1/89

Other Original Suit No. 3/89

Other Original Suit No. 5/89

D.W. 2/1/3

EXAMINATION IN CHIEF BY WAY OF AFFIDAVIT,  
MAHANT RAMVILAS DAS VEDANTI UNDER ORDER 18  
RULE 4 OF CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

I, Vasistha Peethadeeshwara Mahant Dr. Ramvilas Das  
Vedanti, disciple of Mahant Ram Sewak Das, aged about  
51 years, resident of Vasistha Bhawan, Hindu Dham, Naya  
Ghat, Distt.. Faizabad solemnly affirm on oath as under :-

1. That Deponent is Vedantacharya and Vidyavaridhi  
(Ph.D) and is a Mahant and Sarvsahkar  
Vasishthapeethadhiswar of Vasishta Bhawan, Naya  
Ghat, Ayodhya.

2. That, Deponent was born in Distt. Reeva, Madhya Pradesh and permanently living in Ayodhya since 1968.
3. That, Deponent was initiated by the than Vasishthapeethadhiswar Mahant Shri Ram Sewak Das, in 1968 and educated under the guardianship of Mahant Shri Abhiram Das ji and is his spiritual disciple.
4. That, Deponent has passed Shastri examination with Grammar as subject in 1976 from Varanasi Sanskrit University, Varanasi and Degree of Vedantacharya with Shriramanuj Vedanta as a subject in 1979-80.
5. That, Deponent has got the Vidayaridi (Ph.D) in the year 1982 with "Valmikiya Ramayane Dharm Neete" as a subject from Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, Varanasi.
6. That, Deponent has been studying, the sacred books, books and stories etc. concerning to the life of Shri Ramchanderji and Shri Krishanji since student life and still doing.
7. That, Deponent has been a Member of Parliament in Eleventh and Twelfth Lok Sabha from Machali city and Pratapgarh respectively and represented the concerned area as a Member of Parliament.
8. That, Deponent knows the disputed site very well and has been visiting Ayodhya regularly since 1968 at important occasions and in general for the darshan, bhajan-poojan and parikarma etc. of Sriram Janambhoomi during the stay in Ayodhya and has

been doing darshan, pooja and parikarma of the disputed site, as a birth place of God Shri Rama.

9. That, innumerable Hindus from native and alien land have been doing pooja of Shri Ram Chander ji's birth place, at the disputed site, since the time immemorial in accordance with their tradition, customary system and faith. Sanatan Dharami Hindus Worship the disputed site as a birth place of their adorable God Shri Ram Chanderji and Jananmbhoomi temple.
10. That, the main door for making entry into Shri Ram Janambhoomi, before the demolition of disputed structure, was in the eastern side, which is known as Hanuman Dwar. There were pillars of black Kasauti engraved with flowers-leaves, pictures of Jai-vijay at both the side at the main gate. 12 pillars of black Kasauti engraved with earthen pot, new lender leafs, Amrit pitchers, swastika, flowers and leafs, peacock, pictures of deities were in the main building similar to two pillars fixed at the main gate.
11. That, there was a chabutra in the southern side on the way for making entry into the questioned structure from the main gate. Which was known as Ram Chabutra. Idols of God Rama, Laxman, Sita etc. were there. These were worshipped regularly by the Hindu devotees. Below the Ram Chabutra, there was a Gupha temple. There was tree of pipal at the south-east corner of Ram Chabutra under which there were idols of Ganeshji, Shankarji, Kartikeya ji and Pindi. Which were also, worshiped by the devotees. There was a tin shade called Sant Niwas in the north side at the inner part from the main gate. Where some Sants were staying permanently and



sants coming from outside also stay therein. Foodgrain, utensils etc. were kept there.

12. That, there was a wall with grill opposite to main premises in the western side of Ram Chabutra and Mandap and birth place of God Shri Rama, which, in accordance with the Sanatan Dharami Hindus religious tradition, is called Garbh Grih, was situated under the middle dome. Structure situated in the main premises had three domes, where under the mid dome Shri Rama was born in. It is a tradition and faith of Hindus and is proven according to Vedas, theology books, Purans etc. On the basis of this faith, innumerable Hindu devotees of Rama, and general public from native and alien land have been worshipping the disputed site as a birth place of Shri Rama and Janambhoomi. Deponent also regards it as very holy place and holy birth place of God Rama.
13. That, there was also a entry gate called Singh Dwar, in the east-north in the Shri Ram Janambhoomi premises before demolition of the questioned structure. An idol of Garur Dev was above, in the mid of Singh Dwar and two lion, on both the side. There was a Sita Rasoi at the north of building with three domes i.e at the northwest corner of the premises, inside of the Singh Dwar. Chauka, utensils, chulha, footprints etc. were kept there, which were worshiped by devotees. A Hawan kund was also there.
14. That, In accordance with the ancient tradition, custom and faith of Sanatan Dharmi Hindu God Shri Rama, Son of King Dasrath was born at the place situated below the mid dome. Hence this place is a holy place and worshipable and on the basis of this

faith, crores of Sanatan Dharmi Hindus had been taking darshan, worshiping and parikarma of the birthplace of Shri Rama at Ayodhya. There was a stone at the main entry gate. "Janambhoomi daily yatra" was written on it.

15. That, There was a famous and holy koop (well) known as Sita koop at the south-east corner of the disputed site, at a distance of about 200-300 feet from the disputed site. Devotees used to take the holy water of this koop, put on their head and take it to their home as a prasada.
16. That, there were 12 pillars of black Kasauti engraved with pitchers, flowers-leafs, yaksh-yakshani, pot-tender leaf, figures of deities, Amrit pitcher and swastika sign, under the mid dome in Shri Ramjanambhoomi premises.
17. That, Neither any Muslim used to go there in the disputed premises nor any Muslim read namaz there. According to my information, after the year 1934, if any Muslim is seen there, Sadhu, Vairagi used to hit him by sticks. For this fear, no Muslim used to go there and neither namaz was read there in at the disputed site after 1934 nor any follower of Islam went inside.
18. That, there are number of consecrated temples of Hindus around the disputed Bhawan. Janamsthan, Rasoi, Kanak Bhawan, Ved mandir, Vishwamitra Ashram, Siyapiya kelikunj, Mat-Gazendra, Kiteshwar Mahadev, Ram Khazana mandir, Lomas Ashram, Sugreev fort, Gokul Bhawan, Rang mahal, Luv-kush

mandir, Vashishtha kund, Kuber teela and Brahamkund Gurudwara etc. are among them.

19. That, According to my study and knowledge, disputed site situated at Ayodhya is a birth place of God Shri. Ram Chander. It is omniscient and universal fact that God Shri. Rama was born in Ayodhya as a son of King Dasrath and disputed site is being recognised and worshiped by the Sanatan Dharmi Hindus from time immemorial in accordance with their religious faith, tradition, custom and belief and faith. According to Hindu theology, an idol and a site are equally worshipable. By worshipping it one gets Moksha.
20. That, It is described in Valmiki Ramayana, Atharveda, Yajurveda, Skand Puran and in the literature written by Gosawami Tulsidas that God Shri Rama was born at the disputed site in Ayodhya. It is mentioned in Tulsi's Doha Shatak written by Tulsidas that mosque was constructed by demolishing Shri Ramjanambhoomi Mandir by Meerbaki on the order of Babar. There is a reference of bad deeds and atrocities committed by the Mughal Ruler, in Kavita wali by Goswami Tulsidas. The than social, political conditions were described in his creation Dohawali.
21. That, Valmiki Ramayana is a most ancient and recognized book of Hindus, which was written during the time of God Shri Ram Chander ji. Maharshi Valmiki had in the 18<sup>th</sup> canto of Balkand of Valimiki Ramayana while giving details about the birth of Shri Ram Chanderji further described the birth of Rama during Ritu Grahan Nakshtra and had, further recognizing this place as a birth place of God Rama referred

this place from the word "Sarvlok Namaskritam". Birthplace of God Shri Rama has been described in Valmiki Ramayana distinctively as under:-

"Kaushalya gave birth to Lord Rama, on the land manifested with the rising light; the land respected by lokpals and deities, God of universe, controller of world, the land worshipable, with exceptional characteristics i.e characteristics of human and God. The word Sanyat means Kaushalya gave birth to Shri Rama i.e. God Rama manifested, incarnation of God Rama happened in this land."

22. That, Describing the birth of Shri Rama in the family of King Dasrath from the womb of Kaushalya in Ayodhya, kingdom of Dasrath in Ayodhya, coronation of God Rama to the throne, going to the forest etc. in detail, Ayodhya has been described as a main holy place of Hindus.
23. That, The disputed site was described as a birthplace of God Rama. Janambhoomi has been described as a abode of God Rama in Ram Tapayopnishad and Vedas, Theology.
24. That, Ayodhya Mahatamyia has been described in Vaishnav-volume of Skand Puran, famous book of Hindus. Disputed land has been explicitly described as a birthplace of God Sri Rama in it. Relevant lines of Vaishnav Volume of Ayodhya Mahatamiya are as under:-

"Vedvyas describing the importance of Ayodhya has written in Vaishnav Volume of Skand Puran that one should make darshan of Ayodhya with respect – devotion for the fulfillment of all desire. One should, visit the Ayodhya on the third Navratra, chanting

bhazans in the month of chaitra. Yatra of Shri Ram Navami in Ayodhya commence from the third navratra of chaitra month. This yatra is recognized for obtaining divine and progeny and pleasure. The scene with various types of music and dance is alluring and one is protected by it, there is no doubt in it. High ascetic, devotee person lives in the western side of Ramjanambhoomi, the land known as Pindarak. The land worshipable with flowers etc. Men get skill from this pooja. People perform Pooja with due procedure. Worship of Pindarak should be done after taking bath in Saryu River. Sinful person should do its pooja for keeping the lust of the world away during holy nakshtra of navratras. Worship of God Ganesh is performed in the western side for removing obstacles. Ramjanambhoomi is situated at northeastern corner. This land which provides salvation is called Janambhoomi or Janamsthan. Vashishta Kund is in the east of Vigneshwari. Ramjanambhoomi is in the north side of Vasistha Kund and it becomes clear from the word that Ramjanambhoomi is in the north of Vasistha Kund. One should meditate Janamsthan in the western part of Lomas Ashram".

25. That, Ayodhya has been described as a city of the deities in Atharveda, as under:-

"Brahmpur i.e. Ayodhyapuri, where Braham Purush lives are called Purush i.e. people living in Ayodhyapur are hard workers. Eye-sight and knowledge always remain with a person who knows Brahmpuri of Ayodhya, the city of Shri Rama i.e. the soul never get away from him upto very old age, for which reason he is known as scholar of Braham i.e. a person, who know that city has long life with full vision and intelligent. The city with eight wheels,

nine gates in the city of deities which is called Ayodhya. It is prosperous city. Paramanand Ram lives therein. This city is full of lights, knowledge".

26. That, In the couplet 54 of chapter 30 of the famous book "Rudrayamal" of Hindu religion, Ayodhya has been recognized the main sacred place among all the holy places and defining the "Ayodhya as a city of Nitya Sachidanandarupini, defining Ayodhya as God and Vigrah, Ayodhya is recognized higher then the Go-Lok and Vaikunth in Vasishta Samhita. Similar description is found in Ramcharitmanas by Goswami Tulsidas.
27. That, Rudrayamal is a very ancient spiritual religious book of Hindus, wherein disputed site was distinctively described as a birth place of God Shri Rama and Ayodhya has been recognised as God Vasudev, Brahmaji and Rudra in the book. Relevant lines of the said book are as under :-  
 "Meaning of the word Ayodhya has given in the shaloka. Akar, ukar Onkar and dhaya has been explained. Akar=Vasudev, Vasudev=Ram residing in every thing. Ukar means Prajapati Brahma and Onkar means Rudra=Shankar and Dhaya menas Munishwar people worship all these three deities i.e. its meaning is that Ayodhya = Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh, Munishwar people means Sadhu, Saints, Mahatma's worship these three deities regularly".
28. That, Communal harmony prevailed in Ayodhya, Faizabad since ever, at the local level and both the communities had cordial relationship with each other and it exists even today. Local Muslims (excluding a few fanatic members with vested interest) recognize the disputed site as a birthplace of God Shri Rama, adorable of Hindus and are not ready to recognize the disputed site as a mosque.

29. That, During the proceeding concerning to the disputed site under section 145 under Cr.P.C majority of Muslims had recognized the disputed site as a birth place of Shri Rama and confirming the regular occupation of Hindus, had accepted that namaz was not read at the disputed site by the muslims ever and in accordance with the Islam, namaz is not read at such place.
30. That, Deponent during his social religious, political life had interaction with the followers of Islam, their Ulemas and scholars. They do not accept the disputed site as mosque. They also admit that provision for Towers and Vazzu is must in the mosque. In the structure at disputed site neither there is a provision for towers nor for the vazzu. Disputed site is a birth place of God Shri Rama, which is proven on the basis of theology, public-sayings, traditions etc and is being worshipped as a birth place of God Shri Rama from the time immemorial.

Lucknow  
Dated 16.2.2005

Deponent  
Sd/-

(Mahant Ram Vilas Das Vedanti)

Verification

I, deponent, Ram Vilas Das Vedanti do affirm that contents of para-1 to para-30 of this affidavit are true according to my knowledge and study, nothing is false and No material has been concealed. May God help me.

Verified today i.e. on 16.2.2005 at the Hon'ble High Court premises at Lucknow.

Deponent  
Sd/-

(Mahant Ram Vilas Das Vedanti)

The Deponent Ram Vilas Das Vedanti is known to me who has signed before me.

Dated: 16.2.2005

Sd/-  
(Madan Mohan Pandey)  
Advocate

**Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey, Additional District Judge/Officer on special duty, High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.**

**Dated 16.2.2005**

**DW. – 2/1-3, Ramvilas Das Vedanti**

Examination in chief affidavit, page no. 1 to 11, Mahant Dr. Ramvilas Das Vedanti, Peethadhiswar, disciple of Mahant Ram Sewak Das, aged about 51 years, resident of Vasisth Bhawan, Hindu Dham, Naya Ghat, Distt. Faizabad was submitted and taken on record.

(Cross examination on an oath by Shri Tarunjeet Verma, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff Nirmohi Akhara Other Original Suit no. 3/89 begins)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

I am about 51 years old. My guru is Mahant Shri Ramsewak Das ji. I was born in the Distt. Reewa of Madhya Pradesh. My father's name is Ramsuwan Tripathi. I came to Ayodhya after passing half-yearly examination of 10<sup>th</sup> class. I came to Ayodhya in the month of December 1968. Initially I came to Vasistha Bhawan, Ayodhya and have been residing there since than. Since there was no school, I became a spiritual disciple of Baba Abhiram Das of Hanumangarhi.

I started my education in Hanumath Sanskrit University, Hanumangarhi. I have started this education of music in 1970 after 1968. I have done Ph.D in the subject "Valmikiramayane Dharmneeti" in 1982. Whenever I go to Ayodhya for darshan I used to do parikarma alongwith the darshan; not daily but thrice a week. Beside



Ramjanambhoomi, I used to take darshan of Hanumangarhi, Kanak Bhawan, Rangmahal, Maniparbat, Nageshwarnath, Vasistha Kund and Gokul Bhawan etc. in Ayodhya. I have been elected a Member of Parliament for 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Lok-Sabha from Machhali City and Pratapgarh respectively. I was elected Member of Parliament in the year 1996 and 1998. There were two pillars of Kasauti engraved with Swastik sign, nectar pitchers and idols of deities. There were 12 pillars of Kasauti engraved with Swastik sign, nectar pitchers, and pictures of deities in the temple. Someone had made despicable efforts to undo these signs. There was a stone about two and half feet in height, at the Hanumanth Dwar, "Ramjanambhoomi daily darshan" was written there upon. Something has been engraved in it in other language, which was not clear. A number of Shivlingas in the round shape were there at Agnikoan in Ramjanambhoomi. Among them, a broken idol of Parwati and Hanumanji were there. Volunteer: that devotees used to worship them daily. There were a number of temples around the Janambhoomi and some still exists. Sita Rasoi, with Choka, Belan and Chulaha was at Vayava corner in the north of idol of Ramlalla. Adjacent to it, at a little distance on the north there was Singh Dwar and a little ahead at north-eastern corner there was a tree of Pakar (fig tree) and a tin sade adjacent to it, where Rasoi house was. Siya-priya kele kunj, Ramkhazana, Rangmahal, Luv-Kush Bhawan, Gokul Bhawan, Vasistha kund, Brahm kund, Gurudwara, Ved mandir, Koteswar mahadev mandir, jain mandir, Arvind Ashram, Sugreev fort, Kuber tila, Angad tila, Jamwant Mandir, Matgaid, Bari Jagah, Ramgulella mandir, Ramkachehri mandir, Aamava mandir etc. are among them. All these temples still are there.

I have read Skand Puran and Rudrayamal. I have done my Ph.D on Valmiki Ramayana. Birth of Rama has been described in Ramayana. This has been referred in para-21 of my affidavit.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Ram Vilas Das Vedanti

16.2.2005

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by me . In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 17.2.2005. Witness to present.

Sd/-

(Hari Sahankar Dubey)

Commissioner

16.2.2005

**Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey, Additional District Judge/Officer on special duty, High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.**

**Dated 17.2.2005**

**DW. – 2/1-3, Dr. Ramvilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed vide order dated 3.2.2005 passed by Hon'ble Full Bench in Other Original Suit No. 4/89)

(In continuation to dt. 16.2.2005, on behalf of plaintiff Nirmohi Akhara other Original Suit No. 3/89, cross-examination on oath by Shri Ranjeet Lal Verma, Advocate continued)

I am a Tripathi Brahman and Sutradhari. I came to Ayodhya at the age of 14-15 years. Before that I never came to Ayodhya. I came to Ayodhya at the age of 14-15 years for the first time, alone. My aim of coming here was a Bhagwat-bhajan. I came here after I had passed half-yearly examination of 10<sup>th</sup> class. After coming to Ayodhya I stayed here forever. I did not went back to my home. After coming to Ayodhya I opted for the Vairagi sect. I was initiated in Ramanandiya Shri Vaishnav community. First ever jagatguru Ramanandacharya is a prophet of Ramanandiya Vaishnav community. Ramanandacharya was appeared at Prayag but I cannot tell about the period of his appearance. First ever Jagatguru Ramanandacharya was appeared 700 years before. Guru tradition of Ramananda community was also before first ever Guru Ramanandcharya. Adhacharya of Ramanandiya community is first ever Guru Ramanandacharya ji. It may be correct to say that Sarveshwar Bhagwan Ram might be Adhacharya

of Ramanandiya community. Sitaji, Hanumanji, Vashishtaji, Parasharji etc. comes after Adhacharya in Guru tradition. Guru tradition and prophet tradition is one and same. In my view, Guru tradition and prophet are synonymous. One who set forth a principle he is debited to the name of that principle like Ramanandacharya had set forth Visistadwait principle. Ramanujacharya was before Ramanandacharya. He also set forth the Visistadwait principle. First ever Shankaracharya had interpreted the Shaiv principle i.e. principle of Adwaitwad, which is also called Anuvad. Chaitanya Mahaprabhu was also Vaishnav and devotee of Krishna. So far I know, God Vishnu had 24 incarnations. I came to know about this from Srimadbhagwat. All incarnation of God Vishnu were in figures, Animal figures, creature figures and human figures are among these figures. There was a matsyavtar also. Varah incarnation was also the incarnation of God Vishnu. Dasayavtar was referred in Matsyavtar. Volunteer: that number of incarnation has been written separately in various Puranas. It was written as 10, 12, 24 and 124 at different places. God Vishnu has innumerable incarnation. Among ten incarnations referred in Matsya Puran, three incarnations were of deities. Divine incarnations were for a short period, hence called a partial incarnation. Ram and Krishna were the two incarnation remained since childhood to the last. Rama's incarnation happened in the house of King Dasrath of Ayodhya. This incarnation was in human figure. Incarnation as human being and human figure is the two different things. Krishna incarnation happened similarly. Shri Rama appeared in Treta and Shri Krishna in Dwapar. According to the time calculation Treta comes first than Dwapar. Ramchanderji was born in the family of Dasrath and incarnation happened also. We people recognize birth and incarnation as one. The day on which Rama was born,

is called the date of birth and date of incarnation. But incarnation celebration can be celebrated on any day, according to the will of devotees. God appears due to devotion of the devotee.

Description of Dwadas devotee is found. In addition to this Navadha devotion is also found. Navadha devotion is described in Srimadbhagwat and Ramcharitmanas. The description is found in Ramcharitmanas with reference to Shabri in Aranyakand.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the Ramcharitmanas document no. 258 C-1/2/1. Witness after seeing the page 432 of the above book said Navadha devotion is described, next to the couplet no. 34. This description is next to the couplet no. 34 and in the four line's couplet next to the couplet no. 35. The foremost devotion in Navadha devotion is to sit with the saints, second devotion is to concentrate listening/reading story of God. Third type of devotion is to serve the Guru and fourth type of devotion is to describe the qualities of God. Fifth devotion is to have faith in adoration of God, sixth devotion is the control over organs and to do divine act without any expectation of result, seventh type of devotion is to see omnipresent form of God and give more importance to the saints than to God, eighth devotion is the satisfaction and not to see fault of others, ninth devotion is to have faith in God without any deception.

It is described in Gita that one who keeps a slavish feeling in God is called Devotee. All the followers of Ramanandiya community recognize Sita-Ram as their adorable and keep slavish feeling towards them. Gita refers friendly feelings also. Vairagies of Ramanandiya

community, who worship with the slavish feelings, are in abundance in Ayodhya and Varanasi. Ramanandiya community also has the people having aesthetic sense. These people are found in Varanasi, Ayodhya, Janakpur etc. Volunteer: that every type of devotees are generally found at all holy places. Saint is a person, whose heart is clear. Doing altruism without self-motive is a human religion and a characteristic of a saint.

I have referred in para 3 of my examination in chief affidavit about my initiation by Shri Ramsewak Das from which I mean hymn disciple. Rituals are performed during initiation such as Bhadra, bath, wearing kanthi, putting chandan and than hymn, respectively. I am not recalling the date, month and year in which I was initiated. I did not go to Ramjanambhoomi mandir before initiation. I went there after initiation. I also went to Hanumangarhi. Shri Abhiram Das referred in para 3 of my Examination in chief affidavit, was a Mahant of Hanumangarhi mandir situated at Kanhaipur, near Rasoli station Distt. Barabanki. He was also recognized a Mahant of Ramjanambhoomi where Ramlall is sitting. Volunteer: that electricity bill was issued in his name. I came to know about this at the time when I was studying in Hanumangarhi after taking hymn. I had been to temple at Rasoli, of Abhiram Dasji and stayed there. His disciple Ram Krishna Das was living there. Ram Krishan Das was nephew of Abhiram Das. I do not remember whether my name was in Rasoli Barabanki kutumb register i.e. family register and voter list or not. I had been to Rasoli in the year 1970 for the first time. I used to go there. For how many days I used to stay there, it was not certain. I used to stay there for two to four days. I had been a spiritual disciple of Abhiram Das, when I visited Rasoli in 1970. When I became his spiritual disciple, perhaps after visiting

Rasoli in 1970, but after how many years, I do not know. I became a spiritual disciple of Abhiram Das after becoming the disciple of Ram Sewak Das. Sadhak disciple means to engage in spiritual achievement under the guidance of a specific saint. Guru is accomplished and disciple is a devotee to spiritual accomplishment. The relationship in between the Guru and disciple is that of Father and adopted Son. Proven Guru does not give hymn. This tradition is followed generally in all community of Saints. Abhiram Das ji was a Naga of Hanumangarhi. The residence of Abhiram Das was opposite to Gowshala (cowshed) in Hanumangarhi. He was a Sadhu of Ujjainiya patti. He belongs to Khalsa class. I do not remember which his seat was. He had been getting victuals from Hanumangarhi. I had been to his seat. All his Guru Bhai disciple or sub-disciple was getting victuals in the name of Abhiram Das. In addition, Acharya Satyender Kumar Dasji, Govardhan Dasji, Dharm Das pehalwan etc. were the disciple of Abhiram Das. I generally used to go to his seat. Being a disciple of Abhiram Das I am familiar with the tradition and customs of Hanumangarhi. Hanumangarhi is run by Shri Panch Ramanandiya Nirvani Akhara, Decision by Panch is regarded as a supreme decision. Besides Nirvani Akhara, there are Nirmohi Akhara, Khaki and Digamber Akhara in Ayodhya. Akharas have three Annies i.e. Nirvani, Nirmohi and Digamber. I have no knowledge if Vairagees have 18 villages including these three Annies or not. I have no knowledge about, if Vairagies of these 18 villages Akharas together elect the Chairman of council, at the occasion of Kumbh or not. I have no knowledge, if two villages of Ram and Shyam Vairagies are included in Digamber Anni or not. Whether 7 villages comes under a Anni or not, I have no knowledge about it. I have no knowledge whether there are nine village in Nirmohi Anni or not and Jharia village is famous one among them or

not. I have not participated in the election for Akharas at Kumbh. I have not seen the book wherein tradition and customs of Hanumangarhi were compiled. In accordance with the tradition and customs of Hanumangarhi, every patti has its own Mahant. Mahants are elected by election in every patti. Mahant is appointed on the basis of inheritance. I have the knowledge that Panchan are the owners of Akhara and Patti. I have no knowledge whether Mahant of its own can sell or donate any property or not. I have no knowledge about the number of temples in Hanumangarhi.

I, suppose myself a Sadhu of Nirvani Akhara Hanumangarhi. Under this Akhara, Ramjanki is sitting at the Vayavay corner of the place where Hanumanji is. There was no temple in south-west side of the place where Hanumanji is sitting. These are the temples of Ram, Laxman, Janaki and Ganesh. I have the knowledge that offerings of many temples are distributed in Hanumangarhi temple. But I do not know about the number of these temples. There is a Gangasagar Kupilmuni temple under Nirvani Akhara Hanumangarhi. Nirvani Akhara Panchayat manages it. Idol of Hanumanji is installed in the famous Hanuman temple of Nirvani Akhara. Nirvani Akhara is a Sewit or Sarvarahkar of Hanumanji.

Ramanandacharya ji had established Shrimath at Panchgangaghat Varanasi. He had twelve disciple Kabir Das, Anantanand, Sursuranand, Sukhanand, Narhariyanand, Yoganand, Bhawanand, Senji, Dhana ji, Galvanand, RaiDas, Pipa Dasji. There was no caste restriction for joining the Ramanandiya Vairagi community. Since I was living in Hanumangarhi, so I came to know that Galwanand and Abubhawanad, disciple of Sursuranandji had established there Akharas for the



protection of temples from Malecha and Yavans. I have no specific knowledge whether education in arms and science was imparted in these Akharas or not.

There are so many temples under one Akhara. Digambar Akhara is situated adjacent to Ranigali in the east of Hanumangarhi in Ayodhya. It is in Rajganj Mohalla. I had been there at a number of times. The road opposite to Digambar Akhara leads to Ramghat. I know Yogiraj Sanskrit School. I have not studied there. My Gurubhai Sateyender Kumar Das is a Mahant of Gopal temple situated adjacent to Yogiraj school. This Gopal temple was already there. Sateyender Kumar Das is a priest of Shri Ramlalla in the premises of Ramjanambhoomi, on behalf of receiver. I have no knowledge if he gets pay or not.

