सत्यमेव जयते

REPORT OF THE
LIBERHAN
AYODHYA
COMMISSION
OF INQUIRY

CHAPTER 2

AYODHYA AND ITS GEOGRAPHY

9. AYODHYA AND ITS GEOGRAPHY

9.1. *Ayodhya* is accepted in popular Hindu tradition as the birthplace of the Hindu God *Rama* and is therefore regarded as a holy and historical city. There is a plethora of ancient treatises, travelogues and histories written by innumerable authors about Ayodhya and its culture. The prominent mention of Ayodhya in the much venerated holy Hindu text, *Ramayana,* lends itself to a very significant place for this place in the Hindu perception.

9.2. Ancient Ayodhya was traditionally the epitome of Hindu life, culture and a paradigm of co-existence of a multi-religious society. It was a peaceful place with a regular influx of visitors, pilgrims, Sadhus and Sants, monk's traveller's tourists. There was a healthy tolerance for allowing people to follow their respective pursuits and religious rituals according to their beliefs. It was claimed by the protagonist of the movement that *Mir Baqi* after demolishing the temple constructed a mosque under the orders of Baber. Since principally, historically it was a part of *Awadh* region which was predominantly known free from communal and inter-religious division and strife so was the Ayodhya town.

9.3. Ayodhya was also known variously as *Vishala*, *Khosla* or *Maha Khosla*, *Ikshvaku*, *Rampuri*, *Ram Janambhoomi.*

9.4. Ayodhya is of special and specific importance for the sect of Ram believers or those loosely termed as the *Ramanandis* in Hindu religion. The place was the place of unequalled pilgrimage for Hindus. Monks, travellers, pilgrims,

Sadhus and *Sants,* irrespective of their religion and faith visited this town from all over the world throughout the year, apart from the special festivals. The economy of Ayodhya revolved around its temples.

9.5. Later, this hermit country town became a hyper active and religiously disturbed town and a veritable nightmare for the rest of the country. This place had become emotive issue owing to its position as the birthplace of Ram; a theme present in every facet of the culture; connecting the past with the present and the future. This religious fervour had kept the town for centuries alive after successive rulers had gone by.

9.6. Modern day Ayodhya is popularly identified with and accepted as the epic city of Ayodhya.

10. Modern Ayodhya

10.1. The modern city of Ayodhya is steeped in religious fervour, embroidered with local conflicts reminiscent of its long history. The city has been in a state of constant flux and currently witness to increasing intrigues with corresponding increases in levels of intolerance.

10.2. Ayodhya is located in the Faizabad District of western Uttar Pradesh (UP) and forms part of the Awadh region. This region has predominantly flat topography and is well connected with the surrounding areas and the rest of the country by highways, link roads, railway line, national highways, unpaved roads and ferries. The city is vastly spread out and has a number of satellite townships.

10.3. On the East of Ayodhya is Faizabad town with a population of about 2, 10,000. It has a large number of temples, mostly dedicated to the Hindu God Vishnu

10.4. There are six main routes converging on Ayodhya i.e. from Kanshi, Prayag, Chitrakoot, Sita Pur, Gorakhpur, and Jhansi.

10.5. There are two main routes leading from Faizabad to Ayodhya. The first and shorter of these routes runs from *Dogra Regimental Centre* via *Police Station Ram Janambhoomi*[1].

[1] *See statement of SC Chaubey, CGW 23*

10.6. The main entrance to Ayodhya is via the Faizabad national highway. This route, approximately six to eight kilometres, runs from Faizabad via Chowk Ghantaghar, Guddi Bazaar, Saket Degree College via Cantonment area, Navya crossing, Sahib Ganj and Amin Ganj.

10.7. Checkpoints for entrance into Ayodhya are situated at Saryu Bridge, Darshan Pura near Saket Degree College, the college crossing near Sadak Ganj post, main road by the side of the *Durahi Kuan* and the railway station.

10.8. Ayodhya is surrounded by conglomerations of predominantly Hindu villages. The surrounding towns of Gonda, Faizabad, and Sultanpur have been officially treated as "sensitive areas"[2]. Sensitive towns are identified in documents produced before me.

10.9. Over time, the surroundings villages evolved a mechanism to accommodate or shield Karsevaks, coming and staying like nomads in anticipation of any restrictions put by state on their converging to Ayodhya or for Karseva. They used to be taken to Ayodhya as and when their organizers or leaders desired.

