Report of the Fact Finding Enquiry Officer in the matter of complaints among the residents in Ambabhikshu House and certain other Ashramites

Enquiry Officer: A.V. Nagarajan
Director of Tourism (Retd)
Government of Pondicherry

I was appointed as the one man fact finding Enquiry Officer to enquire into the substance and truth in respect of various complaints concerning the inhabitants/inmates of the Ambabhikshu House by Sri Aurobindo Ashram Trust by their order dated 11.9.2004 (Ex. 1). The terms of reference for the enquiry are as follows:

(1) Whether the complaint of harassment, criminal intimidation, obscene gestures and drawings alleged by Jayashree Prasad, Arunashree Prasad, Rajyashree Prasad, Nivedita Prasad and Hemlata Prasad against Saravashree Nirmal C. Swain, Krishna Chander, Girish Panda, Kavitanjali (Dining Room), Prashant, Nisith Banerjee, Santosh (Dining Room), Santosh (Electricity Dept.) Chandramani Patel, Sajal Mitra alias Shankar, Bhagwandas Swain and Ashok Kundu are true.

(2) Whether the complaint made against the above Jayashree Prasad, Arunashree Prasad, Rajyashree Prasad, Nivedita Prasad and Hemlata Prasad by other inmates of Ambabhikshu House, namely Itishree Bal, Bhabani, Mousumi, Simachal, Sunil Patnaik, Sarojini Panigrahi, Geetanjali Padhy, Jayanti Tripathy and Sripati Das in different petitions are true.
(3) The veracity or otherwise of any complaint from the inhabitants of Ambabhikshu House that may be received direct by the Enquiry Authority in the above matter.

Copy of the above order was caused to be exhibited in the notice board of Ambabhikshu House informing all the residents about the enquiry, its scope, nature, etc. and in connection with the third term of reference, representations were called for vide Exhibits 2, 7, and 16 from those desirous of making any representation to me. I also visited AB House personally on 10.10.04 for understanding its logistical topography. The Managing Trustee of the Sri Aurobindo Ashram Trust (hereinafter referred to as the Trust) was requested to forward to me the copies of various complaints and other available records in connection with the terms No.1 and 2 vide my letter dated 11.10.2004 (Ex. 3). In response he instructed Shri Matriprasad vide Ex. 4 to forward me copies of necessary papers which were in the nature of correspondence and a few enclosures containing certain drawings. They have been properly documented serially as Exhibits 22 to 38 so as to form part of the report for appropriate references.

As regards the first term of reference regarding complaints made by Jayashree Prasad, Arunashree Prasad, Rajyashree Prasad, Nivedita Prasad and Hemlata Prasad (hereinafter referred to as ‘sisters’) against a few Ashramites, it is the case of the Trust that Jayashree Prasad and her 4 sisters have not submitted any written complaint, but they made an oral complaint to the trustees on 26th July 2004 (Ex. 22) while the weekly meeting of the Trustees of the Trust was in progress, during which time they left with them copies of series of drawings containing obscene drawings and orally complaining that Jayashree Prasad and her sisters had been harassed by the display of such
drawings and through other ways from the inmates of Ambabhikshu House and a few other Ashramites. Among various documents, copies of which were forwarded to me by the Trust, there is a copy of the letter dated 4.8.2004 (Ex. 24) addressed to the Managing Trustee by Jayashree Prasad and her four sisters jointly making some specific allegation against one Chandramani and a general complaint against whom the sisters had reportedly complained to the trustees on 26.7.2004. There are also two other letters dated 13th June 2004, one written by Arunashree Prasad to the President of the Bar Association, Pondicherry (Ex. 26) and other by Jayashree Prasad also written to the President of the Bar Association, Pondicherry (Ex. 28) narrating complaints against one Sri Nirmal C. Swain, an advocate member of the Bar Association, Pondicherry. After the display of Exhibits 1, 2, 7, and 16 in the AB House I did not receive any representation from the sisters until 24.10.2004. Therefore instead of waiting any further I decided to commence the enquiry on 28.10.2004 and duly informed the Managing Trustee to furnish me the necessary infrastructure to conduct the enquiry which was complied with (Ex. 5 & 6). Notice was sent through personal messenger on 25.10.2004 (Ex. 8) informing the sisters and 12 others who are listed in the first term of reference requesting them to be present in person and put forth their representations to me on 28.10.2004.

The personal messenger who took the notice to be delivered in person to all the 17 persons informed me on 26.10.2004 (Ex. 9) that while he could deliver the letter to 12 persons, he could not deliver the same to Jayashree Prasad and her four sisters since they refused to receive the notice in person and insisted that the letters should be sent by post only. He returned to me five undelivered envelopes (Ex. 10 series).
As the enquiry was about to commence on 28.10.2004 I received a letter through courier sent jointly by the sisters (Ex. 11 series) informing that the statement of the Managing Trustee of the Trust in my appointment order dated 11.9.2004 that after specific written communication dated 31.7.2004 from the Managing Trustee, Jayashree Prasad and her sisters had not put in writing their allegations was false and that they had already given a letter dated 4.8.2004 which was received by the trust on 5.8.2004 thereby intimating that they had given a written complaint on 4.8.2004 (Ex. 24). The sisters had also narrated about certain communication between them and the Trust and about the police complaints against a few inmates and that the matter was placed before National Commission for Women even prior to the trustees’ appointing me as Enquiry Officer. In the circumstances they had expressed serious doubts about proper dispensation of justice, cast aspersions and that the very enquiry itself was a formality and hence requested me to desist from proceeding further with the enquiry as the matter was already pending before various other authorities. A copy of the same letter was received by me through courier and under certificate of posting to my residence also.

However I decided to go ahead with the proceedings since the other 12 persons were in attendance. They were informed about the nature and scope of the enquiry and a few informed that they had also submitted representations in the designated box in response to my notice in the notice board of Ambabhikshu House. A few also gave in person. They were however explained that since the sisters have not turned up, the enquiry was being postponed to 5th November 2004 so that the sisters could be duly informed through post. Accordingly individual notices were sent by registered post with acknowledgement due on 28.10.2004 itself (Ex. 12) to the sisters informing that the notice was being served by registered post with acknowledgement due as desired by
them and intimating that the enquiry was posted for 5.11.2004 and they were requested to participate on that day duly advising them that since their absence would deprive the enquiry of their version in the whole matter it was better they attend the enquiry in the best interest of justice and if they still chose to abstain I would be constrained to proceed with the matter in respect of the terms of reference without the benefit of their version and without any further notice.

When the enquiry commenced on 5.11.2004, the sisters were not present. They have received the notice sent by registered post and the posted acknowledgment cards had since been received (Ex. 13). It was therefore decided that the regular proceedings should be commenced without waiting any more for the sisters. The 12 persons other than the sisters, whose names are listed in the first term of reference were duly present.

As already stated, since no representation of any nature was received by me directly from the sisters and they had themselves indicated in their letter dated 28th October 2004 (Ex. 11) to me about their sending a letter dated 4.8.2004 to the Trustees (Ex. 24), it was decided that the complaints by the sisters against the 12 others could be framed by myself on the basis of the letters from the sisters to the Trustees and to the President of the Bar Association of Pondicherry. Accordingly, the following have been culled out as the specific complaints of the sisters against the 12 persons listed in the first term of reference.
I. Complaint of Arunashree Prasad: Reference Ex. 26 & 27

1. Nirmal C. Swain, Girish Panda and Shankar alias Sajal Mitra have developed a nasty habit of passing urine on the room door and nearby areas since 18.5.2004.

2. Chandramani Patel and Girish Panda at the instigation of Nirmal indulge in making obscene gestures whenever she comes and goes out of the room.

3. On 12.6.2004 at about 9.00 P.M. when she was returning to her room, Nirmal, Girish, Chandramani and Shankar were standing in the passage and made vulgar comments and gestures at her and on 13.6.2004 early in the morning she received a chit containing obscene drawings.

4. On 6.6.2004 Shankar, Santosh and Girish under the instigation of Nirmal removed the wire mesh fixed on the door, opened the window fixed in the door, and splashed urine inside her room at about 10.00 pm.

5. On 3.6.2004 Girish, Santosh, Shankar, Chandramani and Ashok Kundu surrounded her and tried to physically touch her.

6. On 1.6.2004 Nirmal, Shankar, Santosh, Girish and Chandramani surrounded her and abused her in vulgar words and physically assaulted her when she went to collect drinking water at about 6 p.m. Nirmal was leering at her all the time.

7. Nirmal, Girish and Santosh have broken the door lock on two occasions.

8. Santosh and Girish regularly trip the electricity switch of her room early in the morning whenever they leave for the Dining Room work.

9. Santosh and Girish have also damaged her cycle at the instigation of Nirmal and his father Bhagawandas Swain by breaking the various parts, puncturing, etc. for the past twenty days or more.
10. Nirmal Swain, his father, Girish, Santosh, Shankar and a few other convened a meeting on 12.6.2004 at about 10 p.m. on the terrace of ‘B’ Block where she was staying and decided to send her a chit of obscene pictures, a copy of which was also enclosed (Ex. 27).

11. On 9.6.2004 at about 9.30 p.m. Nirmal Swain, his father, Girish, Kabitanjali and couple of others met in Santosh’s room and conspired to harass her and abuse her in vulgar words and gestures.

12. The atrocities were witnessed by the other inmates of Ambabhikshu House and they keep their eyes closed for fear of Nirmal and his gang.

II. Complaint of Jayashree Prasad: Reference Ex. 28

1. Nirmal Swain, Krishna Chander (who had assaulted her on 9.1.2001), Shankar alias Sajal Mitra have been in the habit of passing urine at her room door or nearby, for more than a month.

2. Prashant, who is in charge of block A and B of Ambabhikshu House has not taken any steps to prevent or to stop the above action of Nirmal and others because of Nirmal’s advise.

3. Nishith Banerjee and Prashant who are gang members of Nirmal and on his intimation, have developed the habit of lifting their lungis at night whenever she goes out of her room to collect drinking water, hot water or throw waste in the common bin.

4. Shanker, who is staying in the third floor in Block “B”, comes all the way to the ground floor to hang the undercloth in front of the room as Nirmal encourages him to do so.