I became aware of the situation of Ramjanambhoomi Premises at the very beginning, when I came to Ayodhya. There was a Katha-mandap at east-south corner at a distance of 200 feet from Hanumath Dwar. Its' name was Shri Abhiram Das Katha-mandap. This mandap was on the platform on the pillars made of bricks and there was a tin shade on it. It was 100 x 100 feet in length and width. Siddh Guru had told me that this Katha-mandap was constructed after 1949. This was constructed by Abhiram Das ji. I have no knowledge whether the land for this mandap was obtained from the State Government or not. Similarly I have no information whether the map was approved or not. This Katha-mandap had an electricity connection. The bill for which, I myself used to deposit. The bill for the place where Ramlalla is sitting, was paid separately and that of katha-mandap separately. Both the electricity bills were in the name of Shri Abhiram Das ji. I do not remember at what place the meter concerning to place of Ramlalla, was installed. I do not remember

whether it was at the pole or not. The meter in respect of Katha-mandap was in the Katha-mandap itself. I had never tried to know when the meter at Ramlalla and Katha-mandap was installed. Ramlalla means, the Ramlalla sitting under mid dome. I do not remember in which year for the first time I had deposited the bill in respect of Ramlalla, perhaps after the year 1970. I had deposited the bill opposite to Police Station, Ayodhya. I do not remember whether the bill was deposited in Martin Bern limited company or in the office of electricity council. I had been depositing the bill for years. What was the amount of bill, I do not remember. I do not remember at present what the minimum amount was. I do not remember whether receiver was staying there to receipt the bills or not. Receiver did not come to receive the bill. Abhiram Das ji used to send me for depositing the bill. I cannot say how Abhiram Das ji became the Mahant of Ramlalla Garbh Grih but he was a Mahant when I came to Ayodhya and people used to call him a savior of Janambhoomi and a Mahant of Janambhoomi. Abhiram Das used to call himself a Mahant of Ramlalla. I never asked him, when and how he became a Mahant of Ramlalla. I never felt the need of this. It is written nowhere that Abhiram Das had shown himself as a Mahant of Ramlalla. He used to write only Mahant. Mahant Abhiram Das went to jail during the emergency. At that time I was studying in Varanasi. I was doing shastri in Grammar and Acharya in Vedanta but at present I am not recollecting it properly. During the absence of Shri Abhiram Das, when he was in jail, Dharm Das was looking after the management of Hanumangarhi. Mahant Abhiram Das died either in 1983, 1984 or 1985. I do not remember if Katha mandap had a municipality number or not. I knew since beginning that a suit is going on in respect of Ramjanambhoomi and Maharajji i.e. Abhiram Dasji used to appear for hearing. I had been

seeing Abhiram Das seen for hearing since I came to Ayodhya. I do not remember where he used to go for hearing concerning to this suit. I do not remember, about the numbers of suit, property involved and parties involved in the suit.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards para-II of his examination in chief affidavit. Witness after reading it said that wall with grill was at a distance of 30 feet from Hanumath Dwar. There was a tin-shade, measuring 40 feet in length and eight to ten feet in width in the inner portion on the right side of the Hanumath Dwar. Volunteer: that food was prepared there for Ramlalla and Saints residing there. It was a storeroom. There was a provision for residence. There was a Ram chabutra in the left side, where a temple was. Singh Dwar situated in the north side was at a distance of more than 20 feet from the last point of the wall with grill. There was a Chhatti Poojan sthal and Sita Rasoi in the north of wall with grill and in the north of Ramlalla temple. There was a Chauka, belan etc. Shiv Darbar was in the south and East side of Ram Chabutra where little idols of Shankarji were. An open compound and Hawan Kund was in the western side of Shiv Darbar, ahead to it there was a wall and Parikarma marg. There was a courtyard in the east of property attached, Ramchabutra, peepal tree, Shankar ji ka sthan and store-room etc. in the east of wall with grill. Part from Chhatti Pujan sthal to Hawan kund was called outer part. This site was not attached.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards para-29 of his examination in chief affidavit. Witness after reading it said that I have referred the fact in this para on the basis of the

reply filed by Hasnu S/o Alladeen in Section 145 Cr.P.C. and affidavit of Hasnu.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the written statement by Abhiram Das under section 145 Cr.P.C., Witness said that this is written statement by Baba Abhiram Das in the proceeding. The counter claim by Abhiram Das under section 145 Cr.P.C. has been kept in the file.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards para-11 of his examination in chief affidavit. Witness said that there is mentioned that some saints were living regularly in the tin shade called Saint Niwas, situated in the north side, in the inner part of main gate. These saints were associated with Baba Abhiram Das. I do not know whether these saints were from the Nirmoni Akhara or not. I had seen two boards at Ramjanambhoomi, when I visited there for the first time. "Mahant Abhiram Das Shri Ramjanambhoomi Udharak Ayodhya" was written on the first board and "Shri Sitaram Nam Sankeertan" was written on the second board. First board was at the main gate. This board was placed above the entry gate. These boards were two to two and half feet in length, than said the length of these boards was three feet and width was about 2 feet.

I do not remember whether there was a roof of weed and straw over the Ramchabutra or not. But tin-shed was over it. This chabutra was 12 feet x 15 feet. It is about six feet in height. I do not remember whether there were three doors in Ganga Jamuna Kath Ka Mandir.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 57 of

document no. 200 C-1. Witness after seeing this picture said that a wooden temple with three doors is seen in this picture. There were three caves below it. Three door's Mandir had an idol of Ramlalla. There were duet idols and others idols also but whose idols were there, I do not know. Regular worship was performed at Ramchabutra. Whether five times Arti was done there or not, I do not remember. I generally used to participate in the Arti conducted at both the times. Devotees used to offer leafs, flowers and cash and do parikarma. Priest used to give nectar to the devotee. Siya Raghav Saran was a Pujari of Ramchabutra from 1968 to the year 1975 when emergency was imposed. Devotee who come to Ramchabutra for darshan also go for the darshan of Shiv Darbar and offers leafs, flowers and cash. Priest can be seen performing pooja there both the time. Siya Raghav Saran had been performing pooja there. Similarly devotees also used to go to Chattee Pujan Sthal and pray there.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards para 6 of the counter claim's letter by Abhiram Das under section 145 Cr.P.C., Witness said that matter referred in this para was written by my Guru. How I can say that it is not correct.

There was a reference about "Saints coming from outside" in para 11 of my Examination in chief affidavit. This reference was about the people coming from various part of the country.

I had seen the board of Poojari Siya Raghav Saran since 1968 to 1975 at Ramchabutra. Was Siya Raghav Saran a disciple of Lal Sahab of Kanak Bhawan or not and if not, whose disciple he was I do not remember. I know this much that he was not a Naga of Nirmohi Akhara. I do not know where Siya Raghav Saran lived. There was a

Kirtan sthal adjacent to wall with grill at the main gate of Janambhoomi opposite to Ramchabutra, in the north where continuous kirtan of Ramnaam was performed. When I went there for the first time, kirtan was going on there, but since when the kirtan was going on, I have no knowledge about it. Whenever I went there upto the year 1975, when emergency was imposed, I could not guessed since when the kirtan was going on. Witness later said that Baba Abiram Das had employed a devotee, name of which is not known to me, for doing kirtan. I have no information about if any suit concerning to a Hiranamayee lady was going on against him or not. I have seen Ramlakhan Saran Bhagat. He was living in the right side of the main gate of Ramcharitmanas Bhawan Trust. He was not a friend of mine. I cannot say if I had faith on him or not. I can say only this much that Baba Abhiram Das had deputed him there for kirtan. I have no information about if any law suit is going on against kirtan or not. I have no information about Raja Ram Chandracharya, Mahant of Ranchhor temple, Dacor and Panch of Nirmohi Akhara. I have not heard his name, again said that he might have heard his name but it is not remember to him at present. I do not know whether political parties are involved in the solution of Ramjanambhoomi dispute or not. I have the knowledge about Vishwa Hindu Parishad. I am a member of this organization but not an executive member. I became a member of this organization after coming to Ayodhya. I do not remember, if I was adult or minor at the time when I became member of this organization. I do not remember if I was a member of Vishwa Hindu Parishad or not. I do not give contribution to this organization. I do not know whether Vishwa Hindu Parishad is involved in the dispute or not. I was elected for the Lok Sabha in 1996 for the first time. I do not remember when I became a member of the party, on which

ticket I contested the election. I had not been a executive member of that party at any level, from Mohalla to National level.

I had recognized the disputed Garbh Grih with three domes, which has since been demolished, as a Janambhoomi Mandir and still recognize it. I do not recognize it as a mosque. I have no repentance about the demolition of the Bhawan on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992 rather I am happy that a large, beautiful, new temple of Ramlalla will be reconstructed after its demolition.

Question: Would you feel happy if very ancient Hindu Sanatan Dharm temple of Sidha Peeth is demolished by the person who have no religion, caste?

Answer: Your question is improper. There is no reason in demolishing an ancient historical temple, which is not likely to fall. Disputed Ramjanambhoomi was in a shattered condition before 1992. I was not a member of Bhartiya Janta Party in 1991 and in January 1993.

I came here to depose on behalf of present Mahant Suresh Das of Digamber Akhara. Suresh Das would not have deputed me to depose, had Digamber Akhara not been a party to the suit. It is not correct to say that Paramhans Ramchander Das had been residing in Tapsi ji ki chhawani in Ayodhya as a Sadhu at the time when I came to Ayodhya. I do not know if he had won the election for a member of municipality from Tapsi ji ki chhawani on the ticket of Bhartiya Jansangh in 1968 or not. I have no information, when Paramhans Ramchander Das became a Mahant of Digamber Akhara but I was under his Mahanti. I do not know that Mahant of Digamber Akhara is elected

through election and not according to inheritance. I do not know what was my age at the time of my induction in the Mahanti of Ramchander Das, whether I was adult or minor, I do not know. I do not remember when after coming to Ayodhya I was inducted into Mahanti of Paramhans Ramchander Das. I generally used to talk with Ramchander Paramhans about the suit. I had full faith on his word and statement. I do not know that Paramhans Ramchander Das had ever told me or not those four suits concerning to the dispute is going on. One suit among these was filed by him. Paramhans Ramchander had told me that he had already made a statement in Faizabad about commission. He never discussed with me that Nirmohi Akhara had also filed a suit in this regard. I got a summon in connection with Ramjanambhoomi lawsuit but I do not remember its suit number. I was in Ayodhya in October 1991. At that time Kalyan Singh's Government was in U.P.

Sumitra Bhawan was in the western side of Sita-Koop and Sita-Koop was in the south side of the disputed temple. There was a stone on it. Sheshavatar Sumitra Bhawan was written on it. Sakshi Gopal temple is in the left side of Ramjanambhoomi. Besides, Sankat Mochan and little temples of Ramlalla and shops were there. I do not know whether Kalyan Singh's Government demolished these temples in 1991 or not. I have not read in the newspapers that Kalyan Singh Government had demolished these temples.

I have no knowledge if Sunni Central Board of Waqf and Nirmohi Akhara had filed a writ petition. During that period I did not come to know that Kalyan Singh Government has acquired 2.77 acre land excluding the Garbh Grih, in the name of providing drinking water, urinal



and providing facilities to pilgrims or not. I have no information about this acquirement till today.

I do not remember if I went there for darshan in the month of Kartik in 1991 or at Chaitra Ram navami in 1992. I used to go there but I do not remember the particular day when I visited there.

I am a Sanatan Vaishnavdharmi. I have traveled abroad. I did not visited Thailand. I have visited Singapore but I do not remember when I visited there. I do remember that I went there before the demolition of structure. I went Singapore for religious discourses and in the same dress which I was putting on. Going abroad is not restricted in Vaishnav Religion. I have not contested the first election on Mandir issue. I used to say that I am fighting for the cause of Ramjanambhoomi and people also used to say like this. The suit, after demolition of disputed Bhawan was filed against me. Digamber Akhara is not fighting for ownership right but for the right of Hindus over the Ramjanambhoomi and for providing the facilities for darshan. I do not know whether Ramchander Paramhans was fighting for these rights or not.

In 1998 I have contested the Lok Sabha election from Pratapgarh for the second time. It is not correct that I have started my carrier in politics with the help of Vishwa Hindu Parishad after demolition of structure and on this basis I got the ticket twice and won the seat on this basis. I do not remember if the outer part of the disputed site was attached in 1982 or not. I went there for a number of times after 1982 to 1992. During the period I have seen Ramlalla in Garbh Grih. Besides, there were other idols also. I do not know about their length and width, their being wooden or eight metals and whose idols these were.

These idols were kept on a throne made of wood. I cannot say about the length and width of throne. Idol of Ramlalla was made of eight metals. I do not know about its height. It was complete excluding Avaksh. This was an idol of Ladoo Gopal. An idol, I saw in 1968, is in existence even today. My Guru Maharaj told me that this idol is there since ancient time, since the childhood of Rama. I do not remember if Siya Raghav Saran had filed a suit against my Gurubhai DaramDas for dacoity or not. I do not remember since when Satyender Das was appointed as Pujari by the receiver. Nirmohi Akhara site is opposite to above Gopal temple. I have been there at a number of times. I went there after 1968 for Bhandara but when, I do not remember who was a Mahant there, when I went there for the first time. I know Ram Kewal Das as a Mahant only. I have no knowledge if he was a Golki before he became a Mahant or not. I do not remember the name of any Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara. I know Mahant BhaskarDas. I have not seen him at Janambhoomi. I have seen him in Nirmohi Akhara. He is a Mahant of Hanumangarhi situated at Allahabad road, Faizabad. I have been there at a number of times.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Ram Vilas DasVedanti

17.2.2005

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by me . In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 18.2.2005. Witness be present.

Sd/-

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

17.2.2005

**Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey, Additional District Judge/Officer on special duty, High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.**

**Dated 18.2.2005**

**DW. – 2/1-3, Ramvilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed vide order dated 3.2.2005 passed by Hon'ble Full Bench in Other Original Suit No. 4/89)

(In continuation to dt. 17.2.2005, cross-examination on oath by Shri Tarunjeet Verma, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff Nirmohi Akhara other Original Suit No. 3/89, continued)

I have the knowledge about the proceedings under section 145 Cr.P.C. Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards proceedings under section 145 of Cr.P.C. on the FIR kept in the file. Witness after reading it, in reply to question said that I do not remember if Mahant Abhiram Das had told him about this report or not. I do not remember if any other person had told him about this or not. How I can say that this report is correct or not, if I have no knowledge about the report. It was written in the last two lines of the report that desecrated the mosque by forcefully entering into the mosque and installing the idols. Question of desecration of mosque does not arise when there was no mosque. According to me, temple was already there and Ramlalla was sitting in it and worship was being performed. I have the knowledge about Mahant Ramsubhag Das Shastri, resident of Katra Mohalla, Ayodhya. I have no knowledge if the name of Ramsubhag Das Shastri was in the FIR or not. I have no information

whether Ramsubhag Das Shastri was an accused in the report written on 23.12.49 or not. I do not know Baldev Das.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards document no. 244 of the file, under section 145 Cr.P.C. Witness after reading this said that I do not know Baldev Dasji, disciple Mahant Swami MohanDas, referred therein but I know RamsubhagDas disciple of Bihari Sharan.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards document no. 39 C-1/38 Other Original Suit no. 3/89. Witness after reading it, in reply to a question said that there is signature of Mahant Maithlisaran, I know him. I know Mahant Basdevacharya, Smarak Bhawan whose signatures are appended on the papers. I do not know Mahant Bhagwan Das, Khaki Akhara whose signatures are appended on this paper.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards document no. 39 C-1/39 of the above suit. Witness after seeing it said that signature of Paramhans RamchanderDas are appended against the column of signature. I do not recognize his signatures. Because his name is there, so I am saying that this is his signature. Mahant Baldev Das was referred as an applicant in it. It is not correct that Mahant Baldev Das was a founder of Ramjanambhoomi and provision for kirtan etc. used to be made by him. Volunteer:that the word founder is not correct because Ramjanambhoomi was established during the birth time of Rama.

I have referred Sumitra Bhawan in the statement made by me yesterday. I had not visited to the inner part

of Sumitra Bhawan. I have seen this building from outside. I do not know the length and width of Sumitra Bhawan. There was an idol of Lakhanlal (Sheshawatar Laxman). I have seen the idol. Lakhanlal was sitting in the lap of Sumitra. I have no knowledge if Mahant RamDas, Panch of Nirmohi Akhara, was residing there during the period 1969-70 or not. There was a Sita-koop at the south-east corner of Sumitra Bhawan. Sita Koop was at the agnikon i.e. south-east corner.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of the witness towards picture no. 13 of colour album document no. 200 C-1. Witness after seeing these pictures said that something like a wall is seen in this picture. Figure adjacent to wall is not clear. It is not clear from the picture whether picture no. 13 to 16 is the pictures of same thing or not. My vision is correct. Witness said an idol like Varah at the wall is seen in these pictures. The same idol is also seen in picture no. 16 and 14.

Some thing like this is also seen in picture no. 15. Learned Cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 37 of this album. Witness after seeing the picture said that the scene seen in this picture is not clear. Something like two stairs in the east of Singh Dwar, towards north of the road are seen in this picture. The scene seen in picture no. 38 is not clear. Something like the picture of two lions are seen in picture no. 38. A Garur (eagle) in between the two lions is seen but it is not clear completely. Witness after seeing the picture no. 39 said that pictures of lions are seen clearly. This is picture of main Singh Dwar in the north of temple. An eagle in between the two lions is seen in the picture no. 40. This is the scene of Singh Dwar. Learned Cross-examining draw

the attention of witness towards picture no. 44. Witness after seeing the picture said that nothing is clear in this picture. One stone written with "one" is seen in this picture. This is the scene of main gate. What is written on the stone is not clear. Main Gate and two stone of Kasauti on both the side of main gate are seen in picture no. 45. A few idols with red mahabiri are engraved thereon. Picture no. 46 is of the same place. Upon drawing his attention towards picture no. 52 of this colour album, witness said that this is a pillar of Kasauti fixed at Ramjanambhoomi. Symbol of Nectar pitcher below and an obscure picture of an idol with mahabiri is seen. This is the scene of a temple but I cannot say of which place. The same picture is seen in picture no. 53. A symbol of nectar pitcher in accordance with the Hindu System is seen in picture no. 54. Nectar Pitcher is painted with mahabiri. Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 79 of the album. Witness after seeing the picture said that this a picture of Ramjanambhoomi premises. Which part of the premises is seen in the picture, is not clear. A picture of Ramjanambhoomi premises is also seen in picture no. 80. A wall of temple is seen in the picture. A gate towards temple is seen in this picture. A part below one dome of the temple with three domes is seen in picture no. 85 of this album. It is not clear from seeing this picture which dwar is this. A dwar (door) of Ramjanambhoomi temple is seen in picture no. 86 of this album. Which door is this, is not clear. Witness after seeing the picture no. 98 of this album said this is a picture of a wall of temple. Which wall is seen in this picture is not clear. Scene of the upper and bottom part of a door of temple with curtain is seen in picture no. 100 of this album. But from seeing the picture it is not clear which door is seen in this picture. I cannot say whether it is a right, left or mid door.

A part of God Ramlalla temple, where Ramlalla is sitting is seen in picture no. 111 of this album. A pillar of Kasauti is seen in the picture. There are idols in it and a nectar pitcher is at the bottom. Witness after seeing the picture no. 113 said that a pillar of Kasauti at the inner part of temple engraved with nectar pitcher and few idols is seen in it. Witness after seeing the picture no. 141 said that a scene of pillar of a temple is seen in this picture. This pillar is made of Kasauti stones. This pillar has an idol but whose idol is this, is not clear. Witness after seeing the picture no. 183 said that a photo picture of pillar is seen in it. Two gongs, which were played at the time of kirtan, are seen in this picture. A picture of Shiva in dancing form is seen on this pillar. Witness after seeing the picture no. 186 said that leafs and flowers at the bottom and Shiva in meditation form are seen in this picture. Witness after seeing the picture no. 187 said that Shiva in a meditation form is seen in this picture. Throne of Ramlalla in the mid of Shri Ramjanambhoomi temple with a calendar of Ramlalla is seen in picture no. 152 and a picture of Durga is seen in the picture. Ramlalla was sitting in mid of throne. A glass for Aachman and flowers-leafs, water with tulsi leafs, put in before him, is seen. Witness after seeing the picture no. 152 to 155 of this album said that this is a scene of same place. A thatch at the chabutra in temple premises opposite to Ramjanambhoomi is seen in picture no. 56 of this album. The same scene is seen in picture no. 57. Witness after seeing the picture no. 58 said that some idols seen in this picture but whose idols are these, it is not clear. I have seen Ramlalla in the lap of Kaushalya. Bharat in the lap of Kekai and Laxman and Shatrughan in the lap of Sumitra, in the cave under the chabutra. Learned Cross-examining shown the picture no. 59 to witness. Witness after seeing

the picture said that idols of Shankarji, Ganeshji, Kartikeya ji and Nandi were at agnikon behind Ramchabutra of Ramjanambhoomi temple premises are seen in this picture and some Shivling of Shankarji made of round stones are also seen. A chulha, chowka-belan and a thatch are seen in picture no. 71 to 72 of this album. This thatch is made of tin-shed. This is a Kaushalya Rasoi. Volunteer:some people says it a Sita Rasoi and some calls it Kaushalya rasoi.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture no. 9 and 10 of the black and white album document no. 201. Witness after seeing the picture said that a scene of wall is seen in it. It appears that an idol of Varaha is at the wall, in the parikarma marg towards south direction of the main door in this picture. Witness after seeing the picture no. 20 to 23 of this album said that it is not clear from these picture if a scene of same place is seen in these pictures or not. A Singh Dwar with two lions and eagle in between is seen in picture no. 42. The scene of northern gate is seen in picture no. 23. Two stairs towards the north on the way to east from Singh Dwar are seen. The scene in picture no. 21 to 23 is not clear. Witness, after showing the picture no. 60 by the learned advocate cross-examining the witness, said that main gate of Shri Ramjanambhoomi, stones of Kasauti and inner gate leading to God inside are seen in this picture. Shri Ramjanambhoomi is written there. This is a scene of a wall with grill. Some people chanting Bhazans were sitting aside. Witness after seeing the picture no. 25 and 26 said that main gate of Ramjanambhoomi, a stone written with "Janambhoomi daily yatra" are seen in. "One" is written above. Pillars of Kasauti engraved with idols are also seen. These appear to be idols of Jai and Vijay. Learned Advocate shown the



picture no. 33 of the album to witness. Witness, after seeing the picture said that Shankar ji, Ganesh ji, Kartikeya ji, Shivalings and Nandi sitting under Peepal tree at the agnikon behind Ramchabutra are seen in the picture. Witness after seeing the picture no. 81 and 82 of the album said that Ramlalla sitting in the throne in the Ramjanambhoomi temple is seen in these pictures. Aachmani glass on the panchpatra, calendar of Ramlalla aboe the throne and picture of Ashtabhuji Durga at the right side are seen.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture document no. 154/7 of the suit Gopal Singh Visarad V/s Jahoor Ahmad and others. Witness after seeing the picture said that a scene of rare part of Janambhoomi is seen in this picture. After seeing the picture no. 154/9, witness said that this is scene of Singh Dwar towards north. One eagle in between two lions is seen in the picture. A monkey is seen below in the wall. A passage towards the road below in the east-north of Singh Dwar is seen in the picture document no. 154/5 of this suit. Witness after seeing the picture document no. 154/13 said that an idol is sitting in the middle of this picture. Besides, Garur Ghanti and picture of Ram Darbar is seen in it. There are two flower pot on both sides on the stairs of throne. One gentleman is standing by the pot with his hand in pocket.

Learned Cross-examine Advocate draw the attention of witness towards last three lines, para 19 of his examination in chief affidavit. Witness after reading it said that the fact that an idol and site is similarly worshipable, means that the place where God was born or incarnation happened is worshipable and Hindu community worship that place. Land is also worshipped. Any sign on

that land is also worshipable and if the land has no sign, even than it is worshiped.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards Vishnu Pad situated at Mandhar hill under Distt. Banka, in Jharkhand and asked whether witness have the knowledge about it or not. Witness said that he has heard about the place.

I have referred Vedas in para 20 of my affidavit. Vedas are four in number. "Atharva Veda" is the oldest Veda. I have studied all the four Vedas. I do not remember how many Rachay, division and mantras are there in Rigveda. Rigveda has Rachays. Rigveda have the description about rivers. Saryu River has been mentioned in Vedas but in which Veda it is referred, it is not remember to me at present. Music and musical instruments are referred in Samveda. The subject matter of Atharveda is medicine and medicinal herbs. Yajurveda contains the mantra part. The procedure of worship, poojan is described in it. Rigveda contains the procedure of worship of Dieties. Vedas are four in number. Brahman books were taken from these Vedas. It is correct to say that Saryu River has been mentioned in Rigveda. I have read the Valmiki Ramayana. Geographical condition of the time of Rama was described in it.

This is specifically described in Kishkindha Kand. Ganga, Panchvati, Bhardwaj Ashram, Bharat Kund have been described in Valmiki Ramayana. In addition to this Srilanka etc. has been described in it. These geographical areas still in existence. These geographical places were during the time of Rama and still in existence.

Geography is a base of history. History is written on the geographical conditions. I have the knowledge about Mahabharata written by Vedvyasa. Mahabharata contains the full details of Ramkatha. It has a detail about Krishna-Jamvant battle and Bheem-Hanuman battle. Vedvyasa has taken the parts of Ramayana and described these in Mahabharata in his own way.

I have the knowledge about king Janak. He was also called Seer Dhvaj. So many generations of Janak from the period of Ramchandra to Mahabharata have been described in it.

I have the knowledge about Yugas. These are four in number. These are Satyug, Treta, Dwapar and Kalyug. Four yugas are equal to one Chaturyug. Rama was born in 28<sup>th</sup> Tretayug. 72 Chaturyug have been passed away. But there is difference about Manwantar. Volunteer: that one crore, 50 lakhs and 80 thousand years have been passed away since the birth of Rama. Kalyuga is running at present. Janambhoomi is there since the birth of Rama. Vikramaditya had reconstructed the Ramjanambhoomi temple but in which year it was reconstructed, I do not know.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards para 23 of his Examination in chief affidavit. Witness after reading it said that Vedangs have been referred in it. Vedangs are 108 in number, which are called Upnishads. Education, Kalp, Grammar, Nirukti, Chhand and Jyotish are Six-Sciences. Ramjanambhoomi has distinctively been described in Valmiki Ramayana about which I have referred in para 21 of my examination in chief affidavit. "Ayodhya Mahatamya" referred in para 24 of my Examination in chief affidavit

were taken from Skand Puran. Geographical condition of Ayodhya has been described at some places in it. Ayodhya is described in Atharvaveda also. Ayodhya's description is in Rudrayamal also.

It is not correct to say that all the workers in Janambhoomi were from Nirmohi Akhara and they have been worshiping at that place since beginning. It is correct that I am supporter of Vishwa Hindu Parishad but I am not a member of it. It is not correct to say that I neglect Nirmohi Akhara because of my affiliation with Vishwa Hindu Parishad. Although I have no detail knowledge about all the suits on this subject but I do possess a little knowledge.

(Cross-examination by Shri Tarunjeet Verma, advocate on behalf of plaintiff Nirmohi Akhara, Other Original Suit no. 3/89, concluded)

(No cross-examination was conducted by Shri Vireshwar Diwedi, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 17 and 22, Other Original Suit no. 4/89)

(Kumari Ranjana Agnihotri, Advocate on behalf of Defendant no. 2 All India Bhartiya Shri Ramjanambhoomi renovation committee of this suit said that she is not going to conduct cross-examination of the witness.)

(Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff Other Original Suit no. 5/89, said that he is not going to cross-examine the witness.)

(Learned Advocate Shri D.P.Gupta on behalf of plaintiff Other Original Suit no. 1/89 was given a chance to

conduct cross-examination. But he said that he is not going to cross-examine this witness.)

(Thereafter none other than the learned Advocate on behalf of defendants Other Original Suit no. 4/89 and defendants no. 4, 5, 6 and 26 Other Original Suit no. 5/89 was present for conducting cross-examination.)

(Cross-examination on an oath of witness by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 9 and 10/1, Mahmood Ahmad and Mohd. Farooqu Ahmad, begins.)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

I was present at the disputed site on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992 when it was demolished. But I cannot say anything because I am an accused in this case.

Question: How many people were there on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. You must have heard about this?

(Upon this question, learned Advocate Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey on behalf of plaintiff Other Original Suit no. 5/89 has raised an objection that witness just now said that since he was an accused person in the concerned suit so he cannot say anything about this. Hence question should not be allowed in this connection.)

Answer: I cannot reply any question in regard to the incident dated 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992.

Question: Whether the incident dated 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992 happened during the day?

Answer: I have already stated that being an accused in the incident dated 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. I cannot reply any question in this regard.

I am an accused in the case related to demolition of disputed structure. The proceeding in this regard is going on in the Special Bench at Lucknow. I cannot say whether this Special Bench of Lucknow High Court is larger one or small.

