

**-:: RAM MANDIR CASE ::-**

In continuation of argument dated 07.08.2019 Mr. Parasaran, Senior Advocate (Representing Bhagwann Sri Ram Virajman in OS No. 5 of 1989) proceeded further with his argument.

Mr. Parasaran while relying upon his written submission argued as follows:-

- Mr. Parasaran argued that the cause of action is a continuous cause of action.
- He further argued that in Hindu Religion, idol is not necessary, a place can also be worshiped as holy / sacred place.
- He argued that in the present case entire Ram Janam Bhoomi is a Deity.
- He argued that there is difference in Janambhoomi, Janamsthal, and Janamsthan, he described that Janamsthan means not merely the building but the entire area and there is no dispute that it is the 'Janamsthan' of Lord Ram.
- He argued that 'Janamsthan' need not be the exact spot but can also mean the surrounding area. The whole area is 'Janamsthan'.
- To buttress his argument as above he argued regarding faith and belief, he argued once faith is there then court can't interfere in it, and relied upon the judgment mentioned in his compilation.
- He further argued that concept of judicial person is not statutory, there is no statute on it, however, it is brought by judiciary itself.
- He argued that Ram Janambhoomi has itself become personification of the deity and an object of worship for the Hindus.

J. Bhushan asked a query as whether the bigger place like entire Janamsthan can be the judicial person?

- Mr. Parasaran replied that idol is not the only test to be deity; there are other examples also wherein Hindu worship without idol.

J. Bobde : said that recently Uttarakhand High Court has held entire river to be a juristic person.

J. Chandrachud also said that there are source of worship, it's not always necessary that you have physical form of deity.

- Mr. Parasaran said that in Hindu religion river, sun etc are worshipped. Idol is therefore not necessary, and therefore, the birthplace as a whole can be treated as juristic person.

CJI said to Mr. Parasaran that you can reply to our queries later on, it's not required that you reply these queries right now; you note it down and meet these queries later on.

- Mr. Parasaran further added that deity was not made a party when the Magistrate attached the property under section 145 Cr.P.C and when Civil Court granted injunction.
- Mr. Parasaran thereafter argued Limitation and then Moulding of relief, he argued that Hon'ble High Court dismissed the Suit No. 3 (filed by Nirmohi Akhara) and Suit No. 4 (filed by Muslims parties) on the ground of limitation and thereafter the relief was granted to all the parties.
- Mr. Parasaran argued that the right of the entire area (2.77 acres) had to be decided as a whole.
- Mr. Parasaran argued that if a suit is dismissed on the ground of limitation, then parties can't be granted relief to butness his argument he shown the relevant section of CPC and judgment.
- Mr. Parasaran again argued that we used to go to temple but were not allowed to enter is continuous wrong.

J. Bhushan put a specific query as what is continues wrong?

J Bobde : If a person stopped to enter in temple everyday to worship, is this continuous wrong give us more example on it.

- Mr. Parasaran: I will give examples later, not now.

CJI : Mr. Parasaran you note the query, reply it later.

- Mr. Parasaran further relied upon several judgments in support of his arguments which were mentioned in compilation, handed over to court.
- Mr. Parasaran further argued for Bhagwann Sri Ram Virajman in OS No. 5 of 1989.

CJI: Directed in its order that Mr. Dhawan will make composite submission after finishing the arguments by Hindus + Nirmohi Akhara, he said otherwise it will be difficult to get reply again and again after finishing the argument of each party.

Note: CJI did not direct anything in his order about argument in Suit No. 1.

**:: Hearing resumed, will begin tomorrow ::**

**Notes Prepared by:  
Amit Sharma, Advocate**