5. Shanker, Krishna Chander and Prashant have been damaging her cycle on regular basis for more than a month at the instigation of Nirmal. The damage is in the form of
removing the brake, releasing air from the wheels, shifting the cycle to some other remote place etc...

6. All these atrocities were witnessed by the inmates of Ambabhikshu House who keep their eyes closed for fear of Nirmal and his gangmen.

III. Complaint as contained in the letters at 4.8.2004 (Ex. 24) and 19.9.2004 (Ex.30) addressed jointly by the sisters to the Managing Trustee

1. Despite informing the Trustees on 26.7.2004 about the harassment, criminal intimidation, obscene gestures and drawings, attempt to molest etc... directed against the sisters and showing and giving copies of obscene drawings by the offenders, no action had been taken by the Trustees. Hence a Police complaint has been lodged.

2. On 3.8.2004, at about 10 p.m. when Arunashree was returning to her home after fetching water from the common drinking water filter in the corridor Chandramani was coming in the opposite direction, blocked her path and attempted to touch her by trying to put his arm around her.

Arunashree had also enclosed along with her letter dated 13.6.2004 (Ex. 26) addressed to the president, Bar Association, a Xerox copy (Ex. 27) containing some written message from Chandramani addressed to her in the top portion and some obscene drawings in the bottom portion. Similarly while the Trustees forwarded various correspondences in connection with the first term of reference, (Ex. 22 to 31), had sent among other things, 5 Xerox sheets which contained various types of obscene drawings in 4 sheets (Ex. 23 – 1/5 to 4/5) and a hand written message by Chandramani to Arunashree in the top portion and some obscene drawings in the bottom portion in another (Ex. 23 – 5/5).
With the suo-motu listing of complaints by the sisters against the co-inmates, I decided to go ahead with the regular proceedings and call all concerned for their depositions.

Sri Chandramani Patel was called as the first deponent. In his deposition he has denied all the complaints made against him by the sisters. He stated that in the year 1975 when he was 19 years old he joined a sadhanalaya centre on Sri Aurobindo and the Mother in Orissa and later he joined Sri Aurobindo Ashram in 1985 and became a regular inmate in 1991. He has been in Ambabhikshu House since 1995-96 and according to him the complaints by the sisters against him are malicious. He admitted having sent a chit to Arunashree advising her not to come for cleaning the overhead tank, but he had not drawn any obscene drawings in the sheet nor has he ever behaved in any way affecting the modesty of a lady. He said that he has also sent me a representation (Ex. 39).

Next was Shri Nirmal Swain, not a resident of Ambabhikshu House, but staying in another accommodation provided by the Ashram. He is an inmate of the Ashram since 1986, an Advocate by profession and assisting the Trust in various litigations including against the cases filed by the sisters. He has denied all the allegations made by the sisters against him and explained that the sisters were prejudiced against him because he was actively involved in contesting the cases filed by the sisters against the Ashram. In order to prove his point elaborately, he sought the permission of the undersigned to submit a comprehensive self-made submission with the permission of the Trust relating to the cases he has handled on behalf of Ashram against the sisters. He was permitted for the same and accordingly he has submitted a written submission.
narrating about the various cases and the role played by him as Advocate of the Trust (Ex. 40).

The statement of Shri Krishna Chander was next taken wherein he denied the allegations of the sisters describing them as totally untrue and mischievous. He informed that since he was staying in another building opposite to Ambabhikshu House namely New Creation, he had no connection to go to Ambabhikshu House to discuss with any inmate therein and to conspire any thing against these sisters.

Shri Girish Panda in his statement denied his role in any of the allegations made by the sisters and he said that he had also sent representation to me (Ex. 41) in response to my notice in AB House wherein he had listed certain incidents of Arunashree’s teasing activities.

Similarly Miss. Kavitanjali, both Santosh, Sajal Mitra alias Shanker, Nishit Banarjee, Ashok Kundu, Prashant Nayak, and Bhagawandas Swain have also denied their involvement in any of the allegations listed against them by the sisters and on the contrary narrated the behaviour of the sisters in separate representations sent to me in response to my notice to the Ambabhikshu House. The written representations by the above persons have been brought on record as Exhibits and will be taken up during detailed analysis.

Meanwhile I visited Ambabhikshu House on two occasions on 10th October 2004 and 24th October 2004 when I collected the representations dropped in the designated box.

I also received a letter by post addressed to my residence. A few representations were
also handed over to me in person between 28th October 2004 and 13.11.2004 when the Enquiry was in progress.

By the said date I had received 70 representations from 68 inmates of Ambabhikshu House including a few who are listed in Term no 1 & 2. The other person who gave a representation is Mr. Bhagwandas Swain, who is not an inmate of Ashram, but renders voluntary services and stays elsewhere. Nirmal Swain's letter was received at a later date as permitted by me. On going through the representations I found that the majority of them were relating to the behaviour of the five sisters and vouchsafe for the good conduct of the persons against whom complaints have been levelled by the sisters.

Secondly, in the complaints made by the 9 inmates of AB House against the five sisters copies (Ex. 32 to 38) of which were forwarded to me by the Trust in connection with the second term of reference, I found more or less similar statements voicing concern about the behaviour of the sisters which had become the source of nuisance affecting peace and harmony in Ambabhikshu House.

In view of the above situation, I feel that the detailed appreciation of the statements of twelve persons against whom the complaints from the sisters have been taken note of for the purpose of answering the first term of reference vis-à-vis the complaints made by 9 inmates against the sisters being similar, can be taken up jointly and comprehensively after the deposition of all concerned are taken and written representations submitted by them were brought on record. Hence the deposition and the written representations received from the persons listed in the first term will be taken up for detailed analysis at the later stage.
After taking the statements of 12 persons listed in term no 1 against whom the complaint of harassment, criminal intimidation, obscene drawings etc. has been alleged by the sisters, it was decided to take up the proceedings in respect of term no 2. Since the said term is about the complaint by 9 inmates against the sisters, it was considered appropriate to send notice to the five sisters once again by Registered Post with Acknowledgement Due so as to enable them to take part actively in the enquiry to know the nature of complaint made against them and submit their version so that there would be no plea of miscarriage of justice. In fact, the sisters in their jointly addressed letter of 19.09.04 (Ex. 30) have complained to the Trustees that they were not informed about the complaints against them by some of the inmates to which the Trustees have replied vide Ex. 31 that it was not considered necessary in view of the appointment of the Enquiry Officer who has been given the mandate to deal comprehensively with all complaints, already received and to be received from anyone. Accordingly, while notices (Ex. 17) were sent to 9 complainants to appear for the enquiry on 12th and 13th of November 2004, individual letters (Ex. 14) were sent by Registered Post with Acknowledgement Due to each of the five sisters on 10.11.2004 requesting them to attend the enquiry on 19th November 2004 indicating therein that if they were to remain absent, it would deprive the enquiry of their version in the matter and their participation would be in the best interest of justice. However, in the event of their abstaining, they were informed that the enquiry would have to proceed without the benefit of their version and without any further notice. The letters were duly received by the sisters (Ex. 15).

As informed, the proceedings were held on 12th and 13th November when the statements of the 9 complainants were recorded. The statements are summarized as follows:
1. Ms. Itishree Bal – She is from Orissa, 29 years old, studied up to Higher Secondary level, came to Ashram in 1992, became a regular inmate in 1998 and stays in AB House since then. She serves in the Nursing Home. She and Bhabani gave a joint complaint (Ex. 38) to Managing Trustee on 23.7.2004 about the indecent behaviour of Jayashree Prasad and her sisters, the previous night i.e. on 22.7.2004. In her deposition, she has stated that the sisters knocked at the doors of the inmates around 11.00 pm on 22.7.2004 alleging that somebody had urinated in front of the room door. She felt disturbed and hence sent the above complaint to the Managing Trustee. She said that she had also submitted a representation (Ex. 50) to me in response to my notice in Ambabhikshu House wherein she has stated that Rajyashree, Nivedita and Hemlata were staying on the same floor where she stays, that at 11:15 P.M. Jayashree knocked at her door and when she woke up, she found the five sisters standing there and shouting. They also knocked at the rooms of a few others in 3rd and 1st floors and went to D Block to call other inmates. They were using filthy language and others stood silently listening to them. The behaviour of the sisters has caused an unpleasant situation in Ambabhikshu House disturbing the peace and harmony. She also says that in her 12 years of stay in Ashram, she had found the behaviour of Girish, Santosh, Nirmal etc… very cordial and affectionate.

2. Ms. Bhabani – she is from Orissa, 25 years old, studied upto 10th Standard, came to Ashram in 1996, admitted as an inmate in 1998, and stays in AB House since then. She serves in Ashram Nursing Home. She and Itishree Bal gave a joint complaint on 23.7.2004 to the Managing Trustee about the indecent behaviour of Jayashree Prasad and her sisters on the night of 22.7.2004 (Ex. 38). In her deposition, she has
stated that she had always found the behaviour of the sisters very arrogant and high-handed even with co-women inmates.

3. Ms. Mousumi – She is from Orissa, 34 years old, studied upto Higher Secondary, came to Ashram in 1994, admitted as inmate in 1998, stays in AB House since then, serving in Ashram Nursing Home. She sent a complaint on 23.07.04 (Ex. 37) to the Managing Trustee that around about 11.30 p.m. on 22.7.2004 one of the sisters, Nivedita, came knocking at her door heavily when she was fast asleep. In her representation (Ex. 51) she has stated that she was first woken up by Nivedita at 10:15 p.m. on 22.7.2004 when she called her to her room stating that somebody had passed urine there which she did not believe. Again at 11.30 p.m. she (Nivedita) disturbed her (Mousumi) by knocking at the door when she saw other sisters standing outside shouting and using abusive language. In her deposition she has stated that Nivedita and her sisters were always in the habit of quarrelling with others, making noise, shouting at midnight etc…disturbing the peaceful atmosphere in AB House.