Question: A bench consisting three judges of Hon'ble High Court is hearing the case. Whether the Special Bench you have referred, where the proceeding about suit is going on, is larger to this Bench or smaller?

(Upon this question Learned Advocate Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey on behalf of plaintiff Other Original Suit no. 5/89, has raised an objection that a similar question has been asked above. Hence permission for asking the same question again cannot be allowed.)

Answer: I do not know about this.

I have no knowledge about the Presiding Officer of the Special Bench referred above because I have received only one summons about this. I have not seen from which court of the Magistrate this was issued. I have no information about the Magistrate who issued summons in this regard but his court certainly is in Lucknow. I have no knowledge, at what place the court is in Lucknow because I did not go there. I cannot say whether it is lower to High Court or not. The summons is not with me, at present. I do not know about the date of hearing, mentioned in the summons. I received the summons about one month back.

I have handed over my affidavit to my lawyer after receiving the summons. Mr. Pandey whose full name I am not recollecting is my lawyer. I have no knowledge, where he sits at Lucknow.

I have given my affidavit to the lawyer in Ayodhya a month back when he was in Ayodhya.

(Learned advocate cross-examining the witness has asked the witness to submit a copy of affidavit; which was given to lawyer by him. Witness said that he has no copy at present.)

I came to Lucknow on 15.2.2005. I came to Lucknow at a number of times before. Witness at this point said that I have recollected the name of my lawyer. His name is Sh. Madan Mohan Pandey. Madan Mohan Pandey does not sit in Lucknow. He lives in Faizabad. I have been to his house. The affidavit, which I had given to my lawyer Sh. Pandey; would have been filed in the court at Lucknow but I do not remember the name of court.

Question: Do you remember verbally the points written in the affidavit by you?

(Upon this question, learned Advocate Sh. Ajay Kumar Pandey on behalf of plaintiff no. 5/89 of Other Original Suit no. 5/89 has raised an objection that permission cannot be granted for asking about the conversation held in between the client and lawyer and about the contents of other suits or affidavit.)

Answer: There is no need to tell here what was written in my affidavit. This affidavit is about the incident, which happened on 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992. There is no need to tell about the contents of

affidavit. I do remember all about the incident of 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992, but I cannot give the details about the incident here. There is no need to tell about the court of magistrate where my affidavit was filed by my lawyer. I have already stated that I cannot say anything about the contents of my affidavit here. I cannot say whether it will be a contempt of Hon'ble Full Bench if I do not reply the question asked for about the contents of affidavit or not. I do respect the Hon'ble court and if court; specifically ask me to reply the question in this regard, than I will reply.

Question: Not replying to a question about the contents of affidavit will be treated as contempt of court. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: I respect the Hon'ble High Court and other Courts. If High Court asks me to answer the question in this regard, I will reply.

(At this point learned advocate cross-examining the witness said that the witness is refusing to answer the question asked for about the incident of 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992 and also about the contents of affidavit filed by him and further said that he will answer the question in this regard only after receiving the direction of the Hon'ble High Court. Hence keeping the rights about asking the questions concerning to the above two subjects, in reserve, learned advocate cross-examining the witness has asked for the cross-examination on these points in anticipation of order from Hon'ble High Court. Learned Advocate, on the basis of this statement, the right to ask the question about the above two points kept in reserve and further cross-



examination under the order of Hon'ble Full Bench is being written.)

I came to Ayodhya in 1968 at the age of about 15-16 years; I stayed in a Daharamsala situated at the bank of Saryu River in Ayodhya when I came to Ayodhya for the first time. I stayed therein for a night only and thereafter in Vasist Bhawan, Naya Ghat, Ayodhya. I do not remember the name of manager of that Dharamshala. Vasista Bhawan is at a distance of one furlong from the said Dharamshala. This was a temple. Vasista Bhawan was there for about one and half to two years. Many Sadhus had been living there. Vasista Bhawan was run by my Guru Sh. Ramsewak Das ji. He did not realize any rent from the passengers. Five-six people had been staying there permanently. Other people used to pay visits. No maximum limit for the people was fixed in Vasista Bhawan. People in 10, 20, 50, 100 numbers used to come there. The people, who used to pay visits to Vasista Bhawan do not pay any rent. They used to pay donation etc. to the temple. I have been living in Vasista Bhawan since 1968. I have been living here for last 36-37 years. I had been to my village after I came to Ayodhya for ten-eleven times. My village is in District Reeva in Madhya Pradesh. Both, Bus and train goes to Reeva. My village name is 'Gud' and it is at a distance of about 20 km from Reeva. Reeva is under the jurisdiction of state. I came to Ayodhya from my house for the adoration of God. Allahabad is on the way to Ayodhya. Since Ramjanambhoomi is in Ayodhya, I come straight to Ayodhya and did not stop at any place on the way.

I have been a Member of Parliament for two times. I was elected a M.P. in 1996 from Machhali City for the first time and for the second time from Pratapgarh. I was

8570

elected on the ticket of Bhartiya Janata Party, both the time. I was not elected as Member of Parliament there after. After my election as M.P. from pratapgarh, I stayed in Pratapgarh, Ayodhya and Delhi. I was allotted a house by Lok Sabha in Delhi.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Ram Vilas DasVedanti

18.2.2005

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this, suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 21.2.2005

Dated: 18.2.2005

Sd/-

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

**Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey, Additional District Judge/Officer on special duty, High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.**

**Dated 21.2.2005**

**DW. – 2/1-3, Ramvilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed vide order dated 3.2.2005 passed by Hon'ble Full Bench in Other Original Suit No. 4/89)

(In continuation to dt. 18.2.2005, cross-examination on oath by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 9 and 10/1 Mahmood Ahmed and Mohd. Farooq Ahmed, continued)

I had been a Member of Parliament for two times - Once from Machhali City and second time from Pratapgarh. I was elected on the tickets of Bhartiya Janata Party both the times. So far I know, Bhartiya Janata Party is not against the Muslims. It is a secular party. Had Bhartiya Janata Party not been a secular, Mukhtar Abbas Nakwi would not have been its spokesperson. I have no knowledge about the name of Mukhtar Abbas Nakwi's father. Sh. Mukhtar Abbas Nakwi is an Indian. I have heard from Mukhtar Abbas Nakwi that he belongs to Distt. Allahabad. I have no knowledge from where his mother and father belongs to. I do not know if he was born in Muradabad or not.

I have no knowledge about the number of Muslim members of BJP, beside Mukhtar Abbas Nakwi. Many Muslims have been the Member of Parliament from BJP. Shri Mukhtar Abbas Nakwi was himself a Member of

Parliament, when I was a MP. Besides, Sh. Sikander Bakth was member of Rajya Sabha, Shahnawaz Hussain was member of Lok-Sabha. Machhali City is in Distt. Jaunpur.

I do not know Dr. Sanaullah of Pratapgarh. He has a bungalow in Pratapgarh. I know it. But I am not aware of his name. I have no knowledge about the election held in 1946, because I was not born by then. I do not know if Dr. Sanaullah or his father was *Tallukdaar* or not, although I have seen his bungalow. I stayed in Belha temple at the bank of Sai River when I came to Pratapgarh in 1968. I stayed in Pratapgarh for two-three hours for the first time. I came to Ayodhya from Pratapgarh. Before me, Ratna Singh D/o Dinesh Singh was elected from Lok Sabha seat from Pratapgarh. I have defeated Ratna Singh. The distance between Pratapgarh and Pratapgarh City is about 6-7 km. City is regarded as old Pratapgarh. Second Pratapgarh is called Belha, where Belha Devi temple is situated. Belha was a king of Pratapgarh. I do not know Rukunuddin of Pratapgarh. He might be a member of Lok Sabha from Muslim League and then from Congress. I do not know Imtiaz Sahab of Pratapgarh. I have no knowledge if he was a President of Advocate Association or not. I know Moti Singh of Pratapgarh. He was a MLA and presently also a MLA. He was a minister also. Beside him, I know Hari Pratap Singh, who is a MLA from Pratapgarh Sadar. I know Raja Udai Singh, king of Bhadri. I also know Raja Bhaiya Raghuraj Pratap Singh who is a MLA from Kunda. I know Raja Hari Pratap Singh of Pratapgarh. I was a member of 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Lok-Sabha. 11<sup>th</sup> Lok-Sabha remains only for 13 months and 12<sup>th</sup> Lok-Sabha for 14-15 months. I get three thousand rupees as pension. I do not get anything, in addition to pension from the institute for which I am all in all. I get the "Prasada" in

the form of food and water from the Ashram, which I am running. I went to Allahbad and Varanasi for a number of times, since when I came to Ayodhya but how many times I do not remember. Beside Varanasi and Allahabad I went to Lucknow, Gorakhpur, Delhi, Chitrakoot, Badrinath, Kedarnath, Gangotri, Yamnotri, Guwahati, Jorhat, Majulideep, Ganganagar, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Bhopal, Patna and Bhuvneshwar. I used to travel. I have visited almost every village of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, every city of India and every mohalla of Lucknow. I went to Jhansi at a number of times. I do stay in Ayodhya at the time of Chaitra Navratra, Kartik Shukla Paksha and Sarvan Shukla Paksha. For the rest of the time, I for some time stay in Ayodhya and some time travel outside Ayodhya.

The dates of English year, which falls in Shukla Paksha of Chaitra, Sarvan, and Kartik month are not fixed because it keeps changing. Fairs are organized in Ayodhya at all three occasions. So I have to stay in Ayodhya. Katha-poojan is also organized at the place where I live. This festival goes on for nine days Navratra. Jhula festival of God goes on for 15 days, in the month of Sarvan, similar festivals are organized at my place at the time of Shukla Paksh of Kartik month on Akshay Nawami, Ekadashi and Poornima. Poornima, I mean the day when full moon is seen. Festival is organized at both the days on Poornima. This festival is organized in my presence before the God. Devotee donates alms etc. to the God. The donation thus offered is deposited in the name of God after meeting the expenditure incurred on Pooja, festival and general feast. Amount is deposited in the name of God and is spent for the cause of God. This amount is utilized for the service of people staying in Vasista Bhawan, in the service of guest, saints and God. The

account is audited by a person who has been nominated as a successor by me. The details in this regard are known to my successor only. Quarterly, half-quarterly and annual audit of accounts are submitted not to me but before the persons who look after the affairs.

I have filed my nomination for the Lok-Sabha seat in Pratapgarh during my election to the Lok-Sabha. I withdraw the pension I get being an ex-member of parliament occasionally and utilized it for the cause of Sadhu Saint living in Ashram, for the fodder to the cows and myself. No limit of amount has been fixed for the cowshed. Whenever I withdraw any amount, I utilized it for the above-mentioned work. I did not know how much amount and how many times, it is withdrawn, because the quantum of amount is not fixed. The expenditure to be incurred on providing services to the persons living in my Ashram is met from the offerings. Volunteer: that he has already stated in this regard. It cannot be said how much amount every year is received in the Ashram because the amount thus received keeps changing on yearly basis. My Ashram does not receive 15-20 lakhs rupees but how much amount is received, I cannot say. It is not correct that my Ashram receive 50 lakhs of rupees every year. We serve the person who comes to our Ashram, provide them food etc. Number of guests is not fixed. Thousand to one and half thousand people come at Ramnavami and Saravan fair. Some guests do offers rice and other food grains in donation. They do not bring any material to me. They bring material for Sita-Ram. The material brought by the guests is utilized for providing food etc. to the persons living in Ashram. Food is not bought. It is provided by the devotees. Vegetables are brought from the market. The persons appointed for this purpose go to market to purchase the vegetable. From the word appointment I

mean the person engaged in the service to the God. My Ashram has no salaried person. 15-20 persons live in my Ashram on permanent basis. These people came to my ashram at different point of time. Some living there for the last ten years, some are living for the last 20 years and some of them are living here for the last five years. The number of people residing permanently also keeps changing. No application is required to be submitted for staying in Ashram. Their name and addresses are not recorded. Any one can come and stay there. Their name becomes known to me only after they start residing there in Ashram. I do not enquire about them. God may take cognizance. I have two Ashrams in Ayodhya. The temple at Vasista Bhawan is 60 x 60 feet in measurement and Hindu Dham is in a Bigha. Hindu Dham is in the area more than a Bigha. Hindu Dham and Vasista Bhawan are managed by a person, who has been declared as my successor. I supervised only a little. I do Bhagwat Pooja only. Radheyshyam Vedanti is my successor. I have appointed one successor only. Radheyshyam Vedanti is with me since the age of 14-15 years when he was studying Sanskrit. At present he is 25-26 years old. He is unmarried. No married person can become a Mahant in my Ashram. This tradition is being followed since the time of Jagatguru Ramanandacharya. First ever Jagatguru Ramanandacharya was of Kalyuga. He is no more now. It's been 700 years.

Hindu Dham was established and named by me in the year 1980. Vasista Bhawan is there in Ayodhya since the Ayodhya was in existence. Ayodhya is one crore fifty lakhs eighty thousand years old i.e. before the time when Rama was born. I am living in the same Vasista Bhawan. About 9-10 saints live in Vasista Bhawan. I am living in Vasista Bhawan since the time when I came to Ayodhya. I

became a member of Bhartiya Janata Party before the distribution of tickets for Lok-Sabha in 1996. At present I am not a member of any party.

I never went to Babari Masjid ever since I came to Ayodhya. I always went to Ramjanambhoomi, the place where Ramlalla is sitting. Ramjanambhoomi has three domes. I have seen it. I have a little knowledge about history.

Question: Who had constructed the Bhawan with three domes?

Answer: According to the history, Vikramaditya had constructed the temple on 84 pillars of Kasauti. Three domes were based on 12 pillars of Kasauti. I have seen the temple based on the pillars of Kasauti, constructed by Vikramaditya.

Meerbaki, commander of Babar had demolished the temple based upon 84 pillars and constructed a building with three domes in its place. I have heard about it. Building with three domes was in existence upto 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. Volunteer:that bhajan, poojan, aarti was being conducted there, where Ramlalla was sitting.

Learned Cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards document No. 315 of the file, under section 145 Cr.P.C. Witness after seeing it said that this report was lodged by Ramdev Dubey. Witness after reading the FIR said it is totally wrong. Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards last three lines of FIR. Witness after reading it said that it is written in it that "de sacred mosque by making forceful entry and installation of idols in the mosque." Volunteer:that Ramdev Dubey had written



incorrect FIR by taking money from Muslims. Volunteer:that Baba Abhiram Das used to say that Muslims had caused Ramdev Dubey to write this FIR by offering him liquor and money etc. It is not correct to say that the building referred in was a mosque. Volunteer:that there was no sign of mosque. It is not correct to say that five times a day namaz was being read there regularly. It is also not correct that namaz of Taravi was also read there. I cannot say if District Magistrate visited there on the next day, to the date recorded in FIR in connection with the incident or not because I was not there. The question about the fact stated to be told by the D.M Sahab that he will bring the situation back within a week because Ramlalla was already sitting there does not arise. It is not correct to say that mosque was there or still exists. I have no information whether any suit concerning to the disputed site was decided in 1974 or not. I do not know about the suit which was decided by Hon'ble High Court in 1955.

I do not know about the suit filed in the Hon'ble High Court on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 1986.

Question: Whether the Hon'ble Supreme Court has asked to put the suit before it, in which you are deposing in ?

Answer: I have no knowledge about it.

I have no knowledge if the case was discussed by a Bench consisting five judges of Hon'ble Supreme Court. Through newspapers I came to know that Hon'ble Supreme Court had ordered the Hon'ble High Court to decide the suit filed before it. It was also directed therein that the suit might be heard on day to day basis.

It is not correct to say that it becomes clear from the FIR written on 23.12.1949 at 19:00 hours that disputed Bhawan was a mosque. Volunteer:that it is not correct to call it a mosque since Ramlalla was already sitting there. It is also not correct to say that Ramlalla was not sitting there before. It is also not correct to say that disputed site was a mosque since 1528 to upto-day and still exists. It is not correct to say that disputed site is a mosque. It is also not correct to say that in the last line of FIR the disputed Bhawan was written as a mosque, so it is a mosque.

(Cross-examination of witness by Sh. Abdul Manna, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 9 and 10/1, Mahmood Ahmad and Mohd. Farooq Ahmad, concluded)

(Cross-examination of witness on an oath by Sh. Zafferyab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyaudding and Maulana Mahfuzurrahman begins.)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

There was a "Shri Abhiram Das Katha Mandap" in the south-east at a distance of about one hundred and fifty feet from the east-south corner of the disputed Bhawan. This Katha-Mandap was on the pillars with a tin-shed. Katha-Mandap was about one hundred and fifty feet in length and one hundred feet in width. I am stating this distance roughly. It can be more or less than what was stated. This mandap was used to recite Katha. Katha is recited in the evening in the mandap for about one-two hours. This Katha mandap had no wall around it. It was open from all sides and was based on the pillars of bricks. I have been seeing this kathamandap since the day I came to Ayodhya. Pandit Hanuman Prasad Vyas had been reciting the Katha since I came to Ayodhya. Volunteer:that

after his death, his son had been reciting the katha. Baba Abhiram Das used to say that he constructed this katha mandap with the help of public in 1949.

Electricity meter of katha mandap was installed at the pillar of katha mandap and electricity meter of the disputed Bhawan was near the tin-shed in the inner portion at the right side of Hanumath door of the disputed Bhawan. I, on behalf of Abhiram Das used to deposit the electricity bill. That is why I can say that this electricity meter was got installed by him because electricity bill used to be receive by his name. DharamDas ji came there 7-8 years before the death of Abhiram Das ji. Electricity bill used to be paid only after he comes back. I used to deposit the bill. I have in my statement dated 17.2.2005 at page no. 24 stated that Abhiram Das died in 1983, 84 or 85. I have stated on presumption. He died in 1981 I am stating the date of birth of Abhiram Das ji after seeing the records. Dharm Das was successor of Abhiram Das. Upon the death of Abhiram Das, Dharm Das was installed.

I have stated at page no. 33 on 17.2.2005 that an idol of Ramlalla and some other idols were there in the throne made of wood below the building with three domes. This was about the year 1969-70 when I came for the darshan of Ramlalla in the year 1969-70.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture document no. 154/13 of Other Original Suit no. 1/89. Witness after seeing the picture said the wooden throne referred above is seen on the stairs, in this picture. I have seen the idols kept in such manner for the first time and have been seeing these idols since 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. The throne is kept on the three stairs of stones. The throne is kept on

the top stair kept there. A flowerpot, *Garur ghanti*, *Agarbatti stand*, *Lota*, *Shankh* and *chauki* are on the second stair. A western wall of the disputed Bhawan is seen behind the stairs. A picture is hanging at the wall. It is not clear whose picture is this. Only Ramlalla is sitting on the throne at the top stair. Idols of some deities are seen in this picture. It is not clear whose pictures are these. I have been seeing the idol of Hanumanji, Durgaji in addition to idol of Ramlalla on the said stair at the top during the period from 1969 to 1992 when I used to go there. Little idols of Laxmanji and Kaushalyaji were kept at the top stair.

Idol of Hanumanji is big in size than Ramlallaji. This idol was of stone i.e. stone idol. An idol of Ramlalla was one foot in height. An idol of Hanumanji is little larger than this. No idol of Durgaji was there. A calendar depicting Durgaji was hanging. Idols of Kaushalyaji and Laxmanji were same in size. These idols were made of eight metals. I have taken darshan of the deities kept at that place for hundreds of times. An idol of Ramlalla has been there since ever. When the other idols were kept, I have no information about this. An idol of Ramchanderji was kept there since ever i.e. from the time of Ramchanderji. Maharaj ji used to tell about this. I have full faith on him.

After the demolition of the building on 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992, the darshan is taken from such a distance from where it does not become clear whether the wooden throne kept there and seen in this picture is still at that place or not. An idol is visible due to the light. Hence I can say that an idol is the old one. Only an idol of Ramlalla is visible. Other idols are not visible. I occasionally go for darshan there after the demolition of disputed Bhawan on 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992. I had gone for darshan for a number of times. I went

for its darshan on the day when the court has ordered about this, for the first time after 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992. Court had allowed the darshan in this order. I have taken its darshan in the evening of 5<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992 for the last time before 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992.

I went there on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992 but not for darshan. I was sitting alongwith the other saints on the concrete chabutra opposite to disputed Bhawan on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. Poojan was going on there. Kar-sewa was proposed to be held there after poojan. I did not go inside the building on 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992. Some people had started Kar-sewa in mid of pooja, which resulted in stampede. I have not seen removal of idols from the disputed Bhawan on 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992. After the incident of demolition of the disputed Bhawan, I went there for the first time after the Court's order allowing the darshan. Ram katha kunj was at the southern corner from the chabutra where I was sitting. Leaders were sitting on its roof. Chabutra was at a distance of 500 meter from Ram Katha Kunj. I have not seen anybody carrying stones with them on 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992.

Witness after seeing the picture document no. 154/12 of Other Original Suit no. 1/89, said that I do not remember if the western wall of the disputed Bhawan is seen in this picture or not. I cannot say which place is seen in this picture. Inner part of the southern wall of the disputed Bhawan is seen in the picture document no. 154/14 and 154/15 of the said suit. Three round-shape pictures are made there, and paintings were drawn there. I cannot say if "Allaha" is written in a circle, among the two circles seen in picture document no. 154/14 or not. Similarly I do not recognize if "Allaha" is written in the centre on the two circles, seen in picture document no. 154/15 or not.

Learned advocate cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards the picture document no. 154/5 of the suit. Witness, after seeing the picture, said that the stairs leading to northern side to meet the road situated in the eastern part, on the north of disputed Bhawan are seen in this picture. A chabutra in the north of stairs is seen in this picture. This is not a graveyard but are the *Samadhies* of Sankaadik Sadhus. These *samadhies* are of the Sanak, Sanandan, Sanatan and Sanat Kumar. Volunteer: that Abhiram Dasji used to say that these were the *Samadhies* of the above Sadhus. These *samadhies* were there during the time of Ramchanderji and also later on. I have no knowledge when these *Samadhies* were constructed, one-two thousand years after the Ramchander or at what time. It is not correct to say that these are not the *Samadhies* but the graveyard.

I do not know if Western Wall below the mid dome of the disputed Bhawan is seen in picture document no. 154/12 of the above suit. This may be the picture of Western Wall. I cannot say if "Allaha" on the top and *kalma* below the picture is written therein or not. It is not correct to say that the idols seen in picture document no. 154/13 were kept there on the night 22/23<sup>rd</sup> Dec 1949 and no idol was there before that.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-  
Ram Vilas Das Vedanti  
21.2.2005

Typed by the stenographer in the open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this, the suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 22.2.2005.

Sd/-  
(Hari Shankar Dubey)  
Commissioner  
21.2.2005

**Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey, Additional District Judge/Officer on special duty, High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.**

**Dated 23.2.2005**

**DW. – 2/1-3, Ramvilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed vide order dated 3.2.2005 passed by Hon'ble Full Bench in Other Original Suit No. 4/89)

(In continuation to dt. 21.2.2005, cross-examination on oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued)

I have in para-5 of my Examination in chief affidavit mentioned that I got the Ph.D degree in the subject "Valmiki Ramayan main Dharmneeti". By this I mean, I have studied the entire Valmiki Ramayana and can understand the couplets written therein. According to my study Valmiki Ramayana was written by the first ever poet Maharishi Valmiki. He was during the time of Ramchanderji. Valmiki Ramayana was written after Ravana was killed and coronation of Ramchanderji happened. Valmiki Ramayana was completed during the period of Ramchanderji itself. Valmiki Ramayana, published from Geeta Press, Gorakhpur and filed as document no. 261 C-1/1 and 261 C-1/2, is complete and authentic. Entire Valmiki Ramayana was written by Valmiki.

No part was added later. Some people are of the view that Ayodhya Kand was added to Valmiki Ramayana later on. It is totally wrong. Similarly the views of others is

that Uttar Kand of Valmiki Ramayana was added later on are also totally wrong.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards 12<sup>th</sup> Sloka of 104 canto at page no. 820 of Uttar Kand (second para 261 C-1/2) of Valmiki Ramayana. Witness after reading the couplet said that Ramchanderji had fixed the period of 11 thousand years to stay on the earth. Whatever is written in the couplet is right. Attention of witness was drawn towards fifth and sixth couplet at page no. 824 of 108 canto of this chapter. Witness after reading the Hindi version of these slokas said that this translation is correct. It was written in translation of couplet no. five and six that Ramchanderji and Bharatji both had left Ayodhya, deserting it. This fact happened in his life period. Witness after reading the translation at page no. 831 of sloka no. 10 at page 830 of 111<sup>th</sup> canto of this *Kand* said this translation is correct. The forecast made in it was proved true. According to it Ayodhya not remained deserted for years after Ramchander ji left for abode but it was without Shri Ram. This does not mean that no human being was left in Ayodhya. Its reinhabitation by king Rishaba means king Rishaba had inhabited this city according to his wish. Some people say that entire population of Ayodhya went alongwith Rama when he left for abode. It is not correct. The Ayodhya inhabited during the time of Ramchanderji continued.

Increase or decrease in population is a constant feature but Ayodhya never remained humanless. Volunteer:that universal destruction must have had happened after Ramchanderji. During the universal distruction when entire world immersed under water, thre was no inhabitation in Ayodhya. After *Chaturyug* universal



destruction is inevitable but in accordance with the *shastriya* recognition there had not been any universal destruction, resultant to which it can be said that no such destruction has happened which resulted in human less earth. No limit of human has been prescribed in Valmiki Ramayana but number of human must had been proportionate to monkeys. The length and width of Ayodhya written in Valmiki Ramayana, was of the time of Ramchanderji. From Ayodhya kingdom, I mean as Lucknow City is under Lucknow. Similarly there was a Ayodhya city under Ayodhya Kingdom, which was called Mahapuri in Valmiki Ramayana. There is word "Safito Janpad Mahan" in couplet no. 5 at page 41, fifth canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana. Which means Metropolitan City i.e. Brahmpuri. Volunteer:that the word "Mahapuri" was used in 7<sup>th</sup> couplet of this canto. "Kaushal" referred in above couplet no. 5 menas north Kaushal i.e. Ayodhya.

Question: Whether the word "Kaushal" referred in above fifth couplet was used for the Ayodhya city where according to you Rama lived in or for any other city?

Answer: "Kaushal" means north Kaushal country. Ayodhya had been under north Kaushal.

Question: According to your statement, Kaushal had been written for a district in above couplet and it was mentioned that Kaushal is great, not the Ayodhya city. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is correct that in the couplet no. 5, Kaushal had been referred as a large district.

For me, Kaushal district means Kaushal country and Ayodhya nagari falls under it. Now a day, country includes

the state falling under it and district and cities falling under the states. In the same way there were various states under Kaushal country during the time of Ramchanderji. These states had various districts. Ayodhya itself was a state under Kaushal country. State and province stand for one meaning. Ayodhya City was the capital of Ayodhya State. The capital city of Ayodhya was in district Ayodhya or Ayodhya City.

Question: According to above statement the name of district, in which Ayodhya city falls, was Ayodhya?

Answer: yes.

From the district Kaushal and Ayodhya city under the district, referred in above couplet no. 5 and 6, I mean the Kaushal country. Length and width of Ayodhya City was referred in seventh sloka of fifth canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana. This reference was about Ayodhya. It was not referred for Ayodhya district and Ayodhya City. According to it, Ayodhya City was 12 yojan in length and 3 yojan in width. In other words its area was 144 km in length and 48 km in width. In accordance with the measurement Ayodhya City of today is very small. Ayodhya City of today is five km from north to south and roughly Seven kilometers from east to west. Under the perimeter of 84 kosi Ayodhya, Makhora falls in east north, Rudauli in other side at neritya kon. Sookar i.e. Tarabganj in the north side and Beekapur is in the south side. Makhora is at the Ayodhya-Chapiya marg at east-north corner of Ayodhya. These entire places were covered in the place, which was referred in Valmiki Ramayana. According to me, Ayodhya at that time was very large. All these places were under it. Population of Ayodhya would have been approx. one lakh during the time of

Ramchanderji. Volunteer:that the population of Ayodhya would be in lakhs. Ayodhya city and not Ayodhya state was referred in couplet no. 7 to 22. The things of Ayodhya City referred in fifth canto are in existence even today; such as - land, Saryu River, Ramjanambhoomi, Vasista kund etc. The pitchers with thin layer of Gold referred in fifth canto still exist, such as Kanak Bhawan, Sursari temple and Hanumangarhi. In addition to this the things referred in fifth canto are not in existence in the Ayodhya of today.

