

Babri Masjid- Ram JanmaBhumi Dispute

Date/ Year	Event	Notes
Pre-Independence		
1528	Babri Masjid is built.	Babri Masjid was built by Mir Baqi, who was they commander of Babur. It was built on an area of about 1500 sq. yards.
Middle of the 19 th Century	Hindus start worshipping the Ram Chabootra	Hindus start worshipping ram Chabutra towards South-East admeasuring 17' x 21' (39.6 square yard)
1855	Riot took place between hindus and muslims with respect to Hanuman Garhi.	Hanuman Garhi was a land near the disputed site which was claimed by the muslims to be a mosque.
1857-58	Railing and grill was places by the britishers specifying the the inner portion to be use by Muslims and the outer portion must be used by Hindus.	
1877	Another door for entrance towards the north for Hindus.	

<p>1885</p> <p>Decision on: 24.12.1885</p>	<p>Suit of 1885 being Suit No.61/280 of 1885 in Court of the Trial Court/Sub-Judge, Faizabad.</p>	<p>Mahanth Raghubar Das instituted suit seeking permission to construct a temple over Chabutra Janam Asthan situated in Ayodhya (17' x 21') . Impleadment application is filed Mohd. Ashgar. Court was of the opinion that granting permission to construct temple would amount to laying down foundation of riot between the two communities. Although the Hindus had ownership over chabutra, it was also observed that the need of the hour and the requirement of justice was not to grant the relief which had been claimed. Reference was made to the law of contract prohibiting performance of such contract which is opposed to the public policy (probably Section 23 of Contract Act, 1872)</p>
<p>1886</p> <p>Decision on: 18.03.1886</p>	<p>Civil Appeal</p> <p>No.27 of 1886 before the District Judge, Faizabad</p>	<p>Civil appeal against the judgement dated 24.12.1885 in Suit no. 61/280 of 1885. The learned district judge struck out the words 'holding the ownership of hindus over chabutra' as redundant. It also observed that <i>"The true object of the suit was disclosed by B. Kuccu Mul yesterday when we were standing near the masjid – namely that the British Government as no respector of persons was asked through its courts to remedy an injustice committed by a Mohammadan emperor."</i></p>

<p>1886 Decision on: 01.11.1886</p>	<p>Second Civil Appeal No.122 of 1886 before the Court of Judicial Commissioner, Oudh. (Justice W. Young)</p>	<p>Appeal against the judgment dated 18.03.1886 in Civil appeal no. 27 of 1886.</p> <p>It was observed in the judgment that “There is nothing whatever on the record to show that plaintiff is in any sense the proprietor of the land in question.”</p> <p>“The Hindus seem to have got very limited rights of access to certain spots within the precincts adjoining the mosque and they have for a series of years been persistently trying to increase those rights and to erect buildings on two spots in the enclosure: (1) Sita ki Rasoi</p> <p>(b) Ram Chandar ki Janam Bhumi.</p> <p>The Executive authorities have persistently refused these encroachments and absolutely forbid any alteration of the ‘status quo’.</p> <p>I think this is a very wise and proper procedure on their part and I am further of opinion that the Civil Courts have properly dismissed the Plaintiff’s claim.”</p>
---	---	---

1928	Nevill's Faizabad Gazetteer, 1928	<p><i>“It is locally affirmed that at the time of the Musalman conquest there were three important Hindu shrines at Ayodhya and little else. These were the Janmasthan temple, the Swargaddwar and the Treta-ka-Thakur, and each was successively made the object of attention of different Musalman rulers. The Janmasthan was in Ramkot and marked the birthplace of Rama. In 1528 Babar came to Ayodhya and halted here for a week. He destroyed the ancient temple and on its site built a mosque, still known as Babar's mosque. The materials of the old structure were largely employed, and many of the columns are in good. preservation, they are of close-grained black stone, called by the natives kasauti, and carved with various devices. Their length is from seven to eight feet, and the shape square at the base, centre and capital, the rest being round or octagonal. The mosque has two inscriptions, one on the outside and the other on the pulpit, both are in persian and bear and date 935 Hijri.”</i></p>
Post-Independence		
Pre-demolition		
26.02.1944	Babri Masjid was declared as public Waqf and published in official gazette.	

<p>29.11.1949</p>	<p>S.P. Faizabad, Shri Kripal Singh addressed letter to Shri Nayar, D.M/Dep. Commissioner, Faizabad.</p>	<p>In the letter it was reported that there were reports of graves getting systematically destroyed and that “<i>There is a strong rumour, that on purnamashi the Hindus will try to force entry into the mosque with the object of installing a deity.</i>”</p> <p>The S.P. later retracted the statement in letter to DIG dated 2.02.1950.</p>
<p>22- 23.12.1949 (Friday)</p>	<p>Placing of an idol of Shri Bagwan Ramji in compound of the Babri Mosque.</p>	<p>Idols of Ram Lalla were place under the central done outside the disputed structure.</p> <p>FIR was lodged stating that a crowd of 50-60 persons had broken the babri mosque and placed the idol. It is further mentioned that afterwards a crowd of 5000 people collected and raised religious slogans and performed <i>Kirtan</i>,</p> <p>According to the further case of the Muslims, the idol was placed on mimbar (pulpit) in the meharab (arch) under central dome from where on fridays, the Imam (who leads the congregation prayers) used to read khutba (Sermon, before friday prayer).</p> <p>After 23.12.1949 was continuing and two or three <i>Pandits</i> were deputed to perform religious rites like Bhog and Puja etc. and general public was permitted to have <i>darshan</i> from beyond the brick-grill wall.</p> <p>Muslims stopped offering prayers in the Mosque</p>