4. Mr. Simachal Panda – He is from Orissa, 34 years old, studied upto Matriculation, came to Ashram in 1990, served in Lake Estate upto 1996, went back to Orissa, again returned in 1997 and admitted as inmate in 1998, stays in AB House for 5 years. In his complaint dated 23.07.04 (Ex. 36), he has stated that on 22.7.2004 around 11.00 p.m. there was heavy knocking on his door and on opening he found Hemlata and her sisters shouting and screaming and complaining that somebody had passed urine in Hemlata’s door. Since he felt disturbed at late hours he sent complaint on 23.7.2004 (Ex. 36) about the incident to the Trustees. He has deposed that since he was working as driver in medical service and his services would be
requisitioned any time of the day for which he required adequate rest, he had moved to another accommodation outside Ambabhikshu House at his own request from August 2004. He says that he had known Hemlata and sisters as very quarrelsome with everybody.

5. Ms. Sarojini Panigrahi & 6. Gitanjali Padhy – Sarojini Panigrahi is from Orissa, 39 years old, studied B.A. B.Ed. in Orissa, came to Pondicherry in March 1994 to serve Ashram. After probation, sometime in 1997/1998 she was admitted as an inmate. After serving for nine months in Dining Hall she is now serving in Ashram Dispensary from 1995. Gitanjali Padhy is 37 years old, also from Orissa, studied upto 10th Standard, came to Pondicherry to serve Ashram in March 1994 and after probation, sometime in 1997/1998 was admitted as an inmate. She served in Dining Hall for 7 years and is now in Embroidery Department from 2001. Both live in AB House from 1999. They gave a complaint jointly to the Trustees on 23.07.04 (Ex. 34) about the disturbance caused to them in the previous night, that is, 22.07.04. They have stated that at 11:15 p.m. on 22.07.04, they were called by Nivedita who pulled them out to her room showing that there was urine near the door, that they found nothing of that sort and were upset by the behaviour of Nivedita by disturbing them at midnight. They have deposed that they had known Nivedita and her sisters to be arrogant and quarrelsome and disturbed others by making noise, shouting in the night, using abusive language, and threatening that they would call Police and take them by force as witness. Once, they had also found the drinking water from the tank in their block in a different colour due to mixture of some chemicals causing great panic to all and a few inmates who drank it fell sick and everyone in Ambabhikshu House suspected the sisters for the above sabotage. Sarojini has further deposed that one day around 4:30 p.m. Police came to Ambabhikshu House
and when she was about to enter her room three of the sisters came to her in an agitated mood and showed some chit which they wanted her to see, she did not look at the chit and advised them that they could bring to the notice of the Trustees any of their grievances and not disturb her as she had nothing to do with their problems. In their representation (Ex. 52), both these ladies have narrated certain disturbances caused by Nivedita and the sisters, such as whenever any repair and maintenance work was carried out in their rooms it was strongly opposed by the sisters whereas they were disturbing others often talking loudly till 11:00 p.m., that during some nights the sisters poured water in their rooms and spread baseless rumour that somebody had urinated in their (sisters) rooms and knocked the doors of other inmates disturbing their sleep, that once they had mixed some chemicals in the overhead tank thereby causing great panic, that they bring strangers to the building, coming out of the room around 5:00 a.m. with black dresses and disturb in many other ways like shouting, laughing in late nights. They have stated that the boys against whom the sisters have complained have not misbehaved or ill-treated them or anybody, that it would be better if the sisters were accommodated somewhere else.

7. Mr. Sripati Das – He is from Orissa, 68 years old, studied upto Intermediate, came to Ashram in 1959, admitted as inmate in 1962, staying in AB House since 1997, worked in Press, Guest House, school, editing etc. and now in Navajyothi Kendriya. He sent a complaint on 24.7.2004 (Ex. 32) to the Trustees stating that Hemlata and her 4 sisters started shouting and knocking at his door at about 11.30 pm on 22.7.2004 complaining that somebody had passed urine in front of Hemlata’s room door and has thrown a piece of paper with vulgar drawing into Nivedita’s room and sought his help. In his deposition he has stated that when he went near Nivedita’s room
door, he found some water as if it were a wash. He says that he was also shown a small bit of paper containing some vulgar and obscene figures. He therefore complained to the Trustees to ascertain the facts, to find out the real culprit so that no such undesirable activity would be repeated.

8. Mr. Sunil Patnaik – He is from Orissa, 27 years old, studied upto 10th standard, came to Ashram in 1995, became an inmate in 1998, served in Ashram Press from 1995 to 2002, thereafter in Dining Hall, stays in AB House from 2003. In his complaint on 23.07.04 (Ex. 35) to the Trustees, he has stated that on 22.7.2004 around 11.15 p.m., there was heavy knocking and banging on his door and when he opened the door he found Hemlata, Arunashree, and Rajayshree shouting and screaming that somebody had urinated in front of Hemlata’s room and wanted him to see that. When he went there, there were also a few others. There was some water on the floor which he did not believe to be urine. All the five sisters were alleging that the Oriya people were doing mischief to them. Because he had known that Hemlata and her sisters were in the habit of shouting, abusing in filthy language and making noise in the night disturbing the sleep of the inmates, he gave a complaint on 23.7.2004 to the Trustees (Ex. 35) explaining the previous night incident.

9. Ms. Jayanti Tripathy – She is from Orissa, 52 years old, an M.A. B. Ed., and has taken special training in Kindergarten/Child Education in USA. She came to Ashram in 1992, became a regular inmate in 1998, working in Navajyoti in computer section since 1992. Because of the misdemeanour and objectionable behaviour of Nivedita and her sisters on the night on 22.07.04 she had sent a complaint (Ex. 33) on 23.07.04 to the Managing Trustee. In that complaint and in
her representation (Ex. 53), she has stated that Hemlata, Nivedita, and Rajyashree were also living in the same floor, that on 22.07.04 around 10:15 p.m. Nivedita knocked at her door and asked her to see something in her room. The other neighbours, Mousoumi, Itishree, and Bhabani were also asked to come over. There was some water-like fluid which Nivedita accused that somebody had passed urine there. It was difficult to believe the complaint since all the doors were open to a common corridor, there was no bad odour and none could stoop so low to pass urine like that. Nivedita also showed them a hand-drawn obscene picture in ink in a small sheet of paper which they watched silently and dispersed with disbelief. Later Nivedita made a phone call to Pratijna Devi from her room and left. She has further stated that within an hour at about 11:00 p.m. there was heavy knocking at her door shattering her sleep and when she came out of the room, the five sisters were standing and shouting at the top of their voice. They started knocking at everybody’s door in the floor and also some of the rooms in the 3rd floor and when to D Block to call the inmates there. The sisters were found shouting, screaming, and using filthy language and all other inmates could do nothing except watching such harassment. She has found this behaviour causing a very unpleasant situation disturbing the inmates’ peace and harmony because the problem could have been solved in the morning in a better way with the help and guidance of the higher authorities of the Ashram. She also says that in her 12 years of staying in the Ashram she has known the sadhaks such as Santosh Sahoo, Girish, Chandramani, Nirmal, Santosh Nayak, etc. to be very well-behaved, friendly, helpful, and brother-like and it was very hard to believe any complaint against these persons. In her opinion, the sisters are magnifying the problems by leading police into the building against the Ashram rules which reveals their intention that they did not really try for any solution but made a big fuss for the sake of doing even though maximum
freedom is given in the Ashram for the inmates to grow in mutual trust, goodwill and understanding for the attainment of higher spiritual life. Peaceful and harmonious atmosphere has been the charm of the Ashram life for everybody which has been hampered by the behaviour of the five sisters which is wholly out of the tune to the beauty of Ashram life.

For the reasons explained elsewhere in the previous paras, detailed analysis of statements and written representations submitted by nine complainants listed in Term 2 will also be taken up after the statements and written representations made by the other inmates of Ambabhikshu House who had submitted their representations in response to my notice in Ambabhikshu House are brought on record while the third term of reference is taken up:

After the above exercise, the sisters were expected to come for the enquiry on 19.11.04 so that they could be informed of the nature of the complaints against them by the nine complainants and their counter version could be ascertained and recorded. Again, for reasons best known to themselves, they abstained. Hence the wait was futile.

When the stage came to take up the third term of reference, it was decided to send notice to all the inmates who had given representation to the undersigned in response to my notice in Ambabhikshu House. Totally 71 representations were received by me from 69 persons between 24.9.2004 and 13.11.2004. This number includes the representations from the persons listed in the first and second terms of reference (other than the sisters), whose statements have been recorded and representations been brought on record with brief summarization. It is therefore proposed to discuss in brief the representation from the other inmates in connection with Term 3.
Since the notices calling for representations were exhibited in the notice board of Ambabhikshu House giving chance to all the inmates upto 13.11.2004, no separate notice was sent to the sisters since they also get included among the inmates and have access to the notice board in the Ambabhikshu House. The sisters have not sent any representation in response to the said notice. Therefore the remaining persons were requested to appear before me on various dates for ascertaining the identity and veracity of the representations before bringing them on record. As a few representations have already been recorded in the course of the first and second terms of reference, notices were sent to the remaining persons.

During the course of taking the depositions, wherever the inmates had difficulty in expressing their points fluently in English the services of other inmates who knew English and the respective language were utilized for the purpose of translation. Similarly, the representations which were not in English, but in other languages like Oriya, Gujarati, Bengali etc. were got translated and after being read out to the deponents, were certified for the correct translation. The summary of statements from the 54 persons with reference to their representations are reproduced briefly in seriatim.

1. Mr. Shesadev Kar – He is from Orissa, 44 years old, an M.Com, came to Ashram in 1987, became a regular inmate in 1991, stays in AB House since 1994. After working in Navjyoti Office from 1987 to March 2004, presently in Trust Office from April 2004. In his representation (Ex. 54) he has stated that the boys against whom the sisters have complained of harassment, criminal intimidation, obscene gestures, drawings etc... were well known to him and bear good character. A few
of them helped him in difficulties. In his deposition he had said that he could not believe in the complaints made by the sisters against Chandramani, Girish Panda, Gitanjali, Santosh and others.

2. Mr. Birabhadra Raut – He is from Orissa, 32 years old, a Graduate in Political Science and History and also studied ITI (Electrician) course, became an inmate in 1996, working in Ashram Electric workshop and staying in Ambabhikshu House from 1998, soon after his admission as regular inmate. Confirming his representation (Ex. 55), he had deposed that the boys namely Chandramani, Santosh, Girish Panda etc. have good character and would not harass girls. He has further stated that on 13.10.2004 at around 5.30 p.m. he saw lot of crowd and police in the Second Floor and he was called by Hemlata and a policeman, that the police showed him three small chits containing obscene drawings and that all the three were original in ballpoint pen containing different kinds of drawings without any writings.

