

“OM”
Jai Sri Ram!

Facts About Sri Ram Janma-Bhoomi Liberation Movement

01. Points of dispute

- (i) The Ayodhya dispute is not any ordinary temple-mosque dispute as the Temple of Nativity of Sri Ram is not just any other temple!
- (ii) It is a struggle to reclaim and regain the haloed Native Land/Birthplace of Bhagwan, and this Native Land is a Deity in itself and there can be no splitting up or division of the Deity. Ramlala Virajman (Infant Sri Ram sitting at His Birthplace) at His Native Land – is a perpetual minor and a juridical person – a legal entity – having a distinct identity and legal rights and obligations under the law. None else can have ownership rights over Bhagwan’s property.
- (iii) The birthplace is non-exchangeable. It cannot be swapped, bartered, sold or donated!
- (iv) The entire dispute is over about 1460 square yards (1209.026 Square Meter) of land – the length-width of which is maximum 140 X 100 feet. The 70 acres of land acquired by the Government of India is separate from it and is with the Government of India over which no lawsuit is pending in court.
- (v) The entire site under consideration in the court is that of Ramlala (Infant Ram) Virajman. It is the Place of Birth, Place of Pastimes, playing field and recreational area of Bhagwan. Describing the significance of this place, the Skanda Purana, written thousands of years ago, says that the Darshan (discerning/sighting) of the haloed birthplace of Sri Ram is liberating.
- (vi) Temples of adorable Deities of any community can be built in many places in the country, statues of great men can be put up at many places, but their place of manifestation/birth would be located at one place and that can never be dislocated or put out of place. The birthplace is irreversible, permanent, irrevocable, immutable, invariable, irreplaceable, unchallengeable, incontrovertible, indisputable, undeniable and not able to be forfeited!
- (vii) Ayodhya is to Hindus what Mecca is to Muslims. No new mosque / monument / Islamic cultural center can be built in Ayodhya, which would remind the politico-Jihadi statement and humiliation of 1528 CE.

02. History of conflicts and movements

Chronology of conflicts and movements---1

(i) The struggle to get back the birthplace continues unabated since 1528 CE (since the day invader Babur ordered demolition of the temple and superimposition of the triple-domed Jihadi statement/structure over it).

(ii) The entire Hindu society has incessantly been waging this fight. The saint fraternity of Ayodhya and the kings-emperors of the areas around have had special contributions in this fight back.

(iii) The pages of history record details of 76 battles.

(iv) The history of battles speaks volumes about the fact that Hindus never ever gave up their claim over this place.

(v) These battles and struggles show that the occupation of this place by the Muslim invader and his descendants was never peaceful, continuous, uninterrupted.

(vi) In 1885 CE, an application was moved before the then government official on behalf of Nirmohi Akhara with a request to permit replacement of the thatched canopy by a concrete one above the Ramchabootra (raised-platform) located in the outer courtyard of the birthplace complex. On this subject, the British Judge Colonel FEA Chamier (Faizabad District Judge) declined permission, but in his verdict admitted that **"...It is most unfortunate that a masjid should have been built on the land specially held sacred by the Hindus..."**

Legal Cases on Ram Janma Bhumi..1

(vii) At the midnight of 22-23 December, 1949, there was manifestation of the Lord at Sri Ram Janma Bhoomi. The administration locked the doors of the structure in the name of law & order. When the society objected, the court ordered the worship rituals of the Lord to be conducted every morning and evening by opening the locks and then the rituals continued daily. Even today, Ramlala is seated at the same place and worship is being done continuously.

(viii) In January 1950, Gopal Singh Visharad, a resident of Gonda, filed his suit in the court praying that: "I am a devotee of the Lord! I come for daily darshan, so no person or the administration should put any hindrance in my darshan-poojan." The administration appointed a receiver to manage the place.

(ix) In the year 1959, Nirmohi Akhada filed its suit in Faizabad Court praying that the government-appointed receiver be removed and the management handed over to it.

(x) On December 18, 1961, the Uttar Pradesh Sunni Muslim Waqf Board filed its case demanding that the triple-domed structure be declared a public mosque, and the worship paraphernalia inside the structure be removed.

Chronology of Conflicts and Movements...2

(xi) At the Hindu Conference held at Muzaffarnagar in Uttar Pradesh in March 1983, the late Dau Dayal Khanna, a former Congress minister and legislator, called upon the Ram devotees to "liberate the places of Ayodhya, Mathura and Kashi and bring back the glory of Hindustan."

(xii) On April 07 and 08, 1984, a conference of saints took place at Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi (First Dharma Sansad/Parliament). It was resolved to liberate the Sri Ram Janma Bhoomi. Thus, with the order of the Sant Fraternity, the Vishva Hindu Parishad started the 77th edition of the five centuries old struggle.