25.12.1949 – 27.12.1949	Entry in the Dairy of D.M refusing the removal of idols me	<p>The state government had directed removal of idols. But D.M K.K. Nayyar said that it was inadvisable as it may lead to slaughter.</p> <p>In letter to chief secretary written by D.M on 26 and 27th December, 1949, D.M insisted that the incident of 23.12.1949 was unpredictable and irreversible.</p>
29.12.1949	Preliminary order under Section 145, Cr. P.C. issued by Additional City Magistrate, Faizabad-cum-Ayodhya. Attachment order was also passed.	<p><i>“And the case being one of the emergency I hereby attach the said buildings pending decision.</i></p> <p><i>The attachment shall be carried out immediately by Station Officer, Ayodhya Police Station, who shall then put the attached properties in the charge of Sri Priya Datt Ram, Chairman Municipal Board, Faizabad-cum-Ayodhya who shall thereafter be the receiver thereof and shall arrange for the care of the property in dispute.”</i></p> <p>The pooja and Darshan continued.</p>
30.12.1949	Chief Secretary visit to the disputed structure.	
05.01.1950	Priya Datt Ram took charge.	<p>“..the most important item of management is the maintenance of Bhog and puja in the condition in which it was carried on when I took over charge”.</p>

<p>16.01.1950 (date of institution of suit)</p>	<p>Suit no. 1 - Original Suit (O.O.S.) No.1 of 1989, Regular Suit No.2 of 1950.</p> <p>Gopal Singh Visharad filed a suit in the Faizabad civil court seeking exclusive rights for performing puja for Lord Rama. He seeks a restraint order on the removal of idols on which the judge issued a temporary injunction. This order was later confirmed by a Division Bench of the Allahabad High Court</p>	<p>Facts: One Shri G.S. Visharad was stopped from offering prayers to the idol placed in the mosque.</p> <p>Suit filed by Sri G.S. Visharad claiming that it be declared that he according to his religion and custom is entitled to do worship and <i>darshan</i> of Sri Bhagwan Ram Chandra and others at the place of <i>Janam Bhumi</i> by going near the idols without any let or hindrance and state government or any other authority has no right to interfere in said rights. Prohibitory injunction was sought – against defendants (including Sunni Waqf board after 1989) - not remove the idols of Bhagwan Ram Chandra and others from the place where the idols were and they should also not close the way leading to that and should not interfere in worship and darshan in any manner.</p> <p>Original plaintiff died in 1986 and was substituted by his son.</p> <p>In suit no. 1 notice under section 80 of CPC was not given.</p> <p>The court granted interim injunction.</p>
--	--	---

19.01.1950	Injunction granted on 16.01.1950 was modified.	<p>Suit No.1 temporary injunction order had been passed restraining the defendants of the said suit from removing the idols from the mosque in dispute and from interfering in puja etc. of the Hindus as a result of which Hindus were permitted to perform puja of the idols placed by them in the mosque but the Muslims were not allowed even to enter the mosque.</p> <p><i>“The opposite parties are hereby restrained by means of temporary injunction to refrain from removing the idols in question from the site in dispute and from interfering with puja etc. as at present carried on. The order dated 16.01.1950 stands modified accordingly.”</i></p>
05.12.1950 (date of institution)	Suit no. 2 - Regular Suit No.25 of 1950 (O.O.S. No.2 of 1989) Dismissed as Withdrawn.	<p>Filed by Paramhans Ramchandra Das against Zahoor Ahmad and seven others. First five defendants were Muslims, residents of Ayodhya and those five defendants were defendants No.1 to 5 in Suit No.1 also. Defendant No.6 was State of U.P. and defendant No.7 was Deputy Commissioner, Faizabad. Sunni Central Board of Waqfs was added as defendant No.8 in 1989. Plaint similar to Suit no. 1.</p> <p>Suit No.2, it was mentioned that notice under Section 80, C.P.C. had been given to defendants No.6 & 7 on 07.02.1950.</p> <p>Application for withdrawal was filed by the plaintiff in 1990.</p> <p>Suit was filed so that notice under Section 80 of CPC could be served.</p>
03.03.1951	Temporary injunction order was confirmed by a detailed order.	