10.10. The town is currently inhibited with a multi-religious population consisting of Muslims, Buddhist, Sikhs, Christians, Jains etc., but the majority of the population is Hindu. The temples were open to people of all denominations.

10.11. The town is net work of small wide lanes, by lanes, and market places etc.

[2] *See statement of DB Rai Senior Superintendent of Police. Other documents evidencing this were also duly produced before the Commission.*

10.12. The whole town is constituted into five Thanas[3] under the charge Superintendent of Police, Kotwali. The town is divided into two zones headed by a Deputy Superintendent of Police; and further divided into five sectors, each under the charge of an Inspector.

10.13. The *Ram Janambhoomi Thaana* had two Chowkis under the charge of a gazetted officer with one inspector/sub inspector as the Station House Officer (SHO), and was staffed by three constables and ten home guards. *Ram Janambhoomi Police Chowki* has a territorial jurisdiction of 4 kilometres with *Balki Bhawan*, *Choti Chawani* and *Janki Mahal Trust*. The primary function of the *Chowkis* and the force at *Chowkis* was to arrange for sensitive religious institutions, ensure security of minorities and of the *Karsevaks* and of their camps[4]. The Chowki was in communication with the control room and was responsible for the patrolling of the area[5].

[3] *Police Station*

[4] *See statement of AK Saran, CW8*

[5] *See statement of SC Chaubey (CGW 23), AK Saran (CW8) and CW8/4*

11. The "disputed structure"

11.1. The disputed structure is situated in a village *Ram Kothi Pargan Haveli* in the Tehsil and District Faizabad in UP.

11.2. The most prominent is the main building consisting of a structure with double iron barricades within the complex. The place came to the centre stage and became an issue.

11.3. The structure is referred as the "disputed structure" in judgments, in the statement of witnesses, and also in the issues referred to the Commission.

11.4. Self appointed leaders and hard cores protagonist of Hindus like Vinay Katiyar, made dramatic attempts before this Commission to contest the referral to the site as a "disputed structure". However, the place is claimed to be the birthplace of *Ram* by one section of the claimants and as a mosque by the others. The terms of reference given to this Commission also use the descriptor "disputed structure" and therefore in this report, it will be referred to as the "disputed structure".

12. The layout of the Disputed Structure

12.1. There are large numbers of temples, mosques, shrines, tombs, gardens and other religious monuments spread over a large area; rather, metaphorically it is said that in Ayodhya every house is a temple.

12.2. Prominent temples were *Sankat Mochan Mandir*, *Shakshi Gopal Mandir Shesh Avatar* temple *Ved Mandir*, *Mani Ram Ki Chawni*, *Hanumangarhi*, *Preethi Ke Thakur*, *Kanak Bhawan*, *Rang Mahal*, *Annand Bhawan*, and *Kaushalya Bhawan* etc. Other important buildings in the town were the *Janki Mahal* at a distance of 2.5 km from the disputed structure and 1 kilometre from the *Saryu* River. The disputed structure is connected through narrow streets, roads, and Bazaars. Other important buildings which need to be mentioned are the *Manas Bhawan*, *Dashartha Mahal (Bara Sthan)*, *Raj Sadan*, *Raj Gopal Sadan*, *Vasisht Ashram*, and *Gopal Bhawan*. There was a graveyard near the disputed structure.

12.3. With passage of time, number of well-known Akharas established themselves in the town, namely *Digamber Akhara*, *Mani Das Ram Chawani* (Cantt.), *Bare Chawani*, *Janaki Chawani*, *Tulsi Das Chawani*, *Khaki Akhara*, *Nirman Akhara* and *Hanumangarhi* amongst others. All public places, be it a mosque, church, gurudwara, temple, sarai or Akhara were put to common use.

12.4. There were a number of *Parikarmas*. The *Panch Kosi Parikarma* was confined to *Antra Grah* where 8 Gods are situated namely: *Ran Janambhoomi*,

Hanuman Mandir, *Nageshwar Nath*, *Dev Kali*, *Lakshmanji*, *Saryu Ji*, *Sapt Sagar*, *and Kanak Bhawan.* There were other Parikarmas as well, extending almost till the last one around the disputed structure. Reference can be made to the statement of Paramhans Ramchander Dass[6].