(xiii) Firstly, public awareness campaign was decided to open the locks on the birthplace. Ram-Janaki chariot was consecrated at Sitamarhi. On October 07, 1984, the Ram-Janaki Rath arrived at the banks of the Holy Saryu River in Ayodhya. Thousands of Ram devotees took Saryu Maharani's sacred waters in hand and vowed to liberate the Sri Ram JanmaBhoomi.

(xiv) From October, 1985, public awareness campaign started again in Uttar Pradesh by 6 chariots under the banner of Ram JanmaBhoomi Mukti Rath Yatra. As a result, the locks put on the Sri Ram's Birthplace in the year 1949 CE was opened on 1 February 1986 by order of the court. There were several attempts made to stop public worship and prayers to Ramlala, but the court did not accept it.

(xv) After this, a series of public awareness campaigns started. The Ram Shila Pujan (consecration of clay, stone or marble bricks) programmes were organized in about 300,000 villages across the country. Consecrated bricks from across the country and abroad reached Ayodhya. In the presence of the revered saints and sages, the first foundation stone was laid for the grand Ram temple as per Hindu aspirations by Shri Kameshwar Chowpal, a Karyakarta/worker from amongst the Scheduled Castes brethren. This event was a wonderful example of the united strength of the Ram devotees as well as that of social harmony.

(xvi) Many programs like Ram Jyoti, Ramcharan Paduka Pujan, Vijay Mantra Jaap Abhiyan led to a unique awakening in the country.

Legal Cases on Ram Janma Bhumi- 2

(xvii) In July 1989, a case was filed on behalf of Bhagwan Ramlala Virajman and the Native Land JanmaBhoomi making them party to the case; the Lord Himself presented His side. This is the fourth lawsuit of this place.

(xviii) In 1989, the above four suits were transferred from the lower court to the Lucknow Bench of Allahabad High Court for a collective hearing.

Chronology of Conflicts and Movements...3

(xix) On June 24, 1990, in Haridwar, in a meeting of the Kendriya Margdarshak Mandal it was decided to go to Ayodhya to perform Karseva on October 30, 1990 (Devotthan Ekadashi). The then Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh made formidable cordon off plans around Ayodhya to plug up all entry points whatsoever to make Ayodhya out of bounds for all incoming devotees and declared that 'Not even a bird/avian can dare fly here'. The Hindu society accepted this challenge and thousands of people reached Ayodhya despite all kinds of repression. The Karsevaks (volunteers) hoisted the saffron flags on the domes at the appointed time. There were police firings and sacrifices of karsevaks. The firing incident of November 02, 1990 is known by all. Finally, the government bowed down and all the kar sevaks got permission to have darshan, only then the kar sevaks returned home.

(xx) Ten days of Satyagraha was done; thousands of people used to come every day. The ashes of the martyred Karsevaks were taken around the country and millions of people paid their homage to it.

(xxi) On April 04, 1991, the historic Virat Hindu Sammelan was held at the Boat Club, New Delhi. An estimated 25 lakh (2½ million) Rama devotees attended this meeting. By the concluding minutes of the meeting, the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav resigned. There were re-elections in Uttar Pradesh, Sri Kalyan Singh became the Chief Minister.

Legal Cases on Ram Janma Bhumi..3

(xxii) The government was too late in appreciating the feelings of the public. As a result, the pent up feelings of the society burst out on December 06, 1992. Everyone knows the result.

Chronology of Conflicts and Movements...4

(xxiii) It was announced again that the Karseva would take place on December 06, 1992. Sri Kalyan Singh Ji announced that bullets won't be fired. Security forces were stationed around Ayodhya. The pent up feelings of the society burst out due to the atrocities on the Ram devotees and fortuitously the Babri structure got deconstructed.

Millions of Ram devotees participated in this phase of the Ram JanmaBhoomi struggle started from 1984 CE. The resolve of the Ram devotees became stronger with each and every campaign.

Legal Cases on Ram Janma Bhumi..4

(xxiv) After the deconstruction of the structure, the so-called disputed land, and the 67 acres of land of Hindu society spread around it, was acquired by the Government of India by a law (Act 33/1993) on 07th January, 1993. In this acquired 67 acres of land, not even one inch of land is the property of any Muslim.

(xxv) Against the said takeover, a Muslim gentleman named Ismail Faruqi went to the Supreme Court in 1993 and demanded that the mosque site could not be acquired. On January 07, 1993, the then President of India referred a question to the Supreme Court of India under Article 143 of the Constitution for consideration and opinion thereon. The question was: "WHETHER A HINDU TEMPLE OR ANY HINDU RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE EXISTED PRIOR TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RAM JANAM BHUMI-BABRI MASJID (INCLUDING THE PREMISES OF THE INNER AND OUTER COURTYARDS OF SUCH STRUCTURE) IN THE AREA ON WHICH THE STRUCTURE STOOD?" (Vide 1994 (6) SCC p. 360 Ismail Faruqi vs. Union of India).