26.04.1955	Appeal under Order 43 Rule 1(r), C.P.C. filed against injunction ordered dated 03.03.1951.	
------------	--	--

<p>17.12.1959</p>	<p>Suit no. 3 – Regular Suit No.26 of 1959 (O.O.S. No.3 of 1989)</p> <p>Suit filed by the Nirmohi Akhada, seeking transfer of charge of the disputed site from the receiver.</p>	<p>Filed by <i>Nirmohi Akhara</i> through its <i>Mahant</i>. (after the death of Mahant, Chella was substituted)</p> <p>Defendant No.1 in the suit was initially Babu Priya Datt Ram – receiver under Section 145 CRPC, substituted by new receiver. Defendants No.2 to 5 were State of U.P., Deputy Commissioner Faizabad, City Magistrate and</p> <p>S.P. Faizabad. Defendant No.6 was Phekku (substituted by Sons.) Defendant No.7 was Mohd. Faiq. Defendant No.8 was Mohd. Achhan Mian. Defendant No.11 Mohd. Farook (added in 1991)Defendant No.9 was U.P. Sunni Central Board of Waqfs (added in 1989) Umesh Chandra Pandey impleaded as defendant No.10 on 28.01.1989 on his on application.</p> <p>The case of plaintiff Nirmohi Akhara was that for a very long time in Ayodhya an ancient math and akhara of Ramanandi Varagis called Nirmohis existed which was a religious establishment of a public character. It was further pleaded that Janma Asthan now commonly known as Janam Bhumi, the birth place of Lord Ram Chandra at the time of filing of the suit belonged and it had always belonged to Nirmohi Akhara who through its Mahant and Sarbrahkar had always been managing and receiving offerings made there at in the form of money etc. Entire premises was claimed to be temple using map made by Vakil Commissioner in Suit no. 1. {On 06.12.1992, this plaint was amended. It was asserted that the main temple and other temples of Nirmohi Akharha were also demolished by some miscreants, who had no religion, caste or creed.}</p>
-------------------	--	---

		<p>Nirmohi Akhara was the panchyati Math of Ramanandi Sect. of Vairagies and as such was a religious denomination and the customs had been reduced in writing on 19.03.1949 by registered deed.</p> <p>Muslims could not enter temple. Since 1934 no Muslim ever entered the premises.</p> <p>The attachment under Section 145, Cr.P.C. was stated to be illegal and having been made on wrong persuasion of defendant No.6 to 8, who claimed to represent the Muslim Community.</p> <p>The plaintiffs had wrongfully been deprived of management and charge of the temple and had been waiting for dropping of the proceedings under Section 145, Cr.P.C. but the same were being unduly prolonged and lingered and as no immediate termination of proceedings under Section 145, Cr.P.C. was in sight hence the suit had become inevitable. Cause of action was stated to have arisen on 05.01.1950 – when the magistrate took management and charge.</p> <p>The prayer in the suit is that a decree be passed for removal of the defendant No.1 (receiver) from the management and charge of the said temple of Janma Bhoomi and delivering the same to the plaintiff through its mahant.</p>
--	--	--

26.07.1961	Report by Special Intelligence Officer.	Indicates that K.K.K Nayar was supporter of Ram.
------------	---	--

<p>18.12.1961</p>	<p>Suit no. 4 – Regular Suit No.12 of 1961 (O.O.S. No.4 of 1989) - U.P. Sunni Central Board of Wakfs for the declaration and possession of the Babri site.</p>	<p>Filed by The Sunni Central Board of Waqfs, U.P. and 9 Muslims of Ayodhya (most of whom have died).</p> <p>First defendant in the suit was Sri G.S. Visharad, plaintiff of Suit No.1, second Param Hans Ram Chander Das, third Nirmohi Akhara, fourth Mahant of Nirmohi Akhara, fifth State of U.P., sixth Collector, Faizabad, seventh City Magistrate, Faizabad, eighth S.P. of Faizabad, ninth Priya Dutt (deceased), tenth President, All India Hindu Maha Sabha, eleventh President, Arya Maha Pradeshik Sabha, twelfth President, All India Sanatan, Dharm Sabha, Delhi and some others. Defendant No.21 was Prince Anjum Qadar, President All India Shia Conference, Registered, Qaumi Ghar, Nadan Mohal Road, P.S. Chowk, Lucknow. Defendants 11 to 22 were impleaded after filing of the suit on their own applications.</p> <p>In Ayodhya there existed an ancient historic mosque commonly known as Babri Masjid built by Emperor Babar more than 433 years ago, after his conquest of India and occupation of the territories including the town of Ayodhya. Map was also attached. Dividing the land in ABCD and towards south-east of eastern part a portion is demarcated dimensions of which are given as 17' X 21' and it is denoted by the words Chabutra Masjid. On all the four sides was ancient graveyard of the Muslims consisting of the graves of the Muslims who lost lives in the battle between Emperor Babar and the previous Ruler of Ayodhya; that the mosque and the graveyard vested in Almighty; the Mosque had since the time of its construction been used by the Muslims for offering prayers. U.P. Muslim Waqfs Act, 1936, Commissioner of Waqfs made a detailed enquiry and held that Babri Masjid was built by Emperor Babar</p>
-------------------	--	--