12.5. The disputed structure and the places around it were known as the Ram Janambhoomi Complex. Shilanyas site in Ram Janambhoomi complex is at a distance of 162 feet on the east of the disputed structure / *Garb Grah*[7] in the acquired land of 2.77 acres. It is immediately to the west of the *Manas Bhawan* lane. There was an open area on the southern side of *Shilanyas Sthal.*

12.6. The leaders of the extant movement and all the relevant people were staying at *Janki Mahal Trust* at the time. Another place used for stay was the *Saket Degree College* at a distance of about two kilometres away from the disputed structure.

12.7. Between *Shilanyas* and *Garb Grah,* only about a thousand people could collect at a time. The site of *Karseva* was at a distance of 200 yards to 300 yards away from the disputed structure.

12.8. *Shesh Avatar* temple was demolished and rebuilt for 2000 people[8]. Nearby on the western side an iron gate was fixed from wherein, the construction material for *Shesh Avatar Mandir* used to be taken. The gate was closed on

[6] *DW 11*

[7] *Sanctum Sanctorum*

[8] *Stated by Mahant Paramhans Ram Chander Dass, (DW11)*

the 6th of December 1992[9].

12.9. A security wall popularly known as *Ram Deewar* started from below the disputed structure from south-western end of it towards *Shesh Avatar Mandir*, passing before *Ram Katha Kunj,* going up to *Sita Rasoi* running around the *Shesh Avatar Mandir*. On the east, west, and south, a security wall was constructed on three sides of disputed structure around 2.77 acres of acquired land. The height of the wall varied between five and a half feet high (from inside) and six to seven feet high (from outside).

12.10. *Karseva* was to start in the acquired land at a distance of 200 feet from the *Garb Grah* at *Chabutra.* The other place in the *Ram Janambhoomi* complex is *Ram Katha Kunj.* It is a vacant space outside the security wall. People were accommodated there in the hundreds before 1984. After levelling about 10,000 people could sit there[10]. Giri Raj Kishore also stated that there was no *Ram Katha Kunj* in 1984. However, that is immaterial for the purposes of the report. *Ram Katha Kunj* is in an area of 40-50 acres of open land. There is a small structure in it, which was and continues to be an office of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) and meetings including public meetings used to be held here. Public address system of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad or the organizers was there. It was known as *Ram Katha Kunj* .

12.11. The distance between disputed structure and *Ram Katha Kunj* was 250 meters and outside the wall at *Ram Katha Kunj* karsevaks and the public used

[9] *Stated by Shukla (CGW4)*

[10] *Stated by Giriraj Kishore (CW28)*

to gather. There was no specific exit point in the open areas.

12.12. The topography and facts about *Ram Katha Kunj,* Ayodhya town or the *Ram Janambhoomi* complex or *Ram Katha Kunj* or the disputed structure are however not disputed. The facts are corroborated by NC Padhi[11] in his statement with no contradiction.

12.13. The disputed structure was situated on raised ground on a mound of 30 feet height in the east, 50 feet on the West resembling a *Stupa.* There is a huge trek near it and there was a turf on the western side of the structure. Land around the disputed structure was uneven.

12.14. On three sides of disputed structure, on the east west and south, a security wall was constructed around 2.77 acres of acquired land which was known as *Ram Dewar.* It was the boundary wall of the proposed temple at the disputed structure. There was a perimeter or Security wall and surrounded the temples. There was a wall on the back of the domes and after the wall; there were fields with 30 feet deep gradient of one and half *Bighas.* The height of the walls varied in the structure. There were houses, roads and the fields on the back of the disputed structured after 30 feet depression. There were three domes in the disputed structure. The middle dome was described by one section to the dispute, as the *Garb Grah* while others described it as a *Mosque.* It is well understood by the rival claimants and even by a common man that land in dispute means the actual structure and *Ram Chabutra* within the inner courtyard subservient to structure towards the East of the disputed

[11] *CGW32*

structure. The total length of the disputed place from west to east is 75 feet while the length of the proposed temple to be constructed is 270 x 250 feet. The main gate of it was to be constructed at a distance of 255 feet away from the East while the *Shilanyas* of the temple was at a distance of 250 feet from the proposed main gate which would be outside the precincts of the disputed place[12].