(xxvi) A constitution bench of five judges was set up in the Supreme Court to find an answer to the petition challenging the takeover and the President's question. After about 22 months of hearing, the Constitution Bench returned the President's question respectfully, without answering it, and wrote that the situation obtaining at the site prior to 1528 CE could be answered only on the basis of science and archaeology.

(xxvii) At the same time, the Supreme Court, by a majority verdict, cancelled the acquisition of the disputed land and ordered the resumption of all the cases related to the disputed land. It also said that the Government of India would maintain the status quo of the disputed land and would protect it. The Supreme Court accepted the acquisition of the entire 67 acres of land by the Government of India except the disputed land. This lawsuit is known as Dr. M. Ismail Faruqi Etc, Mohd. ... vs Union Of India And Others, which was decided in October 1994.

(xxviii) In 1995 CE, in the Lucknow Bench of Allahabad High Court, a bench of three judges was constituted to hear all the suits related to Sri Ram JanmaBhoomi. The bench acted like a trial court for 15 years.

(xxix) To know the situation prior to 1528 CE, the Hon'ble Full Bench of Lucknow High Court, after hearing the parties, suo-moto ordered for Geo-Radiological Survey (Ground Penetrating Radar Survey) by Canadian experts on 01.8.2002 and subsequently on the basis of GPRS

Report passed order for excavation by the Archaeological Survey of India (ASI of GOI) on 23.10.2002 to verify the truth of GPR Survey results.

(xxx) The Geo-Radiological Survey Report, the ASI Excavation Report, and the 30th September, 2010 verdict of the Lucknow Bench of Allahabad High Court demolished the Muslim claim that the triple-domed structure sat on a virgin land. It was, in fact, parked/superimposed on a pre-existing Hindu temple as part of wicked and spiteful Jihadi statement and agenda of Ghazwa-e-Hind.

(xxxi) The High Court, while outrightly dismissing the suits of the Nirmohi Akhara and the Sunni Waqf Board, wrote that no relief could be given to them. On the contrary, it accepted the suit of Ramlala Virajman, but ordered equal distribution of the disputed land among the three parties which was not justifiable. Due to this unjudicious move, it became necessary to move an appeal in the Supreme Court.

(xxxii) All appeals were filed in December 2010. Till July 2017, the turn to hear appeals did not come. When the Supreme Court saw the case for the first time in August 2017, it was found that the documents in Hindi, Sanskrit, Persian, Urdu and French languages needed to be translated into English. The Uttar Pradesh government got about 14,000 pages translated into English in 4 months.

(xxxiii) During the hearing of the appeal in the Supreme Court on October 29, 2018, the court remarked that there were many more cases in their priority. Having said that, the trial was deferred till January 2019. At the same time, the court ordered that the trial be heard by a five-judge bench.

03. Present Context of Court Process

(i) In February 2019, the court expressed the desire that all parties find a solution to the dispute on the basis of mutual negotiations. By its order, the court declared a three-member mediation committee. The Mediation Committee held separate talks with all the parties in seven rounds between March 13, 2019 and August 01, 2019. All the talks were kept confidential. The mediation finally ended on August 01, 2019 undecided and unsuccessful.

(ii) On 02 August, 2019 the Mediation Committee's letter of termination of mediation was presented before the Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court. As a result, the Constitution Bench passed the order for regular hearing of appeals from 6th August, 2019. It also ordered that appeals would be heard from Monday to Friday 5 days a week and daily from 10.30 am to 4.00 pm. Verbally informally it said that they could hear also on Saturdays as per requirement or can hear for an extra hour after 4.00 pm.

(iii) A total of 40 days of arguments were heard from August 6, 2019 till October 16. During the last 11 business days everyday they heard for an additional hour.

(iv) During the debate in September, 2019, the subject spontaneously came up before the court that the Muslim and Hindu parties were getting ready for a solution by negotiation. The court ordered that the parties interested in the negotiation might appear before the mediation committee, but the court proceedings would continue as before. On behalf of Ramlala Virajman, it was immediately given in writing to the Registrar of the Supreme Court that we were not part of any negotiation. After a few days, the senior advocate of Ramlala Virajman stood in front of the bench and put this fact verbally. In October, again a stir was made in the court on this matter.

On October 2, the Chief Justice was again given in writing on behalf of Ramlala Virajman, and again on October 10, a letter was given that we were not part of any negotiation.

(v) On 16th October evening, the Constitution Bench declared the hearing complete. Simultaneously, there was a written order that all parties should give their positions in writing in the next three days on alternate relief or moulding of relief sought by them. The final decision in the Supreme Court was declared reserved.

The world is now waiting for the verdict in the world's greatest historical (491 years) case. The verdict is likely to come by mid-November, 2019.

04. Hindu-Muslim Talks on Sri Ram JanmaBhoomi

(i) Many intellectuals of the country have been of the opinion that the matter should be resolved by mutual talks or judicial process. Therefore, the Vishva Hindu Parishad tried through all the media of talks that the Muslim leaders of India should know, understand, appreciate and respect the feelings, sentiments and beliefs of the Hindu society. But the experience was that the Muslim leadership was not interested in ending this age-old struggle and starting a new era of mutual trust and harmony.