3. Ms. Ila Joshi – She is from Gujarat, 42 years, studied upto graduation from Ashram school. She is an inmate for 8 years, an Ashramite from 1983, working in reception and photo section and teaches Gujarati in Ashram school. In her representation (Ex. 56) she has stated that to her knowledge it was the five sisters who were disturbing the peace in Ambabhikshu House and the other residents were nice and friendly with one another. She has explained her own personal experience of harassment by the sisters. One evening at about 5.00 p.m. when she was sitting in the door way of her room doing some stitching work one of the five sisters namely Nivedita while passing through the corridor deliberately came close and kicked her leg, even though there was plenty of space on the other side. Being elder in age and a senior
member, when she questioned her behaviour, Nivedita answered rudely and screamed to her eldest sister Jayashree that Ila Joshi was troubling Nivedita. Narrating another incident Ila has stated that about a month back, Jayashree Prasad herself while passing by her side suddenly lifted her elbow close to her cheek as a gesture of hitting. According to her, the sisters were in the habit of throwing water and dirty things themselves outside the room and then blame the other residents for harassment. She has further stated that on 2nd October 2004 around 5.30 p.m. while she was going to her room she happened to look at Jayashree’s room and there was no water at that time, but within a half a minute she heard Jayashree screaming that someone had thrown water into the room, thereby creating a scene. If the five sisters feel that they were being harassed they could seek an alternative accommodation and leave Ambabhikshu House so that Ambabhikshu House residents can live in peace. She has deposed that Jayashree was staying right opposite her room and the nuisance from the sisters had become intolerable and not conducive for peaceful and harmonious life for other inmates.

4. Ms Jahnavi Ravikanti – She is 38 years old, from Andhra Pradesh, came to Ashram in 1971, graduated in Biochemistry from the Ashram School in 1986. She is a regular inmate of Ashram from 1987 giving her services in Cottage Restaurant since 1987. Her parents had come for staying in Pondicherry in 1996 and they give voluntarily service and are not inmates. Her two younger sisters were also educated in Ashram School and they are full fledged Ashramites staying in Ambabhikshu House. She spent her day time in Ambabhikshu House and goes to her parents’ house for night stay. In her representation (Ex. 57) she has stated that the same inmates against whom complaints have been alleged by the sisters have always been friendly and helpful to her, on the contrary the sisters were of quarrelsome nature.
and no inmate can freely use the staircase when the sisters happen to pass by for fear of encountering their misbehaviour. She had stated that the harmony in the Ambabhikshu House has been shattered and the atmosphere vitiated since arrival of the sisters as they cannot get along with anyone. In her deposition she has amplified her representation by saying that the behaviour of the sisters towards Ashramites was detestable and very irksome and not conducive for harmonious and peaceful living in Ambabhikshu House. She says that Arunashree stays near her room, that she knew Arunashree from 1987 while both of them served in cottage restaurant and Arunashree had always been the habit of telling that male members were after her and used to behave arrogantly with all.

5. Ms. Priti Chandak – She is 29 years old and graduated from Ashram School. She was born in Pondicherry since her parents were in Pondicherry out of their devotion to Sri Aurobindo and the Mother. After some time, the parents left for Maharstra to look after their business leaving her behind. After graduation from Ashram school in 1996 she became a regular inmate of Ashram and gives service in Central Office. She has been staying in the Ambabhikshu House since 1997. In her representation (Ex. 59), she has stated that she did not believe that there was any truth in any of the charges of alleged misbehaviour etc. as all the persons such as Santosh (Dining Room), Chandramani, Girish, Shankar, etc. were known to her of decent character and helpful to others. She has also cited a specific incident that sometime ago around 11.00 p.m. she heard banging of the doors and many inmates were called out of their rooms and she saw Hemlata shouting in bad language and a few days later the drinking water was contaminated and after she drank the water without knowing about the contamination, she vomited. In her deposition she has stated that Hemlata was her classmate in the Ashram School, but still her and her sisters’ behaviour had
become very undesirable which has hampered the peace and harmony in AB House. In her statement and her deposition she has expressed that there was no truth in the allegation by the sisters against other co-residents such as Girish, Chandramani, Santosh etc. and a decisive step needed to be taken when a few start disturbing the atmosphere, as such the sisters could be given a separate place for accommodation.

6. Mr. Gopal Naik – He is 34 years old, born in Pondicherry, graduated from Ashram School, has given a joint representation (Ex. 60) with his sister Datta Naik. He has deposed that his father was a doctor in JIPMER and the parents had settled in Pondicherry, offering voluntary service in the Ashram out of devotion to Sri Aurobindo and the Mother. They are not inmates and live in their own house. After graduation from the Ashram School in 1990, he was admitted as an inmate and has been staying at Ambabhikshu House for the last eight years. He works in Park Guest House and Sanjeevan Karyalaya dealing in Marathi publications. He says that even though he did not have much knowledge about the sisters, he did not believe in the accusations made by them against some of the inmates. In his representation he has stated that the atmosphere in Ambabhikshu House was peaceful and harmonious till recently, until Prasad sisters began to make allegations against the some of the co-inmates.

7. Datta Naik – She is 40 years, born in Pondicherry, elder sister of Gopal Naik and had her education in Ashram school. After graduation in 1985, she was admitted as an inmate and has been staying in Ambabhikshu House ever since it was constructed. She teaches science, maths and music in the Ashram school after her graduation. She had deposed that she did not have much knowledge about Jayashree, Arunashree and Rajyshree. However the youngest two sisters namely,
Nivedita and Hemlata were her students in the Ashram school and were found to be slightly erratic and quarrelsome in nature, Hemlata being more of that character. She has sent a representation to me jointly with her brother expressing that she did not believe in the accusations made by the sisters against a few inmates. (Ex. 60)

8. Mr. Ajit Reddy – He is 48 years old, from Hyderabad, was sent to Ashram School in the year 1964 at the age of 8 and graduated in 1976, after graduation was admitted as a regular inmate sometime in 1980 after some probation period. He is working in the Air Conditioning Department for the past 20 years. He has been staying in the Ambabhikshu House for 8 years. In his representation (Ex. 61), he has stated that the sisters do not do any work but take all the benefits of food, clothing and shelter and still disturb all the residents, their attitude amounts to taking advantage of the facilities and misusing the freedom given in the Ashram. He has questioned how it could be possible to harass the five sisters where so many other inmates are living together harmoniously for many years. How could it be that except the Prasad sisters no other inmate has witnessed such serious misconduct as alleged by the sisters against a few inmates. He has stated that according to him persons against whom the sisters have levelled accusations were well behaved in their place of work. In his opinion the boys Shankar, Girish, Chandramani etc. could not have committed any mischief as alleged by the sisters. He has questioned the action of the sisters in approaching the police and press and making false allegations. He has deposed that the sisters spoiled the reputation, peace and harmony in the Ashram community by giving false complaint to the police and making police enter Ambabhikshu House for interrogation etc. He knew many departments were not willing to take the services of the sisters because of their quarrelsome nature and irritable behaviour. He has further stated that he was deeply
disturbed by the activities of the sisters and hence temporarily staying with his friend outside Ambabhikshu House after entry of police, but retaining the room with the hope of returning after the problems created by the sisters are settled. He has therefore expressed that it was not fair every one to suffer for a few and hence the authorities should not show any more leniency and should taken stern action.

9. Mr. Narendra Pati – He is 52 years old from Orissa, studied upto B.A. He has deposed that he came to Pondicherry in 1975 and is living in Ashram since then. After a few years of probation he was admitted as permanent member sometime in 1983/84. He has been working for the past 10 years in Audit Department and staying in Ambabhikshu House since 1995 as one of the earliest residents. He has stated in his representation (Ex. 62), that Santosh, Chandramani, Girish, Prashant and others against whom allegations have been levelled by the sisters were well known to him for their good character and behave very decently with co-inmates especially the lady residents. He has therefore stated that accusations by the Prasad sisters against the boys were malicious with view to spoil the peaceful and harmonious co-existence in Ambabhikshu House.

10. Mr. R. Viswanath – He is 43 years old, from Kerala and a graduate in Economics from Kerala University. After serving in Dubai for 6 years he came to Pondicherry in 1993 and was giving service in Cycle Maintenance Department. He became a regular inmate in the year 1997 and from then onwards staying in Ambabhikshu House. He has deposed that to his knowledge, he did not believe in the complaint by the sisters against co-Ashramites of any indecent behaviour, criminal intimidation etc. According to him it is the 5 sisters who have been speaking in very indecent and arrogant manner against co-Ashramites and giving false complaint to
the police and indulge in disturbing peace and harmony in Ambabhikshu House by shouting, meddling with drinking water etc. In his written representation (Ex 63) he has stated that he did not have any kind of problem or trouble from any of the co-Ashramites whereas for the last few months, the five sisters were creating a lot of trouble to inmates in the Ambabhikshu House. He has stated that a couple of months back, the sisters disturbed him in the night by shouting and banging at his door. He believes that the complaints made by them against fellow Ashramites were baseless and fabricated.

11. Mr. Niranjan Jena – He is 50 years old from Orissa, a Matriculate and finished two years teacher training course in Orissa. He has deposed that he came to Pondicherry in 1983 to lead a spiritual life in the Ashram. He has been giving service in Honesty Society ever since. He was admitted as a regular inmate of Ashram in 1991 and has been living in Ambabhikshu House for more than 10 years. In his representation (Ex. 64) he has stated that he had worked and lived with the persons against whom the sisters have accused of misbehaviour. He was surprised and shocked to know about the allegations and that he did not believe them. In his deposition he has stated that he knew the boys accused against to be very gentle and well-behaved with everybody. He has stated that because of the five sisters, the atmosphere in the Ambabhikshu House has been spoiled and wanted strong action.