12.15. There was an open passage in front of the disputed structure, known as *Sankirtan*. JD Puri[13] stated that half the distance from the disputed structure towards eastern security wall was open, because the barricading was not placed fully up to the western wall for the entrance of the pilgrims and this fact is not disputed by any one.

12.16. The distance between the highway and the disputed structure was 200 yards. *Karseva* was to start in the acquired land at a distance of 200 feet from the *Garb Grah* at Chabutra. Distance between inner and outer cordon was 150 feet. Distance between isolation cordon and inner cordon was 10 to 15 feet. There was iron double barricading with inlet and outlet doors with Main entry gate and exit gate in the main disputed structures. There was a passage provided by wooden barricading to regulate pilgrims. Walls were constructed as boundary of the worship site with two doors therein. *Shilanyas* and main building of disputed structure had double iron barricades[14]. *Karsevapuram* was at the back of the Saryu River at a distance of 2-4

[12] *See file number 4.200/30/D/89*

[13] *DW5*

[14] *Topography is recorded in the office file number 11. 131/1/10/90 – cx- 3 and File No 5 – 1 355/D/91.*

kilometres from the disputed structure. The Karsevapuram office was at the bank of the Saryu River. Singhdwar was at a distance of 192 feet, Shilanyas was at 162 feet on the east of the idols. The distance of Shilanyas was at a distance of 300 yards from the disputed structure. The camps of the karsevaks were half a mile from the disputed structure. The public address system was at the same distance.

12.17. In the outer cordon, a 10 feet wall was constructed to which subsequently, three gates were added. There was a barricading of 10 feet height. There were some concertina wires in the inner cordon. The level of barricading was low. It was adequate to regulate the crowd[15]. Pilgrims could approach the 2.77 acres in two lines, one for men and other for women with a dividing barricade being there. No other passage was there. Mohammad Subrati[16] stated that the locality of *Kalyana* is situated at a distance of 200 yards from the disputed structure and there are 70 acres of land lying vacant. He stated that between the layout and disputed structure is a garden, while the police post *Ram Janambhoomi* was 50 metres away from the disputed structure towards the Eastern northern side. It was corroborated by Ganga Prashad Tiwari[17], and Sheikh Juman[18], D.D Gupta[19], Ashok Singhal[20] read with

[15] *See CW8/3*

[16] *CGW46*

[17] *CGW53*

[18] *CGW47*

[19] *DW2*

[20] *DW9*

Paramhans Ramchander Dass[21]. There were two main roads on eastern side and northern side of the disputed structure.

12.18. On the east of the disputed structure touching the boundary wall were shops, huts, *Shakshi Gopal* Temple. On the north eastern corner of the acquired land was *Ram Janambhoomi* sandesh. Temple of *Sankat Mochan* was situated on the entry to the disputed structure from the *Ved Mandir* crossing on the *Durahi Kuan* Road. Down south of *Sankat Mochan* Temple and East of the disputed structure were the sites of *Shilanyas*, Shila - Sangrah and further little down was Akhand Manas Path Sthan, with further down was Amar Das Mandap, Sita well, or some huts. All the above sites were adjoining the boundary wall within the acquired land. There is the Maine Road on the East of disputed structure with plain lane passage to the disputed structure. There was a door with double iron barricading in front of the eastern gate of disputed structure which is the second frisking gate. On eastern side, half of the length of was without security wall with no barricades. On the east of the disputed structure, there was the wall with entry gate followed by another wall with gate with *Ram Chabutra* in between.

12.19. There were *Kacha* house on the west of the disputed structure. There was a concertina wire on the West and South side of disputed structure with a gate on western side.

12.20. On the north of the disputed structure there was a metalled road. It ended on the western side of the *Durahi Kuan road* at a distance of 1 km on eastern

[21] *DW11*

side, while ended on the crossing near the northeast corner of the acquired land known as *Ved Mandir* crossing. The road was known as *Durahi Kuan* Road with ten feet width[22]. From this crossing, one road leads to *Hanuman Garhi* towards East, the other to *Ved Mandir* towards North while the third lead to Faizabad on south. Across the road on the north, disputed structure there was *Sita Rasoi*. Toward the south of the *Durahi Kuan* on the north of disputed structure, there was *Kaushalya Rasoi* with a fence of barbed wire.