(ii) During the period of Late Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi, Sri Buta Singhji and Mrs. Sheila Dixit used to mediate. In Delhi itself, they held several meetings with the Vishva Hindu Parishad and the Babri Masjid Action Committee officials sitting across the table. Once Ven. Swami Satyamitranand ji Maharaj was also in the meeting! It was noon time and a Friday – the sixth and most important day in Islamic week – and it was time to offer the Prayer of Jummah. When the gentlemen of the Muslim side returned after offering Namaz, Ven. Swami Satyamitranand ji Maharaj stood up and spreading his monk's robe said: 'Salat (prayer/namaz) is followed by Zakat (alms-giving). I beg of you Sri Ram's birthplace as alms!' The Namazis kept their mouths shut and their total silence spoke volumes about their intentions. Maharajshree sat down. The Government of India in its White Paper (para No. 2.3) regarding the Ram JanmaBhoomi/Babri Masjid issue published in 1993, records the proceedings of another round of mediatory talks as follows: "During the negotiations aimed at finding an amicable solution to the dispute, one issue which came to the fore was whether a Hindu temple had existed on the site occupied by the disputed structure and whether it was demolished on Babur's orders for the construction of the Masjid. It was stated on behalf of the Muslim organizations as well as by certain eminent historians that there was no evidence in favour of either of these two assertions. It was also stated by certain Muslim leaders that if these assertions were proved, the Muslims would voluntarily handover the disputed shrine to the Hindus." Naturally this became the central issue in the negotiations between the Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP) and the All India Babri Masjid Action Committee (AIBMAC). (This Para No. 2.3 of White Paper is quoted / mentioned in Ismail Faruqi judgment as 2.8, which is wrongly typed.)

(iii) This 'voluntary handover' promise was particularly made by late Syed Shahabuddin – a leading figure of the AIBMAC. But this promise was never ever honoured.

(iv) Bilateral talks started on the initiative of the Government of India during the tenure of Shri Chandrashekharji as Prime Minister. The then GOI Minister of State for Home, Shri Subodh Kant Sahai, the then Chief Ministers of Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan, Mr. Mulayam Singh Yadav, Mr. Sharad Pawar and Mr. Bhairon Singh Shekhawat respectively also used to remain present in these meetings. On December 01, 1990, representatives of the Vishva

Hindu Parishad held talks with members of the All India Babri Masjid Action Committee. On behalf of the VHP, Shri Vishnu Hari Dalmia, Shri Badriprasad Toshniwal, Shri Srish Chandra Dixit, Shri Moropant Pingle, Shri Kaushalkishore, Shri Bhanupratap Shukla, Shri Acharya Giriraj Kishore and Shri Suryakrishna were present.

(v) Sri Moropant Pingley had suggested that in the next meeting, three or four experts from both sides should be included, so that they could present authentic evidence of their side. The Chief Minister of Rajasthan, Shri Bhairon Singh Shekhawat had suggested that experts of both sides should exchange their evidences and verify.

On this, Mr. Jilani Saheb said that members of the committee should first verify the evidences among themselves, then seek the cooperation of experts. Sri Pingale ji suggested that a time limit be set for amicable resolution of this dispute. It was then decided that:-

01. Both parties should provide their respective evidences to the Minister of State for Home by 22 December, 1990.

02. The Hon'ble Minister would make copies of the evidences available to all concerned by 25 December, 1990.

03. After verification of these evidences, the two sides again would meet on 10th January, 1991 at 10.00 a.m.

(vi) A formal document of the bilateral talks was prepared in the office of the Minister of State for Home Affairs.

(vii) The evidences of each other were to be responded/rejoinded to by January 06, 1991. The Vishva Hindu Parishad responded by dismissing the claims of the Babri Masjid Action Committee. Whereas, instead of giving any rejoinder to VHP's evidences, only photocopies of some additional evidences were given by the Babri Committee to further prove their stand. In the absence of any rejoinder from the Babri Committee, it became difficult for the government to find out what were the points of agreement and disagreement. A meeting was held on 10 January 1991 at Gujarat Bhavan. Apart from other representatives, Prof. B.R. Grover, Prof. Devendra Swarup Agarwal and Dr. S. P. Gupta joined as experts on behalf of Vishva Hindu Parishad. It was decided that the documents presented should be classified under Historical, Archaeological, Revenue and Law categories. It was also decided that both sides would give the names of their experts, who would study the relevant documents and then meet on 24 and 25 January, 1991 and give their comments by 05th February, 1991. Thereafter, both sides would reconsider the reports of these experts. The Babri Masjid Committee suddenly started dodging maneuvers. The committee did not name its experts. They continued to change their list of experts. Among the experts who came on 24 January 1991, four were the executive officers of Babri Masjid Action Committee and Dr. R.S. Sharma, Dr. D. N. Jha, Dr. Surajbhan and Dr. M. Athar Ali were experts. Present, on behalf of the VHP, were legal luminaries like Justice ® Guman Mal Lodha, Justice ® Deoki Nandan Agarwal, Justice ® Dharamveer Sahgal and Senior Advocate Shri Virendra Kumar Singh Chaudhury, and present as historians and revenue experts were Dr Harshnarain, Prof. B.R. Grover, Prof. K.S. Lal, Prof. B.P. Sinha, Prof. Devendra Swarup Agarwal and Archaeologist Dr S.P. Gupta. At the very start of the meeting, the experts of the Babri Committee said that they had neither visited Ayodhya nor had studied the evidence and said that they needed at least six weeks for it. This happened on 24th January, 1991.