		<p>and hence was a public waqf. This fact was published in official gazette dated 26.02.1944 and was'nt challenged by Hindus.</p> <p>It was also stated that the suit of 1885 operated as res judicata.</p> <p>On 29.11.1963, amendment was made to the plaint and following para was added:<i>“That assuming, though not admitting, that at one time there existed a Hindu temple as alleged by the defendants representatives of the Hindus on the site of which of which emperor Babar built the mosque, some 433 years ago, the Muslims, by virtue of their long exclusive and continuous possession beginning from the time the mosque was built and continuing right upto the time some mischievous persons entered the mosque and desecrated the mosque as alleged in the preceding paragraphs of the plaint, the Muslims perfected their title by adverse possession and the right, title or interest of the temple and of the Hindu public if any extinguished.”</i></p> <p>Order 1 Rule 8 C.P.C. against Hindu public and for the benefit of entire Muslim community along with application for permission under Order 1 Rule 8 C.P.C.</p> <p>23.12.1949. It was also stated in para 23 that <i>“Hindus unlawfully and illegally entered the mosque and desecrated the mosque by placing idols in the mosque, thus causing obstruction and interference with the rights of the Muslims in general of saying prayers.”</i></p> <p>By way of this suit, plaintiff prayed for recovery of possession.</p>
--	--	--

After the demolition of Babri in 1992, it was stated that under Muslim Law, a mosque is a place where prayers are offered publicly and it does not require any structure and even an open space could be a mosque, hence even after demolition the land continued to be mosque. The cause of action raised in 1949 when idol was placed and it was further stated that the injuries caused were continuing injuries and cause of action was renewed de-die-diem.

On 25.05.1995, another amendment to plaint - to the effect that statutory receiver be commanded to handover the property in dispute by removing the unauthorized construction erected thereon – apart from recovery of possession and removal of idol.

In reply – defendants filed written statements.

Main points are mentioned below:

- Plaintiff (Sunni) had no right to make the defendant contest the suit in a representative capacity.
- suit was hopelessly barred by time and the Muslims had not been in possession of the property in dispute since 1934 and earlier
- Muslims were never in possession of the temple called Ram Janam Bhoomi and if ever they were in possession of the so called Babari Mosque, their possession ceased thereon in 1934 and since then Hindus were holding that temple in their possession.
- It was also denied that the judgment in the suit of 1885 operated as res-judicata. Additional written statement was also filed which also related to

		<p>Waqf Act and Government of India Act, 1935.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Denied that Babar had made any conquest or occupation of any territory in India at the time alleged in the plaint or had constructed a mosque at the disputed place. Existence of graveyard was also denied.· Temples of Nirmohi Akhara etc. were demolished by some miscreants on 06.12.1992, who had no religion, cast or creed; and that Ram Chabootara whose existence was judicially recognised in 1885 was in possession of Nirmohi Akhara.· Passing of U.P. Waqf Act of 1935 (Sic. U.P. Muslim Act 1936) was an atrocity committed by the British Rulers and on regaining independence original Hindu Law had revived and Constitution itself having been imposed by misrepresentation was voidable <i>ab-initio</i>.· It was also stated that the temple did not belong to any sect, group, math or individual or Mahanth or any Akhara. Plea of bar of limitation had also been taken. It was also pleaded that Britishers reclaimed the entire land in Oudh/Ayodhya and thereafter no fresh grant was made in respect of the property in dispute, hence rights of Muslims, if any, stood lost.· Placing idol not mischievous act but a perfectly lawful exercise of their right by the Hindus to worship the Deity.· Ancient temple of Maharaja Vikramditya's time existed at Sri Rama Janma Bhumi, and that was demolished by Mir Baqi.· Bhagwan Sri Ram manifested himself
--	--	---

		<p>in human form as an incarnation of Bhagwan Vishnu according to the tradition and faith of the Hindus.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Mosque even if constructed was against the principles of Muslim Law and that attempt to construct mosque did not completely succeed.· It was stated that as the story goes, whatever was constructed during the day fell down during the night, and it was only after making certain material concessions in favour of the Hindus for the continued preservation of the place as a place of Hindu worship, that the construction of the three-domed structure was somehow completed by Mir Baqi.· Idols were not placed in the night of 22nd /23rd December, 1949 but were in existence from times immemorial and what was demolished on 06.12.1992 was not a mosque and the Babar was invader and had no legal authority to construct any Masjid.· Babar neither demolished any temple nor constructed any mosque and Britishers wrongly gave currency to the said idea. It was also stated that in case there had been any mosque then Tulsi Das or Beveridge or Laiden should have mentioned it. It was also stated that Ayodhya Mahatim was also silent about any mosque. Further statement was that until 1855 there was no mosque, entire premises in dispute was temple.· if Babar constructed mosque, it was no mosque in the eye of Muslim Law. In the same para, it was also mentioned that subsequently Aurangzeb also desecrated the shrines of Ayodhya.
--	--	---