12. Mr. Arupananda Das – He is 36 years old from Orissa, a matriculate, came to Pondicherry to serve in Ashram in 1986 and became a regular inmate in 1991. He worked in Navajyoti Press for 12 years and from 1998 serving in the fruit room. He stays in Ambabhikshu House from 1995. He has deposed that his room was just close to the staircase on the first floor in ‘B’ block and Jayashree Prasad and her
sisters were in the habit of assembling in the ground floor near the staircase in late
nights and talking loudly, causing lot of disturbance to him since his balcony was
just above where they used to chat. Because of the quarrelsome nature he dared not
tell them not to disturb. Arunashree was staying in the third floor of the same block
and that whenever they happened to cross each other in the staircase she would
come so close as though to dash against him making him feel uncomfortable for the
fear of any false complaint by her against him. He has reiterated the same in his
representation. (Ex. 65)

13. Mr. Madan Mohan Sahoo – He is 46 years old, from Orissa, a matriculate, came to
Ashram in 1985 and became a regular inmate in 1991. He has been working in
Dining Room from 1985 and staying in Ambabhikshu House from 1995. He has
deposed that he knew the five sisters for quite long, that they were notorious for
arrogant and rude behaviour against all, that they were in the habit of talking loudly
in the nights, putting on the light in the passage / staircase and take pleasure in
disturbing others. Arunashree was staying diagonally opposite to his room in the
same floor and used to throw water in the passage, make noises and sing loudly.
When the sisters come in the staircase other inmates used to avoid for fear of
unfounded allegations such as physical dashing, behaving indecently etc... since the
sisters were in the habit of making false complaints to police, press etc.. In his
representation (Ex. 66) he has stated that he knew the boys namely Chandramani,
Shankar, Santosh, Girish and others for 20 years and that they were well disciplined
and the allegations by the sisters against them were not true. He has further stated
that he had not experienced any kind of nuisance from the above boys and it is the
five sisters behaving rudely and talking against the ashram and inviting police to the
premises thereby creating panicky situation.
14. Mr. Manas Chand – He is 40 years old and from Orissa. He has deposed that out of devotion his family members and parents had sent him to the Ashram at Pondicherry in 1969 when he was about 7 years old to study in Ashram school. He had graduated from Ashram school in physic and foreign languages. He knows Italian, French and to some extent German other than English, Hindi, Bengali and Oriya. After his graduation in 1984 he was doing voluntary services in electric workshop and in the publication of Italian Magazine. He became regular inmate sometime in 1986/87 and has been staying in Ambabhikshu House from early 1990, when it was constructed. He was serving in the Cottage Restaurant for 15 years where he is now the Manager for the past 6 years. In his representation (Ex.67) he has stated that he had come to know that the sisters had been causing lot of inconvenience to a few other residents who are well known to him and he has expressed surprise about the allegation. He has stated that the sisters did not carry a healthy and friendly atmosphere around them, that they have terrorized people and harassed many inmates because of which they have instilled a sense of insecurity in their building affecting the safety and privacy. Because of such situation many inmates have shifted from Ambabhikshu House. He has requested to help restore peace, safety and security in Ambabhikshu House.

15. Ms. Luminaura Ravikanti – She is from Vishakhapatnam, 27 years old, was sent to Pondicherry at the age of 4 for education in Ashram School. She has deposed that she has graduated from Ashram School in 1998 and immediately thereafter admitted as a regular inmate of the Ashram. She is working in the Accounts section of the Ashram. Her parents after retirement have come to stay in Pondicherry since 1996 living in their own house and giving voluntary services in the Ashram. Her elder
brother and two elder sisters were also educated in the Ashram school. She and her
two elder sisters are also inmates of the Ashram and all the three stay in
Ambabhikshu House. She spends her daytime in Ambabhikshu House and joins her
parents at night. She has deposed that the persons against whom the sisters have
made complaint are well known to her, bear good character and behave decently
with ladies. She therefore does not believe in the complaint of the sisters against
them. In her representation (Ex. 68) she had stated that a couple of years back the
atmosphere in the premises was more homely than what it is now. She has stated
that the sisters have brought lot of confusion causing unnecessary inconvenience
and therefore requested to sort things out for a more harmonious living.

16. Ms. Ushma Choksi – She is from Gujarat, 42 years old, a graduate in economics
from South Gujarat University. She has deposed that she came to Pondicherry in
1988 with a desire to serve the Ashram and has been rendering services in Park
Guest House since then. She was admitted as a regular inmate of the Ashram in
1992 and has been staying in Ambabhikshu House for past 7 years. She states that
since last few months she was mentally disturbed very badly on account of the
indecent and unashramite behaviour of the sisters with co-residents. They have been
indulging in noisy behaviour, shouting, banging the doors of other inmates in late
night, disturbing their sleep for no reason. In her representation (Ex. 69) she has
stated that a few months back the sisters disturbed her by banging at the door at
midnight. She believes that the complaints made by the sisters against fellow
Ashramites are pointless and fabricated. Her only concern is peaceful and
harmonious living in the Ambabhikshu House to serve the Mother and follow her
teachings which has been greatly hampered by the behaviour of the five sisters.
17. Ms. Jayashree Das – She is from West Bengal, 36 years old and a matriculate. She has deposed that she came to Pondicherry in 1984 and since then serving in Dining Room(Kitchen). She stays in Ambabhikshu House for past 7 years. In her representation (Ex. 70) and in the statement she has stated that she knew the boys Chandramani and others against whom the sisters have complained of bad behaviour, very well for the past 15 years. They behave very decently and modestly with all and particularly with the ladies. Jayashree and her sisters are notorious for rude behaviour in the Dining Hall and Ambabhikshu House and other places and they have brought police to Ambabhikshu House on false complaint. She has stated that she was badly disturbed with this kind of behaviour of the sisters who are indulging in anti-ashram activities, abusing the trustees, co-residents, going to police, press, court, etc.

18. Ms. Matruprabha Dwivedy – She is from Orissa, 33 years old and studied up to intermediate. She is from a family staunchly devoted to Sri Aurobindo and the Mother. She came to serve in Ashram in 1990 and started working in Ashram Nursing Home since then. She became a permanent inmate of Ashram in 1998 and staying in Ambabhikshu House from 2002. In her representation (Ex. 71) she has stated that she knew personally Chandramani, Girish, Santosh, Shankar, Nirmal etc. for quite long and do group activities and cultural programs together. They are very friendly, helpful and cordial and she has no complaint against any of these male sadhaks whose names have been mentioned with some complaints.

19. Ms. Pragyan Shila Mallik – She is from Orissa, 30 years old and a graduate from Orissa University. She came to Pondicherry in 1995 and is working in Honesty Departmental Stores since then. She became a regular inmate of Ashram in 1998
and staying in Ambabhikshu House for the past five years. In her representation (Ex. 72) and in the deposition she has stated that that Chandramani, Santhosh, Nirmal and others were well known for their friendly behaviour with everybody including ladies and complaint against them by sisters is not true. She has deposed that one night around 11.00 p.m. the sisters banged and knocked the door of all the inmates including hers and were making a lot of noise and were shouting. She had also noticed on quite a number of occasions the sisters talking loudly and making noise late at night and disturbing the tranquility in the campus.

20. Mr. Swapan Kumar Banerjee – He is from West Bengal, 56 years old and an intermediate. His mother came to Pondicherry in 1967 along with him and his five sisters and 2 brothers. He was 18 years old at that time. The whole family was admitted as inmate of Ashram in 1967 itself. After retirement his father also settled in Pondicherry in 1981 as an inmate and expired in November 2000. His mother expired in May 2004. After working in various departments he is now giving services in the Audit Department for the past 25 years. He says he is the first occupant of Ambabhikshu House after it was constructed in March 1994. In his representation (Ex. 73) he has stated that the sisters were not doing any work for Ashram for several years, but take all facilities and privileges from Ashram like food, shelter, clothing etc. They also use vulgar language, speak lies, tease inmates, banging the doors of co-inmates and have a snake tongue against others. According to him the sisters are of crude nature and dangerous type, entangled many Ashramites in criminal cases in order to cover up their lies, mistakes, and falsehood. According to him, the sisters behave against Ashram’s interest and their complaints against co-inmates are lies and harassment. In his deposition he has stated the sisters have been the source of nuisance to other inmates due to their rude
behaviour, foisting false complaint, disturbing other inmates at odd hours with their tantrums. He has further deposed that Jayashree was staying right below his room and for no reason she used to pick up quarrel with him alleging that he had thrown burning agarbathies from his balcony into hers. She also used to complain in loud voice branding co-Ashramites as beggars who have joined Ashram for the sake of food. The other sisters Arunashree and Nivedita used to jump on the terrace at odd hours reverberating in all rooms and stopped that practice after the notice of enquiry. By giving false complaint they have brought police into Ambabhikshu House to terrorise the co-Ashramites. He had therefore represented to rescue the inmates from the clutches of the sisters and adverse circumstances caused thereof.

21. Mr. Rabi Sasmal – He is from Orissa, 47 years old, finished intermediate and one year in engineering course in Orissa. He came to Pondicherry in 1976, working in Ashram Press, was admitted as a permanent inmate in 1986 and has been staying in Ambabhikshu House since 1997. In his representation (Ex. 74) he has stated that some of his colleagues had been harassed and tortured by a few members of Ambabhikshu House implicating them in some unpleasant incidents on account of which they had to stay in the lock up for two nights for no fault of theirs. He felt sorry for them because they were innocent. In his deposition he has stated that he felt disturbed because on account of false complaint made by the sisters against a few inmates they had to suffer in police custody. He has stated that the persons against whom the sisters have given complaint, bear good character and are innocent of any misbehaviour alleged. According to him the complaints by the sisters were malicious and not true.
22. Mr. Ramachandra Mahapatra – He is from Orissa, 71 years old and studied up to intermediate. He came to Pondicherry with his wife and 3 children in 1970. He has known the Mother very well and was admitted as inmate immediately. He has been working in Navajyoti office and his wife in the Dining hall. His two sons and only daughter studied in Ashram school. The eldest son got married after education and rendering voluntary services in the Ashram. The other son and the daughter are inmates and serving in the children’s canteen and Ashram school respectively. He is a resident of Ambabhikshu House for the past five years. His wife and children live in separate accommodations provided by the Ashram elsewhere. In his representation (Ex. 75) he has stated that things were going on well in Ambabhikshu House but recently due to some undesirable activity of evil minded inmates the atmosphere is polluted. Some innocent boys of the Ashram have been falsely accused for no fault of theirs. He knows those boys personally to be of good character and he believes that the complaint against them was totally baseless, false and in malicious. He has deposed that the complaint of harassment, indecent behaviour etc., by the sisters against the boys two Santosh, Shankar, Chandramani, Nirmal are not true. He says that he has found the behaviour of the five sisters very disturbing and not conducive for Ashram life.