Question: You have in your statement above said that among the things of Ayodhya city referred in above fifth canto "Ramjanambhoomi" is the same which according to you was referred in fifth canto. Since you treat this Ramjanambhoomi as a disputed place, would you please tell in which couplet of fifth canto that Ramjanambhoomi was referred, which according to you is at the disputed site?

Answer: In the fifth canto of Valmiki Ramayana, where the word "Ayodhya" figures. Ramjanambhoomi is covered under the word "Ayodhya".

Question: According to your statement above, no specific place has been referred as Ramjanambhoomi and you are treating the entire Ayodhya city as Ramjanambhoomi. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct to say that I am treating entire Ayodhya as Ramjanambhoomi.

Question: Would you please tell by which word the place Ramjanambhoomi, in couplet of fifth canto, was indicated?

Answer: The word "Tatrasilokvishruta" is written in the couplet no. 6 of the fifth canto, which also means "Ramjanambhoomi".

Question: I am to say that the word "Tatrasilokvishruta" also stand for the meaning "famous in all ages". What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: This can be a meaning.

Question: I am to say that the word "Tatrasilokvishruta" never mean that this word was used for "Ramjanambhoomi" referred by you?

Answer: It is totally wrong.

I have stated in my statement above that king palaces of today are similar to the king palaces of the time of Ramchanderji. Present kanak Bhawan is similar to the king's palace of the time of Ramchanderji. Except this, there is palace similar to the palaces of the time of Ramchanderji. It might be possible that the palace during the time of Ramchanderji would had been at other place than the present area and location of Kanak Bhawan and its area can be differ. Present kanak Bhawan is made of brick, stones, wood and cement. The palace of the time of Ramchanderji would have been made of brick, stones and wood and precious stones were fixed on that palace. In this context I am referring couplet no. 15 of fifth canto. The present Kanak Bhawan is a high rised palace.

More than one hundred pitchers fixed on the Kanak Bhawan are covered with a thin layer of Gold. I cannot say the number of such pitchers. Sursari temple and

Hanumangarhi have, one each, pitcher covered by a thin-layer of Gold.

I am referring the same kanak Bhawan, which was given to Sita by kekai after the marriage of Ramchanderji at the occasion of face showing ceremony. Sita lived in that kanak Bhawan and at other places too.

Question: Was Sitaji not lived at one place with Ramchanderji; was she lived at different places from time to time?

Answer: Sita lived with Ramchanderji in one palace and also at other palaces from time to time.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards couplet no. 45 written at page no. 190 of the fourth canto of Ayodhya Kand. Witness after seeing it said that translation of this couplet is correct. Palace of Ramchanderji has been mentioned in this couplet. It cannot be said that it is referred for kanak Bhawan or for some other palace. Only one palace has been referred in it. The palace, where Ramchanderji and Sitaji lived, was referred in this couplet. Attention of witness was drawn towards 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> couplet at page no. 191 of fifth canto of above Valmiki Ramayana. Witness said, after reading it, that meaning given in the book of these couplets is correct. The palace of Shri Rama referred in 15<sup>th</sup> couplet, is the palace which was mentioned in 45<sup>th</sup> couplet of fourth canto. Same palace of Rama has been referred in 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> couplet.

Question: Beside this palace, referred in the above three couplet, is there any reference about any other palace where Shri Ramchanderji lived, in Valmiki Ramayana?

Answer: I do not remember if any palace other than the above palace, was referred in Valmiki Ramayana or not. I can answer the question only after reading the book.

The Queen of Tikamgarh constructed the present Kanak Bhawan 300 years ago. I do not know whether any remains were there at the place where the present Kanak Bhawan was constructed or not. Neither I have read about it nor do I remember if any Bhawan was constructed by king Vikramaditya at a place where present Kanak Bhawan is. Volunteer: that I have heard in the stories that Queen of Tikamgarh had constructed the same Kanak Bhawan, which was appeared in her dream, as was constructed by the Queen Kekai in Treta Yug. There is no reference in Valmiki Ramayana that Queen Kekai had donated the Kanak Bhawan to Sita after her marriage with Shri Ramchander at the occasion of face showing ceremony. There is no description about the palace of king Dasratha to the effect that in how much area the palace was built in. I have not heard anything from Saints and Mahatamas about the area of Bhawan i.e. its length and width. It becomes clear from reading Valmiki Ramayana that Bhawans of Ramchanderji, Dasrathji and Queen Kaushalya were separate. It is also clear that Bhawans of Queen Kekai, Sumitra and Laxman were also separate.

Question: Is any reference is obtained by reading Valmiki Ramayana that palace of King Dasrath would had been at any specific place in present Ayodhya?

Answer: No specific place has been referred in Valmiki Ramayana.

Question: Whether drawing any conclusion is not possible about the place where palaces of Kaushalya, Kekai, Sumitra and Ramchander were situated during the time of King Dasratha?

Answer: It is not correct to say that there is no general introduction about the above places.

Question: Please tell at what place in the present Ayodhya the palace of Kaushalya was during the time of King Dasrath?

Answer: It is mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana that the place of birth of Rama in the present Ayodhya, was the residence of Kaushalya. Disputed site was also Kaushalya Bhawan during the time of king Dasratha.

Question: Please tell, at what places in the present Ayodhya, were the Sumitra palace, Kekai Bhawan and palace of Ramchanderji were during the time of King Dasratha?

Answer: The place of than Sumitra Bhawan was at a distance of about 150-200 feet at the east-south corner of the disputed site in the present Ayodhya. The than Kekai Bhawan was situated in the north of the disputed site of present Ayodhya. But I cannot say about its distance from the disputed site. I cannot say if this distance is about 100-150 feet, thousand or two thousand feet or more or less. Similarly the palace of Ramchanderji was at a distance of one thousand feet approx. in the east north of the disputed site. It is a builtup structure at present and is called Ram Palace and is situated under Ramkot. It is also called gem throne.

Kaushalya Bhawan in the present Ayodhya is situated at the road leading to Hanumangarhi in the north of the disputed site. This place is at a distance of three-four hundred feet from the disputed site. Manas Bhawan is in the east of the disputed Bhawan. Kaushalya Bhawan is at a distance of approx. 100-150 feet from the northern gate of the Manas Bhawan. Kaushalya Bhawan is hundred to hundred fifty feet in length in the north south and 40-50 feet in width in east west. In my view the present kaushalya Bhawan is not at a place where it was situated during the time of king Dasratha. I have no knowledge when the Kaushalya Bhawan was constructed and since when it is called as Kaushalya Bhawan. I have been seeing it as a Kaushalya Bhawan since I came to Ayodhya. I have no knowledge if this Bhawan was called Kaushalya Bhawan for 100, 200 or 1000-2000 years. I have no knowledge if King Vikramaditya had constructed any Bhawan at the place where Kaushalya Bhawan is situated at present or not. Kekai Bhawan is situated in the northeast of Kaushalya Bhawan. Length and width of Kekai Bhawan is similar to Kaushalya Bhawan. I have no knowledge when the Kekai Bhawan was constructed. I have no knowledge if it is two-four hundred years back or thousand - two thousand years back. It cannot be said distinctively if the Kekai Bhawan was at a place during the time of King Dasratha where the present Kekai Bhawan is situated. No reference is found about the construction of Kekai Bhawan by King Vikramaditya. "Bada Sthan" also called "Dasratha Palace" is situated in Ayodhya. I cannot say certainly if present "Bada Sthan" or "Dasrath Mahal" is at the place where Dasrath Mahal of the time of King Dasrath was or not. I have no knowledge when the Dasrath palace was constructed. I have no knowledge if it was constructed 100-200 years before or one thousand to two thousand years back. Area of Bada Sthan is 1500 X



1000 feet approximately. Bada Sthan has an idol of God Rama with bow and arrow. I used to go Bada Sthan temple.

Question: Is this Bada Sthan (Dasrath palace) related to any building/temple of the time of Shri Ramchanderji?

Answer: This place must have been related to the tradition of Ramchanderji.

Reference of Dasrath Mahal (Palace) is found in Valmiki Ramayana. But "Bada Sthan" (Dasrath Palace) was not referred in Valmiki Ramayana.

Kaushalya Bhawan, when it was in existence, was about 100 feet in length in north-south direction and about 50 feet in width in east-west side. Sumitra Bhawan was demolished, for construction, on 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992. Sumitra Bhawan was demolished at the time of leveling of disputed site. I have no information etc. who demolished it. Sumitra Bhawan was constructed during the period of Vikramaditya. The first ever Vikramaditya was two thousand years before.

Question: Was Vikramaditya two thousand years to hundred years before or thousand years before or more or less years before?

Answer: King Vikramaditya was 2000 years to 100 years before.

It is the same Vikramaditya on whose name Vikrami Era was started. Ramjanambhoomi is an oldest temple in Ayodhya. From Ramjanambhoomi, I mean disputed site.

Question: The present structure at the disputed site was constructed on 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: Structure at the disputed site prior to 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992 means the oldest temple.

Question: Among the structure, constructed at the disputed site prior to 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 1992, was a Bhawan with three domes, which was constructed during the period of Babar. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: Disputed Bhawan was constructed by demolishing a temple, which was constructed with the remains of 12 pillars of Kasauti, which was unconstitutional. I mean the temple constructed on the pillars of Kasauti.

Question: Disputed Bhawan with three domes, wherein 12 pillars of Kasauti were, was constructed during the rule period of Babar as a Masjid. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct to say that Meerbaki, commander of Babar had constructed the mosque by demolishing the temple. If construction of a mosque was the aim of Meerbaki, then why there is no sign i.e., Tower of mosque.

I have stated in my statement above that Abhiram Das was my Guru, whose successor was Dharm Das. I do not know English language. My Guru Abhiram Das also did not know English. I know that Baba Abhiram Das was a party in the suit in which I am deposing in. Baba Abhiram

Das used to tell me that he had filed a counter claim in the suit. But he never told me about the details of counter claim. After the death of Abhiram Dasji, Dharm Das was replaced as a party. The facts written by Abhiram Das in his counter claim were written on the basis of facts or not, this I can say only after reading the counter claim.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards document no. 461/8, Other Original Suit no. 4/89 (Original Suit no. 12/61) and asked if the signature appended at document no. 461/8-A-1, were of Abhiram Dasji? Witnesses after reading this document said that signature appended thereon were of Abhiram Dasji. The matter written on these documents was in English. I cannot understand it.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the document no. 40-A-1/1 to 40-A-1/23. Witness after seeing the signature appended in these papers said that I do not recognize the signature of Dharm Das.

I am giving my statement on behalf of Suresh Das, disciple of Paramhans Ramchander Das ji. Paramhans Ramchander Das was a party to the suit. After his death Suresh Das became a party. I know that Paramhans Ramchander Das had filed a counter claim in the suit. I have no knowledge about what he had written in the counter claim whether Suresh Das had filed any counter claim in the suit, after becoming a party or not. The facts written in counter claim by ParamhansDas ji would be correct.

Question: I am to say that ParamDas Ramchander Das had written in his counter claim that no battle

was fought in between Babar and King of Ayodhya. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: If Paramhans Ramchander Das had written this fact in his counter claim, it would be correct.

Question: Paramhans Ramchander Das had also written that if the so called Babari mosque was in occupation of muslims, in that case their occupation must have been over in 1934. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: Paramhans Ramchander Das had written the correct facts.

Question: Do you also recognize the Bhawan referred as a Babari Mosque by Paramhans Ramchander Das, a Babari mosque?

Answer: No.

I do not agree with facts written by Paramhans Ramchander Das that disputed Bhawan was a Babari mosque because I never seen it as a Babari mosque. Whenever I saw this Bhawan, I saw Ramlalla sitting therein. I have never seen the disputed Bhawan prior to 1968.

The religious book referred by me in the third line of para 6 of my examination in chief affidavit are – Vedas, Upnishads, Valimiki Ramayana, Ramcharitmanas, Purans and Mahabharat etc. Geeta, Ramayan Mimamsa, Raghuvansh Mahakavya, Geetawali, kavitawali, Vinay Patrika, Dohawali, Ramlalla Navhachu, Janki Mangal, Hanuman Bahook, Barwe Ramayana, Manas Piyush, Sur-Ramcharitawali, Manas Muktaawali, manas Rahasya,

Valmiki Ramayana - Ek Drishtikon, Tulsi Shataka are among the ancient books. Names of other books are not remembered to me. I have not read Tulsi Shatak as a book. I have seen it in manuscript form by a saint. I do not remember which saints had written these manuscripts and with whom I had seen it. I had seen it last year. I have seen it, with Jagatguru Rambhadracharya ji. There were two couplets running into four to five pages. I have a copy of it with me. I did not bring it today. I can show it on Monday.

I have not seen "Tulsi Shatak" in a printed form. I have not seen these couplets in any other book also. I have heard about it during a Ramkatha in 1977 by Karpatri ji. I do not know the full name of Karpatriji. We know him by this name. He is not alive. He died in 1980 approximately.

The word "Tulsi" is used in these couplets at a number of times. I know that these were written by Tulsidas. "Tulsi Shatak" is not included in the twelve books by Tulsidas. Tulsi Shatak has not been mentioned in other literature by Tulsidas. These hundred couplets are not remembered to me.

Learned advocate Cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards page no. 20 of his examination in chief affidavit. Witness said that Tulsi Shatak was referred in fourth, fifth and sixth line of this para and it was written therein that Meerbaki had constructed a Babari mosque by demolishing the temple on the order by Babar. I have written this fact from above couplets. There was a reference about construction of mosque in these couplets but I do not agree to treat it a mosque, as there was no sign of mosque.

It is not correct to say that no creation such as "Tulsi Doha Shatak" had been written by Tulsidas and was written by some one else by the name of Tulsidas. I do not remember the Sl. number and numbers of those couplets, on whose basis I have written the matter referred in para-20 of my examination in chief affidavit.

Verified the statement after reading.

Sd/-

Ram Vilas Das Vedanti

23.2.2005

Typed by the stenographer, in the open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 24.2.2005.

*www.vadaprativada.in*

Sd/-

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

23.2.2005

**Before: Commissioner Shri Hari Shankar Dubey, Additional District Judge/Officer on special duty, High Court, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow.**

**Dated 24.2.2005**

**DW. – 2/1-3, Ramvilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed vide order dated 3.2.2005 passed by Hon'ble Full Bench in Other Original Suit No. 4/89)

(In continuation to dt. 23.2.2005, cross-examination on oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff no. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued)

There is a reference about the birth of Ramchanderji in 18<sup>th</sup> canto of Valmiki Ramayana Balkand. Witness after seeing the couplet no. 8, 9 and 10 at page no. 69 of 18<sup>th</sup> canto of Balkand, Valmiki Ramayana document no. 261 C-1 /1 said the place where Ramchanderji was born, was referred in couplet no. 8, 9 and 10 is given at page no. 69 of this book which is partially correct. True meaning of "Prodhmane" and "Sarvlok-namaskritam" is not given in it. Rest is correct. *Prodhmane* means appearance with specific form and "Sarvlok-namaskritam" means the land respected by deities.

Question: According to the meaning of above three couplets, as given by you, there is neither any sign nor *Chauhadi* about the place where Ramchanderji was said to be born. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: According to the Grammer science, where a word is implied in Sanskrit's word, the meaning of that word which was not appeared to be there should be drawn by other sources. According to the principle "Sarvloknamaskritam" means the land where Kaushalya gave birth to Rama with unique characteristics i.e. the land where Rama was born. This land is respectable to all. This is the meaning of the Sanskrit's word.

Question: From the answer given by you above, it cannot be drawn which land was referred in sloka no. 8, 9 and 10 of the above 18<sup>th</sup> canto or where the land is situated?

Answer: This is the land where Ramlalla is sitting. This is 90 feet in length in east-west side and 110 feet in width in north-south side. Kaushalya had given birth to Shri Rama at this place.

Question: On which words of couplet no. 8, 9 and 10 your answer is based. Please tell us.

Answer: The words "Kaushalya, janyad Ram" and "Sarvlok-namaskrityam", "Divya Lakshansanyutam", "Jagannath" proves that this land is where Ramlalla is sitting.

Question: From the words referred by you above neither any indication can be drawn about the land nor it can be said that meaning of these words is that disputed land which was referred in these words. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct to say that Shri Ramjanambhoomi was not referred in these words.



There is no reference in Valmiki Ramayana about the birthplace of Shri Ramchanderji except the above three couplets.

I have referred these three couplets of Valmiki Ramayana, wherein the reference about the birthplace was given, about the birthplace of Shri Ramchanderji in para 20 of my Examination in chief affidavit. Couplet no. 8, 9 and 10 of 18<sup>th</sup> canto are about the birth of Rama, couplet no. 13 is about the birth of Laxman and Shatrughan. Birth of Bharat, Laxman and Shatrughan was referred in these couplets. Disputed site was referred as a birthplace, in these couplets too. Couplet proves itself that Sumitra gave birth to Laxman and Shatrughan at a place, in the south of birthplace of Shri Ramchanderji.

Bharat was born at a place below the dome in the north of a place where Ramlalla is sitting. After the birth, residence of Sumitra and Kekai would have been marked separately by the people as a symbol. At the time of birth of Bharat, Laxman and Shatrughan, the residence of their respective mother was at the places under mid domes of north and south side. I have referred the birthplaces of Bharat, Laxman and Shatrughan on the basis of description given in couplet no. 13 and 14 of 18<sup>th</sup> Canto and sayings by saints of Ayodhya. Volunteer: that Saints, Mahatmas of Ayodhya says that King Dasratha had constructed the labour-rooms for his queens. These labour-rooms were similar to one described in Valmiki Ramayana and this description is same, as I have described above. No description is found in Valmiki Ramayana about the labour-rooms but it is learnt from the above couplets that labour-rooms were at that place. These labour-rooms were not in the palace of King Dasratha. These were adjacent

to the palace to facilitate easy way to the palace. I was told about this by Saints-Mahatamas of Ayodhya. Existence of labour-rooms is mentioned in the above couplets of 18<sup>th</sup> canto. Besides this, sayings by saints-mahatamas are the basis of these things. Above labour rooms are not mentioned in the Valmiki's Ramayana as distinctively as Bhawan of king Dasratha, Kaushalya, Sumitra, Kekai and Shri Rama's are mentioned. Volunteer:that internal matters of kings such as labour-rooms etc. are not described in the literature.

Question: Your view appeared to be incorrect because whenever the birth of Krishana is specifically referred in that case in the literature that particular place is mentioned. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: Because mother-father of Shri Krishna, Dewaki and Vasudeva were in jail, so Vedvyas had described the place in reality where Devki and Vasudev were lodged. But Kaushalya was not in jail at the time of birth of Rama. Hence such description was not mentioned.

Question: Since there is no mention about the place where Ramchanderji, Bharatji or Lakshamanji or Shatrughanji were born in Valmiki Ramayana. You are saying the fact about the labour rooms of your own or on the basis of sayings by Saints and Mahatmas and trying to connect it with Valmiki Ramayana, although there is no mention about it in Valmiki Ramayana. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: The place (land) is distinctively becomes clear from the word "Sarvlok-namaskirtyam" and "Kaushalyajanyad Ram". Hence we can say that this was the land, where Ramlalla is sitting at present.

My statement above that birth place of Ramchanderji is mentioned in couplet no. 8, 9 and 10 of Balkand in Valmiki Ramayana only is not correct because this description is also available in the sixth couplet of fifty canto of Balkand. In addition to this, its mention will be available at any other places. Learned advocate cross-examining the witness has invited the attention of witness in this regard. Witness said that description of Janambhoomi is also available in 30<sup>th</sup> couplet of 15<sup>th</sup> canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana. Details regarding the birthplace of Ramchanderji are not available except in the above couplets of fifth canto, 15<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana. The other rituals after the birth were mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana. These rituals includes, *Namkaran* ceremony, *Chhattee Poojan* ceremony and *yagyopaveet* ceremony. Besides, other ceremonies would have been referred in Valmiki Ramayana. But I have no knowledge about this. *Chhattee Poojan* ceremony had not been referred in Valmiki Ramayana. *Namkaran* ceremony and *Yagyopaveet* ceremony had also been referred in Valmiki Ramayana. *Jaatikarm* ceremony i.e. *Mundan Sanskar* has also been referred in Valmiki Ramayana. This reference is in 24<sup>th</sup> couplet of 18<sup>th</sup> Canto. The details about *Namkaran* ceremony is in 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> couplet of this Canto. It becomes clear from the above couplet No. 21 and 22 that all the four brother Ram, Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughan were born on the same day and *Namkaran* ceremony was performed on the 11<sup>th</sup> day from the date of birth. It does not become clear from these couplets that at what place the *Namkaran* ceremony was held. I also had not heard from Saints and Mahatmas about the place where *Namkaran* ceremony of the four brothers was held. It becomes clear from the above couplet no. 21 and 22 that the king Dasrath had the

*Namkaran* ceremony of his four sons performed by Maharishi Vashishta. Since the place where naming ceremony was held is not distinctive, worship of the place of naming ceremony is not worshipped in Ayodhya. Witness himself said that naming and *Jaatikarm* ceremony would have been held at the palace of King Dasratha. Since location of the palace is not known, nothing can be said about these ceremonies. Above couplet no. 24 refer completion of *Jaatikarm* ceremony. These ceremonies would have been performed in the palace of King Dasratha as according to the Hindu tradition father get these ceremonies performed at his own place.

Question: When you say that these ceremonies would have been performed in the palace of King Dasratha and it is not possible to indicate about the palace, how *Chhattee Poojan* sthal was established at the disputed site and from when it had been treated as *Chhattee Poojan* sthal.

Answer: I have said in my statement that labour room would have been adjacent to palace of King Dasrath. Hence *Chhattee Poojan* ceremony would also have been performed near the palace. *Chhattee Poojan* ceremony would have been performed near the palace of King Dasrath.

All rituals of the sons of king Dasratha were performed near the palace of king Dasratha but *Chhattee Poojan* sthal would have happened adjacent to his palace. I mean near the palace or in the palace.

Question: The word "Sannikat" adjacent used by you in your statement today was with reference to labour room. Do you mean, it is in the palace or outside the palace?

Answer: Sannikat I mean, inside of the palace but this palace would have been adjacent to the palace.

This is also applicable in the case of *Chhattee Poojan* site.

Question: When you says that labour room i.e. place below the three domes of the disputed Bhawan and *Chhattee Poojan* sthal were adjacent to the palace of king Dasratha, than why you say that location of palace of king Dasratha is not an evident.

Answer: I have not seen the palace of king Dasratha. Hence I have used the word adjacent.

Adjacent means at a distance of 8-10 feet or 100-200 feets. Hence I cannot say how far the palace of king Dasratha was. Palace of king Dasratha would have been adjacent to disputed site. Adjacent means at some distance. *Chhattee poojan* has not been referred in Valmiki Ramayana but might have been referred in Ramcharitmanas. I do not remember whether it was referred in Geetawali or in any other creation by Tulsidas or not. Three words "Nrip Bhawan", "Bhupati Bhawan" and "Manjul Bhawan" were used in connection with the buildings of the time of King Dasratha. These three words might have been used for the palace of King Dasratha. Only after seeing where these words were used it can be said that in what contexts these word were used for. Both the meaning can be drawn from the word "palace of king Dasratha" i.e. this palace could be a place for conducting the affairs of kingdom or residence of King Dasratha.

Learned Advocate cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards couplet no. 2 and 3 at page no. 28 and 29 of document no. 46 C-1/1 Geetanjali book.

Witness after reading this second and third line said that *Chhattee* ceremony of Ramchanderji has been described in these couplets. Meaning of these two couplets is given at page no. 30 of this book is correct. The place, where *Chhattee* ceremony was celebrated, described in it.

Manjul Bhawan could be residence or palace of king Dasratha. Again said that Manjul Bhawan means the residence because Raj Bhawan is a place from where kings run the affairs of his kingdom. Sixth couplet of Rag Jaitshri is given at page no. 31 under the title "*Namkaran*".

Question: This "Rag Jaitshri" is the sixth rag given in this book, which have 27 couplets. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: This is the sixth couplet of "Jaitshri" rag. Its number is 27, which is called charan.

The words "Dasrathapur" at serial no. 8 couplet at page no. 32, "Bhumidev" at couplet serial no. 22 at page 33 and "Pur-teeke" at couplet serial no. 26 of this page respectively were used. This word was used for the place where naming ceremony of four brothers was held. The word "Grih" was used at serial no. 6. It is for the palace of King Dasratha. It cannot be drawn from the couplet given at serial no. 11 at page no. 32 of this book that Queen Kaushalya was called from other Bhawan to the place where naming ceremony was being held. Because there can be number of rooms in a building. And it was mentioned because she would have been called for from a specific room. In the next couplet it was mentioned that she was called for with the ladies, singing songs. Similarly, all the three queens had been called from their respective rooms. In my view, all the queens were called

for from their respective rooms at naming ceremony place. They might have been living in their rooms. Bathing ceremony of children is also held and this ceremony must have been held for Ramchanderji. Bathing ceremony is held at the place other than the chhattee poojan site separately. It is held at a specific time. But I have no knowledge about this.

Bath after *ubtan* (cosmetic paste) ceremony and collyrium in the eyes, tilak of Gorachan, fixing a small round mark on the forehead to avoid any ill-will, was mentioned under the couplet no. 10 under the title "Rag Kedara" at page no. 39 of this book. It is not mentioned in the couplet at what place this ceremony was held. But this ceremony would have been held at that palace where queen resides. "Bhupati Bhawan" is mentioned at serial no. 2 of 21<sup>st</sup> couplet at page 49 of this book. "Bhupati Bhawan" means residence of King Dasratha.

In this couplet the palace of king Dasratha, where he had been residing with his queens was described in accordance with the imagination of Tulsidas and on the basis of scenes, which might have appeared during his meditation. As per my knowledge, Tulsidas might have described this, on the basis of Puranas. But I have no knowledge about this.

Geetawali also have the details about the birth of Ramchanderji. No specific place where he was born has been mentioned in it.

(Hindi version of the couplet written in Sanskrit, mentioned in para 21, 24 and 25 of my Examination in chief affidavit is submitted at document no. 11-A to 11-D

with the affidavit. Two lines of para-27 are given below. Its Hindi version has not been filed.)

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards couplet no. 17 under a title "Rag Bilawal" at page no. 45 document no. 46 C-1/1, which is also given at page no. 46. Witness after reading it said that there is a mention in this couplet about calling for a Jyotish by Kaushalya. The said Jyotish was called for in the palace of Dasratha. Translation of couplet no. 17, given at page no. 46, is correct. The word "Bhupati Bhawan" figuring in couplet no. 21 at page no. 49 of this book was used for the palace of King Dasratha, the residence of King Dasratha. Translation of couplet no. 21 given in the book is correct. The word "Nrip-Bhawan Dwar" figuring in couplet No. 39, at page No. 72, 73 of this book, was used for the residence of King Dasratha. Translation of couplet No.39 at page no. 73 of this book is correct. Tulsidas had written the "Geetawali" after Ramcharitmanas. Some such contexts were given in it, which were not in Ramcharitmanas.

It was mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana that King Dasratha after completing the age of sixty thousand twenty-five years (60025) had proposed the coronation of Ramchanderji. It is also found in Valmiki Ramayana that Ramchanderji was 16 years old at the time when King Dasrath was 60,000 years old. It was mentioned in "Ayodhya Kand" of Valmiki Ramayana that King Dasratha after the marriage of Ramchanderji had declared himself as an old man. This was also described in Balkand. This intent was also described in couplet no. 2, 7 and 10 of 20<sup>th</sup> canto of Bal Kand of Valmiki Ramayana. The meaning of these couplets given at page no. 74 and 75 is correct. Volunteer:that there is no clear description about the old



age of king Dasratha in couplet No.10. It was mentioned therein that he got the son after great difficulty. Details regarding coronation of Ramchanderji was described in the description given at page 188 to 190 of fourth canto of Ayodhya Kand of Valmiki Ramayana. It becomes known after reading the couplets at page no. 4, 8 and 10 that these two palaces were adjacent to each other. Meaning of couplets of fourth canto given at page no. 188, 189 and 190 is correct. The palace referred in 8<sup>th</sup> couplet is also the palace of residence of king Dasratha. It was mentioned in the couplet no. 12 of fourth canto of this Kand. King Dasratha had declared himself as an old man. In couplet no. 29 of this canto there is a mention about Ramchanderji going to the room of Kaushalya. Her living room was a part of the palace for residence of king Dasratha. It was mentioned in couplet no. 33 at page no. 190 that Kaushalya engrossed in meditation of Narayana i.e. Lord Vishnu. The Vishnu who appeared in as Ramchanderji.