(viii) The Babri Committee experts did not turn up in the meeting scheduled on 25th January while representatives and experts of the VHP waited for two hours. The same thing happened also in the subsequent meeting. The talks finally stopped.

(ix) In October, November 1992 also there was correspondence between Vishva Hindu Parishad and the Babri Masjid Action Committee. The result turned out to be zero.

(x) A three-member Mediation Committee comprising of (1) Justice (Rtd. SCI) Ibrahim Kalifulla (Chennai), (2) Senior Advocate of Madras High Court, Shri Sriram Panchu, (3) Art of Living Founder Sri Sri Ravi Shankar was formed in March 2019 on the initiative of the Supreme Court. The talks took place in seven rounds and the talks were kept confidential.

The mediators offered thanks to everyone on 01 August 2019, and on 02 August, they presented their mediation termination letter to the Supreme Court. Even this talks attempt proved unsuccessful.

★ ★ ★

CR/SJ/GKC

From Vishva Hindu Parishad:
New Delhi (Bharat/India), November 09 Saturday, 2019–

(1)

(i) Today is a day of great rejoicing, satisfaction and fulfilment. After 72 battles and 350,000 sacrifices since 1528 CE and 70 years of court cases since 1949 CE, the Supreme Court of India (SCI) has finally pronounced the truth and justice on the 491 year old Sri Ram JanmaBhoomi Ayodhya issue. This verdict, given after a marathon hearing of 40 days/200+ hours and without being distracted by a range of obstacles, is one of the greatest judicial verdicts in world history. The Hindu society the world over, forming one-sixth of the over seven billion global population, had been anxiously waiting for this verdict for seven decades through all judicial processes at all levels including District Court, High Court and Supreme Court. At the end of the day, that wait fructified and truth and justice have prevailed. Today, the Supreme Court also vacated the High Court decision that had trifurcated the disputed land and in conclusion it ruled that the land belonged entirely to Ramlala Virajman (Infant Ram sitting at His Birthplace in Ayodhya).

(ii) The Lucknow Bench of Allahabad High Court had outrightly dismissed the suits of the Sunni Waqf Board and the Nirmohi Akhara and written that no relief could be given to the two. In its verdict delivered in 2010 CE, it had happily accepted the site of Ramlala Virajman as His Birthplace, but, unfortunately, ordered equal distribution of the disputed land among the three parties which was neither justifiable nor had it been asked for by any of the parties.

Due to this unjudicious move, it had become necessary to move an appeal in the Supreme Court as it was a struggle to reclaim and regain the haloed Native Land/Birthplace of Bhagwan, and this Native Land being in itself a Deity there could be no splitting up or division of the Deity and none else whosoever could have any ownership right over Bhagwan's property, it, besides being the Place of Birth of Bhagwan, also was His Place of Pastimes, playing field and recreational area. Describing the significance of this place, the Skanda Purana, written thousands of years ago, says that the Darshan (discerning/sighting/glimpse) of the haloed birthplace of Sri Ram is liberating.

(iii) The five-judge SCI bench, comprising of Chief Justice Ranjan Gogoi and Justices S A Bobde, D Y Chandrachud, Ashok Bhushan and S Abdul Nazeer, unanimously handed over the land for the construction of the Ram JanmaBhoomi Temple and ordered to set up a trust for the purpose.

(iv) The virgin land theorists, guided by the tukde-tukde gang historians, who argued that no temple existed at the site prior to the Babri construction, cut a very sorry figure as their arguments miserably failed to stand archaeological, historical and other scrutiny.