06.01.1964	<p>Order by Civil Judge, Faizabad for consolidation of suits.</p> <p>All suits from no. 1 to 4 were before the Munsif Sardar, Faizabad.</p>	<p>All three suits filed by Hindus and the one filed by the Waqf Board are consolidated as suit No. 12/196, becoming the main case in the dispute.</p>
25.01.1986	<p>Application by Umesh Chand Pandey stating that the public must be permitted to do darshan from inside and locks placed on brick-grill wall should be remove.</p> <p>This application was rejected by Munsif Court. Appeal was filed on 31.01.1986.</p>	
01.02.1986	<p>Judgment by District Judge passed on application to open the grills and doors.</p>	<p>District Judge held that keeping both the doors in the grill/ railing was unnecessary, irritant to the applicant and the other members of the public and it was an artificial barrier in between the idols and the devotees.</p> <p>Within minutes of this order the gates were opened.</p>
1986	<p>Muslims set up Babri Mosque Action Committee in protest.</p>	

1987	Transfer to the High Court.	State of U.P. filed an application in this High Court under Section 24, C.P.C. seeking withdrawal of the four suits, which were pending at that time before Munsif Sadar Faizabad to this High Court.
1989	VHP steps up campaign, laying the foundations of a Rama temple on the land adjacent to the disputed Mosque.	

<p>01.07.1989</p>	<p>Suit by Shri Ramlala. Before the Civil Judge, Faizabad.</p>	<p>Filed by Bhagwan Sri Ram Birajman at Sri Ram Janam Bhoomi Ayodhya, Asthan Sri Ram Janam Bhoomi, Ayodhya and Sri Deoki Nandan Agarwala, senior advocate and retired Judge, High Court, resident of Allahabad.</p> <p>Defendants in the said suit are Rajendra Singh son of Gopal Singh Visharad, the original plaintiff of Suit No.1. Defendant No.2 is Param Hans Mahant Ram Chandra plaintiff of Suit No.2 defendant No.3 is Nirmohi Akhara, plaintiff of Suit No.3. Defendant No.4 is Sunni Central Board of Waqfs. Defendants No. 5 & 6 are Mohammad Hashim and Mohammad Ahmad. (27 defendants)</p> <p>Both the plaintiffs No.1 & 2 are juridical persons and plaintiff No.3 is a Vaishnava Hindu and seeks to represent the Deity and the Asthan as a next friend.</p> <p>Ram Janam Bhoomi is too well known at Ayodhya and it does not require any description for purposes of identification of the subject matter of dispute.</p> <p>The place itself being birth place of Lord Ram is object of worship as Deity.</p> <p>Illustration of Kedarnath has been given where there is no idol and where an undulating surface of stone is worshipped as Deity. Next example given is of Vishnupad Temple at Gaya, which does not contain any idol and said place is believed to have born the footprints of Bhagwan Vishnu, hence it is worshipped as Deity. Thereafter, it has been stated that the place, Sri Ram Janam Bhoomi is worshipped as Deity, which is a juridical person and the actual performance of puja of such an immovable Deity by its devotees is not essential for its existence as a Deity. There was an ancient temple of Maharaja Vikramditya's time at Sri Ram Janam Bhoomi, which was destroyed partly by Mir Baqi, a commander of Baber's hordes and an attempt was made to raise a mosque there and for the construction of the mosque almost entire material used was of the temple</p>
-------------------	--	--

including its kasauti pillars with figures of Hindu Gods and Goddesses carved on them. Thereafter, it is mentioned that neither there is any minaret nor place for storage of water for Vazoo in the alleged mosque in question. It is also stated that many battles were fought by the Hindus, the last one of which occurred in 1855.

The 1928 gazetteer was quoted.

10.07.1989	Suits were transferred to the High Court.	The suits were withdrawn to the High Court and directed to be heard by a Full Bench.
9.11.1989	The then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, allows 'shilanyas' or ground-breaking ceremony, at an undisputed site.	
1990	The then BJP president L.K. Advani launches a Rath Yatra to amass support for the construction of a temple at the disputed site.	
07.10.1991 & 10.10.1991	Land acquisition under Section 4 and 6 of the LA Act. – State of U.P. acquired the premises in dispute along with some adjoining area (total area 2.77 acres) for 'development of tourism and providing amenities to Pilgrims in Ayodhya'	This acquisition was challenged by six writ petitions leading one being writ petition no.3540 (MB) of 1991. The operation of this notification were stayed.
Post-Demolition		

<p>06.12.1992</p>	<p>Demolition of the Babri Masjid.</p> <p>Karsevaks construct a makeshift temple under the central dome.</p> <p>Filing of First Information Reports</p>	<p>Karsevaks demolish the Babri Masjid at 12.15 pm.</p> <p>Two FIRs were registered following the demolition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Crime no. 197 – against ‘ lakhs of unkown kar sevaks’- for demolition and for spreading communal hatred. (demolition case) ii. Crimne no. 198 – against 8 named persons being L.K. Advani, M.M. Joshi, Uma Bharti, Ashok Singhal, Giriraj Kishore, V.H. Dalmia, Vinay Katiyar and Sadhvi Ritambhara for delivering communally inflammatory speeches prior to the demolition (Sec. 153 A of the IPC). (Speeches Case) <p>President rule was imposed in U.P. Demolition case was assigned to CBI. Speeches case was assigned to the State police initially but later to the the CBI.</p> <p>Later, both criminal cases were tried in two different court, Lucknow and Rai Barailey, despite being corresponding and inseperable. Notification dated 8.10.1993 was issued by the government with respect to trying of Case no.</p>
-------------------	---	---