Verified the statement after reading.

Sd/-

Ram Vilas Das Vedanti

24.2.2005

Typed by the stenographer, in the open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 25.2.2005.

Sd/-

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

24.2.2005

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

**Dated 25.2.2005**

**D.W.-2/1-3 Shri Ram Vilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide order passed on 3.2.2005, in Other Original Suit No. 4/89.)

(In continuation to dated 24.2.2005, Cross-examination on an oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff No. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued).

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards para 21, page -7 of his Examination in chief affidavit. Witness said that these couplets have been taken from the couplet No. 8, 9 and 10 of 18<sup>th</sup> Canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana. I have already made my statement in regard to these couplets, yesterday. I have referred to these three couplets in para -21 of my affidavit. In addition to this, I have referred to Ramcharitmanas in my affidavit. Ramcharitmanas had the details about birthplace of Shri Ram Chanderji. This detail figures in the fifth couplet after the couplet No. 3(C) of Uttarkand. This couplet is as follows: - "*Janmbhoomi Mampuri Suhavani, Uttardishi Bah Saryu River Pawani*". This means, this Suhavanipuri is my birthplace, Saryu River flows in its north. In addition to this, Janmbhoomi or Janmsthan was also referred to in the Chhand next to couplet No. -191 of the Balkand. In the first line of

Chhand following words have been used: "*Bhey Pragat Kripala, Deen Dayala Kaushaliya Hitakri*". This means "Kind God, Kind to poor and Well-wisher of Kaushaliya, incarnated". Here Prabhu means Ramchanderji. Besides, "Jag Niwas Prabhu Pragat" is written in couplet No. –191 of this Kand, which indicates Janmsthan or Janmbhoomi. It means God lives in the entire world, in each and every particle. God Shri Ram was incarnated in this land; that takes care of the entire universe.

Question: Please tell which word in the couplet is meant for "this land".

Answer: "Prabhu Pragat" these two words are the indication of this land, where Ramlalla is ensconced.

Question: You are giving false statement because any land cannot be indicated by the word "Prabhu Pragat". This means God has taken incarnation. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: I am to say in this regard that the intent of Goswami Tulsidasji was to indicate the land where Shri Ramlalla is ensconced from the word Prabhu Pragat in Ramcharitmanas. God can appear in the land also. Hence the word Prabhu Pragat indicates the Ramjanmbhoomi.

Question: If Goswami Tulsidas recognize the disputed site as a Janmbhoomi or Janmsthan of Shri Ramchanderji, he would have not referred to the building with three domes in his creations and would have described the location around it

in very clear terms. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: I am to say that Tulsidasji had seen the incarnation of Shri Ramlalla in this land in the state of meditation. If there had been a mosque at that place, he would have referred to it. He had seen the incarnation of Shri Ram Chanderji only. Hence he had tried to tell the people through the words " Akhil Lok Vishram" and "Jag Niwas" that incarnation of God Shri rama had taken place.

I have no knowledge about if building with three domes had been constructed at the time of creation of Ramcharitmanas or not. I have not read anything about it, anywhere. Goswami Tulsidas had written Ramcharitmanas in 1631 Samvat.

Question: Do you not know, how many years the Samvat year is ahead to Christian era?

Answer: I do not know exactly.

At present Samvat 2061 is running. At present Christian era 2005 is running. There is a difference of 57 years in between the two. It is clear from it that Samvat is ahead by 57 years from Christian era. Samvat year started in the name of Vikramaditya. Thus samvat 1631 was the Christian year 1574.

As such disputed Bhawan was constructed prior to 1530. Disputed Bhawan was over 40 years old at the time of creation of Ramcharitmanas. Tulsidas had been in Ayodhya for most of the time when he has written Ramcharitmanas. He must have spent at least two years

in Ayodhya during this period. It is said that Tulsichaura is a place in Ayodhya where Tulsidas had started writing Ramcharitmanas. I have no knowledge in what condition the Tulsichaura was, at that time. I cannot say whether this place was in the form of a temple, house or Ashram; at that time. Tulsidas was born in 1554 at a place known as Rajapur, which is now a days in Chitrakoot. I have no information if he had been at his birthplace, Rajapur, during the period when he was writing Ramcharitmanas or not. There are two viewpoints about it, whether he had gone to his birthplace again after coming to Ayodhya or not. One says he went back while others say he did not. I have read a book about his daily routine in a book kept in Sanskrit University Varanasi. I do not remember the name of the book. It is written in the book that he used to take bath in Saryu River, take darshan of Nageshwar Nath Temple and meet with some scholars. It is said and I also believe that Tulsidasji came to Ayodhya on the order of Hanumanji in 1628. Nar Hari Das was the Guru of Tulsidasji who lived in Sukar. He started writing Ramcharitmanas in the Samvat 1631 and completed it in the year 1633 Samvat. During this period – 1631 to 1633- he went to Varanasi for some time and came back to Ayodhya. Ramcharitmanas was completed in Ayodhya. It took him 2 years, 7 months and 26 days to complete the Ramcharitmanas. After he completed the book, he went to Kashi again. Being a firstever creation in Hindi, Pandits of Kashi had protested against Ramcharitmanas but when it was reviewed by keeping it over the head of Shankar ji along with other Vedas, Lord Shankar had written down Satyam, Shivam, Sundram over it and the book was recognized as the Vedas. It is described in the History.

King Todarmal was a friend of Tulsidas ji. King Todarmal was one among the nine gems of Akbar. It is

described that King Todarmal might have come to Ayodhya.

The fact mentioned at page 30 to 32 of document No. 258 C -1/2 of Ramcharitmanas is correct. Photo of Tulsidasji given at document No. 258 C -1/2/17 cannot be said as imaginary because I have seen such photos at many places. This photo could be said as his actual photo. Picture of Ramchanderji and Sita ji are at document No. 25 C -1/2/18; along with the picture of Laxmanji, Bharatji and Shatrughanji. Picture of Hanumanji is also there.

These pictures are from time immemorial and had been in the same form. Volunteer : that there are other pictures also, which are in different position.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards 261 C -1/1/1 to 261 C -1/1/8 and asked for as under:-

Question: Can you tell for how long the above pictures are in this form.

(Upon this question, Learned Advocate on behalf of plaintiff of Other Original Suit No.-3/89, has raised an objection that the questions about the picture cannot be asked for unless question about the size and form are not asked for because form and size differs. Hence permission cannot be granted for asking the question.)

Answer: Statement of Learned Advocate Shri Ranjeet Lal Verma, Advocate is correct. From these pictures it cannot be guessed that for which time these pictures belongs to. Pictures are changeable. Their form and figures get

changed in accordance with the region, period and circumstances.

Question: Whether the picture of Valmiki, shown in document No. 261 C -1/1/1 is in accordance with the time when Ramayana was written?

Answer: This picture belongs to the time when Kronch was murdered by vyadh at the holy bank of Tamsa. The first couplet of Ramayana was written by Maharishi Valmiki upon seeing this scene.

Witness, after seeing the picture document No. 261 C -1/1/2 said that this is a picture of Kaushaliya and Shri Rama of his childhood. This is a picture of Ramchanderji after his birth. This picture is of the time when Kaushaliya residence was in the palace of King Dasratha. The shape and size of the people shown in picture document No. 261 C -1/1/3 to 261 C -1/1/8 are similar to the colour and shape of the people of the time of King Dasratha. People shown in the picture document No. 261 C -1/2/1 to 261 C -1/2/8 of document No. 261 C -1/2 second part of Valmiki Ramayana are similar to the people of that time. I do not remember if there is any other reference about the birthplace of Ramchanderji except the couplet and Chhand I have referred to in my statement above. Then said that sixth couplet next to couplet No. 33 of Balkand of Ramcharitmanas also refers about it. It contains the details of birth ceremony but detail about taking birth by Ramchanderji had not been included in it.

Question: I am to say that no detail is found in any couplet of Ramcharitmanas on the basis of which it can be said that Tulsidasji had referred

to the disputed site as a "Janmbhoomi or Janmsthan of Ramchanderji".

Answer: It is not correct.

There is no clear description about the '*Chhattee Pujan*' of Shri Ramchanderji in the Ramcharitmanas. Jaat Karm ceremony, Namkaran ceremony etc. were clearly described in it. This description is given in the second couplet next to couplet No. -196 at page No. -144, Ramcharitmanas document No. 258 C -1/2. Jaat Karm is described in the first but last line of couplet No. 196. Scholars have taken it from the word "Jaat". Except this there is no description about Jaat Karm ceremony or Namkaran ceremony anywhere. Learned advocate cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards couplet No. 193 at page No. 142 of the above book. Witness said that "Jaat Karm Ceremony" have not been described clearly in this.

(Upon this point witness submitted Hindi version of Salok given in the last of para -27 of his examination in chief statement. It was marked with document No. 11E and be kept with the affidavit.)

There is word "Nripdwar" in the last but second line in couplet No. 193 at page No. 142 is the referred of the palace of King Dasratha. Tulsidas has described the greatness of Ayodhya at a number of places in Ramcharitmanas. Ayodhya Mahatmya was described in the last but third and fourth line of couplet No. 34 of Balkand. The word "Ramdhamdapuri Suhavani" figuring in the third couplet means the city, which describes place of Ramaji. The city is known as a holy place in all Loks (throughout the universe). The meaning of this entire couplet is that "this city is a holy one known to everyone.



Last but fourth couplet next to couplet No. 33 of Balkand of Ramcharitmanas is about the indication of the work of Ramcharitmanas. It was said in it that work relating to writing of Ramcharitmanas began in 1631 Samvat. The word "Avadh" used in the first couplet next to couplet No. -15 and couplet next to couplet No. 16 was for Ayodhya. In the couplet next to couplet No. 15 Ayodhya Mahatmya was described.

Question: Ramjanmbhoomi Mandir was not referred to at any places where Ayodhya was described in Ramcharitmanas?

Answer: It is not correct.

Question: Please tell at what place and in which Kand of Ramcharitmanas, Ramjanmbhoomi in Ayodhya was described?

Answer: This was described in the couplet "*Janmbhoomi Mum Puri Suhavani — Uttar dishi Bah Saryu Pavani*"— this means that Mum Janmbhoomi i.e. birthplace of mine is Ayodhya. Shri Rama used the word "mum Janmbhoomi" for his own birthplace.

Question: Do you recognize Ayodhya Puri or Ayodhya City as a birthplace of Ramchanderji?

Answer: There is no difference in between the Ayodhya Puri or Ayodhya City. Ayodhya City in Ayodhyapuri and Ayodhyapuri in Ayodhya City, both the words have a same meaning.

Question: Do you think that there is a difference in between the word Janmbhoomi or Janmsthan or both the words were used for a same meaning?

Answer: This word has double meaning. Janmbhoomi means the place where Shri Ramlalla is ensconced and Janmsthan means any place adjacent to Janmbhoomi. Thus, the meaning of both the words may be different or same it depends.

Question: Can Ayodhya be called a Janmsthan?

Answer: People in general say that the birthplace of Shri Rama is in Ayodhya. But after going there one will ask at which place he was born, reply would be the place where Shri Ramlalla is ensconced, is his birthplace.

"Janmbhoomi" is a Sanskrit word used in Hindi and the word "Janmsthan" is also a Sanskrit word, which is also used in Hindi. In my view there is no difference in the word "Bhoomi" or "Sthan". The word "Janmsthan" was not used in Valmiki Ramayana but the word "Janmbhoomi" used in couplets in Valmiki Ramayana, were used for Janmsthan.

According to my knowledge, Janmsthan word had not been used for Ramjanmbhoomi in Ramcharitmanas. It is not correct to say that the word "Janmbhoomi" was used for Ayodhyapuri in Ramcharitmanas and not for any particular place i.e. for disputed site.

Ramcharitmanas submitted in the Court as document No. 258 C -1/1 and its two copies were marked with

document No. 258 C –1/2, is authentic and whole creation is of Goswami Tulsidas.

In the last lines of couplet No. 79 of Ayodhya Kand of the above book Ramcharitmanas. There are details about Ramchander's going to exile in it. It was described in these lines that Ramchanderji came out of his palace and stood before the gate of Vashishta Bhawan while going to exile. Distance from the palace of Shri Ramchanderji to Vashishta Bhawan was not described in Ramcharitmanas or in any other book. I have not read about it in any book. I do not remember if distance from the palace of Shri Ramchanderji to Vashishta Bhawan was given in Rudryamal or not.

Arrival of Ramchanderji in Shringverpur was described in the first line next to couplet No. 86 of Ayodhya Kand of Ramcharitmanas. Shringverpur is still exists in Ayodhya. This place is situated at the northern bank of Ganga, on western side of Allahabad at a distance of 180 Kms from the southern part of Ayodhya. Ramchandra held his first halt at the bank of Tamsa and Second in Shringverpur. Tamsa River, where Rama held his first halt, still exists, is at a distance of approx. 17 Kms from Ayodhya and is known as Tamsa River. This River was not within the boundary of Ayodhya at the time of Rama and to day also. It was described in Valmiki Ramayana that Rama, after travelling for a little distance from Tamsa and at some distance before Shringverpur get down from the chariot and bowed with respect towards Ayodhyapuri. Rama said that he will come back after 14 years of exile. The fact that Ramchanderji, after going out from Ayodhya stayed at the bank of Tamsa River is described in couplet No. 84 of Ayodhya Kand. The fact about going from Tamsa, is given in the last but eighth

couplet of couplet No. 84 and couplet No. 85. There are four couplets about this in the couplet No. 85. It is given in the seventh and eighth line of couplet No. 85 that the people from Ayodhya, who stayed there at Tamsa for the night, came back. It becomes clear from these couplets that Tamsa River was not in jurisdiction of Ayodhya. Tamsa River might have been referred in Skand Puran. Description in this regard is given in Chapter No. 98 of Kedar Khand of Skand Puran.

It is described in religious books that "*Garur*" is a *Vahan* (Vehicle) of God Vishnu. He has partly human figure and partly of bird. This was referred in Valmiki Ramayana and Ramcharitmanas at a number of places. In Ramcharitmanas it is described in Lanka Kand and Uttar Kand. Description about "*Garur*" is found in Lanka Kand of Ramcharitmanas, when Meghnath tied Lord Rama by Nagpash, *Garurji* get him free from this Nagpash. Description about *Garur* in Uttar Kand is found at two places. Attracted from the deeds of Rama, *Garur* went to Shankarji and Shankarji asked him to go to Kagbhushundi for any clarification. Second subject is about the conversation held in between Kagbhushundi and *Garur*.

Reference about *Garur* is found in Kadruvinita Katha of "Ayodhyakand" of Valmiki Ramayana. In addition to this, reference is also found in Yudh Kand with reference to release from Nagpash Bandhan and many stories were given in Uttar Kand.

Reference is also found, about Rama's going to Saket Dham, in 108<sup>th</sup> and 109<sup>th</sup> Canto of Uttar Kand of Valmiki Ramayana. Then said, this description is about going to Saket and Shantanik Lok. In the earlier Canto i.e., Canto No. 107, there is a reference about coronation

of Lav and Kush to the throne of South Kaushal and North Kaushal respectively. This Coronation ceremony was held in Ayodhya.

Learned advocate cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards the couplets No. 16, 17 and 18 at page 824 of Canto No. -107 of Uttar Kand of Valmiki Ramayan, document No. 261 C -1/2. Witness after reading the couplet said that the word "South Kaushal" used in it was for present Chhatisgarh and North Kaushal was for Ayodhya. Hence kingdom of Ayodhya was given to Lav and Chhatisgarh to Kush.

It was given in couplet No. 19 of this Canto that Ramchanderji had given thousand chariot, ten thousands elephants and one Lakh horses each to both of his sons. It is given in couplet No.-20 that Ramchanderji then send both Lav and Kush to their respective Capitals. One brother was sent to South Kaushal and second one was given the Kingdom of Ayodhya.

Question: You have stated that second brother was not sent to anywhere and was retained in Ayodhya. This fact is not in agreement with the matter given in above couplet No. 20, it is clear from the above couplet that second brother was also sent out of Ayodhya?

Answer: The word "Swey Pure Presyamas" means that he was sent to North Kaushal within Ayodhya State.

Question: Do you mean that the couplet No. 20 above is mean that one son was not sent out of Ayodhya?

Answer: Ayodhya City, i.e. Ayodhya Puri was also spread outside of the City. This is evident from the fact that Shri Rama, before going ahead from Tamsa bank, bowed towards Ayodhya with respect. It shows that border of Ayodhya, according to Valmiki Ramayan was 144 kilometers in length and 48 kilometers in width. The word outside of Ayodhya means the Kingdom of Ayodhya and not outside of Ayodhya.

Question: In accordance to you, Capital of North Kaushal was Ayodhya City and not any other City?

Answer: Ayodhya City was the capital of North Kaushal during the period of King Dasratha.

It was asked about couplet No. 17 to 22 of Canto No. 109 of Uttar Kand of Valmiki Ramayana if the translation given at page No. 828 is correct or not. Witness after reading the translation, said that the translation of couplet No. 17 to 21 is correct except the translation of couplet No. 22. The meaning of this couplet is that the people, who went to Gopartar Ghat with Rama, had followed Shri Rama.

Question: Does the meaning of couplet no. 22 is not that even smallest living being had left Ayodhya with Shri Rama?

Answer: This was written with a meaning that devotee of Rama do not think it proper to live without Rama i.e., even do not like to breath.

It was referred in Canto No. 110 that Shri Ramchander was at a distance of about one and half yojan, i.e., 18 Kms. from Ayodhya. There is no reference about Rama's entering in Saryu River in the entire Canto. Attention of witness was drawn towards couplet No. 22 of this Canto. Witness after reading the couplet and its translation said that there is a reference about Rama's taking bath in Saryu River at Gopartar Ghat.

Question: Is it not necessary to enter in to the river to take bath?

Answer: There is a reference about reaching in the Saryu River and not about entering in to it.

Shri Ramchanderji and all followers reached there to take bath in Saryu River.

Verified the statement after reading.

Sd/-

Ram Vilas Das Vedanti

25.2.2005

Typed by the stenographer in the Open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further Cross-examination for 28.2.2005. Witness to be present.

Sd/-

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

25.2.2005

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

**Dated 28.2.2005**

**D.W.-2/1-3 Shri Ram Vilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide order passed on 3.2.2005, in Other Original Suit No. 4/89.)

(In continuation to dated 25.2.2005, Cross-examination on an oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff No. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued).

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards document No. 289 C – 1/202 of exhibit No. OOS 5-3 (document No. 289 C –1/1) Other Original Suit No. 5/89. Witness in reply to a question said that Ramjanmbhoomi-Babri structure was shown at the bank of Saryu River in this map. According to this map this place is in the western side. Place named Vighnesh was shown in the east and north in it. This is the same Vighnesh, which I have mentioned in my statement as Vighneshwar. Location of Vighnesh has been shown correct. Hanumangarhi is shown in the east of disputed site, which is correct. Similarly the location of Lomash is also correct.

Vashishta Kund is shown in the south side, it is also correct. Kekai Bhawan is shown in the north side, its location is also correct. Pindarak has been shown above the Kekai Bhawan, its location is also correct. Jamwant



has been shown correctly in the east of Pindarak. Vibhishan Kund was shown above the Jamwant, is correct. Rishabh has been shown correctly in the western side of Vibhishan Kund. Rishabh means Rishabhdev Jain. Location of Begumpura Mohalla has been correctly shown in the north of Vibhishan Kund. Location of Swargdwar in north has correctly been shown in the map. Location of Aurangzeb mosque in the east of Swargdwar has been shown correctly. Volunteer: that it is in a shattered condition at present. Only one tower is there in a shattered condition. Location of "Aurangzeb mosque" above the Swargdwar is also correct. Two Swargdwars have been shown in the map, one is Swargdwar Ghat and other is Swargdwar Mandir. Beside this there is Mohalla in Ayodhya by this name. Location of Chanderhari Mandir in the west of Swargdwar has been shown correctly. Location of Sahastra Dhara, Laxman Ghat and Swargdwar, the three Ghats in the north of Chanderhari Mandir are correctly shown in the map. But at present there is no Swargdwar and Sahastra Dhara, only Laxman Ghat is at present. Laxman Ghat is at the bank of Saryu River but at present Ram ki Paidi is constructed there. Rinmochan Ghat is in the western side of Laxman Ghat. This Ghat is at the bank of Saryu River. Kaushaliya teerath is written below it, where Kaushaliya Mandir is. Presently this holy place is known as Kaushaliya Ghat and is situated at the bank of Saryu River. Sumitra teerath is written below it, which means Sumitra Ghat. Brahmkund is written below it, which means Brahmkund Ghat. A Gurdwara is there at this place. Location of Prahlad Kund in the south of it is shown correct. The places shown in the map from Rajghat to Prahlad Ghat, are presently being used as Ghats. He himself said, some Ghats are being used as parks, such as Rajghat. Saryu River does not flow on this side from Rajghat to Prahladghat but except during monsoon

season. Devotees and pilgrims used to take bath on these Ghats. Chakra Teerath has been shown in the south below the Vashishta Kund and Neel Teela in the east of Chakra Teerath. Sugreev Teela is in the east of it. Dantdhawan Kund is in the north of Sugreev Teela. "Ramsabha" is in the northeast and "Ratnamandap" is in the north west of Dantdhawan Kund. Location of "Ratnamandap" has been shown in the map correctly. "Ramsabha" as shown in the map is actually a "Raj Sabha". It's earlier name might be "Ramsabha". If "Ramsabha" means "Rajsabha" then Kanak Bhawan is situated in the west south corner of "Rahsabha". I have heard that Vighnesh or Vighneshwara is in Ayodhya but I have not been at these places.

Pindarak is situated in the north of the disputed site. Pindarak is at a distance of 1100 yards from the disputed site. At Pindarak, where some idols are there, people do worship. This is a famous place of Ayodhya and has been there since long. It was also referred in Shastras. I have been at this place for a number of times. I do not remember in which direction the Vighneshwar from the disputed site is.

Question: If you do not remember the location of Vigneshwara place from the disputed site, how you have, in your statement above, said that location of Vighneshwara shown in the document map No. 289 C –1/202 is correct?

Answer: I have the said on the basis of map.

Question: You have in your statement, just before, said that the location of Vighnesh, shown in the map is correct according to ground situation. Would you please tell how on the basis of map, you

have stated this fact, particularly when you do not remember its location?

Answer: After seeing the map, I recollected to some extent about the facts stated above in my statement.

I have stated in my statement to day that Vighnesh or Vighneshwara is in the east and north of the disputed site. My statement is correct. I recollected after my attention was drawn towards this. Vighneshwara is in the east of Pindarak. Vashishta Kund is in the south west of Vighneshwara.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards tenth and eleventh line of document No. 11 -B, attached to his Examination in chief affidavit. Witness said that translation given is correct. This is the translation of couplet No. 13 given in para 24 of my affidavit. Translation - "One should worship the Ganesha, who removes all obstacle, situated in the west" of sixteenth line of document No. 11 -B is of the couplet No. 16 of para 24 of my affidavit. It was given in 19<sup>th</sup> line of document No. 11 -B that " Ramjanmbhoomi is situated at Ishan Corner of Vighneshwasa". This is a translation of couplet No. 19 of para 24 of my affidavit. The translation - "Vashishta Kund is in the eastern side of Vighneshwara. Ramjanmbhoomi is situated in the north of Vashishta Kund". Given in 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> line of document No. 11 -B is the translation of first line of couplet No. 19 referred in para 24 of my examination in chief affidavit. Volunteer: that translation - "Ramjanmbhoomi is situated as Ishan corner of Vighneshwar" rendered by me is not correct. This is not a translation of any couplet. Correct translation of couplet No. 19<sup>th</sup> has not been written in

document No. 11 –B. Correct translation is as under: -  
 "Janmsthan is in the eastern part of Vighneshwara and in the northern side of Vashishta Kund and in the western side of Lomashh". On which side of Vighneshwara, Vashishta Kund and Lomashh Janmsthan falls, is described in couplet No. 19. According to it Janmsthan falls in the east of Vighneshwara and according to me Janmsthan is in west south side of Vighneshwara. It might be possible that direction of Janmsthan from Vighneshwara given in couplet No. 19 was correct at the time when couplet was written and now it get changed. Direction of Janmsthan from Vighneshwara given in the couplet might not be correct in accordance to me.

In the translation rendered by me, in 21<sup>st</sup> line of document No. 11 –B it is not correct that Vashishta Kund is in the eastern part of Vighneshwara. It is correct that Vashishta Kund is in the southwest side of Vighneshwara. Translation of couplets given in para 24 of my examination in chief affidavit, none of the couplet means that Vashishta Kund is in the eastern part of Vighneshwara. Ramjanmbhoomi is in the north of Vashishta Kund. This is the translation of first line of 19<sup>th</sup> couplet of para 24 of affidavit i.e. "Vashishtadutare".

(Since according to the witness, translation of the couplets given in para 24 of his Examination in chief affidavit is not correct, witness requested that cross-examination may be conducted only after submission of true translation. Similarly there are some mistakes in the translation of other couplets also, a request was made by him for postponement of cross-examination. Witness said that he would submit the true translation tomorrow.)

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards his statement recorded today at page No. 78, dated 23.2.2005 wherein witness said that he would tell about the palace where Shri Rama lived, as mentioned in Valmiki Ramayana, after reading the book. Witness after reading above part of his statement said that this was described in couplet No. 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 21, 22 and 26 of fifth Canto of Ayodhya of Valmiki Ramayana.

Ayodhya Mahatamya is described in about 200 couplets of Skand Puran. I do not remember in how many couplets, out of 200 couplets, Ramjanmbhoomi or Ramjanmsthan was described. The couplets of Ayodhya Mahatamya, the description of which I have given in my affidavit, were given keeping the Ramjanmbhoomi and Ayodhya in view. Ramjanmbhoomi was described in the couplets No. 18, 19, 22, 24 and 25 in para 24 of my Examination in chief affidavit. The word "Janmsthan" was used in couplet No. 18, 19, and 24, whereas "Janmbhoomi" was used in couplet No. 22 and 25. Janmbhoomi and Janmsthan, both were used in Ayodhya Mahatamya of Skand Puran for the same and one meaning. Volunteer: that Janmsthan means Janmbhoomi. Janmbhoomi means the place where Ramlalla is sitting. Janmsthan and Janmbhoomi, both were used for the place where Shri Ramchanderji was born.

Question: Were different places described in above couplet No. 18, in respect of "Janmsthan"?

Answer: "Janmsthanmidem" is written in couplet No. 18. The "Idem" means Ramlalla is sitting at the Janmbhoomi demarcated by different directions.

Hence "Idem" was used along with the "Janmsthan".

Question: In the couplets referred earlier other than 18 by you in para 24 of your affidavit, Janmsthan or Janmbhoomi demarcated by different directions, were not referred in any couplet. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: When a poet described the importance of a particular place, it is not necessary that he use the word near to it. When a poet reaches at a stage of main stream, he highlights the subject matter only. Otherwise poem will suffer from repetition disorder. Hence poet had not repeated Janmbhoomi or Janmsthan in the couplets. Janmbhoomi or Janmsthan were used only for highlighting the main point. Hence it is not correct to say that the word Janmbhoomi and Janmsthan have not figured in these couplets. There was no necessity of using directions in these couplets, hence it was not mentioned.