(v) The SCI said in its verdict that the faith and belief of Hindus that the land in Ayodhya where the Babri structure (since 1528 CE) once stood was the birthplace of Lord Ram was based on scriptures and religious books, including 'Valmiki Ramayana' and 'Skanda Purana', and it "cannot be held to be groundless". It said: "Thus, it is found that in the period prior to 1528 AD, there was sufficient religious texts, which led the Hindus to believe the present site of Ram Janmaabhoomi as the birthplace of Lord Ram." In its 1045-page (929-pages judgment plus 116-page addenda) unanimous judgement the SCI said, "Religious scriptures, which are main source of Hinduism, are the foundation on which faith of Hindus is concretised. The epic Valmiki Ramayana, is the main source of knowledge of Lord Ram and his deeds....". Quoting from relevant Shlokas, the SC further said: 'Shlokas' in 'Valmiki Ramayan' referred to birth of Lord Ram with planetary situation at Ayodhya... 'Shlok 10' of Valmiki's Ramayan stated that Kaushalya gave birth to a son who was the Lord of the whole world and Ayodhya was blessed with his arrival... He was invested with divine symptoms. It was not birth of an ordinary man. Ayodhya was blessed with the arrival of the Lord of the whole world. Even then Aligarh historians say that Ayodhya was never sacrosanct because of the birth of Rama".

(vi) On the 5-century long Ram JanmaBhoomi issue, the verdict stands for "Satyameva Jayate" ("Only Truth prevails" - Mundaka Upanishad 3.1.6; National Motto of the Republic of Bharat); It is "Yato Dharmastato Jayah" ("Where there is righteousness [Dharma], there is victory [Jayah]; Motto of the Supreme Court of India/Bharat; It occurs eleven times in the great epic Mahabharata.). The Srimadbhagavad Gita begins with the word "Dharma" (Righteousness/Discipline) and signs off with the key word "Vijaya" (victory) in its last 700th verse in chapter 18, the main idea being action with detachment (nishkaam karma). It is "Janani Janmaabhoomis cha Svargaad api gariyasi" ("Mother and motherland are greater than heaven". Source: Valmiki Ramayan. Context: This was said by Sri Ram to Lakshman after victory in Lanka. It is the national motto of the present Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal – it was in Treta Yuga the country of Rajarshi Janak – Sri Ram's father-in-law).

(2) The last two paragraphs of the 116-page addenda attached to the 929-page SCI judgment entitling Hindus for Sri Ram JanmaBhoomi succinctly summarises the judgment thus:-

(i) **“169. The sequence of the events as noticed above clearly indicate that faith and belief of Hindus was that birth place of Lord Ram was in the three-dome structure Mosque which was constructed at the janamasthan. It was only during the British period that grilled wall was constructed dividing the walled premises of the Mosque into inner courtyard and outer courtyard. Grilled iron wall was constructed to keep Hindus outside the grilled iron wall in the outer courtyard. In view of the construction of the iron wall, the worship and puja started in Ram Chabutra in the outer courtyard. Suit of 1885 was filed seeking permission to construct temple on the said Chabutra where worship was permitted by the British Authority. Faith and belief of the Hindus as depicted by the evidence on record clearly establish that the Hindus belief that at the birth place of Lord Ram, the Mosque was constructed and three-dome structure is the birth place of Lord Ram. The fact that Hindus were by constructing iron wall, dividing Mosque premises, kept outside the three-dome structure cannot be said to alter their faith and belief regarding the birth place of Lord Ram. The worship on the Ram Chabutra in the outer courtyard was symbolic worship of Lord Ram who was believed to be born in the premises.”**

(Page 1044-45/P.115 of SC Judgment)

(ii) **“170. It is thus concluded on the conclusion that faith and belief of Hindus since prior to construction of Mosque and subsequent thereto has always been that Janmaaasthan of Lord Ram is the place where Babri Mosque has been constructed which faith and belief is proved by documentary and oral evidence discussed above.”**

(Page 1045/P.116 of SC Judgment)

(iii) In Acknowledgments, the Chief Justice of India says: “In crafting this judgment, the forensic contest before this Court has provided a valuable insight in navigating through the layers of complexity of the case.”

(iv) The 929-page SCI judgment (plus the 116-page addenda attached to it) is enclosed hereby (pdf) for your kind information and keeping the Karyakartas abreast of the developments. A 45-page Summary of the same is also enclosed (pdf) hereby for quick reference.

The Hindu society, thus, expresses its gratitude to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India!

(3) Naturally there is immense joy and cheer in the Hindu society all over the world. It is also certain that the Hindu has the nature to live in a *Maryada* (modesty/dignity/refinement/grace). Therefore, this expression of joy cannot be aggressive. No one has been defeated. Both Hindus and Muslims of Bharat share common ancestors. There should not be anything that offends or humiliates anyone. Everyone should try to keep the harmony, warmth and cordiality within the Bharatiya society.

(4) Today is also a day of expressing gratitude and thanks giving. The first gratitude goes to all those known and unknown Hindu brethren who participated in these centuries old struggles, suffered immensely and many made supreme sacrifices!

The Archaeological Survey of India (ASI), whose untiring efforts and unquestionable technical expertise enabled the Hon'ble Judges to arrive at this important unanimous verdict is particularly deserving of the accolade. The Hon'ble Supreme Court said that the conclusion drawn by the ASI about the underlying structure being that of a temple is supported by evidence. The conclusion cannot be rejected as unsupported by evidence or lying beyond the test of a preponderance of probabilities, which must govern a civil trial. We thank all those historians and other experts whose irrefutable evidence formed the basis of this decision! We congratulate all the senior jurists and advocates, whose untiring diligence has brought justice to the Hindu Society!

