BLOGS

# Important Judgement for CLAT PG 2024: Ayodha Ram Mandir Case

Indrasish Majumder · 27 Jan 2023

**M Siddiq (D) Thr Lrs vs Mahant Suresh Das & Ors**

**Date – 9th September, 2019**

**Court – The Supreme Court of India**

**Bench – Justice Ranjan Gogoi, Justice Sharad A Bobde, Justice D.Y. Chandrachud, Justice Ashok Bhushan and Justice Abdul Nazeer**

**Summary of the Case**

- Until December 6, 1992, an old mosque structure stood on the site. The Hindus assert that there existed at the disputed site an ancient temple dedicated to Lord Ram that was demolished upon the conquest of the Indian subcontinent by Mughal Emperor Babur. On the other hand, the Muslims contended that the mosque was built by Babur or at his behest on vacant land.
- Under the Acquisition of Certain Area at Ayodhya Act 1993 (Ayodhya Acquisition Act 1993), the Central Government took over an area of about 68 acres, including the sites in dispute.
- On November 9, 2019, a Supreme Court Bench led by Chief Justice Ranjan Gogoi unanimously ruled that the disputed land be given to the Ram Janmabhoomi Nyas for the construction of a temple, and the Muslim side be compensated with land at a prominent site in Ayodhya to build a mosque.
- The Supreme Court granted the entire 2.77 acres to the deity Ram Lalla and directed the Center and the Uttar Pradesh government to allot an additional 5 acres to Muslims in Ayodhya.
- The Supreme Court stated that the case's outcome was based on the archaeological investigation, which stated that an enormous structure had been discovered beneath the remains of the demolished Babri Masjid, where the presence of walls and pillars of a temple-like structure was also discovered in the survey.
- The mosque was thus constructed not on vacant land but on remnants of a pre-existing structure that was not Islamic. The Supreme Court further observed that the desecration of

Muslims and the demolition of Babri Masjid were violations of the Rule of Law and that the wrongs committed must be remedied.

- The Supreme Court held that the Court ruled on concepts of proof and evidence, not conviction and faith. It called the act of putting an image of Rama in the Masjid's premises "defilement," and the 1992 destruction of the Babri Masjid "unconstitutional."
- According to the Supreme Court, Nirmohi Akhara's claim of being a shebait was denied. But the Nirmohi Akhara had a historical presence at the disputed site. So, it was decided that the Nirmohi Akhara would play a suitable role in running the new Ram Mandir.

https://indiankanoon.org/doc/107745042/