Similarly, places in the different directions of Janmbhoomi or Janmsthan were not described by me in the couplets No. 22, 24 and 25.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards map document No. 289 C -1/203 of O.O.S. 5 -3 (document No. 289 C -1/1). Witness after seeing the map said that the description about the disputed site and places around it, is given in the map. Lomash Rishi Ashram was shown in the south side of the disputed site in the map. Lomash Rishi was

during the period of Ramchanderji. His Ashram was there during the period of Shri Ramchanderji. Lomash Rishi would have lived in it so this is called Lomash Rishi Asham. Location of Lomash Rishi Ashram as shown in the map is not correct. This map i.e., document No. 289 C – 1/203 is partly correct and not fully. Lomash Rishi Ashram in the south of the disputed site, as shown in the map, is not correct. Location of Sumitra Bhawan has been shown correctly. The distance of Sumitra Bhawan from the disputed site has been shown as 54 meter, is correct. Lomash Rishi Ashram and Lomash Chaura are two different places. Lomash Chaura means Lomash Chabutra. Lomash Chaura is a disputed one. This place is called Shankar-Chabutra because God Shankar came to this place for the darshan of Ramlalla. Volunteer: that description in this regard is in Geetawali and Ramcharitmanas. Shankarji sat at this place. This place is in eastern side opposite to Ramlalla, aside to eastern door of the disputed site. It is at a distance of 50 to 100 feet from the main gate. Shankar Chabutra is there since the period of Ramchanderji. Shankar Chabutra had been in the outer portion of the disputed site boundary. Then said, this place would had been in the outer side but later developed into an important place among the saints of Ayodhya, as a Shankar darbar under a Peepal Tree at agnikon of the disputed site. There are two sayings. According to first saying, when Shankarji came to see Ramlalla, he sat in the eastern side place, at the main gate, outside of boundary of disputed site at the place shown in the above map (document No. 3/30 A –1) as a Shankar Chabutra. According to second saying, the place where Shankarji sat, after he was called by Sumitra into the palace, is known as Shiv Darbar i.e., Shankar Darbar. This place is situated under the tree of Peepal and Neem at the south east corner of the disputed site; which is

shown in document No. 3/9 –A –1 of Other Original Suit No. 3/89. Location of "Sakshi Gopal Mandir" is shown correctly in document No. 289 C –1/203. Chabutra shown above the Ramchabutra in the map is not correct.

"Abhiram Das – Mandap ka Chhappar" is written in the map, is correct. "Sita Koop" as shown in the map is correct. "Remains" in the south side of the disputed site, as shown in the map, is correct. "Gopal Bhawan" in the eastern side, below to "Abhiram Das Mandap" as shown in the map is correct.

Verified the statement after reading.

Sd/-

Ram Vilas Das Vedanti

28.2.2005

Typed by the stenographer in the Open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further Cross-examination for 01.3.2005. Witness to be present.

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

28.2.2005

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

**Dated 01.3.2005**

**D.W.-2/1-3 Shri Ram Vilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide order passed on 3.2.2005, in Other Original Suit No. 4/89.)



(In continuation to dated 28.2.2005, Cross-examination on an oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff No. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued).

I have read so many books about history of disputed site. "Shri Ramjanmbhoomi ka rakta-ranjit itihaas" is among them. Beside this I have read a number of books, but name of those books are not remember to me. I have not read the book "Ayodhya Ka Itihaas" by Avadhvasi Lala Sitaram and "Shri Ramjanmbhoomi (Sachitra Pramanik Itihaas)" by Dr. Radheyshyam Shukla. I have made a perusal of the book written by Ex-District Magistrate of Faizabad, Shri Ram Sharan Srivastava but not in full. I have read a part of book "Sikh Itihaas main Shri Ramjanmbhoomi", by Rajinder Singh but not the full book. Volunteer: that I have read the book "Ayodhya Ka Pathik Ashok Singhal" wherein history of Ramjanmbhoomi was described. I do not remember when this book was published. This book was published after the demolition of disputed Bhawan. Ashok Singhalji is the same person who is a executive President of Vishwa Hindu Parishad. I have not read the book "Ayodhya Ka Itihass avam Puratatwa" by Thakur Prasad Verma and C.P.Gupta but it was shown to me during cross-examination.

I do not properly remember about the contents of above book by Ram Sharan Srivastava because I have only made a retrospection of it.

I have stated in my earlier statement about four samadhies of Sanak Sanandan etc. in the north of disputed Bhawan. Besides, there were three more samadhies in the north of four samadhies. Whose

samadhies were these, I do not remember but these were of Rishies. These samadhies were little one and symbolic. These samadhies were in the shape of three little Chabutras. Besides, samadhies of Jabali, Narad and August Rishies were there in the south of disputed Bhawan. My Guru Abhiram Das had told me about this. I do not remember if I have seen these samadhies after coming to Ayodhya or not. My Guru used to tell me about these samadhies. I had performed parikarma of disputed site for hundred of times. I used to start parikarma from the place next to a wall of disputed site. Samadhies were in the south side of parikarma Marg. I do not remember if I had worshipped these samadhies or not.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards document No. 136/6, of Other Original Suit No. 1/89, the map prepared by Shiv Shankar Lal, Commissioner Lawyer dated 25.5.50, was shown to him. Witness after seeing it said that there are samadhies of Janib Garg, Gautam, Shandilya and Narad Chabutra in the north east. Location of samadhies shown in the map is correct.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture document No. 154/5 of Other Original Suit No. 1/89 and line four to eight in para second at page 68 of his statement dated 21.2.2005 in this regard. Witness after reading the statement said that his statement was correct. Chabutra seen in picture document No. 154/5 is situated in the eastern side. I have not stated it as a samadhies of Sanak, Sanandan, Sanatan and Sanat Kumar. Learned advocate cross-examining the witness has again drawn the attention of witness towards second line at page No. 68 of statement dated 21.2.2005. Witness after reading it

said that this statement is about the Chabutra seen in north east of above picture document No. 154/5. About this Chabutra, my statement was recorded at page No. 68 that there were the samadhies of Sanak, Sanandan, Sanatan and Sanat Kumar. I have in my statement, after seeing the map document No. 136/6, said that the location of samadhies shown in the map is correct. Hence samadhies situated in the north east of disputed Bhawan were of Garg, Gautam and Shandilya and Narad Chabutra was also in the north towards east. According to this map, samadhies of Sanak, Sanandan, Sanatan and Sanat Kumar were in the north West Side of the disputed Bhawan.

Question: It appears from the above statement concerning to above map document No. 136/6 that your statement dated 21.2.2005 at page 68 is not correct because you have in your earlier statement stated that samadhies of Sanak, Sanandan, Sanatan and Sanat Kumar were in the north east of disputed Bhawan, at a place where Chabutra was. Whereas to day you have stated that these samadhies were in the north west of the disputed Bhawan. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: After hearing the above question and statement recorded on 21.2.2005 and in accordance with the photo shown on that day, I could not remember properly and got confused by the name of north east and north west samadhies. But to day i.e. on 01.3.2005 after seeing the map it becomes clear from seeing the Chabutra and samadhies situated near the stairs towards north east that Chabutra of Garg, Gautam,

Shandilya and Narad were in the north east and samadhies of Sankadiks were in north west. Hence the statement given by me on dated 21.2.2005 in second para at page 68, is not correct.

Narad Chabutra in northeast as shown in above picture document No. 154/5 is not clear and the Chabutra seen actually are the samadhies of Garg, Gautam and Shandilya. These samadhies might have been built up during the time of Ramchanderji. Again said that these samadhies were constructed during the time of Ramchanderji after his coronation.

Question: According to your statement, the parts seen in picture document No. 154/5 were of the time of Ramchanderji and might be a part of King Dasratha palace. In these circumstances is it possible to construct the samdhies of those Rishies in the palace?

Answer: These souvenirs shown in the map might have been constructed in the memory of the Rishies who went there in-groups to congratulate Shri Rama after his coronation. All the samadhies shown in the map document No. 136/6 are souvenirs. These samadhies are not as such, where a dead body is buried. Narad Chabutra is also a same type of souvenir. Volunteer:that samadhi means profound meditation towards God. There were in all 12 samadhies including the samadhies shown in the north south in map document No. 136/6. Three among them are in the south side and none is in north side. Witness again said that there are total 9

samadhies in the north and south. Two samadhies are in south side and 7 samadhies are in the north. Besides, one Narad Chabutra in the north and one Lomash Chabutra in the south side are shown in the above map. In my view Narad Chabutra and Lomash Chabutra are also souvenir. So are the Shankar Chabutra and Shankar Darbar. Ramchabutra is not a souvenir because child Rama was sitting in the lap of Kaushaliya. Above nine samadhies and two Chabutras were the souvenirs of Rishies where they used to sit. I have heard about this from the saints of Ayodhya and my Guru and also read in Valmiki Ramayana. I gave a statement on 21.2.2005 that I do not know when this samadhi was constructed, one thousand or two thousand years after Ramchander. My statement was correct. I have stated to day that above samadhies were constructed during the period of Ramchanderji. My both the statements are correct because these samadhies would have been constructed during the period of Ramchanderji or after his period. I do not remember their period. There was no reference in Valmiki Ramayana about the samadhies of Rishies, only arrival of these Rishies was described therein. The samadhies about which my Guru told me, shown in the map document No. 136/6; some among them are clear and some are not. It is not clear whose samadhies are these and in what number.

I have stated in my statement that my Guru had told me that samadhies of Jabali, Narad and Augustya Rishi were among the samadhies situated in the south side.

There is no reference about the samadhies of these three, in the map document No. 136/6. The statement of my Guru is correct that the samadhies of these three Rishies were in the south side. These three samadhies might not be visible at the time when Vakeel Commissioner prepared the map. Among the above thirteen Rishies, Narad, Lomash, Sanat, Sanandan, Sanatan and Sanat Kumar are still alive. I do not know about rest. Live Rishies can have the samadhies because the samadhies constructed in their names are symbolic and are souvenir of their state of meditation. It is not correct that the places, which were shown as samadhies or Chaura or Chabutra in the document No. 136/6, are not the samadhies of Rishies but graves of Muslims.

Ramchabutra shown in document No. 136/6 is 17 X 21 feet in size. It is two and half to three feet in height. Volunteer: that in the earlier statement of mine, I have stated it to be 6 feet in height. I have stated this height as a height from Chabutra to Mandap.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the picture No. 29 and 30 of black and white album document No. 201 C -1. Witness after seeing it said that I am supposing the scenes seen in these pictures as a scene of Ramchabutra. Upon seeing the picture it becomes clear that Chabutra was more than three feet in height and approximately 4 feet. Two caves one the east and other in the western side are seen in picture No. 29 and 30. In these caves, material for Pooja, Prasad and clothes were being kept. I am recollecting that idols of Ram, Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughan in the lap of Kaushaliya, Kekai and Sumitra respectively were kept in the caves. I do not remember, whose idol was kept in the western cave and whose idol

was in the eastern cave. I do not remember whose idols in addition to the idols of Kaushaliya, Kekai and Sumitra, were there. I have not performed worship in any cave. I might have seen these idols. How many times I have seen these idols, I do not remember. Two idols were also on the Chabutra. Idols of Ram, Laxman, Bharat, Shatrughan and Hanumanji are seen in the caves in picture No. 29. I do not remember if Ram, Laxman, Bharat and Shatrughan were sitting in the lap of their mothers or not. There were three idols. All the caves have three thrones, one in each cave. The idols were kept on the throne. I used to go to Ramchabutra occasionally so I do not know the exact details. I remember that these idols were made of eight metals.

The statement given by some witness is not correct that the idol of Ramlalla on the Ramchabutra was removed from there and kept under the mid dome of the building with three domes, on the night of 22<sup>nd</sup>/23<sup>rd</sup> December 1949. In my view an idol of Ramchanderji was already there under mid dome of the disputed Bhawan. This idol was there before the time, when disputed Bhawan was constructed by Meerbaki. In my view King Dasratha had installed an idol of Ramchanderji during his time in memory of Ramchanderji. Since then this idol had been there. I do not remember at present when the idols kept at Ramchabutra were installed. Baba Abhiram Das used to tell me that during the period of Britishers and Governments thereafter had prohibited the darshan of Ramlalla inside the disputed Bhawan, some saints of Ayodhya had installed the idol of Ramchanderji at Ramchabutra as a symbolic to Rama for worship, darshan and parikarma. But I have not seen the idol. Again said that I do not remember if I had seen it or not.

Question: You said yourself to be a devotee of Rama and you are saying that you do not remember whether idol of Ramlalla was there at Ramchabutra or not. Would you please tell whether you have ever seen an idol of Ramlalla on the Chabutra or not?

Answer: Since I had been taking the darshan of Shri Ramlalla sitting at Ramjanmbhoomi, I do not remember properly if I had taken his darshan or not. I cannot say definitely.

Learned advocate cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 31 of above album. Witness after seeing this picture said that two idols of Hanumanji are seen in this picture and one idol aside to it. The scene seen in picture No. 31 is not clear.

Question: I am to say that the scene seen in picture No. 31 is the scene of cave below the Chabutra, which is seen in picture No. 29 and 30?

Answer: May be.

I have no knowledge if the Chabutra seen in picture No. 29 and 30, was constructed after 1857 or not. I have no knowledge about the fact that it was a temporary structure in 1857 and was cemented after 1949, as seen in picture No. 29 and 30. There was a Chhapper over it, this I do remember. There is no reference about this Chabutra in Valmiki Ramayana or Ramcharitmanas. No body says that Ramchanderji was born at this Ramchabutra. In my view this Chabutra has the only recognition that God was sitting there. Every place where God sits gets recognition.

Since people say that the temple situated in the north of road, in the north of disputed site, is a Janmsthan temple. Volunteer: when public was prohibited from taking the darshan of Ramlalla, people used to take darshan of Ramlalla from this place. Some people call it Janmsthan



because they took the darshan of Ramlalla from this place. I do not know in which period, people were prohibited from taking darshan. But my Guru used to say that during the period of fanatic Mughals, people were prohibited from taking darshan in order to hurt them. Meerbaki, commander of Babar, was among one of them. Volunteer:that there is reference about it in "Tulsi Dohashatak". I do not remember the couplet wherein it was mentioned. I have the book. I read it. These couplets are with me in the form of photocopies of the manuscript and not in a form of a book. I have not seen these couplets in book-form. Volunteer:that Tulsidas had distinctively described the condition of that period in these couplets. Tulsidas was during the time of Akbar. The details given by him were of the time of Akbar. There would have been a number of fanatic Mughals, after Akbar. I have no knowledge about them. I have read the details about the period of Akbar in history book. I do not remember in which book I have read it. I remember only two books about history, which I referred above in my statement at page 130. Except this, I do not remember the name of any other book and their authors. There are a number of books available in Ayodhya by the name "Shri Ram Janmbhoomi Ka rakta-ranjit Itihas". These books have distinct writers. I do not remember the name of authors.

I do not remember the name of author of the second book "Ayodhya Ka Pathik – Ashok Singhal" referred above by me in my statement. I have no knowledge if the said author is a historian or a scholar.

Learned advocate cross-examining draw the attention of the witness towards the document No. 44 C – 1/1 of Other Original Suit No. 3/89. Witness after seeing the document No. 44 C –1/1 to 44 C –1/8 said that I have read this book written by Shri Ram Gopal Pandey

“Sharad”. This is the same book, which I have referred in my statement today. I do not remember if I had seen the author Shri Ram Gopal Pandey “Sharad” or not.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the last para of page 14 and 15 of this book (document No. 44 C –1/2, 44 C –1/3). Witness after reading this in reply to a question said I agree with the contents. The facts written in these pages are correct that the temple made by Vikramaditya on 84 pillars of stone (Kasauti) were brought by Hanumanji from Lanka. My Guru had told me about this. Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the comments given at page –15 (document No. 44 C –1/3) of this book. Witness said that I agree with the comments. The incident referred in second para (document No. 44 C –1/4) at page 31 of this book is correct. Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards page –33 (document No. 44 C 1/5) of this book. Witness after reading the page, in reply to a question said that the contents written therein are correct. The Chabutra referred in the last five lines at this page is the same Chabutra, which I referred as “Ram Chabutra” in my statement. Attention of witness was drawn towards page –24 (document No. 44 C –1/6) of this book. Witness after reading it said that I do not agree with the contents written therein because Hindu Community never accepted this as a Babri Mosque, as Shri Ramlalla had been sitting there forever. I have no knowledge about the fact written in first and second line at page No. 34 that “Ramjanmbhoomi was attacked twice by Hindus during the rule of Britishers”, but I have heard that battle for removing Ramlalla had been fought for 76 times. But none had succeeded in removing the Ramlalla from the place where it is at present. I have heard about Hindu-Muslim riots of 1934.

Question: Who had attacked at the disputed site during the 1934 riots and who had caused damage to it, Hindus or Muslims?

(Upon this question learned Advocate Shri Ranjeet Lal Verma on behalf of Other Original Suit No. 3/89 has raised an objection that this fact has not been established that disputed site was attacked by someone. Witness simply said about the riots in between Hindus and Muslims. He has not referred the incident of attack at the Bhawan. Hence question in this regard cannot be asked for from the witness.)

Answer: So far I knew disputed Bhawan was not attacked. Only Hindu-Muslim riots took place and thereafter no Muslim could enter in Ramkot.

Sadhu and Saints of Ayodhya used to beat the Muslims going towards Ramjanmabhoomi. With the result no Muslim went there for fear and Ramlalla was being worshipped regularly.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-  
Ram Vilas Das Vedanti  
1.3.2005

Typed by the stenographer in open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 02.03.2005. Witness to be present.

Sd/-  
(Hari Shankar Dubey)  
Commissioner  
2.3.2005

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

**Dated 2.3.2005**

**D.W.-2/1-3 Shri Ram Vilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide order passed on 3.2.2005, in Other Original Suit No. 4/89.)

(In continuation to dated 1.3.2005, Cross-examination on an oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff No. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued).

During 1934 riots, damage was caused to the disputed Bhawan also. South west corner wall was partially damaged in it. Rear wall of the disputed Bhawan was also damaged but no dome was damaged. I was not born, when the riots of 1934 were broken out. I am telling this on the basis of what I have heard from the people of Ayodhya. I had not talked to any Muslim about the riots of 1934. I have heard about the riots of 1934 and about paying visit to the disputed Bhawan by Muslims from the Sadhus and my Guru Abhiram Das ji. Hindus of Ayodhya were taxed for causing damage to the disputed Bhawan in the riots of 1934 and the disputed Bhawan was repaired from the money so realized. It is not correct to say that Muslims even after the riots of 1934 continued to read namaz in the disputed Bhawan.

(At this point, witness on behalf of defendant No. – 2/1, Other Original Suit No. 4/89, has again submitted the

Hindi version of Sanskrit couplet referred in his Examination in chief affidavit as document No. 11 –F to 11 –O. This was taken on record.)

(In this context, Learned Advocate Shri Tarunjeet Verma, on behalf of plaintiff of Other Original Suit No. 3/89 has submitted second copy of the book “Geetawali”, which was marked with document No. 46 C –1/1 –A. One copy of this book was already filed as document No. 46 C –1/1.)

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the word “Ganj Shaheedan” referred in 10<sup>th</sup> line of second para (page – 31) of document No. 44 C –1/4, Other Original Suit No. 3/89. Witness after reading the para said that I have not heard the name of “Ganj Shaheedan” ever. A Chabutra has been referred in the last but two lines of this page. It was mentioned in these lines that Royal Army had dug Ramchabutra and it was remain in this condition for long time. This fact might be true.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the last para of document No. 44 C –1/6 (page –34) of the document No. 44 C –1/1, Other Original Suit No. 3/89 “Shri Ramjanmbhoomi Ka Rakt-Ranjit Itihas” written by Ram Gopal Pandey “Sharad”. Witness after reading it, in a reply to a question said that I am not following the last four lines of this para. Witness again said that I do not believe on the contents written therein.

Attention of witness was drawn towards first para of document No. 44 C –1/7 (page 95). I agree with this except the word “again”. On inviting attention of witness

towards second para (page 95) of document No. 44 C – 1/7, witness after reading it, in reply to a question, said that the contents of the para are correct. I personally know about the facts written in this para. The facts written in the last para at this page running up to page No. 96 are correct. Some part of the book have been filed with the document No. 110 C –1/52 to 110 C –1/54 of Other Original Suit No. 5/89. Attention of witness was drawn towards the first three lines of para second (page –7) of document No. 110 C –1/52. Witness after reading it said that I do not agree with the given year of birth of Ramchanderji i.e., Nine Lakhs year back because Rama was born One Crore Fifty Lakhs eighty thousand years before from to day. I have read about this at a number of places that this time was assessed by the scholars of the country. Details in this regard are found in “Ramayan-Meemansa”, “Valmiki Ramayana – Ek Drishtikon”, “Valmiki Ramayana – Meemansa” books. Among these Valmiki Ramayana was written by Karpatri ji. Volunteer : that Karpatri’s name was Hariharanand Saraswati. I agree with the matter – “King Prasenjit was a king of Saket during the time of Bodh”, written in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> line (page –7) of document No. 110 C –1/52. Attention of witness was drawn towards last line at this page and first three lines at page –8. Witness after reading it said that the matter written therein is correct. Part of para second (page –7) of document No. 110 C – 1/53, “Manu Dwara Pratishthit Suryavansh----- Ayodhya ko Apni Rajdhani Banaya”, is correct. “God Rama coronated during Tretayug in 64<sup>th</sup> generation of Suryavansh”, is also correct. The fact “King Anranya Dev of 64<sup>th</sup> generation of Suryavansh had constructed a magnificent palace at this place” is correct. Witness again said that it is not correct that King Anranya Dev was the king in the 64<sup>th</sup> generation of Suryavansh because king

Anranya Dev was before Ramchanderji. So far I remember he was born in 61<sup>st</sup> generation of Suryavansh. The matter written at this page that Ravana had destroyed the king palace constructed by Anranya Dev and had taken away its 84 pillars with him, is not correct because this fact is not in conformity with the Valmiki Ramayana. I have also read the book "Shri Ramjanmbhoomi Ka Rakt-Ranjit Itihas" mentioned at document No. 110 C -1/52 of Other Original Suit No. 5/89.

Translation, filed as document No. 11 -F and 11 -G, referred in para -21 of my Examination in chief affidavit, is the translation of couplet No. 8, 9 and 10 of Canto -18 of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana, which is correct. It is a translation-cum-analysis. Translation and analysis of couplet No. -8 has not been given separately because it was not possible to do so. However translation and analysis of couplet No. 8 and 9 is given together; which is given in the first to fifth line, up to "Sthan ko dekh rahe thay" at page No.11F. Translation and analysis of couplet No. 10 was given from the fifth line of document No. 11 - F, "that place" or "that" to the last of document No. 11 -G i.e., up to Shri Rama appeared". There is no reference of Rama's birthplace in the translation and analysis of couplet No. 8 and 9 given by me but this couplet indicates about Ramjanmbhoomi.

Question: There is no indication, on the basis of which, it can be said that above couplet No. 10 indicates the disputed site as Ramjanmbhoomi, is given in the translated document No. 11 -F and 11 - G, in which you have written about the 10<sup>th</sup> couplet of 18<sup>th</sup> Canto of Balkand. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: I am to say that the analysis given in fifth line of para -21 to the last line of document No. 11 -G, indicates about Ramjanmbhoomi.

The words "Prakrishten Udhayman, Udeeyaman Prakyaman, Prakashman Bhoomou Parambraham Shri Ram Chandrasya" etc. given in the sixth line of document No. 11 -F, indicate this place.

The words given in document No. 11 -G indicates the Janmbhoomi or Janmsthan of Ramchanderji, land respected by all, Holy Land, where Kaushaliya gave birth to Rama with unique characters, where Rama appeared.

Question: No word or line mentioned by you in document No. 11 -F and 11 -G, above indicate that disputed site was a Ramjanmbhoomi. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct to say.

It is not correct to say that the translation and analysis of couplet No. 8, 9 and 10 of 18<sup>th</sup> Canto of Balkand of Valmiki Ramayana, given by me in document No. 11 -F and 11 -G, is not correct. It is not correct to say that the translation or analysis of couplet No. 8, 9 and 10 given in Valmiki Ramayana document No. 261 C -1/1 (page -69), is not correct in totality.

I have filed the translation of couplet No. 10 to 25 of Ayodhya Mahatamya, referred in para -21 of my examination in chief affidavit, in document No. 11 -H to 11 -L. I have no idea about the number of couplets in "Ayodhya Mahatamya". I have given the extracts of a few couplets of it, in para -24 of my examination in chief affidavit.



Ayodhya Mahatamya is a part of Vaishnav Khand of Skand Puran. Skand Puran contains the conversation held in between Skand, who was a Rishi and deity and Narada. Rishies are three types – Devrishi, Rajrishi and Brahmishi. Rishies are not deities but are like deities. Narad is a Rishi and not a God or deity. Skand Puran is in Seven Volumes – Namely Maheshwar part, Vaishnav part, Brahm part, Kashi part, Avantika part, Nagar part and Prabhas part. Maheshwar part is further divided in to three sub-parts; Kedar part, Komarika part and Arunchal part. Skand Puran has about 81000 couplets and details about various places and holy places. “Ayodhya Mahatamya” is concluded in this part too. Ayodhya Mahatamya contains the description of various places and sacred places of Ayodhya and borders of Ayodhya. Brahmkund, Rinmochan Ghat and Pappmochan Kund are described in it as sacred places. It also contains the details about Swargdwar, exaltation of Chanderhari holy place. It contains the detail about Dharmhari and Swarnhari sacred places. Exaltation of Samved teerath, Sita kund, Gupthari and Chakrahari were mentioned in it. It also contains the details about Goptar teerath and journey to abode by Shri Rama. Vashishta Kund is also described in it. Various sacred places like Gayakoop etc. were also described in the last part of it. “Gayakoop is a famous sacred place. This part also contains the exaltation about ‘Nandigram’ and ‘Jata Kund’. It was mentioned about Jata Kund that Shri Ramchanderji had got his mated hair trimmed at this place hence this place is called Jata Kund. It is also mentioned about this Jatakund that it is a highest sacred place. Veermatgajendra was referred in the north of this place. It is said about Veermatgajendra that he was a gallant person who guarded the Ayodhya. It was also written

there that Pindarak was in the west of Matgajendra. The fact written therein is not correct that Pindarak is in the west of Matgajendra because according to Ayodhya Mahatamya of Skand Puran, Pindarak is in the west of Ramjanmbhoomi, which is correct. I do not remember in which direction from the Matgajendra, Pindarak is. I know both the places Pindarak and Matgajendra.

The word Pindarak is figuring in couplet No. 13 referred in para 24 of my Examination in chief affidavit. Learned advocate cross-examining the witness had drawn the attention of witness towards document No. 289 C – 1/202 of O.O.S. 5 –3 where in Pindarak was shown in the east north of disputed site. Witness after seeing the map said that location of Pindarak, shown in the map, is not correct. In my view it should have been shown in the west of Brahmkund. I have not seen Pindarak place in Ayodhya of to day. I have heard from my Guru about this place. The above statement of mine is based upon the saying of my Guru and on the description given in Ayodhya Mahatamya. I have in my statement, just now, stated that I know Pindarak. It is based upon the saying of my Guru. I myself had not seen this place; Matgajendra place is also known as “Maatgair”. Whatever I have heard about Matgajendra, on the basis of it I cannot say at what distance from this place, Kanak Bhawan is. Because Pindarak is located at the bank of Saryu River in Manjha i.e., in sandy plain. According to my knowledge no pooja etc. is performed at Pindarak now a days. It is not correct to say that in accordance with the faith of Saints and Mahants of Ayodhya, Pindarak is situated in the east north of the disputed site. It is also not correct to say that location of Pindarak as described in the couplet No. –13, translation of which is given at page 11 –I, is not correct.

The location of "Vighneshwara" described in the translation of the couplet No. 16 and 17, mentioned in para -24 of my Examination in chief affidavit, was stated to be in the west of the disputed site. I myself had not seen the place called Vighneshwara because it is located in a sandy place. Vighneshwara would have been at the place where Pindarak was. Volunteer: that there is mention about it in Ayodhya Mahatamya. My Guru had told me about the place where Vighneshwara was. 'Ishan Kon' means location in between north and east. Pindarak is in the west of Vighneshwara. Although, I have not seen both the places.

Question: At what place in Ayodhya Mahatamya it is written that Pindarak is in the west of Vighneshwara?