(5) We expect that the Central Government shall now expeditiously take further steps, as directed in the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court towards facilitating construction of a grand Temple in Ayodhya.

(6) (i) It is not just any other temple! It is the Temple of Nativity of Bhagwan Sri Ram! Ayodhya is to Hindus what Mecca is to Muslims and the Nativity Grotto contained in the Basilica of the Nativity located in Bethlehem is to Christians. The grotto holds a prominent religious significance to Christians of various denominations as the birthplace of Jesus of Nazareth. The grotto is the oldest site continuously used as a place of worship in Christianity, and the basilica is the oldest major church in the Christian Holy Land. The Khwarezmian Turks had desecrated the place in April 1244. Since 2012, the Basilica of the Nativity is a World Heritage Site and was the first to be listed by UNESCO under 'Palestine'.

(ii) Ayodhya is the birthplace of Rama and setting of the Ramayana – the first epic of the world written in Sanskrit by Adi Kavi Maharshi Valmiki – the first poet of the world. The Brahmanda Purana names Ayodhya among the seven most sacred and foremost cities (Saptapuri) of Bharat capable of granting Moksh (liberation) to an individual soul – an eternal spark of the Divine Almighty. The *Skanda Purana* Book-II *Vaisnava Khanda* Section-VIII: *Ayodhya-Mahatmya* Chapter 10 Pilgrimage to Ayodhya (it is a dialogue between Maharshi Agastya and Maharshi Vyasa) says: “...*This holy spot of the birth of Rama, it is said, the means of achieving liberation.*” (18-19). “...*By visiting the place of birth one attains that benefit which is obtained by one who gives thousands of tawny-coloured cows everyday...*” (22). “*By seeing the place of birth one attains the merit of ascetics performing penance in hermitage, of thousands of Rajasuya sacrifices and Agnihotra sacrifices performed every year. By seeing a man observing the holy rite particularly in the place of birth he obtains the merit of the holy men endowed with devotion to mother and father as well as preceptors...*” (23-25).

(iii) About the importance of the holy river Sarayu, sourced from the Himalayas (the river having ancient significance, finding mentions in the Vedas and the Ramayana), at Ayodhya, the *Skanda Purana* says: “...*It gives infinite satisfaction to the Pitrs, the devotee gets more merit than that of Gayasraddha, if Sarayu is visited. One gets that merit thereby which is obtained by staying in Kasi for thousands of Manvantaras...*” (26-27).

(iv) “...*By (visiting) the city of the Son of Dasaratha (i.e., Rama) in Kali Yuga, it is said, one gets that merit which is obtained by persons who perform Gayasraddha and then visit Purusottama (Jagannathapuri)*”(28).

(v) As Sri Rama stood for seven noble qualities, Seven Noble *Tirthas* (fords to liberation) emerged in Ayodhya. They are: “*Satyatirtha* (Truthfulness), *Ksamatirtha* (Forbearance), *Indriya-nigraha Tirtha* (Restraint of the sense-organs), *Sarva-Bhuta-daya Tirtha* (Mercifulness to all living beings), the most excellent *Tirtha* of *Satyavadita* (Speaking the truth), *Jnanatirtha* (Knowledge) and *Tapastirtha* (Penance). Thus the seven *Tirthas* have been recounted. The mind will become pure in the *Tirtha* of mercifulness to all living beings.” (46-47) these seven are *Manasa Tirthas* as well as sacred geo-locations designated as *Tirthas*. A pilgrim is expected to maintain *Manasa-Vacha-Karmana* (Mind-Speech-Action) purity. His conscience must be free from impurities. With the sense-organs under control, he should take the holy baths in the *Manasa Tirthas*. He who performs the rite perfectly well, attains the merit of visiting the *Tirtha*. Verse 48 of *Skanda Purana* says: “*Purification of the body alone by means of water is not implied by the word Snana (holy bath). If the mind of a man is pure he is said to have (really) taken Snana.*” “49. *Just as some parts of the body are known as excellent, middling, etc., so also there are some places on the earth that are proclaimed as exceedingly meritorious. 50. Therefore, one should have his stay in certain geo-locations designated as Tirthas and one should also practice to immerse in meditation leading to sacred state of mind. He who takes his holy bath in both, attains the greatest goal.*”

(vi) Sri Rama, who is considered an incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu – the protector, preserver and promoter of the cosmic order, respect for nature and life, altruism and philanthropy – and so neutralized global terrorists, assassins and mercenaries in his time and established *Rama Rajya* (Welfare State), belonged to the great ancient line of *Ikshvakus* (Suryavansh/Solar dynasty). The *Ikshvakus* reigned from their Capital Ayodhya on the banks of the holy River Sarayu since the commencement of the *Treta Yuga* (the second of the four yugas, or ages of mankind) as *chakravartins* (the universal rulers).