12.21. On the northeast of it was police control room, with an exit gate between *Kaushalya Rasoi* and police control room opening on the south of the *Durahi Kuan* road. There was *Singh Dwar* on the north of disputed structure for exit from it to *East of Kaushalya Rasoi*. *Singh Dwar* is south of *Durahi Kuan* Road and *Sita Rasoi*. There was main road on the north side of disputed structure with plain passage leading to the disputed structure. Land on the north around disputed site was uneven. The distance between the security wall and the disputed structure on the north was half furlong.

12.22. *Police Chowki Sumitra Bhawan* was on the south of the disputed structure in the southeast corner in the south of acquired land. On the south of the disputed structure, there was a huge depression on the acquired land which was not filled before 6th December 1992. On the south of the disputed structure, there was open land. *Dwarka Dass* temple, exhibition pandal was on the south west of the corner of *Shilanyas* Sthal with sidewalls of bricks with two entrances opening on the north side with no doors and having

[22] *As stated by Anju Gupta (CGW8); however DB Rai stated it to be 20 – 25 feet wide*

wooden frames[23]. On the southern side filling of depression near *Ram Janambhoomi* adversely affected the barbed wire fencing on the outer cordon. There was an open area on the south side of the *Shilanyas Sthal.*

12.23. Peeyush Srivastava[24] stated that on the corner of South east acquired land there was *Anand Gali* known as *Anand Keshatra* leading to *Ram Katha Kunj* with Barrier. Distance between the security wall and the disputed structure on the South was 42 acres.

12.24. The District Magistrate vide his letter dated 15th July 1992 suggested in his plan for traffic movement at the disputed structure, that the passage for exit and entrance from *Singh Dwar* be divided into three parts one for females one for males and one common passage for all to exit to the *Durahi Kuan* Road. It was suggested that entry to other area at the acquired land within security wall should be on the eastern side of the security wall near *Sita Koop* for both coming and going. Entry to disputed structure was not possible from the open space in required land. It was accepted by SC Chaubay that there was only one route for exit and entry to dispute structured and no escape route for isolation cordon was thought of. DB Roy stated that prior to February 1992 the entry to complex used to be from Sita Koop and exit was from *Singh Dwar*. The people were not allowed to have Parikarma. Entry to *Shesh Avatar Mandir* was separate. There was separate passage for Sheshavtar Mandir. It was alleged that there was a separate passage for *Karsevaks* and

[23] *Refer to CGW 23/16, CGW 16/4. Reference may also be made to the statements of SC Chaubey (CGW23); Mulayam Singh (DW12)*

[24] *CGW10*

Darshnarthis from Raghu Dwar channel[25]. However, this is contrary to the facts on the spot. Abdula Nasir[26] stated that a new road of 80 feet wide from the police Chowki was constructed to go to the complex obviating the need to go to the bazaars.

12.25. A new control room was constructed at the distance of 30 m on the advice of the Intelligence Bureau (IB) on the 80 feet wide road. It was proposed to construct a Parikarma road which has not been constructed even till date. The proposal of entry and exit to 2.77 acres through Raghu Gate being closed was rejected as not possible till the metalled road from Raghu gate to channel gate is widened by 10 feet to provide three barricades lines. Entry from *Shilanyas* side was closed to the disputed structure on 6th December 1992. Entry and exit was provided from *Singh Dwar* by putting the barricade. There were Channels gates at entrance and exit in the outer cordon[27].

12.26. Akhilesh Mehrotra[28] stated that iron gates fixed on disputed structure and nobody could enter when the gates were closed[29]. The pilgrims or the *Karsevaks* or the security forces had an access to the disputed structure coming from any direction, i.e. from the *Hanuman Garhi* Road, *Ved Mandir* Road, *Durahi Kuan* Road or lane of Manas Bhawan, through an entry from

[25] *Refer to DW5/8*

[26] *CGW20*

[27] *Refer to CGW 23/22*

[28] *CW11*

[29] *Refer to DW 13/21*

Durahi Kuan where DFDM was put. The iron barricading starting from *Durahi Kuan* ended up at the gate of disputed structure. It had another inlet from the side of police post on the north to provide an entry to *Sankat Mochan* Temple as well as the area of *Shilanyas* at *Shila Nyas, Amar Das Mandap, Sumatra Bhawan, Sita Koop, Mani Ramdas Mandir*, *Ram Janambhoomi* Nyas etc. There were doorframe metal detectors (DFMD) provided there. There was a gate opening to and from the isolation cordon to outer cordon of the barricade with two gates providing an opening.