23. Ms. Rahmi Das – She is from Orissa, 36 years old and studied up to +2. She came to Ashram in 1986 and admitted as permanent inmate in 1991 and has been serving in Dining Hall (kitchen) since 1986. She is staying in Ambabhikshu House for the past 7 years. In her representation (Ex. 76), she has stated that she was very much surprised that the sisters had complained against some good persons who are good young sadhaks. She has stated that the persons namely Girish, Chandramani, both Santosh, etc. were well known to her, bear good character and were friendly with
all. The complaints made against them by the sisters are stupid and false and on the contrary it is the sisters who have been harassing the co-inmates by their arrogant behaviour, foistering false complaints, disturbing, shouting etc... She states that she knew the sisters very well for such kind of behaviour.

24. Mr. Debasish Mukherjee – He is from West Bengal, 30 years old. Because his family is devoted to Ashram, his mother came to Pondicherry along with him when he was a two years old child. His mother started giving services in the ashram dispensary and after few years she was admitted as regular inmate. He had his entire education in Ashram School and after graduation he became a regular inmate in 1996 and staying in Ambabhikshu House since 1997. After graduation he has been giving services in the Audit Department. His mother also stays in Ambabhikshu House in a different room. His father after retirement in 1994 had settled down in Pondicherry, lives separately and giving voluntary services in Ashram. In his representation (Ex. 77) he has stated that he did not ordinarily meddle into other peoples’ affairs and did not want to involve himself. He has felt that when he came to know certain unwarranted incidents through various notices pasted in the notice board of Ambabhikshu House he was compelled to send his representation. He has stated that in the context of his Ashram life he had many dealings with the persons charged with misbehaviour by the sisters and he had no reason to doubt the character and integrity of the persons complained against. On the other hand he stated that seen in the larger context, the problem created in Ambabhikshu House was on account of the vindictive nature of the sisters. The sisters have flouted the guidelines expected to be followed by the inmates of the Ashram. When he was asked to be more precise he stated in his deposition that he knew the five sisters for rude behaviour with others. The last sister namely Hemlata was his classmate in the
Ashram school. He says that he knew the character and integrity of all persons like Girish, Chandramani, both Santosh, Nirmal, Shankar, etc. to be flawless and beyond doubt since he has working relationship with them on account of his working in the Audit Department. Therefore he says that the complaint made by the sisters against them is fabricated. According to him, the reasons for the allegations by the sisters were more personal because of the very serious violation of Ashram code governing the personal character by Hemlata which became scandalous and well known to the entire Ashram community. He has further stated that their general behaviour was in gross violation of ethics and discipline of the Ashram and because of their being girls they were trying to exploit gender discrimination and cover up their lapse, anti ashram activities etc. by wild allegations against others. The behaviour of the sisters by taking advantage of their being women tantamounts to exploit and hold the institution (Ashram) to ransom.

25. Mrs. Kokila Pati – She is from Orissa, 50 years old and studied Higher Secondary she came to Pondicherry in 1975 along with her husband Shri Narendra Pati, became a regular inmate some time 1986 and serving in Ashram dispensary. She stays in Ambabhikshu House from 1995 along with her husband in independent accommodations. She had deposed that she knew very well the boys namely Girish, both Santosh, Chandramani etc… to be well behaved and disciplined to everybody including ladies. In her representation (Ex. 78) she has stated that she had never complained against anybody until recently and had not felt uncomfortable with anybody in the campus. The inmates have been living peacefully together like brothers and sisters and she never found any misbehaviour or mischief in the conduct of the accused boys especially with girls. She has stated that the complaint against the boys by the five sisters is not true and that no other ladies or young girls
in the complex has any complaint against these boys. After the earlier Police search and harassment, she has started feeling insecure that the police might come at any time under any false pretext and anybody might be arrested. She had therefore requested for a permanent solution so that the inmates could lead a tension free and peaceful life.

26. Ms. Tripti Das – She is from East Bengal (now Bangladesh) and 54 years old. Her mother migrated to Pondicherry along with her and her two sisters in 1956 and were admitted as regular inmates by the Mother immediately. Her father joined them in Pondicherry sometime in 1959. She and her sisters had education in the Ashram school. Her father passed away in 1998, her two sisters got married. One of them had gone to Kolkata and the other is in Pondicherry whose husband is a Doctor and giving voluntary services in Ashram. She is giving services in the Ashram tailoring Department and stays in Ambabhikshu House for the past 7 years. In her representation (Ex. 79) she has stated that a few days ago some colour was mixed in the drinking water tank and some of the inmates who drank it fell sick. The atmosphere was very peaceful, but it is spoiled because of police coming now and then and harassing the inmate boys without any reason. She therefore wants peace and harmony restored in Ambabhikshu House.

27. Mr. Jayaram Das – He is from Orissa, 50 years old, and a Matriculate. He came to Pondicherry in 1969, worked for sometime in Ashram Press and Navajyoti Office and now working in Cottage Industries (Agarbathi Unit) for the past 20 years. He was admitted as regular inmate in 1969 itself and staying in Ambabhikshu House for the past 10 years. In his representation (Ex. 80) he has stated that the persons Chandramani, Girish, both Santosh etc. against whom complaints have been
levelled were very good, reliable persons to the best of his knowledge and the sisters residing in the same complex cause much disturbance to others. He has therefore stated that the sisters should be shifted somewhere as other inmates did not like them (sisters) to stay in Ambabhikshu House.

28. Nilakantha Das – He is from Orissa, 28 years old and a Matriculate. He came to Pondicherry in 1988, gave services in Nellitope Farm till 1992 and there after went back to Orissa and again returned Ashram in 1995 and served in the same farm upto 1998 and there after in Honesty Departmental Stores. He is a regular inmate from 1998 and staying in Ambabhikshu House since then. He has deposed that he had found Jayashree Prasad and her four sisters to be very aggressive and arrogant with others, causing lot of disturbance by shouting, singing, pouring water, banging at the door etc. They were particularly biased against the Orissa people and therefore in habit of abusing that the Oriya inmates in Ashram were very bad and spoil the Ashram. In his representation (Ex. 81) he has stated that the sisters were not courteous to their neighbours or to other inmates in the building, that they were in the habit of disturbing the other inmates by knocking the door anytime and speaking loudly, arousing communal feelings, abusing etc. He has also stated that after an incident in the month of June, they attempted to pollute the drinking water and with their aggressive behaviour inside the building they have brought a feeling of terror among other inmates since he has been watching police entering Ambabhikshu House very often led by the sisters. He has suggested and requested that the sisters be accommodated in some other place.

29. Ms. Rita Kanungo – She is from Orissa, 52 years old and finished Higher Secondary. She came to Pondicherry to serve Ashram in 1973. She has deposed that
she was allotted service in the Laboratory. She says that her family as a whole was staunchly devoted to Ashram. Her parents have died and her four sisters though married, continue to be devotees and time permitting volunteer for service. One of them is a Doctor working in Pondicherry Institute of Medical Sciences in Pondicherry and gives voluntary services in the Ashram as well. Other two sisters are working in Matru Bhavan, Cuttack, a relics Centre of Ashram while another sister is also working in another Relics Center in a place called Bhadrak in Orissa. One of the grand children in the family is now a student in the Ashram school. She went to Kerala for acquiring Medical Laboratory Technology Qualification after which she came back again to Ashram for service in 1978. She became a regular inmate sometime in 1980 and has been staying in Ambabhikshu House for the last 10 years. She has further deposed that she knew Jayashree Prasad and her sisters as co-inmates and that their behaviour was rude and arrogant even with the elders. In her representation (Ex. 82) she has stated that she is an Ashramite for 31 years and respects the dignity of the place. She states that the persons against whom complaints have been made, that is, Chandramani, both Santosh, Shankar etc. were staying in Ambabhikshu House and she had not felt any bad behaviour from them. Santosh is her neighbour and she has found him to be gentle and helping in nature. She has further stated that one evening she saw Jayashree Prasad and Aunashree Prasad coming with the police in the Ambabhikshu House when she was coming to her room in the upstairs. She also states that when she happens to pass Arunashree in the staircase she (Arunashree) would try to dash and block her way. In her deposition she has stated that the sisters were known for making loud noises, passing comments about others, laughing and singing and disturbing in the nights. According to her the complaint made by the sisters against the boys Girish,
Chandramani, Shankar, both Santosh and others was not true and that she knew these boys for their good behaviour.

30. Ms. Arati Kar – She is from Orissa, 34 years old and studied up to +2. She came to Pondicherry in 1989 and after probation she was admitted as a regular inmate in 1992. For 12 years she worked in the cottage restaurant and from 2000 she is working in the school office and in the petrol bunk office. She is an inmate of Ambabhikshu House since 1999. In her representation (Ex. 83) she has stated that she knew the boys against whom complaints have been made and that they would not harass the girls. In her deposition she has stated that the complaint by Jayashree Prasad and her sisters against the boys Chandramani, both Santosh, Girish, Shankar etc. are not to be believed since she knew them very well and they behave very decently with all the girls. On the contrary, she says, that the sisters were in the habit of causing disturbance by noisy behaviour and that on one night they came in a group and banged the doors of all the inmates at dead of night disturbing everybody.