Answer: It is stated in couplet No. -16 that Pindarak is in the west of Vighneshwara.

Question: It is nowhere written in the translation of couplet No. -16, filed by you to day at page No. 11 -I that Pindarak is in the west of Vighneshwara. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: I have not rendered the free translation. It is a word-by-word translation. Hence it is not written there that Pindarak is in the west of Vighneshwara.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards his statement recorded at page 123 on 28.2.2005 that "in the translation rendered by me -----Vashishta Kund is at the corner in the south west side". Witness said that his statement is correct.

Since Vighneshwara was mentioned in Ayodhya Mahatamya, it would have been there definitely but at

present it is not seen. My Guru did not told me that Vighneshwara still exists. He told me that Vighneshwara was mentioned in Ayodhya Mahatamya.

Question: Have you ever heard from any saint or Mahant or anyone where the Vighneshwara is?

Answer: I have heard that there was a place named Vighneshwara, situated at a sandy land at the bank of Saryu River, which was consigned to flow of Saryu River water. This place was described in Ayodhya Mahatamya.

This sandy land of Saryu River was in the north south, about one kilometer in width and spread to four to five kilometers in east west. Saryu's River sandy land is spread from the line drawn below the Prahlad Ghat up to the line drawn below Rajghat, in document No. 289 C – 1/202. Vighneshwara would have been in this place and Pindarak also. Volunteer:that temples would have been constructed in Ayodhya in the memory of these places, later on. Water of Saryu River flooded at the place where Pindarak and Vighneshwara were. The places shown as Pindarak and Vighneshwara in the map document No. 289 C –1/202 are the places constructed in the memory of Pindarak and Vighneshwara. These are not the original places.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness has again drawn the attention of witness towards his statement, dated 28.2.2005, recorded in the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> line of para 1, at page No. –123, that "According to me Janmsthan is in the west south side of Vighneshwara". Witness after reading it said that his statement was not correct. The part of my statement in this para that

"According to me Janmsthan -----  
 -- of Vighneshwara" is not correct.

It is not correct because it is in not accordance with the couplet.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness has again drawn the attention of witness towards his statement recorded at page -123 and asked for whether the statement as a whole, given by the witness is not correct. Witness said that it is not correct to say that the whole statement is not correct.

Question: Would you please tell the correct part of statement recorded at page -123, which according to you is correct?

Answer: First 6 lines of the page 123 are correct. Statement at 7<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> lines is not correct. Statement recorded in 12<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> line is correct.

Question: You have just now stated that your statement in line 12<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> at page No. 123 is correct. Your today's statement and the statement written in 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> line at page 123 are not contradictory to the statement given by you at page 123 in line 7<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> about which you have said today that it is not correct?

Answer: I have not followed the question asked for by Learned advocate cross-examining the witness.

Question: I want to know whether there is a contradiction in between the statement given by you above?

Answer: My statement based on the map may not be correct but couplet is correct. Whatever statement based on the couplets I have given is correct and if you want to understand the statement again in the form of couplets, I can make an analysis of each couplet in Hindi.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Ram Vilas Das Vedanti

2.3.2005

Typed by the stenographer in open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 03.03.2005. Witness to be present.

Sd/-

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

2.3.2005

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

**Dated 3.3.2005**

**D.W.-2/1-3 Shri Ram Vilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide order passed on 3.2.2005, in Other Original Suit No. 4/89.)

(In continuation to dated 2.3.2005, Cross-examination on an oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff No. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued).

Vashishta Kund is at a distance of one furlong from the disputed site. Vashishta Kund is situated at the road, leading to Tedhi Bazar from Dorahi Kuan. Crossing of Dorahi Kuan in the rear part of disputed place is at a distance of about 500 feet in the western side. Vashishta Kund is in the south of this crossing. Vashishta Kund is in the south towards west, from the disputed site. Kuber Teela is in the south side of disputed site. Kuber Teela is at a distance of 600-700 feet from the disputed site. Vashishta Kund is at a distance of about 200-250 feet from Kuber Teela. Vashishta Kund is in the western side of the road leading to Tedhi Bazar from Dorahi Kuan. Vashishta Kund is adjacent to this road. A grand idol of Vashishta ji is in the hall of Vashishta Kund. Beside this, there is a Kund called Vashishta Kund.

Vashishta – vatika is above the Vashishta Kund hall. The hall is adjacent to the road and kund is next to it. Brahm Kund Ghat is in the West Side at a distance of 400-500 feet approx. from Dorahi Kuan crossing. Sandy land of Saryu River begins after Brahm Kund. Brahm Kund Gurdwara is situated at the Ghat. Pindarak is in the western side towards south from Brahm Kund. I cannot say the distance from Brahm Kund to Pindarak. Vighneshwara is in the west south from Pindarak. Pindarak is in the eastern side from Vighneshwara. This place is in curvature position towards north. Vashishta Kund is in the south, towards east, from Vighneshwara. The direction Vashishta Kund from the Vighneshwara is similar to the direction from Pindarak. Matgajendra is in the northeast from Pindarak. I do not know the distance from Matgajendra to Pindarak. May be 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet, one Kilometer or two-kilometer. I have no knowledge about this. It is not correct to say that I have no knowledge about the location of Matgajendra and Pindarak.

Question: The reason behind not telling the distance from Pindarak to Matgajendra may be that this would contradict your earlier statement?

Answer: It is not correct to say.

Brahmkund is in the north west of Vashisht Kund. Crossing of Dorahi Kuan is in the north of Vashisht Kund in a curvature position towards east. It is not correct to say that Dorahi Kuan crossing is at a distance of about one thousand yards from the disputed site. There was a slope in the western side of the Bhawan before it was demolished in 1992. It is not correct to say that there was no pit in the western side of the disputed Bhawan. There



was hundred to hundred and fifty-meter long slope in the west, in the rear part of disputed Bhawan, before its demolition.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 5 and 6 of the black & white album document No. 201 C -1. Witness after seeing these pictures said that a slope is seen in these pictures in the rear part of the disputed Bhawan. A new wall was constructed in rear part of the disputed Bhawan in 1991. This wall was constructed during the Chief Ministership of Shri Kalyan Singh. This wall was constructed at a distance of 10-12 feet from the place where slope begins. There were fields after that wall. Next to fields, there were temples, which still exists. There was a house, one tree, which exists still and a road thereafter. The fields did not belong to any Muslim. Mahantji of the temple had been using these fields. I do not know name of owner of the fields. This temple was 100 feet in width, including the Chabutra in the east west. It had a length about 125 feet in north south. There was a little house in the west of temple.

This house was about 20-25 feet in width in east west. There was a tree next to it and crossing of Dorahi Kuan was next to it. I have the knowledge about the road leading to disputed site from Dorahi Kuan crossing. Volunteer: that the road leading to Ramjanmbhoomi from Hanumangarhi is divided into two parts from the place "Bari Jagah". One road leads to Dorahi Kuan from the north side of Ramjanmbhoomi via Ramkot and second road leads towards south side. After a little distance this road leads to Kanak Bhawan and further goes to Tridand crossing via Ved Mandir.

There were fields in the southern side of the road, in the west side of the disputed Bhawan, leading to Dorahi Kuan from Hanumangarhi and some vacant land and a few houses were there in the north of the road. I have not seen any house of Kureshies or other Muslims in the south opposite to Dorahi Kuan. Volunteer: that I have seen houses of Hindus only. I have no knowledge if the houses of Muslims were also demolished in Ayodhya when disputed Bhawan was demolished in 1992. But I have read about it in the newspapers. I have not seen any Muslim's house, brunt or demolished at Dorahi Kuan or at any other place in Ayodhya after 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. I have not seen any house of Muslim because I do not look on the houses.

My Ashram in Ayodhya is situated in the east of Faizabad-Gorakhpur National Highway, at the southern bank of Rampaidi. I do not know at what distance from there the "Mughalpura" is because I never heard the name of "Mughalpura". I have not heard about "Suthatti" Mohalla and "Kazipur" Mohalla but I have heard the name of "Panjipur" Mohalla but I have not seen it.

Saket University falls on the way from Faizabad to Ayodhya. I do not know the name of any Mohalla adjacent to Ramjanmbhoomi Police Station. I have heard the name of Begumpura Mohalla but do not know about it. I would have been to this Mohalla. Where this Mohalla was situated, I do not remember.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the statement recorded on 28.2.2005 at page -119. Witness after reading the part - "Begumpura Mohalla has been shown in the north of Vibhishan Kund. Said that its location is also shown

correctly” in eighth and ninth line at this page. My statement is correct. Volunteer:that he might have given his statement on the basis of map.

Question: Have you given the above statement without knowing the location of Begumpura Mohalla?

Answer: Begumpura Mohalla is written in the map on the basis of which I have given my statement.

Question: My question was whether you have given the above statement without knowing the location of Begumpura Mohalla. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct to say. I have given my statement about Begumpura Mohalla after seeing the map.

Question: You have stated in the above statement that location of Begumpura Mohalla, shown in the map, is correct. You can say about the location of any Mohalla only if you know where the Mohalla in Ayodhya is. Then my question is whether you have given your statement without knowing about the location of Begumpura or you had the knowledge about Begumpura Mohalla?

Answer: This question is Dubadham – Subadham. This question has been asked twice. The question is not correct. I have already stated about the location of Begumpura Mohalla after seeing the map. Hence asking question again and again is not just.

Question: Because today you have stated in your statement "I have heard the name of Begumpura Mohalla but not seen it-----where the Mohalla is and it is not remember to me" and on 28.2.2005 at page 119 you have stated that the location of Begumpura shown in the map is correct. Hence you was asked for the question. Because only one answer can be correct out of both answers and one is not correct but you are in spite of replying a question beating about the bush. It appears that you do not want to answer the question. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct to say that I do not want to answer the question. Had I not answer the question how I would have said that Begumpura is in the north of Vibhishan Kund. I am saying even to day that I do not know where the Begumpura was. But when I recollected about the Vibhishan Kund on seeing the map, I in very clear terms said that I know Begumpura. It might be possible that during the question-answer hours, I would have used the words in haste and Cross-examining had not followed the answer properly and hence he is asking the questions about the location of Begumpura again and again.

I am stating to day that I know about Begumpura. My earlier statement about not knowing the Begumpura was also correct.

Question: You, on one side states on an oath that you know Begumpura Mohalla and on the other hand saying "I do not know about it" and again saying that both the statements are correct. Please tell us whether you are habitual for giving false statement?

(At this point Learned Advocate on behalf of plaintiffs O.O.S No. 5/89 has raised an objection that witness is being confused by asking the same question again and again and witness is being harassed by leveling unnecessarily allegation. Hence such question should not be allowed particularly when witness has already expressed his view about the knowledge in regard to Begumpura.)

(On the above objection, Learned Cross-examining has raised a counter objection that the above objection by learned Advocate on behalf of plaintiff Suit No. 5/89 is very regrettable because witness knowingly giving false statement, which is also effecting the dignity of Court and Learned Advocate in spite of persuading the witness to cause true statement, is objecting the question.)

(Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey, Advocate has answered the counter objection by saying that witness is giving statement for maintaining the dignity of the Court; witness can answer the question in accordance with his Caliber and reason. I have no objection in asking true fact from the witness but asking a question again and again to harass, torture the witness mentally is objectionable. Hence such question should not be allowed.)

Answer: It is not correct because I have already answered the question properly so I do not

think it proper to answer the same question again and again. I am deposing in this case to maintain the dignity of Court. I do respect the court and ready to give statement.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the part of his statement "Pindarak namak sthan vivadit sthal-----namak sthal per main kai bar gaya hun" recorded at page -121 on 28.2.2005. Witness after reading this said that my above statement is also correct.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards a part of statement recorded to day "I cannot say how far the Pindarak is from Brahmkund" and " I do not know the distance of Pindarak from Matgejendra". Witness after reading these parts, in reply to a question said that both the statements of mine are correct.

Question: When you know the distance from disputed site to Pindarak, why you are not able to say about the distance of Brahmkund to Pindarak?

Answer: I have stated the distance from Pindarak after seeing the Pindarak in the map which was discussed on 28.2.2005 in second para at page -121. Since it is not possible to identify the distinct place of Pindarak because the Pindarak described in the couplet of Ayodhya Mahatamya of Skand Puran was in the sandy land at the bank of Saryu River. Hence it is not possible to guess about the distance of Pindarak. The Pindarak described in second para at page -

121 is not the Pindarak described in Ayodhya Mahatamya.

It is not possible to identify the location of Pindarak referred in Ayodhya Mahatamya of Skand Puran, because it is in the sandy land. The Pindarak and Vighneshwara described in the couplet of Ayodhya Mahatamya, referred in para -24 of Examination in chief affidavit were situated in a sandy land and it is not possible to identify their location. Since I have no knowledge about these two places, I could not go at these places. Since both the places are in the sandy land of Saryu River and nobody knows about these places, people do not go to these places. I have not read about the location of these places in any other books also.

Place named after Lomash referred in my examination in chief affidavit in para -24, was described in couplet No. -19 only. There was no reference in the couplet about the distance of Lomash named place from the disputed site. These couplets are, in Sanskrit Language. Among the couplets given in para-24 of my Examination in chief affidavit the word "Janmsthan" was used in the couplet No. 18, 19 and 24 and the word "Janmbhoomi" was used in couplet No. -22 and 25. Both the words "Janmsthan" and "Janmbhoomi" were used in Ayodhya Mahatamya for one purpose and one meaning only. It is not correct to say that the word "Janmsthan" is not used in Sanskrit Language. The word "Janmbhoomi" and "Janmsthan" were used in Ayodhya Mahatamya for the disputed site and for the place where Ramlalla is sitting. It is not correct to say that the word "Janmsthan" or "Janmbhoomi" were not used in Ayodhya Mahatamya for the disputed site. It is correct that the distance of Janmbhoomi or Janmsthan from any place is not given in

the couplets referred in para -24 of my Examination in chief affidavit. It is also not correct to say that the Vashishta Kund referred in my statemnet is not in the south side of the disputed site but in the western side. It is also not correct to say that the place called Lomashh Chaura is in the north of disputed site. It is also not correct to say that no temple by the name of Janmsthan or Janmbhoomi was referred in Ayodhya Mahatamya.

I have filed the translation of the couplets of Skand Puran in document No. 11 -I and 11 -J. Significance of "Vighneshwara" was described in the translation of couplet No. -17. Western side of Ramjanmbhoomi was described in couplet No. -16. This reference was about the western wall of Ramjanmbhoomi and not for any other place. Again said that it is not correct to say that western wall of the Ramjanmbhoomi was described in above couplet No. -16. Then said that western wall of Ramjanmbhoomi was referred in couplet No. 16 and poojan of Ganeshji was referred therein. The word "that place" referred in couplet No. -18 were used for the place named "Vighnesh". I have referred about the Ishan Kon of Vighenshwara in the translation of couplet No. 18. I have used the word "that place" in the translation but it should be "from that place" in actual. Ishan Kon I mean towards northeast i.e., towards north leaning a little too eastern side.

The word "Tasmat Sthanat" referred in 18<sup>th</sup> couplet referred in para -24 of my examination in chief affidavit means "From that place".

The alphabet " £ " above " ÷, " used in couplet No. 18, is not correct. The word actually is "Tasmat Sthanat". Similarly the word "Aishane" used in couplet No. 18, is not correct; it should be "Ishane".



Translation of the word "Ramjanm Parvartate" used in first line of couplet No. 18 is given in document No. 11 –J. Literal meaning of the word "Parvartate" is "is". "Ramjanm" means birth of Ramchanderji. "Ramjanm Parvartate" means "birth of Rama took place". The word "Janmsthanidam" used in second line of this couplet means, "it is Janmsthan". "Proktam" means, "it is said" or "to be known". The word "Pramrimum" used in the translation of couplet No. 18, document No. 11 –J, is not correct. It should be "Proktam". The words used in couplet No. 18 are for the Ramlalla sitting in Shriramjanmbhoomi.

Question: The word used in couplet No. 18, does not indicates the meanings that one can get salvation by taking darshan of Shri Ramlalla and the idols or place?

Answer: The word "Idam" used with word "Janmsthanmidam" indicates Ramlalla sitting in Janmbhoomi. It would have not been a Janmbhoomi of Shri Rama, if Ramlalla is not sitting there and the word "Mokshadiphalsadhanam" have not been used in the couplets. It means that one can get salvation by taking the darshan of Shri Ramlalla Sitting in Janmbhoomi.

Question: I am to say that meaning of second line of 18<sup>th</sup> couplet is that "this Janmsthan is recognized as a place giving salvation". What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: You have expressed the substances in brief.

This meaning is also correct in itself

Question: Meaning of the first line of 18<sup>th</sup> couplet is that "Rama was born in the Ishancon (north-west) from that place". What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: "Rama was born" is correct but he was born in the birthplace of Rama, which is at the northwest corner.

Question: The word "that place" figuring in 18<sup>th</sup> couplet means "Vighneshwara" the location of which is not known from any book or Ayodhya Mahatamya. Hence, it cannot be said that disputed site was indicated as "Ramjanmbhoomi" in 18<sup>th</sup> -19<sup>th</sup> or in any other couplet. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: Learned advocate cross-examining the witness has earlier said that Shri Ramjanmbhoomi is situated at northwest corner. Then why Learned Advocate using the word "Tasmat Sthanaat" for this question that Rama was born there.

"Vighneshwaratpurvabhage" is the first word of 19<sup>th</sup> couplet. Literal meaning of which is "in eastern side of Vighneshwara". Here part and direction are used for one purpose i.e., part means direction.

Question: Translation of this word rendered by you in document No. 11 -J is "In eastern part". Is it correct and what you are saying now, "it is in east direction" is not correct?

Answer: It is not correct to say.

"Vashishtadutare" is the second word of first line of couplet No. –19. It's literal meaning is "in the northern part of Vashishta" i.e., in northern direction. Vashishta means Vashishta Kund.

Question: I am to say that literal meaning of "Vashishtadutare" is "in the north of Vashishta" and cannot be "in the north direction from Vashishta Kund". What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: "Vashishtadutare" is a Sanskrit word. The sound of "Vashishta" is fifth division i.e., "from" and not "of". If it stood for "of" it would have been "Vashishtasya". From the point of grammar this word of Sanskrit, cannot be "from" in spite of "of". Hence, what you are saying that it is not a Vashishta Kund, is not correct. Whereas at present, Vashishta Kund is there and an idol of Vashishta is also there.

The translation of couplet No. –19, which I have given in document No. 11 –J, I have written that "in the north of Vashishta Kund". It is correct.

Question: You yourself have written the translation of "Vashishtadutare" as "in the north of Vashishta Kund". But now you are saying that the meaning of "Vashishta" is "from" and not "of". And you are also saying that the meaning given by you in second line of para –19 at document No. 11 –J is also correct. Please tell which

meaning is correct – given at page 11 –J or given by you in your statement above?

Answer: Both the meanings are correct. If analysis or proposition is done and is translated along with the proposition, it would mean the same. Which I have given in the last and in brief it's meaning would be as mentioned in document No. 11 –J.

Question: Should I comprehend that in brief its meaning is "of" instead "from" and in detail meaning it would be "from" instead "of"?

Answer: There is formula in grammar, "Shashtyarth Panchamayo" according to which, at sometime when used in fifth division, it stand for Shashtyarth. Hence both the meanings are correct.

It is correct to say that the translation of "Vashishtadutare" is "in the northern part of Vashishta Kund" as given in couplet No. –19.

If we add "Vashishtadutare" of 19<sup>th</sup> couplet with the words "Tat Smritam" of the same couplet, it would mean "Janmsthan is in the northern part of Vashishta Kund".

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-  
Ram Vilas Das Vedanti  
3.3.2005

Typed by the stenographer in open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 04.03.2005. Witness to be present.

Sd/-  
(Hari Shankar Dubey)  
Commissioner  
3.3.2005

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

**Dated 4.3.2005**

**D.W.-2/1-3 Shri Ram Vilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide order passed on 3.2.2005, in Other Original Suit No. 4/89.)

(In continuation to dated 3.3.2005, Cross-examination on an oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff No. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued).

In the translation of couplet No. -19 referred in para -24 of my Examination in chief affidavit given in document No. 11 -J, wherein translation of "Lomashhatpaschame" was given as "Janmsthan is in the western part of Lomash". It is a literal meaning. Literal meaning of first line of 20<sup>th</sup> couplet is that one gets salvation from rebirth. Literal meaning is that one gets salvation without donation, penance, going to sacred place and Yajna. Literal meaning of the word "Janmbhoomay Pradarshanat" used in second line of couplet No. -22 means "particularly by taking darshan of Janmbhoomi. The alphabet "Pra" in the word "Pradarshanat" means "particularly". Literal meaning of first line of 22<sup>nd</sup> couplet is that " a person who regularly take darshan of Janmsthan". Literal meaning of the second line of 24th couplet is "the reward one get from serving mother-father, Gurus and gentlemen". Except the above literal meaning, whatever I have written in the translation is the analysis of the word.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the 10<sup>th</sup> couplet referred in para -24 of his examination in chief affidavit. The literal meaning of which is to take darshan for the fulfillment of all wishes. The meaning of word "Tasya" used in 10<sup>th</sup> couplet is "that". The word "that" stands for "Ayodhya". Meaning of first two lines of 10<sup>th</sup> couplet is that "it is fruitful to take darshan, worship with respect for the fulfillment of all wishes". Translation of third line of 10<sup>th</sup> couplet is given along with the translation of 11<sup>th</sup> couplet. Literal meaning of third line is that "Should performed with songs and playing with instruments". Literal meaning of first line of 11<sup>th</sup> couplet is that "Pilgrimage should be done on the third day during Navratras". Literal meaning of second line of 11<sup>th</sup> couplet is that "Should obtained spiritual knowledge for the progeny". Literal meaning of last line of 11<sup>th</sup> couplet is "Various types of songs, dances, festivals appears good". There is only one line in 12<sup>th</sup> couplet, the literal meaning of which is "there is no doubt that by doing such work one gets protection". The 13<sup>th</sup> couplet contains three lines. Literal meaning of first line is that, highest saint lives in its western part. Literal meaning of second line is that "Pindarak famous by this name and is vigorous". Literal meaning of the last line is that "one should honestly worship with water, flower, Akshat etc.".

It is not correct that Ayodhya Mahatamya was added to Skand Puran later on. In my view, Ved Vyasa ji created Skand Puran and Ayodhya Mahatamya was included in Skand Puran. Ved Vyasa ji was in Dwaper Yuga. Ved Vyasa ji was born lakhs of years later to Ramchanderji. Location of Pindarak, Vighneshwara, Vashishta Kund and Lomash, described in Ayodhya Mahatamya by Ved Vyasa

ji was with reference to the time of Ramchandra's period. Ved Vyasa ji on the basis of his knowledge gained after meditation has described the location, which were lakhs of years before. It is not correct to say that the reference given in para -24 of my Examination in chief affidavit to the effect that disputed land was distinctively described as a birthplace of God Rama, in Ayodhya Mahatamya, is not correct.

It is also not correct to say that from the couplets referred by me in para -24 of my Examination in chief affidavit, it cannot be concluded that disputed land is the birthplace of Shri Rama.

It is not correct to say that there is no reference about the Ramjanmbhoomi in the *Richaas* of Atharv Ved mentioned in para -25 of my examination in chief affidavit. Literal meaning of the first line of 28<sup>th</sup> *Richa* is that "to the Brahmpur where Brahm sleeps". The word "Purush Uchayate" used in the same line means "Brahm sleep there". Literal meaning of 29<sup>th</sup> *Richa* is that "the Brahmpur known in Vedas that puri is full of prosperity". Vedic deities provided eyes, soul and progeny to it". Both the lines of third *Richa* means that eyes, soul does not leave one before attaining the old age who knows Brahampuri.

Literal meaning of 31<sup>st</sup> *Richa* is that Ayodhya is a city of deities with eight wheels, nine doors. Its' Gold reserve always remains full with the lustre of heaven. I have in the translation rendered by me at document No. 11 -N, written the meaning of treasure as "Sheshagar", it should be "Koshagar" (treasury).

I have in para 26 of my Examination in chief affidavit, while referring "Vashishsta Sanhita" and "Rudryamal"

written that it is a main city among the seven cities. I have referred couplet No. -54 of chapter -30 of Rudrayamal in para -26 of my Examination in chief affidavit but has not given the extract of this couplet in my affidavit.

I have not written chapter and couplet number of the couplet referred in para -27 of my affidavit. I can say about this only after studying the book "Manas Piyush", wherein Rudryamal was described. I will state about this book after its perusal, after lunch.

Couplet described in para -27 was defined in document No. 11 -O. Meaning of its first line is "Akaar" which means Vasudev. "Yakaar" means Prajapati Brahma. "Ukaar" is for Shankarji, which is worshipped by Munies. Word "Ayodhya" was not referred in this couplet. However, I presume that Ayodhya was indicated in this. Meaning of " , " , " i , " , " , " is given in this couplet. Meaning of the word "Dhya" is also given in this couplet. It is not correct to say that the words " , " , " i , " , " , " and "Dhya" were used in this couplet but their meaning was not given. It is not correct to say that there was no reference about "Ramjanmbhoomi" in this couplet. I have not referred about "Ramjanmbhoomi" in the translation rendered by me. I have mentioned Ayodhya. It is not correct to say that there is no reference about "Ramjanmbhoomi" and "disputed site" in "Rudryamal" and "Vashishta Samhita". "Rudryamal" was written by a Rishi but I do not know his name.

I have no knowledge when "Rudryamal" was written. But it was written during the period of Rama. I have no knowledge if the book is 100-200 years, thousand to two thousand or lakhs of years old or not. Vashishta Samhita



was written by Vashishta ji, during the period of Rama. My Guru Shri Abhiram Das had told me about this.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards fifth and sixth line of para -8 of his Examination in chief affidavit. Witness said that the word "disputed site" means a part below the mid dome of the disputed Bhawan with three domes.

After coming to Ayodhya in 1968 I went on the second day for the first time to take darshan of disputed site. I took the darshan from outside of the gate with grill. Thereafter I have been taking darshan regularly from that place upto the period when it was unlocked.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw that attention of witness towards picture No. 37 of black and white album document No. 201 C -1. Witness after seeing the picture in reply to a question said that a wooden enclosure wall is seen in this picture. I used to take darshan from the outside of this wall. The place from where I used to take darshan is not clear. There was a way for going inside, by the side of a tree seen in this picture. I used to go with my Guru from this gate for darshan, occasionally, prior to it was unlocked. After it was unlocked, I used to go by front gate. There were two gates in the wooden enclosure wall.

Witness after seeing the picture No. 107 of this album, in reply to a question said that which wall is seen in this picture, is not clear. It appears that scene opposite to front wall is seen in this picture. The place from where I used to take darshan, is at about a distance of 25 - 30 feet from the place where idols were kept.

Learned advocate cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards document No. 154/13 of Other Original Suit No. 1/89. Witness after reading it said that when I used to go for darshan, the idols were at the same place, as shown in the map. This place was aside to the Western Wall of the mid dome. The part below the mid dome was about 15 feet in width. Next to it there was courtyard. Courtyard was 20-25 feet in width; Idols were at a distance of 35-40 feet from the place, from where I used to take darshan. At present the idols are at a distance of about 30-35 feet from the place from where people seeks the darshan. An idol of Rama was clearly visible due to the light of bulb, from the place, from where I used to take darshan but other idols were not clearly visible.

I have stated in the affidavit that there were 14 pillars of Kasauti in the disputed Bhawan; out of which 12 pillars were at the inner portion and two were at the door. I have stated in para -10 of my affidavit that picture of Jai-Vijay and deities were engraved on these pillars. Picture of Jai-Vijay were at the main door and not in the inner part. Then said that these pictures would have been in the inner part but were not visible due to mutilation of idols. In addition to the picture of Jai-Vijay, pictures of Shankarji in meditation, Padmasan, Sidhasan were there. Besides, there were pictures of Hanumanji, Durgaji and pictures of Deities are not in a position to recognize.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 25 and 26 of the black and white album document No. 201 C -1. Witness after seeing the pictures said that pillars are seen in these pictures. These pillars are not complete and clear that is why pictures are also not clear. Picture No.