12.27. The barricade on the *Manas Bhawan* Street Lane provided a passage from the street of *Manas Bhawan* to the site of *Shila Nyas, Summitra Bhawan, Sita Koop, Mani Ramdas Mandir, Ram Janambhoomi* Nyas, Police Chowki, and Amar Das Mandap. There are openings from Lane of the Manas Bhawan trust to the *Shakshi Gopal Mandir*.

12.28. On the 6th of December, the entrance from *Shilanyas* side was closed, and entrance and exit was provided from *Singh Dwar* by putting a barricade and dividing it[30]. There was an entry to disputed structure through the acquired land from the *Durahi Kuan* near the crossing *Ved Mandir* touching *Sankat Mochan* Temple entry gate on the east of disputed structure. The feeding roads leading to temple were Durahi Kuan, Ved Mandir, *Hanuman Garhi* and Teri Bazaar.

[30] *Refer to CGW23/22*

12.29. NC Padhi[31] and DD Gupta[32] have stated that in the outer cordon, at main entrance and exit, channel gates were there. There was no special route either for the entrance of, or for calling in additional forces. Iron gates were fixed on the disputed structure. Akhilesh Mehrotra[33] stated that there was a main gate and nobody could enter when the gate was closed. There were three narrow exit and entrance in the walled area[34].

12.30. There was an iron gate near the security wall where *Shesh Avatar Mandir* was under construction and for which, the material was taken in from this gate; this gate was closed on the 6th December. Shukla[35] stated that from the disputed structure via *Shakshi Gopal Mandir* and *Ved Mandir,* trucks could not reach the main road leading to Faizabad.

12.31. There was a road on the back of the land and disputed structure with no link road in between, leading to the main highway to Faizabad. From the side of *Hanuman Garhi* trucks could not reach to disputed structure. There was another road from *Hanuman Garhi* to the disputed structure. It was under construction on which trucks could ply with some difficulty.

12.32. There was a staircase on the south east corner of the disputed structure leading to the roof of the dome. Ram Lal Ram[36] stated that *Karsevaks* were

---

[31] *CGW32*

[32] *DW2*

[33] *CW11*

[34] *Refer to DW 13/21*

[35] *CGW4*

[36] *CGW15*

neither permitted nor required to go to the dispute structure. They were required to go to *Shesh Avatar Mandir* and go through a separate entry while *Darshnarthis* were to go by another entry to disputed structure and exit separately.

12.33. A message dated 27th of May was sent that the entry gate from *Shilanyas* site was closed and visitors were allowed to enter from the recently opened *Singh Dwar* Gate which was used for entry as well as exit by putting a barricade in between[37].

12.34. For entry of *Karsevaks*, a gate was constructed in front of the Shakshi Gopal Mandir; pilgrims would enter and they would be frisked at the gate., It was pointed out vide the White Paper issued by the Government of India, that frisking to *Ram Janambhoomi* Complex was discontinued in 1992 which fact was not controverted by any one[38]. It was after paying obeisance at *Garb Grah* they would go to *Summitra Bhawan* premises through the barricade passage and pass through *Abhi Ram Das Mandir* passage to the *Shilanyas* path; exit through the Manas Bhawan passage. *Karsevaks* could be permitted from the passage near Manas Bhawan to *Shilanyas* premises. If they wanted to go to the disputed structure, they had to go to Main Channel Gate and go through the above said route. On demolition of major portion of *Sankat Mochan* Temple, for the passage through the Channel Gate and *Shilanyas* premises there was no barricading. It was suggested, that it was desirable to erect strong barricade before 30th of October 1991 and that a sufficient number of

[37] *Refer to CGW 23/2*

[38] *Reference is made to the Government of India White Paper*

police personnel be deployed so that people may not be able to come directly from *Shilanyas* premises directly to the disputed structure[39].

12.35. S.V.M. Tripathi[40] stated that *Ram Katha Kunj* is situated outside the outer wall shown in the Plan Ex. CW-15/3. The *Karsevaks* were to enter from the gate marked in the said site plan and go along with this double barricade and throw whatever sand they were permitted to throw and then they would go outside from the *Shesh Avatar* gate. Raman Kirpal[41] stated that *Karseva* had to be performed all over the plot and it had two gates; the entrance known as the Ram Gate and the exit as the Laxman Gate.