31. Ms. Jyotshna Rani Parida – She is from Orissa, 32 years old and matriculate. She came to Pondicherry in 1994 and giving service in the Tailoring Department. She was admitted as a regular inmate in 1998 and staying in Ambabhikshu House since then. In her representation (Ex. 84) she has stated that to her knowledge the persons whose names are mentioned in the notice board were nice, gentle with good character and their behaviour was always good with her. Supplementing this in her deposition, she says that the persons referred to by her in the representation to be gentle and bear good character are the boys Girish, Chandramani, Shankar, both Santosh and others against whom the Prasad sisters have given police complaint.
32. Mr. Mruganka Sekhar Dash – He is from Balasore in Orissa, 35 years and a post graduate in commerce (M.Com). He has deposed that he came to Pondicherry in 1993 and since then serving in Honesty Departmental Stores. He was admitted as a regular inmate sometime in 1998 and staying in Ambabhikshu House for the past two and half years. In his representation (Ex. 85) he has stated that the five sisters were not obeying Ashram rules. They were always in a mood to create disturbance to their neighbours at late night for small matters which were capable of being solved in the morning with good understanding. Further the sisters had given complaint against innocent and disciplined brothers and sisters and that after the disturbance they had attempted to pollute drinking water and ignoring ashram discipline, they bring police into the premises. In his deposition he says that he was not supporting or opposing anybody and his only concern was service to Divine Mother and to ensure peaceful and harmonious atmosphere in Ambabhikshu House. To his knowledge the sisters were not disciplined and causing annoyance to inmates with false complaint against co-Ashramites and bringing police into Ambabhikshu House.

33. Mr. Kripa Anuru – He is from Andhra Pradesh, 44 years old. His parents were devoted to Sri Aurobindo and the Mother. Hence his mother migrated to Pondicherry along with him in 1960 when he was 9 months old child. His mother is an inmate since then and he was admitted as inmate in 1963. After education in Ashram school he worked in the Press and for the last 5 years he is in the service in the Mother’s room. His father, an LIC officer, settled in Pondicherry after his retirement some time in 1980 and was giving voluntary service in the Ashram. Both his parents have died now. He has been staying in Ambabhikshu House from 1995.
In his representation (Ex. 86) he has stated that the accusations made by the Prasad sisters against some of the inmates were utterly false. He has wondered about the charge of molestation as to how it could be possible with about 400 people living in the premises! Regarding the defiling of the doors he has stated that there were cats and monkeys which sometimes defile the places and this has been twisted and given an ugly turn. He has further stated that the sisters have presently made out an FIR and in later period they might concoct something more serious. He has therefore stated that such accusation must be brought to an end and if possible the sisters should be removed from the ashram, as everybody had come to do sadhana for the Mother. He has confirmed his representation in his deposition wherein he has stated that allegations by the sisters were baseless and fabricated and the persons namely Girish, Chandramani, Shankar, both Santosh and Nirmal against whom the sisters have thrown allegations were well known to him for decent behaviour with all. The incidence of defiling with urine or making the place dirty could have happened due to the cats and monkeys who loiter in that area and could not have been by any inmates. He says that such defiling has happened in his room also on a few occasions. Therefore the sisters seem to have unnecessarily blown a non issue out of proportion with false police complaint etc. According to him the behaviour of the five sisters were always rude and unbecoming of Ashramite spoiling the peaceful and harmonious living and they should be removed from the ashram in the interest of peace and harmony, since they were the main cause for the disturbing situation.

34. Mr. Govinda Chandra Mohapatra – He is from Orissa, 55 years old and Matriculate. He worked for 10 years in Land Acquisition Department in Orissa and came to Pondicherry in 1987 to serve in the Ashram. After probation he was
admitted as a regular inmate in 1995 and stays in Ambabhikshu House since then. He worked in Ousteri Farm (Lake Estate) up to 1997 and thereafter in Electric Workshop till now. In his representation (Ex. 87) he has mentioned about the presence of police in Ambabhikshu House sometime ago, who enquired about Girish, Chandramani, Shankar, both Santosh and he felt sorry for such type of atmosphere as he wanted peace and harmony in Ambabhikshu House. In his deposition he has stated that he found police coming into Ambabhikshu House quite often and they enquired him also once about Girish, Chandramani, Shankar and both Santosh. On enquiry with his co-inmates he was informed that police were making such enquires because the sisters had given complaint to police. He has further stated that he did not know much about Jayashree Prasad and her sisters, but the other boys namely Girish, Chandramani, Shankar, both Santosh were known to him and they were well behaved.

35. Mr. Michele Neville – He is born in London, a British National, 73 years old, a Mechanical Engineer, became a resident of Pondicherry since 1965 and maintaining his British Nationality. He has deposed that he came to Pondicherry at the invitation of the Mother in 1965 as visitor with his wife and two children. As advised by The Mother he stayed back in Pondicherry with his family and settled as regular inmates of Ashram in 1965 itself. Both his daughters were educated in Ashram school and one of them went back to Europe after education and passed away after few years. At present he, his wife and the surviving daughter stay at Pondicherry as inmates of the Ashram. He has been serving as a Teacher in the International Centre of Education of Ashram from 1983. He stays in Ambabhikshu House from 1993. His wife also stays next to him in Ambabhikshu House and his daughter stays in another building called “New Creation”. In his representation
(Ex. 88) he has stated that he was well acquainted with the residents against whom the Prasad sisters have complained about. He says that Prashanth was the main person in charge of running the building for many years and had been doing a good job. Nishith Banerjee was responsible for settling disputes among residents and Chandramani and himself look after electric and water supply and to the best of his knowledge, all the people against whom the sisters have complained were well mannered and respectable residents. In his deposition he has explained that he, Nishith, Prashanth and Chandramani worked as a group in the maintenance of Ambabhikshu House. Jayashree was staying near his room and on a few occasions she had complained to him that somebody had urinated near her room which he did not believe.

36. Ms. Nirupama Sahu – She is from Orissa, 46 years old and a Matriculate. She came to Pondicherry in 1987 and had been serving since then in the Dining Room (washing section). She was admitted as an inmate sometime in 1990-91. She is staying in Ambabhikshu House for 10 years. In her representation (Ex. 89) she has stated that the peaceful atmosphere of Ambabhikshu House was disturbed by the behaviour of the Prasad sisters by their falsely accusing co-inmates whom she knew personally for several years. She has found the sisters to be quarrelsome and cannot get along with anybody and hence strong action should be taken against them for calling the police to Ambabhikshu House by giving false complaint. In her deposition she has stated that a few days ago when she saw police on a few occasions in Ambabhikshu House she was frightened and on enquiry with other inmates found out the reasons that Jayashree and her sisters had given complaint against Shankar, Girish, both Santosh etc. to the police. She says she knew many of the boys as they worked with her in the Dining Room and they were very well
behaved with ladies and others. When she came to Pondicherry in 1987 she stayed in Rupantar Guest house where the boys Girish, Santosh and Chandramani also stayed. They were also working in the Dining Room together for many years. According to her she knew them personally to be very humble and polite with ladies.

37. Mr. Vibhu Prasad Subuddhi – He is from Orissa, 46 years old and an intermediate. He came to Pondicherry in 1989 and became a regular inmate in 1992. He has been serving in the Honesty Departmental Stores from 1989 and for last one year in Honesty Society. He has been staying in Ambabhikshu House from 1994. In his representation (Ex. 90) he has stated that he knew very well Chandramani, Girish, Santosh etc... to be persons of good character and not harassing anybody. He also felt uncomfortable when police came to Ambabhikshu House on 8.10.2004 as his aim was spiritual life and observance of the teachings of Sri Aurobindo and Mother. He has confirmed in his deposition that the boys Chandramani, Girish etc. were well known to him for their good character and decent behaviour with all. Therefore the complaint of misbehaviour or harassment against them by Jayashree Prasad and sisters could not be true. He did not know much about the sisters as he had not interacted with them.

38. Mr. Pabitra Mohan Sahu – He is from Orissa, 37 years old and a Matriculate, came to Ashram in 1992 and was admitted as a regular inmate in 1998. Until last year he was working in lake estate in Ousteri and presently in the Furniture Department since December 2003. He stays in Ambabhikshu House for the past one year. In his representation (Ex. 91) he has stated that he was feeling uncomfortable because of police coming into Ambabhikshu House unnecessarily which made him feel
uneasy. He has stated that Chandramani and others have not misbehaved or harassed anybody. In his deposition he has stated that Chandramani was working in a relic Centre in Orissa where he also used to go before coming to Pondicherry. Therefore he knew Chandramani for many years. The other boys namely Girish, both Santosh etc. were also known as co-inmates bearing good character and not misbehaving with anybody. He say that he did not know much about Jayashree and her sisters. He learned through his friends in Ambabhikshu House and from newspapers that police visited the Ambabhikshu House on a few occasions based on the complaint made by the sisters.

39. Mr. Brajendra Nath Pati – He is from Orissa, 42 years old and a graduate in history. He came to Pondicherry to serve Ashram in 1988 and became a regular inmate in 1997. He has been working in Honesty Engineering Department since 1988 and for the past 6 years giving part-time service also in the Dining Hall in the evenings. He stays in AB house from 1998. In his representation (Ex. 92) he has stated that though he had no bad feelings with other people, still he avoids the sisters because they were against Ashram. They want to create some type of problem and they do have a few friends helping them and encouraging them for that purpose. He has narrated that some times they bang the door of other inmates in the middle of night for petty reasons and that some nonsense papers would be under their doors or mix some colour in the drinking water tank. He considers them as dramas and that they call the Police to give an impression that others are against them (sisters). He has therefore suggested that the rotten eggs should be removed. In his deposition he has stated that he was neither favourable nor prejudicial against any of the inmates. However, he has found the behaviour of Jayashree Prasad and her sisters very much unashramite who indulge in giving false police complaints.
and making Police enter AB house for interrogation, mixing colour in the drinking water tank etc. According to him, if some person has a problem or grudge against anyone they would try to do such things. To his knowledge the persons Girish, Shankar, Chandramani, Santosh, etc. were good characters since he knew them as his group persons in the Dining Hall. He says that his room was by the side of the staircase in block D and that the sisters use only the staircase in that block and were in the habit of assembling daily in the passage near the staircase after 10 p.m. gossiping and thereby disturbing. He is aware of the accusation made by the sisters against Girish, Santosh, Chandramani, etc. of allegedly urinating near the doors which he didn’t believe to be true. He further has deposed that he knew a cat causing such kind of nuisance in blocks A and B where his brother Narendra Pati and sister-in-law Kokila Pati reside. He says that he has also seen the cat urinating in the staircase sometimes when he passes by. Therefore he considers the sisters as rotten eggs in the basket which should be removed in the interest of peace and harmony in AB House.