25 is the picture of the place adjacent to main gate. Among these, one picture of Jai-Vijay is seen clear. No picture is seen in picture No. 26. No deity of Jai-Vijay is seen in picture No. 27. At what place the pillar which is seen in this picture was, I do not know.

Upon seeing the picture No. 55, 56, 57 and 58, witness said that some mutilated pictures are seen in picture No. 55. Whose pictures are these is not clear. Pillar seen in picture No. 55 was at the corner below the mid dome. Mutilated pictures are seen in picture No. 55, 56, 57 and 58 but not clear.

Upon seeing the picture No. 59, 60, 61 and 62, witness said that mutilated pictures are seen in these pictures but whose pictures are these is not clear. Upon seeing the picture No. 63, 64, 65 and 66, witness said that mutilated pictures of deities are seen in these pictures but it is not clear whose pictures are these. Pillars seen in picture No. 63, 64, 65 and 66 were in the inner side of temple but at which part, are not clear. Upon seeing the picture No. 71, 72, 73 and 74, witness said that broken idols are seen in these pictures but it is not clear whose idols are these.

Upon inviting the attention of witness towards picture No. 75 and 76, witness said that idols are seen on these pillars. Feet of Shankarji in Singhasan or Padmasan are seen on both the pillars. Figure of foot is seen at the round figure in mid of pillars in picture No. 75 and 76. I am saying this that this is foot of Shankerji because when I saw the pillar in the disputed Bhawan, there was a beheaded body of Shankarji on the pillar. Torso is not seen in the picture. Pillars seen in picture No. 75 and 76 are different pillars. I do not remember at what places

these were in the disputed site. Upon seeing the picture No.86, 87, 88, 89 & 90, witness said that a broken idol is seen in this picture. I am not recognizing an idol seen therein. "Aum" is seen on a stone in picture No. 87 but no idol is there. A broken idol is clearly visible in picture No. 88. A scene of broken idol is seen in picture No. 89. No idol is seen in picture No. 90. I cannot say, at what place the pillars, seen in picture No. 86 to 90 of this album, were. Upon seeing the picture No. 91 of this album, witness said that broken idol is seen in it. Upon seeing the picture No. 95, 96, 97 and 98, witness said that an idol of a deity along with the clothes is seen in picture No. 95 but I am not able to recognize it because this idol is broken. A broken idol is seen in picture No. 96 but whose idol is this, I cannot say. A broken idol is seen in picture No. 97. No idol is seen in picture No. 98 and 99. A broken idol is seen in picture No. 100 but whose idol is this, I cannot say. Upon seeing the picture No. 101, 102, 103 and 104, witness said that idols are seen in picture No. 101, 102 and 103 but whose idols are these, can't say. No idol is seen in picture No. 104. Upon seeing the picture no.105 and 106, witness said that no idol is seen in picture No.105. A broken idol is seen in picture No. 106, so it cannot be recognize. Upon seeing picture No. 81 and 82, witness said that it is a scene of the inner part of the temple and was of the time when 'Swing' used to be organized. Swing was organized in the month of Shravana. This Swing was thereafter kept at the place meant for it. At the occasion of Shravana Swing, idol of Ramlalla was kept on the throne, as is seen in picture No. 81 and 82. After the Shravana month Swing was removed from there and was kept at its original place. An idol, kept on the stairs, was remained there as it was. Only an idol of Rama was used to keep over the swing.

Throne along with swing is seen in picture No. 81 and 82. This is the same throne, which was kept on the stairs.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 47 and 48 of the document No. 200 C –1 of colour album. Witness after seeing the pictures said that mahabiri is painted in picture No. 47, so it is not visible if there is any picture or not. Mahabiri is painted on the picture No. 48, clear picture is not seen but whose picture is this, I cannot say. Upon seeing the picture No. 49, 50, 51, 52, 53 and 54, witness said that no idol is seen in picture No. 49, 50 and 51. The same thing is about picture No. 52, 53 and 54 and no picture is seen therein. Upon seeing the picture No. 58 of this album, witness said that this is the picture of the lower part of Ramchabutra; wherein there were two idols of Hanumanji and an other idol is not clear. Rear part of Ramchabutra is seen in picture No. 66 of this album. No idol kept on Ramchabutra is seen. Tulsi Chaura is seen therein. One boy is standing towards Tulsi Chaura. Upon seeing the picture No. 103 of this album, witness said that a temple and photo of Lal Das Pujari is seen in the picture. A portion below mid dome is seen in it. Upon seeing the picture No. 104, 105, 106, 107 and 108, witness said that a picture of Hanumanji in the mid of Pillar is seen in picture No. 107. No other picture is there in picture No. 107. A non-explicit picture is seen in picture No. 108, upon which mahabiri is painted with. No idol is seen in any other picture. An idol of Hanumanji is in the mid of the pillar and adjacent to place where word "Barni" is written. Upon seeing the picture No. 109, 110, 111, 112, 113 and 114, witness said that a mutilated picture of Hanumanji, painted with mahabiri, is seen in picture No. 109. No picture is seen in any other pillar. Again said that it appears that Hanumanji is standing at

**8678**

the place, painted with mahabiri, in picture No. 114. No picture is seen in the mid of pillar in picture No.112 because picture is not clear.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Ram Vilas Das Vedanti

4.3.2005

Typed by the stenographer in open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further cross-examination for 07.03.2005. Witness to be present.

Sd/-

(Hari Shankar Dubey)

Commissioner

4.3.2005

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

**Dated 7.3.2005**

**D.W.-2/1-3 Shri Ram Vilas Das Vedanti**

(Commissioner appointed by Hon'ble Full Bench vide order passed on 3.2.2005, in Other Original Suit No. 4/89.)

(In continuation to dated 4.3.2005, Cross-examination on an oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff No. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued).

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 115 to 120 of colour album document No. 200 C -1. Witness after seeing the pictures in reply to a question said that a picture, painted with mahabiri is seen in picture No. 115. No pillar is seen in picture No. 116. Volunteer:that a calendar of Ramlalla is seen in this picture. Picture of Hanumanji, painted with mahabiri is seen in picture No. 117. A picture engraved in the middle is seen in picture No. 118. Whose picture is this, it is not clear. The same thing is about picture No. 119. A photo of Hanumanji painted with mahabiri is seen in picture No. 120. At what place in the disputed Bhawan the picture seen in picture No. 115 to 120 were fixed, I cannot say. Picture of Hanumanji seen in the picture No. 115, 117 and 120, is at a place where mahabiri is painted. No other picture is seen to me. At what place in the disputed Bhawan the

picture seen in picture No. 115 to 120, were, I cannot say. Picture of Hanumanji is seen in the picture No. 115, 117 and 120, at a place where mahabiri is painted. No other picture is seen to me.

Learned advocate cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 121 to 126 of this album. Witness after seeing the picture said that a picture of Hanumanji above the nectar pitcher, at a place painted with mahabiri is seen in picture No. 121. Nothing clear is seen on the pillar in picture No. 122. The same thing is about the picture No. 123. An idol, engraved in pillar is seen in picture No. 124 but whose picture is this, is not clear. No picture is seen in picture No. 125. Picture of Hanumanji is seen at a place in picture No. 126, where mahabiri is painted. I cannot say at what places the pillars seen in picture No. 121 to 126 were in the inner parts of disputed Bhawan under the dome. Upon seeing the picture No. 127, witness said that the pillars seen in it were at the place where mahabiri is painted. Upon seeing the picture No. 128 and 129, witness said that a photo Thakur Gurudutt Singh is seen in these pictures at a place under the south dome of the disputed Bhawan at western wall. One scene, taken from different angles, is seen in these two pictures. I have seen this picture at that place since beginning.

Upon seeing the picture No. 131, witness said that a picture of Ram, Laxman and Janki is seen at a wall in this picture. The western wall under northern dome of the disputed Bhawan is seen in this picture. Aarti of the calendar seen in this picture is performed. I do not remember since when this picture is there. Volunteer: that I once performed the Aarti of this calendar. I have performed this aarti prior to, it was unlocked i.e., before



1986. A photo of Rama framed with, at the south-west corner of the wall o south side under mid dome of the disputed Bhawan is seen in picture No. 116. It is not like that only a picture of God Rama, under mid door, is seen in picture No. 116.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw that attention of witness towards picture No. 136, 137 and 138 of this album. Witness after seeing these pictures said that an idol of Hanumanji at a place where mahabiri is painted is seen in picture No. 136. No figure is clear in the picture No. 137. The same thing is about picture No. 138.

Learned advocate cross-examining witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 139 to 144 of this album. Witness after seeing the picture said that pictures are seen in picture No. 141, 142 and 143 but whose pictures are these, is not clear. A Rishi sitting in meditation position is seen in picture No. 141. An idol of Hanumanji at a place where mahabiri is painted with, is seen in picture No. 142 and 143. Pillars seen in picture No. 142 and 143 were on both the sides, at the places where Ramlalla was sitting, then said that it is not clear if these pillars were on both the sides or on one side. It is not clear if the pillars seen in picture No. 142 and 143 are of one or different one.

Learned advocate cross-examining witness draw the attention of witness towards picture document No. 154/13 of Other Original Suit No. 1/89. Witness said that no pillar is seen in this picture. Pillars seen in picture No. 142 and 143 of the colour album were at the Western Wall under mid dome of the disputed Bhawan. These pillars were in

the west of stairs seen in picture No. 154/13 of Other Original Suit No. 1/89.

Learned advocate cross-examining draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 145, 146 and 147 of colour album again. Witness after seeing these pictures said that a upper part of a foot of God Shankar in Padmasan or Sidhasan, is seen in picture No. 146 and 147. This figure is seen below the place where mahabiri is painted.

Learned advocate cross-examining witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 157 to 162 of this album. Witness after seeing these pictures said that a figure of Hanumanji is seen at a place where mahabiri is painted with adjacent to Garur Ghat in picture No. 157. A broken idols above the bell is seen in picture No. 158. Whose picture is this is not clear. The same situation is about the picture No. 159. A figure is seen in picture No. 160 at a place where mahabiri is painted. But whose figure is this is not clear. The same situation is about the picture No. 161. An idol is seen in picture No. 162, at a place where mahabiri is painted with, but whose idol is this, is not clear. Pillars seen in picture No. 157 to 162 wre in the part under the mid dome of the disputed Bhawan. But at what part the particular pillar was, is not clear.

Learned advocate cross-examining witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 163 to 167. Witness after seeing these pictures said that an idol of Hanumanji is seen in picture No. 163, at a place where mahabiri is painted. Upper part of the pillar seen in picture No. 164 and 165 is in broken condition. It appears to me that idols on the pillars were broken out. It appears

from these broken idols that these were engraved in Ramjanmbhoomi. A figure of deity is seen in picture No.166 and 167 at a place where mahabiri is painted. At what places the pillars seen in picture No. 163 to 167 were in the disputed Bhawan, is not clear.

The pillars, about which I have stated, were in a broken position, were in the disputed Bhawan since its construction. These pillars would have been broken at the time of demolition of the Bhawan. These idols would have been broken at the time when Meerbaki demolished the temple for construction of said structure.

Question: My question is this that no broken figure is seen in the picture of any pillars. In fact there was no figure on the pillars. Your statement is imaginary. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct to say that there was no idol on the pillars. Meerbaki, by removing the signs of deities, wants to prove that there was no temple. With this ill will, Meerbaki had tried his best to abolish the signs of Hindu deities by breaking the idols. But none could succeed.

Learned advocate cross-examining witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 176 to 180 of this album. Witness after seeing these pictures said that pictures engraved with in picture No. 176, 177 and 178 are seen in the place where mahabiri is painted. A picture of Ashtbhuji Durga is seen in picture No. 180, at a place where mahabiri is painted.

No figure is seen in picture No. 178 and 179. It is not clear that in which part, the pillars, seen in picture No. 176 to 180 were in the disputed Bhawan.

Learned advocate cross-examining witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 181 to 186 of this album. Witness after seeing these pictures said that an idol of Durga is seen in picture No. 181. God Shankar in Padmasan is seen in picture No. 186, the upper portion of which appears to be cut down with a chisel. The same is the situation with the picture No. 185. No figure is clear in the picture No. 182 and 184. A figure is seen in picture No. 183, at a place where mahabiri is painted with, but whose figure is this is not clear. The pillars seen in picture No. 181 to 186, were in the inner part of the disputed Bhawan, but at which places were these, is not clear. I cannot say that at which part these were in the disputed Bhawan.

Learned advocate cross-examining witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 187 to 192. Witness after seeing these pictures said that a figure of God Shankar, in Padmasan or Sidhasan, without upper torso, is seen in picture No. 187. This figure is seen in the picture No. 187, above the pillar. An idol of Hanumanji is seen in picture No. 188, at a place where mahabiri is painted. The same situation is about picture No. 189 and 190. A mutilated figure is seen in picture No. 191. But whose figure is this is not clear. A figure is seen in picture No. 192. Pillars seen in picture No. 187 to 192 were in the inner part of the disputed Bhawan. But at what places were these, I cannot say.

Learned advocate cross-examining witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 193 to 198.

Witness after seeing these pictures said that an idol's figure is seen in picture No. 193 to 195, but whose picture is this is not clear. This idol is being seen at a place where mahabiri is painted. No idol is seen in picture No. 196 to 198. Pillars seen in picture No. 193 to 198, were at the place where Ramlalla was sitting. At which places this particular pillar was, I cannot say.

Upon seeing the picture No. 199 to 200, witness said that idol of Hanumanji on the pillars, seen in these pictures, were at a place where mahabiri is painted. At which places these pillars were, is not clear.

Upon seeing the picture No. 201 of this album, witness said that a scene of the disputed Bhawan is seen in this picture. But I cannot say which part is seen in this picture.

Question: My question is this that neither any figure is seen clearly nor in a broken position, on the pillars shown to you, in both the albums, document No. 200 C -1 and 201 C -1. The figures stated by you on the pillars are imaginary and false. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the last para at page 177, running into next page No. 178, of his statement dated 4.3.2005. Witness said that I would not be able to say about the couplet described in para -27 of my Examination in chief affidavit and its couplet number verbally. I can state the chapter number and couplet number only after seeing the book "Manas Piyush" to day. Witness with the

permission of the Commissioner, after seeing the book "Manas Piyush" said that the couplet written in para -27 of my Examination in chief affidavit is the couplet No. 62 of "Ayodhya Mahatamya" of "Rudrayamal" chapter number is not given. "Rudrayamal" is a book about *Tantra*. It has two parts – Poorva Tantra and Uttar Tantra. Poorva Tantra contains the description about "Ayodhya Mahatamya". I have not authenticated the couplet number from the book "Rudrayamal". I am stating the couplet number from the book "Manas Piyush".

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the fourth to last lines of para -28 of his Examination in chief affidavit. Witness after reading it, in reply to a question said that a number of Muslims living adjacent to Ksheereshwar Nath temple have stated to me that we want to settle the dispute early. Ramlalla was born in Ayodhya. Every Muslim of alien and native land knows this. I do not remember the name of any Muslim with whom I talked about this. Then said that Rehman Khan was one of them. He lives adjacent to Ksheereshwar temple but I do not remember the name of that Mohalla. Perhaps it is Kaziya. I never went to Kaziya Mohalla. I have seen some houses with green flags but I do not know about the owners of these houses. Because of the flags, it appears that these houses were of the Muslims. Except Kaziya Mohalla, I have not seen any house with green flags in Ayodhya. I met Rehman Khan, prior to the demolition of disputed Bhawan i.e., before the year 1992, for the last time. Rehman Khan told me that disputed site is a birthplace of Shri Rama. A number of people were there at that time but I do not remember the name of any one, among those. Rehman Khan has told me this, near the Ksheereshwar temple. Volunteer: that thousands of saints were gathered there in

1992 when Arjun Singh was about to visit Ayodhya to attend the programme of "SAHMAT" organisation. At that time Rehman Khan was passing from there and he in the presence of all said the above fact. He told me this fact personally. I was leading the demonstration to stop the programme of "SAHMAT" organization.

Decision to stop the programme of "SAHMAT" organization was taken by the saints of Ayodhya. Rehman Khan had met me, at a number of times in the past. But I do not know where he lives. It is not correct to say that no Muslim of Ayodhya had ever told me that disputed site is the birthplace of Shri Rama. It is also not correct to say that no Muslim of Ayodhya is not ready to accept that disputed site is a birthplace of Shri Rama and i.e., it is not a mosque.

I have, in para 29 of my examination in chief affidavit, written the facts concerning to proceedings under Section 145 of Criminal Procedure Code, on the basis, what my Guru Abhiram Das told me. My Guru had told me about this in 1970. I came to know about the records concerning to the proceedings under Section 145 of Criminal Procedure Code, only after seeing the F.I.R. It is not correct to say that no fact was written in F.I.R. about the continuous possession of Hindus over the disputed site. It was not written in the F.I.R. that namaz was never read there in the disputed Bhawan by Muslims but my Guru used to say that no Muslim had ever read namaz there because the pillar of Kasauti have the signs of idols engraved in. My Guru had shown a copy of F.I.R. to me. But I do not know the date and year of F.I.R. Then said this F.I.R. was of the year 1949. I have no knowledge who had written the F.I.R. Perhaps Baldev Das had got it written. Learned advocate cross-examining

the witness draw the attention of witness towards the part of the statement recorded to day – "I have seen the F.I.R. only concerning to the record of proceedings under Section 145 of Criminal Procedure Code. It is not correct to say that the fact about continuous possession of Hindus over the disputed Bhawan was not written therein". Witness said that I have given such a statement. Upon asking that at what place the fact about continuous possession of Hindus was written in the F.I.R. Witness, with the permission of Commissioner, after reading the F.I.R. document No. 115, available in the file of Section 145 of Criminal Procedure Code, said that the fact about continuous possession of Hindus over the disputed Bhawan is not written in the F.I.R. Volunteer: that Ramlalla was already sitting in the disputed site. I have written all the facts in para 29 of my Examination in chief affidavit on the basis of sayings of my Guru. I have neither seen any record nor I have written the para 29 on the basis of records. Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards first three lines of para 30 of his Examination in chief affidavit and asked whether witness has talked to any follower of Islam including Ulema and Scholars, who are prominent in the field of Social, religious, political life on the subject mentioned in para 30. Witness said, I had talked with many people including Mukhtar Abbas Naqvi, Sikander Bakth, Shahnawaz Hussain etc. In addition to this, I have talked with so many other people but their names are not known to me. I have referred the word "Ulema" in para 30 of my affidavit, which means "Dharmaguru". The three persons mentioned above are the followers, Scholars and Ulemas of Islam. Beside these three I do not remember the names of others. Other people, excluding the above three had come to me at my flat in Delhi to meet me; before or after 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992.



These people along with Mukhtar Abbas Naqvi came to me, at my temple "Vashishta Bhawan" in Ayodhya before 1992. Shri Naqvi told me that among the visiting personalities, one is from Rampur, second one is from Delhi and third one is from Allahabad. Mukhtar Abbas Naqvi, Shahnawaz, Sikandar Bakth are national level leader of Bhartiya Janta Party. Among them Sikandar Bakth is no more. These people had been a minister in the Bhartiya Janta Party Government, from time to time.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards last line of page No. 10 and first three lines at page No.11 of para 30 of his Examination in chief affidavit. Witness said that from the word "since time ever" means from the time of Ramchanderji. An idol of Ramlalla, made of eight metals is there since the time of birth of Shri Rama or from the time of King Dasrath. Meerbaki has demolished this Bhawan and constructed the disputed Bhawan, this Bhawan also had three domes.

Question: According to you, Meerbaki had constructed the disputed Bhawan by demolishing the temple. Whether in accordance with your faith an idol of Ramlalla was there at the disputed Bhawan at the time of demolition or these would have been removed from there?

Answer: An idol of Ramlalla was not an ordinary idol. It was an idol of Shri Ramlalla, even after demolishing the temple from time and again oppressors had not seen it. According to the faith of Hindu religion, holy idol was remained there at that place where it is at present.

Question: My question was whether an idol, stated by you, which according to your statement has been at the disputed site since the time of King Dasratha, was removed from the disputed Bhawan or remained there, when Meerbaki demolished the said temple and constructed the disputed Bhawan?

Answer: An idol, where it was, was not seen to Meerbaki because God is seen to devotee only. God does not give his darshan to any oppressor and wicked person; so oppressors and wicked person could not removed an idol of Ramlalla from there, which still exists there.

Learned advocate cross-examining witness draw the attention of witness towards the last four lines of para -11 of his Examination in chief affidavit. Witness after reading it, in reply to a question said that I had seen the Sant Niwas described in it, in 1969 for the first time. In which year the Sant Niwas was constructed, I do not remember.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards the matter – Garur Dev above the Singhdwar and fact concerning to two Lions – referred in third and fourth line in para -13 of his Examination in chief affidavit. Witness said that I had seen this after coming to Ayodhya. It is not correct to say that there were no lions above the northern gate and fishes were there. It is also not correct that there was no sign of Garur. "Sita Rasoi", described in para -13 of affidavit is also called "Kaushaliya Rasoi", but most of the people call it a "Sita Rasoi". "Sita Rasoi" was written over this place. I saw this place before the demolition of structure in 1992, for the last time.

Learned advocate cross-examining the witness draw the attention of witness towards picture No. 39 of black and white album, document No. 201 C -1. Witness said

that same place is seen in this picture which I called "Sita Rasoi". "Kaushaliya Rasoi" is written there and not "Sita Rasoi". My statement is not incorrect that "Sita Rasoi" is written thereupon.

Question: I am to say that Sita Rasoi is not written at the above place, which you are saying as a Sita Rasoi; rather Kaushaliya Rasoi is written there. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is correct that Kaushaliya Rasoi is written thereupon, but at a place where Chauka-belan has been kept, in the above picture No. 39, Sita Rasoi is also written on a stone kept there. I have written about Sita Rasoi on the basis of this.

Question: My contention is that Sita Rasoi was not written there at any place. Only Kaushaliya Rasoi was written. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct.

There were two footprints at this place. These footprints were made of stones. Whether these footprints were from the time of Ramlalla or of which period, I cannot say. I also cannot say for which period, Chauka, Chulah and Belan were. Whether these were hundred - two hundred or thousand - two thousand years old or lakhs of years old, I cannot say.

Verified the statement after reading.

Sd/  
Ram Vilas Das Vedanti  
7.3.2005

Typed by the stenographer in the Open court as dictated by me. In continuation to this the suit may be listed for further Cross-examination for 9.3.2005. Witness to be present.

Sd/-  
(Hari Shankar Dubey)  
Commissioner  
25.2.2005

**Before : Hon'ble Full Bench, High Court, Lucknow Bench,  
Lucknow.**

**Dated 9.3.2005**

**D.W.-2/1-3 Shri Ram Vilas Das Vedanti**

(In continuation to dated 7.3.2005, Cross-examination on an oath by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff No. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, continued).

I have in para 23 of my affidavit neither referred the concerning religious books, Ram Taapniyopnishad, relevant parts from Ved-Vedangs nor given any extract in the affidavit. Because it was described in the religious books and Vedangs that Ayodhya is a birthplace of Shri Rama. So I have given such type of matter in this para of my affidavit.

Question: I am to say that the disputed site has not been referred or described as a birthplace in the above Ram Taapniyopnishad and Ved-Vedangs. What you have to say in this regard?

Answer: It is not correct.

Question: If I am not correct, please refer any couplet wherein disputed site was described as a birthplace of Shri Rama?

Answer: The couplets described in Vedas are called Mantras. I have mentioned these mantras in para -25 of my affidavit.

It is not correct to say that in a religious book, referred by me in my affidavit or statement, disputed site was not called a birthplace of Rama. It is also not correct to say that there was no Ramjanmbhoomi temple at the disputed site. It is also not correct that no mosque was constructed by demolishing a temple. It is also not correct that five time's Namaz or Namaz of Jumma (Friday) was being read there in the disputed Bhawan since the construction of disputed Bhawan to the night of 22<sup>nd</sup> December 1949. It is also not correct that there was no idol in the disputed Bhawan on the night of 22<sup>nd</sup>/23<sup>rd</sup> December 1949. It is also not correct that disputed Bhawan was used as mosque up to the night of 22<sup>nd</sup>/23<sup>rd</sup> December 1949 and not as a temple. It is correct that I am affiliated to Vishwa Hindu Parishad and according to me the entire Hindu community is a part of Vishwa Hindu Parishad but it is not correct to say that I am giving false statement being affiliated to Vishwa Hindu Parishad.

(Cross-examination by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate, on behalf of plaintiff No. 1, 6/1 and 8/1, Sunni Central Board of Waqf, Ziyauddin and Maulana Mahfuzurrehman, concluded.)

(Cross-examination by Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff No, -7 of Other Original Suit No. 4/89, begins.)

XXX XXX XXX XXX

I have referred the word "Idam" in my statement. This is Sanskrit word. "Idam" means "This". "Idam" in Sanskrit language is if used before or after any word, meaning remains unchanged.

I have stated in my statement at page No. 200 that the idol was not seen to Meerbaki because God gives his darshan only to the devotees. This statement is correct because Meerbaki was not a devotee of Rama. I am a devotee of Rama. The feeling expressed by me is based on the Bhakti.

(At this point Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate said that he on behalf of his client accepts the cross-examination conducted by Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate.)

(And thus, Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddiqui concluded the cross-examination.)

(Shri Irfan Ahmad, Advocate, on behalf of defendant No. 6/1, of Original Suit No. 3/89, Shri Fazle Alam, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 6/2, of Original Suit No. 3/89, and Shri C.M. Shukla, Advocate on behalf of defendant No. 26 of Original Suit No. 5/89, have accepted the Cross-examination conducted by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate, Shri Zaffaryab Jilani, Advocate and Shri Mushtaq Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate.)

**Objection referred to at page 50 and 51 of his statement is over ruled vide our order of date in the order-sheet of Suit No. 4 of 1989.**

(In this context, with reference to above order of Hon'ble Court, dated 9.3.2005, Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff No. 9 and 10/1, Mahmood Ahmad and Farooq Ahmad has again started the Cross-examination on an oath.)

I was in Ayodhya on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. I have not heard about any incident in this connection in the morning of that day. There was no Bhawan by the name of Babri Mosque in Ayodhya. So the question about its demolition does not arise. I have not heard about the demolition of any Bhawan on that day. It was not a Babri Mosque. I have not seen any disputed site in Ayodhya, so I cannot say if there was a building with three domes at the disputed site or not. In my affidavit I had referred the structure under dispute to the place where Ramlalla is sitting. I have heard about the demolition of structure under question on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. I have not heard about the demolition of Babri Mosque on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. I have heard about the demolition of the Bhawan where Ramlalla was sitting. Structure with three domes was demolished on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. I do not know who had demolished the structure. I went up to the outer place of the site where Ramlalla was sitting, at 8.00 A.M. I stayed there for two- three hours. There was a huge crowd at the outer place. Peoples continued to pour in. I was in fix, what will be pulling down there.

There were 15-20 thousand people at the time when disputed structure was demolished. I do not know if those people were from outside or not. In my view, people from Faizabad and out side both were in the crowd. I stayed there up to 11.00 A.M. on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992. By that time the crowd raised to 20-25 thousand.

I left at 11.00 A.M., thereafter I came to know through newspapers that domes of the disputed Bhawan were being demolished. The disputed Bhawan had three domes, which were called Shikhars. Since I left at 11.00 A.M., I cannot say whether the crowd stayed or went back from there or some stayed there and some left. I stayed in

Ayodhya on that day. After 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992, I stayed in Ayodhya for few days. I went at the site after Hon'ble Court has accorded permission to seek the darshan of Ramlalla. I do not know after how many days, this permission was granted. I saw, Ramlalla at the same place where he was before 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992 and he is being worshipped. I went in the evening when Aarti was being performed. I went there after Sunset. I have not seen anyone removing the idol of Ramlalla on 6<sup>th</sup> December 1992.

(Cross-examination on an Oath by Shri Abdul Mannan, Advocate on behalf of plaintiff No. 9 and 10/1, Mahmood Ahmad and Farooq Ahmad, concluded.)

Cross-examination on behalf of all plaintiffs concluded. Witness is discharge.

Verified the statement after reading

Sd/-

Ram Vilas Das Vedanti

9.3.2005

Typed by the stenographer, in the Open court as dictated by me.

Sd/-

9.3.2005