		<p>198 with stopped the court trying Case no. 197 to take cognizance of Case no. 198. This defect was curable as stated in Justice Bhalla's High Court order. But nothing was done with respect to the same. This point is crucial to understand the dilution of criminal cases.</p>
--	--	--

16-17.12.1992	Government set up commission of inquiry consisting of Justice Manmohan Singh Liberhan, a sitting judge of High Court of Punjab and Haryana.	
11.12.1992	Writ petitions challenging the land acquisition in Ayodhya was challenged and both notifications were quashed.	
October, 1993	Composite charge-sheet by CBI in the criminal cases.	
1993	White Papers on Ayodhya by Government of India	
1993	<p>Acquisition of Certain Areas at Ayodhya Act, 1993.</p> <p>Simultaneously, reference was also made by the President of India to the Supreme Court under Article-143 of the Constitution of India. - Dr. M. Ismail Farooqi Vs. Union of India, 1994 (6) SCC 360.</p>	<p>By the acquisition act, a large area of about 68 acres including the premises in dispute. There was a provision that stated that all suits shall remain abated.</p> <p>Reference: “Whether a Hindu temple or any Hindu religious structure existed prior to the construction of the Ram Janam Bhoomi and Babari Masjid (including the premises of the inner and outer courtyards on such structure) in the area on which the structure stands or not?”</p>

1994	Dr. M. Ismail Farooqi Vs. Union of India, 1994 (6) SCC 360.	<p>Supreme Court refused to answer the reference. Supreme Court struck down Section 4(3) of the Acquisition Act, 1993 which had directed abatement of all pending suits, as unconstitutional and invalid and upheld the validity of the remaining Act.</p> <p>The test of comparative significance was laid down.</p> <p>Supreme Court had held that while offering prayer or worship is a religious practice, offering prayer at every location where such prayers can be offered would not be an essential or integral part of such religious practice, unless the place has a particular significance for that religion.</p> <p>Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court had, in <i>Ismail Faruqui v. Union of India</i>, held that the superfluous land surrounding the 0.313 acres under dispute must be restored to its original owners. One of such owners is the Ram Janmbhoomi Nyas.</p> <p><i>“The Central Government has no objection in principle if the superfluous land is restored to RJB Nyas as well as other owners after determining the extent of land required for proper access to and enjoyment of rights in the disputed area by preparing a plan map.”</i></p>
------	---	--

1996	Writ petition no. 746 of 1996.	Writ petition against the order passed by District Judge dated 1.02.1986 by which the gates/ grilling were opened.
04.05.2001	Sessions Judge, Lucknow, exonerated L.K. Advani and other leaders by dropping conspiracy charges.	
1.08.2002 & 23.10.2002	Orders passed with respect to Geo Radiological Survey of ground beneath the disputed land under Order XVI Rule 14, Order XVIII Rule 18, Order XXVI Rule 10-A and Section 151, C.P.C. This survey was conducted by Tojo-Vikas International Pvt. Ltd	
2003	A court rules that seven Hindu leaders should stand trial for creating the destruction of the Babri Mosque, but no charges are brought against Advani, who was also at the site in 1992.	

17.02.2003	Report of GRS came out.	
05.03.2003	Due to anomalies in GRS report, direct excavation by A.S.I.	
31.03.2003	Decision in <i>Mohd. Aslam alias Bhure v. Union of India</i>	<p>The Court had held that status quo be maintained with respect to both the disputed land as well as the surrounding land, pending the determination of the dispute by the Allahabad High Court. In that order, the Court held,</p> <p><i>“...the manner and extent to which the adjacent land could be used would depend upon the final outcome of the pending dispute in the High Court...two acquired lands are intrinsically connected with one another and cannot be separated at this stage...it will not be appropriate to disturb the status quo...”</i></p>

25.08.2003	Report by ASI.	<p><i>The Hon'ble High Court, in order to get sufficient archaeological evidence on the issue involved "whether there was any temple/structure which was demolished and mosque was constructed on the disputed site" as stated on page 1 and further on p. 5 of their order dated 5 march 2003, had given directions to the Archaeological Survey of India to excavate at the disputed site where the GPR Survey has suggested evidence of anomalies which could be structure, pillars, foundation walls, slab flooring etc. which could be confirmed by excavation . Now, viewing in totality and taking into account the archaeological evidence of a massive structure just below the structure and evidence of continuity in structural phases from the tenth century onwards upto the construction of the disputed structure alongwith the yield of stone and decorated bricks as well as mutilated sculpture of divine couple and carved architectural' members including foliage patterns, amalaka, kapotapali doorjamb with semi-circular</i></p> <p><i>pilaster, broken octagonal shaft of black schistpillar, lotus motif, circular shrine having pranala (waterchute) in the north, fifty pillar bases in association of the huge structure, are indicative of remains which are distinctive features found associated with the temples of north India."</i></p>
------------	----------------	---