12.36. Succinctly and finally, the position emerged on the ground on 6th of December 1992, that the pilgrims were required to enter from road through the gate on *Durahi Kuan* Road and here that they were frisked. They passed through a double barricade providing two lines, one for men and other for women, parallel to the *Durahi Kuan* road to reach an opening in the piped barricade forming an outer cordon, thus entering the outer cordon through marked gate. Within the piped barricade, there was no restriction on the movement of the persons entering it. Site plans of before and after the demolition of the disputed structure on the 6th of December 1992 are annexed with this report.

12.37. The pilgrims used to enter inner cordon through a door in a wall around the disputed structure thereby reaching into open place wherein *Ram Chabutra*

[39] *Facts were recorded in official nothings in File No. 20.200/87/D/91.*

[40] *CW15*

[41] *CW24*

was located. *Singh Dwar* was in this wall near Kaushalya Rasoi which was the exit gate in outer cordon with further having the opening in it on the Durahi Kuan. There was another wall encircling the disputed structure with two gates in it. *Darshnarthis* used to enter the disputed structure within the walled area known as an isolation cordon within where *Garb Grah* was situated. Exit route from the isolation cordon was from *Singh Dwar* to *Kaushalya Rasoi* in outer cordon from there through *Raghbar Dwar* to *Durahi Kuan* Road. A stair case having an iron gate in the isolation cordon for going to the roof of the domes was closed with concertina wires. The other gates were opening in the acquired in land where *Shilanyas* and other places in the *Ram Janambhoomi* complex were situated within security wall. Two walls were constructed in boundary wall at the worship site in 1990.

12.38. Though the isolation cordon is described differently by witnesses and the Government notes, yet finally in pith and substance it emerges that the isolation cordon fell inside the common wall of isolation cordon and inner cordon including the disputed structure with an inlet and exit gate[42]. It was an area of about 200 – 250 square feet around the dispute structure consisting of inside portion of shrine. There was a doorframe metal detector (DFMD) at the main entry gate. It was surrounded by an eight feet high wall. The inner portion of this wall constituted the isolation cordon[43]. The distance between the isolation cordon and disputed structure was about 10 to 15 feet.

[42] *As stated by J S Bisht (CGW7), OPS Malik (CGW16), Suman Gupta (CGW9), Acharya Dharminder Dev (CGW10 etc).*

[43] *as stated by RK Swami (CGW3)*

The distance between inner cordon and outer cordon was about 150 feet.

12.39. The inner cordon can be identified as the area between the outside wall of inner cordon and inner side of the wall of the inner cordon area. That is, between the inner cordon and south of the wall of the isolation cordon and west of the wall of inner cordon – the area between the two walls of isolation cordon and inner cordon constitutes inner cordon with a frisking in it. It had a 10 feet high concertina wire and iron piped barricade and an iron door[44]. Cordons were shown in CW8/30[45]. The outer cordon, earlier to the construction of the security wall area other than the isolation and inner cordon, was described as the outer cordon and thereafter the area between outside the wall of inner cordon and piped barricade in the acquired land was outer cordon. Security wall of ten feet height and 18 feet wide was built around the disputed structure on the acquired land except the north of the disputed structure[46].

12.40. Vehicular traffic was not permitted on the road and it was stopped at *Durahi Kuan* at a distance of 1 kilometre from the dispute structure regardless of whether the vehicle belonged to the police, leaders, *Karsevaks* or the public. The car park was situated at Durahi Kuan. Additional parking space was providing across Saryu at Katra on the other side of the Saket Degree College near *Darshan Pura*[47].

---

[44] *Refer to the statements of OPS Malik (CGW16) and AK Saran (CW8)*

[45] *Refer to the statements of OPS Malik (CGW16) and AK Saran (CW8)*

[46] *Refer to DW 13/21*

[47] *as stated by CW11 Akhilesh Mehrotra*

12.41. Ultimately, from a geographical perspective it emerges that there was every possibility of the crowd or the hard cores coming out of Faizabad to reach Ayodhya and by all possible means. With their stated apathy towards the disputed structure, the people could not by any means be contained, restricted, or stopped. They were in a position to make their way, at their own terms conveniently.