Other prominent kings and emperors belonging to this royal house (at least 61 of them preceding Sri Ramachandra) were Mandhatri, Muchukunda, Ambarisha, Dilipa, Raghu, Aja, Dasharatha, Bahubali, Harishchandra, Sagara, Bhagiratha, Pasenadi, et al. The *Ikshvakus* are also identified as *Raghuvansha* or *Raghu-kula* because of King Raghu who was the great grandson of *Ikshvaku* and great grandfather of Bhagwan Rama. The supreme preceptor of the *Ikshvaku* dynasty was Brahmarshi Vasistha.

(vii) Twenty-two of the twenty-four *Jain Tirthankaras* (ford-makers and propagators of Dharma) belonged to the *Ikshvaku* dynasty. Rishabhadeva (or Ādinātha - "First Lord") – the first Jain Tirthankara and from the *Ikshvaku* dynasty – and other four Tirthankaras – all associated with the legendary *chakravartins* – were born in Ayodhya (also variously called Saketa, and also locally Awadh-puri or Awadh).

(viii) According to Buddhist texts, Prince Siddhartha Gautama or Shakyamuni ("Sage of the Shakyas") Gautama Buddha (early part of 6th century BCE) belonged to this illustrious dynasty. Bhagwan Gautama Buddha and Bhagwan Mahavira (an *Ikshvaku* dynasty prince; early part of 6th century BCE) also visited and lived in Ayodhya.

(ix) All the Sikh Gurus from Guru Nanak Dev to Guru Gobind Singh Ji Maharaj (descended from the Bedi and Sodhi clans of Punjab) trace their ancestry to Luv and Kush – the twin sons of Sri Rama & Sita.

Thus the Sikh Gurus also descended from the Ikshvaku lineage and the Light of Sri Rama shone through them.

In November-December, 1858, Sardar Nihang Singh Faqir Khalsa, a resident of Punjab, who followed the principles of Guru Gobind Singh Ji Maharaj, organized Havan and Puja for Bhagwan Sri Ram within the premises of the Babri structure! Mr. Syed Mohammad Khateeb, Muazzim had admitted in his FIR that "...Previously the symbol of Janamsthan had been there for hundreds of years and Hindus did Puja..." This incident is also quoted in the SCI judgment.

(x) The quiet town of Ayodhya annually attracts millions of pilgrims from all over the country and abroad, especially during the Panch Kosi (15 kms) or 14 Kosi (42 kms) or 84 Kosi (252 kms) Parikramas (clockwise circumambulation/revolution on foot). 84 Kosi Parikrama starts from and culminates at Makhauda Dham (Makhabhumi – Yagna Kundam - sacrificial fire pit – 20 kms from Ayodhya).

(xi) Now under the Ram Nagari Ayodhya projects, the city is on its way to achieving great re-development and pinnacle of glory. Ramayana Circuit is one of the fifteen thematic circuits identified for development under the Swadesh Darshan scheme of GOI Ministry of Tourism. The Ministry has initially identified fifteen destinations for development under the Ramayana Circuit theme, namely, Ayodhya, Nandigram, Shringverpur & Chitrakoot (Uttar Pradesh), Sitamarhi, Buxar & Darbhanga (Bihar), Chitrakoot (Madhya Pradesh), Mahendragiri (Odisha), Jagdalpur (Chattisgarh), Nashik & Nagpur (Maharashtra), Bhadrachalam (Telangana), Hampi (Karnataka) and Rameshwaram (Tamil Nadu).

(7) This important verdict is a significant and decisive step towards the construction of a grand Temple of Sri Ram. We are confident that this grand temple will now be constructed at the earliest possible. It is certain that as this temple rises, it will inculcate the respect for Maryadas, build an organised and harmonious Hindu Society, endeavour to inculcate Hindu values of life in personal lives and will thus be able to fulfil its obligations to ensure peace and harmony in the world.

(CHAMPAT RAI)

Vice-President

Vishva Hindu Parishad

(Captained the Sri Ram JanmaBhoomi Case in Courts of Law at all the three levels since 1984)

Encl.:

(A) PDF of the 1045-page/full-text of Ayodhya verdict by Supreme Court of India. It is also available at: https://www.sci.gov.in › pdf › JUD_2

- (i) Pl see its Page-920 for: P.2 Conclusion on title
- (ii) Pl see its Page-925 for: Q. Reliefs and directions
- (iii) After page 929, pl see Addenda (Page 1 - 116)

(B) A 45-page Summary of the 1045-page SC judgment for your kind information and keeping the Karyakartas abreast of the developments. Compiled by Advocate Bhakti Vardhan Singh (AOR)(M-9818249711)

(C) Facts of Sri Ram JanmaBhoomi Temple (History) compiled on 31st October, 2019, prior to the 9th November verdict. (pdf)

!!JAI SHRI RAM !!