03.10.2003	Historians lambast ASI report	<p>ASI report criticized for manipulating the evidence to prove that there was a temple below the babri masjid land.</p> <p>As per independent archaeologists who were permitted by High Court to observe the excavation work, the site yielded animal bones without marks from different layers below the mosque. This bones were not tested using C-14 method. The glazed pottery that is recovered is also not tested using the thermoluminescent method. The pillar bases found are not in any alignment and are not capable of supporting any structure.</p>
2004	A court in Uttar Pradesh rules that Advani 's role in the destruction of the mosque should be reviewed.	
30.06.2009	Liberhan committee Report.	<p>The report was heavily criticized for its delay and political biasness. It absolved anyone from liability including P.V. Narsimarao and L.K. Advani. It stated the IB officials failed to provide information on time.</p>
11.01.2010 – 27.07.2010	Hearing in Allahabad High Court.	<p>Arguments in all four suits concluded and discussion on possibility of amicable settlement in terms of Section 89 of CPC.</p>

23.09.2010	A day ahead of the Allahabad High Court verdict, the Supreme Court stayed the judgment.	
28.09.2010	Supreme Court rejects deferment plea and the judgment to be pronounced on September 30, 2010	

<p>30.10.2010</p>	<p>Judgment in Allahabad High Court</p>	<p>Main Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Whether the building had been constructed on the site of an alleged Hindu temple after demolishing the same? 2) Whether the building in question described as a mosque was a mosque as claimed by the plaintiffs? 3) Whether the building had been used by members of the Muslim community for offering prayers from times immemorial? 4) Whether the idols of Rama, Lakshman and Sita were placed inside by Hindu activists or appeared miraculously? 5) Have the Hindus been worshipping the place as Sri Ramjanmabhoomi and visiting it as a sacred place of pilgrimage since time immemorial? 6) Who owns the site? The Muslim community or has the Sunni Waqf Board lost the ownership of the site? <p>Gist of the Judgment:</p> <p>The gist of Justice Sudhir Agarwal's summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Area covered by the central dome of the three domed structure, is the birthplace of Lord Rama as per the Hindu faith and belief and thus belongs to the Hindus (Plaintiff Suit No. 5) and shall not be interfered with, in any manner 2. The area within the inner courtyard belongs to members of both the communities i.e. Muslims and Hindus as it has been in use by both since times immemorial 3. Whereas the three structures of Ram Chabutra, Sita Rasoi and Bhandar are placed in an area in the outer
-------------------	---	---

		<p>courtyard, that area is the share of Nirmohi Akhara (in absence of a better title to the suit)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4. The open area of the outer courtyard is to be shared between Nirmohi Akhara (Defendant No. 3) and the Hindus (Plaintiff Suit No. 5)5. Also, share of Muslims to be not less than $\frac{1}{3}$rd of the total area of the premises and if necessary they may be given some area of the outer courtyard6. Successful parties to the suit will acquire and utilise the land in such a manner so as to have separate entries and exits, without disturbing each other's rights7. All parties can file suggestions for the actual partition by submitting an application to Ayodhya Bench or the Lucknow Bench8. For the next three months, parties to maintain <i>status quo</i> <p>The gist of Justice S.U. Khan summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. No temple was demolished for the construction of a mosque2. All 3 parties, i.e. Hindus, Muslims and Nirmohi Akhara are declared joint title holders3. The portion below the central dome where at present the makeshift temple is situated will be allotted to the Hindus4. Mosque was constructed over the ruins of a temple, which was lying there for a very long time and some material was therefore used for the construction of the mosque5. Inside the boundary wall and the compound of the mosque, Hindu religious places were identified and both Hindu and Muslim religious prayers were offered side by side6. In view of the religious activities taking place alongside each other, both the Hindu and Muslim parties are joint possessors of the entire disputed site7. That since both the parties have failed
--	--	---

		<p>to prove the commencement of their titles to the disputed land, they are held joint possessors</p>
--	--	---

Post Allahabad High Court Decision

2010	M. Siddiq v. Union of India CIVIL APPEAL NOS.1086610867 OF 2010	Dr. M. Ismail Faruqi and Ors. Vs. Union of India and Ors., (1994) 6 SCC 360 (hereinafter referred to as “Ismail Faruqi’s case”) needs reconsideration, hence the reference be made to a larger Bench.
9.05.2011	Supreme Court stays Allahabad High Court verdict.	Bench of Justice Aftab Alam and RM Lodha remarks, “How could the high court engineer something like partitioning of disputed land on its own.”
10.08.2015	Order of the court refusing to issue directions for translation of record.	<p>Parties submit that the records relevant to the hearing of these appeals is voluminous comprising documents in several languages including Persian, Sanskrit, Arabic, Gurumukhi, Urdu and Hindi. Tells the Court that translation of these documents has not been very satisfactory and may itself require to be verified and corrected at some stage; Seek appropriate directions to be issued be issued to all concerned to file their compilations of the record in suitable numbers.</p> <p>Court refuses to issue any directions instead stating that counsel for the parties may appear before the Registrar and work out a satisfactory and agreeable method by which documents may be translated, collated, compiled and filed by the parties concerned.</p>

2016	Subramanian Swamy v. Union of India & Ors. Writ Petition (Civil) 105/2016	This was a petition filed by Subramanian Swamy for construction of Ram temple in Ayodhya. The Court today asked Subramanian Swamy to intervene in the appeals against the Allahabad High Court judgment which are already being heard by Supreme Court. The court then converted the writ petition to an intervention application and tagged it along with the appeals against the 2010 Allahabad High Court decision
11.11.2016	Justice Rohinton Nariman recuses from the M. Siddiq's case.	

5.12.2017	<p>In M. Siddiq's case.</p> <p>Senior advocate Kapil Sibal submits before that the matter should be heard only after the completion of 2019 Lok Sabha elections. He proceeds to tell the Court that since the BJP has the issue of Ram Mandir in their election manifesto, the Bench must hear the matter only after July 2019. Senior advocates Rajeev Dhavan and Dushyant Dave also echoes Sibal's arguments and seek leave to recuse themselves from the proceedings.</p> <p>Court turns down the same. Lists the matter for February 8, 2018 for arguments.</p>	
08.02.2018	<p>In M. Siddiq's Case:</p> <p>Senior Advocate Rajeev Dhavan, appearing for Sunni Waqf Board, seeks a day-to-day hearing in the case, but the Bench turns it down. Lists the case for hearing on March 14, 2018.</p>	

27.09.2018	Judgment in M. Sidiq case – Supreme Court declined to refer the case to Constitution bench.	<p>The Supreme Court today held that the Ram Mandir-Babri case need not be referred to a Constitution Bench. Effectively, the Court held that its 1994 judgment in <i>Ismail Faruqui v. Union of India</i> need not be revisited. The judgment was delivered by a Bench of Chief Justice Dipak Misra and Justices Ashok Bhushan and S Abdul Nazeer.</p> <p>Justice Bhushan penned one judgment on behalf of himself and CJI Misra, while Justice Nazeer wrote a dissenting judgment.</p> <p>The observations in the Ismail Faruqui judgment on mosques not being essential to religion is in the context of acquisition of the mosque and made with respect to the facts of that case, Justice Bhushan held.</p> <p>"The use of "particular significance" in Ismail Faruqui judgment is only in the context of immunity from acquisition."</p> <p>Justice Bhushan further held that the Ismail Faruqui judgment will not impact the decisions in suits. Thus, the majority opinion held that there was no need for the matter to be referred to a Constitution Bench.</p> <p>Justice Nazeer dissented, observing, that questionable observations in <i>Ismail Faruqui</i> have permeated the Allahabad High Court verdict. He was of the opinion that <i>Ismail Faruqui</i> needs to be brought in line with the <i>Shirur Mutt case</i>.</p>
------------	---	---

9.01.2019	<p>M. Siddiq' case.</p> <p>A Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court comprising Chief Justice of India, Ranjan Gogoi and Justices SA Bobde, NV Ramana, UU Lalit and DY Chandrachud will hear the case concerning Ram Mandir- Babri Masjid dispute</p>	
25.01.2019	<p>M. Siddiq's Case</p> <p>Chief Justice of India Ranjan Gogoi has constituted a new Constitution Bench to hear the Ram Mandir-Babri dispute. Justices Ashok Bhushan and S Abdul Nazeer have replaced Justices NV Ramana and UU Lalit on the Bench.</p>	<p>The earlier Bench comprised CJI Ranjan Gogoi along with Justices SA Bobde, NV Ramana, UU Lalit, and DY Chandrachud.</p>

8.03.2019	<p>The order was passed by a Constitution Bench of Chief Justice of India Ranjan Gogoi and Justices SA Bobde, DY Chandrachud, Ashok Bhushan, and S Abdul Nazeer.</p> <p>In a significant move, a Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court today referred the Ayodhya dispute for mediation.</p> <p>The Bench invoked Section 89 of the Code of Civil Procedure (CPC) to do so while also taking into consideration the objections raised by the parties on the strength of Order I rule 8 (sub-rule 2, 3 and 4) of the CPC and Order XXIII rule 3-B of the CPC . It then held that there is no legal impediment in referring the matter for mediation.</p> <p><i>"Considering the provisions of the CPC, indicated above, we do not find any legal impediment to making a reference to mediation for a possible settlement of the dispute(s) arising out of the appeals."</i></p> <p>The mediation panel will be chaired by former Supreme Court judge Justice FMI Kalifulla, and will also comprise spiritualist Sri Sri Ravi Shankar, and Senior Advocate Sriram Panchu.</p>	
-----------	---	--

--	--	--