40. Ms. Samikshya Samant Singh – She is from Orissa, 26 years old and studied up to plus 2. She came to Pondicherry in 1996 and started giving services in the Dining Hall. She was admitted as a regular inmate in 1998 and stays in AB House since then. In her representation (Ex. 93) she has stated that she was surprised when she came to know about the stupid complaints against good boys who were young sadhaks whom she personally knew very well as they were all working together for the past 8 years. She has stated that they were all behaving with each other like brothers and sisters of one family and hence confidently says that those boys were really very innocent and that it is the sisters who were trying to harass them. She believes that the Divine Mother would definitely relieve these boys from the unfair
problems. In her deposition she confirms that the complaint of misbehaviour, harassment etc. against the young sadhaks namely Girish, Chandramani, Santosh etc. is not true and cannot be believed.

41. Mr. Biswanath Panda – He is from Orissa, 35 years old and a graduate in History and Political Science. He has deposed that he desired to join Sri Aurobindo Ashram due to his spiritual quest and hence he came to Pondicherry in 1991, joined the Ashram and became a regular inmate sometime in 1996/1997 and stays in AB House since then. He has been giving services in Honesty Departmental Stores since 1991. In his representation (Ex. 94) he has narrated various disturbances caused by Jayashree Prasad and her sisters such as attempt to pollute drinking water, talking loudly during rest time, moving up and down in the staircase without due concern for all users, gathering and discussing in the common passage and ignoring Ashram’s discipline, they have brought police into the premises of AB house on a few occasions. He has confirmed in his deposition that he had seen Jayashree Prasad and her sisters quite often talking during rest time and that the police came to the premises on the basis of a complaint by them. Their behaviour was very erratic and not predictable. He says that he came to know that one of the sisters enquired somebody regarding the storage and supply of drinking water system and therefore he suspects their hand when the drinking water was found polluted one day. He has no complaints against other inmates.

42. Ms. K. Padma – She is from Mumbai, 83 years old and from a family wholly devoted to Sri Aurobindo and the Mother. She came to Pondicherry to join the Ashram in 1957 and became a regular inmate in 1960. She was teaching in the Ashram school and now she engages herself with some lighter activities with the
children. She has been staying in AB House for over 10 years. In her representation (Ex. 95), she has stated that the five sisters have made a great nuisance of themselves. Citing a few examples, she has stated that they (the sisters) pass urine on the passage, enjoy in the discomfort of the neighbours and others passing by, switching on the light in the nights which disturb the neighbours from sleep and draining the electricity consumption. She has stated that she has sent the representation in defence of the few inmates against whom allegations have been levelled by the five sisters. She has stated that all the boys were so preoccupied with their duties allotted to them in the Ashram and they can hardly find time for other things. She has observed that the sisters have made themselves notorious in the Ashram and all the accusations are their own concoctions to amuse themselves. She says that the eldest of the five sisters dared to take pride that when she was in her native town, she had flattened many boys. She has explained the behaviour of the girls that they roamed like intoxicated elephants wildly and felt depressed that they had not profited by their stay in the atmosphere of the Ashram. She has sympathised with the persons troubled by these sisters and desired that they (boys) should be helped and the Ashram left in peace.

43. Ms. Sushila Ojha – She is from Orissa, 50 years old and a graduate. She came to Pondicherry to serve the Ashram in 1976 and became a regular inmate in 1998. She was giving services in the Dispensary from 1976 to 1984 and thereafter in Park Guest House upto 1998 and since then again in the Workers’ Dispensary in the morning session and in the studio (Art Gallery) in the afternoon. She has been living in AB House since 1994. In her representation (Ex. 96) she has stated that all the boys Girish, Prashant, Santosh, etc. were decent people and behave as brothers and sisters with all. In her deposition she has confirmed that the boys complained
against were known for good behaviour and therefore she did not believe in any of
the accusations made against them by the sisters, who are known for their rude
nature and arrogant behaviour.

44. Mr. K. Ramarao – He is from Orissa, 46 years old and a matriculate. He came to
Pondicherry to serve the Ashram in 1993, admitted as a regular inmate in 1998 and
stays in AB House since then. He works in Ashram Press. In his deposition and
representation (Ex. 97) he has stated that the boys complained against were not bad
characters and that though he didn’t have much knowledge about the sisters, the
complaint of misbehaviour by them against Chandramani, Girish, Santosh etc. was
not true.

45. Mr. Sudhir Mohapatra – He is from Orissa, 53 years old, a graduate in Economics
and Political Science from Utkal University. He comes from a family staunchly
devoted towards Sri Aurobindo and the Mother. He has deposed that after
graduating in 1973 he joined in one of the relics centres in Orissa, namely, Sri
Aurobindo Srikhestra at Dalijoda in 1974. Since he used to visit Sri Aurobindo
Ashram, Pondicherry quite often, he came to Pondicherry in 1986 to join the
Ashram and became a regular inmate in 1991. He worked in the Dining Hall
initially. Now for the past 6 years he is working in the Liaison Office. He has been
staying in AB House since 1991. In his representation (Ex. 98), he has stated that
the allegations made by the five sisters against some Ashramites of AB House were
not true to his knowledge. He knew all of them personally and they cannot do such
things. On the other hand, it is the five sisters who were creating situations like
calling Police frequently, roaming in the nights making everybody including
himself feeling not safe as they could make false allegations against anyone and
complain to the police. He has therefore suggested in the representation that they should be taken out of AB House and kept out in some other place so that they could not complain or do any harm to other Ashramites. In his deposition he has stated that he knew the boys Chandramani, Girish Panda, both Santosh, Nirmal, etc. for many years for their good character and congenial behaviour, that the complaints against these boys by Jayashree Prasad and her sisters were concocted and not true, that she had also known the 5 sisters for their arrogant behaviour and quarrelsome nature. He has also narrated his personal experience with the behaviour of Arunashree in the matter of the chit sent by Chandramani which will be discussed at greater length in the later part. He has further deposed that he was unhappy when police were made to enter Ambabhikshu House on the basis of false complaints by the sisters against co-inmates and hence felt that the sisters should be shifted out of AB House.

46. Ms. Suranjika Pradhan – She is from Orissa, 42 years old and a graduate in History. She came to Ashram in 1988 and became a regular inmate in 1990. She has been staying in AB House for 6 years. She is serving in Dining Hall (washing section) since 1988. In her representation (Ex. 99) she has stated that in her 16 years of staying in the Ashram, she had opportunity to work with the brothers who are accused of false allegations and are being harassed. She has informed that she had not seen or felt any unsocial activity or bad behaviour from the boys. She has deposed that she knew the boys Girish, Chandramani, etc. to be very friendly and well-behaved with ladies and that she had also known the five sisters for their erratic behaviour and about their bringing police on a few occasions by giving false complaint against other inmates. She says that the complaint by the sisters against the co-inmates were not true.
47. Ms. Rangalata Dora – She is from Orissa, 41 years old and a matriculate. She came to Ashram in 1989 and was made a regular inmate in 1991, serves in the Dining Hall (kitchen) since 1989 and stays in AB House from 1994. In her representation (Ex. 100) she has stated that the brothers and sisters living in AB House help each other. But presently the 5 sisters have joined and given false complaints against a few inmates to the police and are giving trouble. She says that she saw the police coming into the AB House for the first time. The 5 sisters are wild by nature and their behaviour was bad. Often when they walk, they try to dash against her (Rangalata Dora). They switch on the light throughout the night and don’t allow her to sleep peacefully and sometimes upto 12 midnight, they sing and laugh loudly mocking at other Ashram people and disturb the atmosphere. Therefore, if the sisters want they might go elsewhere and let others in AB House live in peace. She has deposed confirming her feelings expressed in the representation and has stated that the sisters were known for their rude and arrogant behaviour and that she herself has been a victim while Jayashree was also working in the Dining Hall. She says that the complaint made by the sisters against persons like Shankar, Santosh, Girish, Chandramani etc. were not true as she knew them for their decent behaviour.

48. Mr. Jagabandhu Raut – He is from Orissa, 42 years old and has studied up to Matriculation. He came to the Ashram in 1990 and became a regular inmate in 1995/1996, has been working in the Dining Hall (washing) since 1990, staying in AB House since 1998. In his representation (Ex. 101) he has stated that he has not seen or heard of any misconduct caused by the persons in the complex, but the five sisters were creating violence during the last few months. He has stated that the sisters used to walk here and there till late night and if people object they give false
complaints to the police and therefore the other inmates were scared to pass by in front of their rooms even when there is urgent need fearing that the sisters might give false complaints to the police. In his deposition he has stated that he had seen Jayashree and her sisters behaving in a rude manner with co-inmates and disturb others in the late nights with their loud noises loitering here and there, that the gents were afraid of walking near their rooms or come across the sisters in the staircase for the fear that the sisters would complain against them to the police. To his knowledge other than the 5 sisters no other inmate behaves indecently with others.

49. Ms. Reena Barik – She is from Orissa, 30 years old and studied up to 8th standard. She came to the Ashram in 1993, admitted as a regular inmate in 1998 and working in the Dining Hall (kitchen) ever since. She stays in AB House since 1998. In her representation (Ex. 102), she has stated that the brothers and sisters complained against by the five sisters were known to her and that they did not misbehave with others and didn’t do any bad thing, rather helped others. She has further stated that 3 months ago, the drinking water was found polluted and police were coming to the AB House about which she was not happy. In her deposition she has stated that the boys Chandramani, Girish, Santosh, etc. move like brothers and complaints against them cannot be true. Her younger brother is also in the Ashram as probationer giving services in the Dining Hall from 2002.

50. Ms. Annapurna Mohanty – She is from Orissa, 52 years old, a matriculate and done teacher’s training course. She has been a frequent visitor to the Ashram from 1974 and ultimately came to serve the Ashram in 1987 and admitted as a regular inmate in 1991, working in Honesty Departmental Stores ever since. She is staying in AB House for 10 years. In her representation (Ex. 103), she has stated that the inmates
are in Sri Aurobindo Ashram to undertake the work of the Mother and Sri Aurobindo for a noble cause. In such a peaceful atmosphere, Jayashree and her sisters were creating controversial situations and putting others in trouble. Sometimes they join together, sing and laugh at midnight and give false complaint to police and spoil the peaceful atmosphere. Chandramani, Prashant, Nirmal, Santosh and others have been living with others as brothers and their behaviour was not bad at all. The sisters were creating fear in the minds of others by complaining to the Police. The 5 sisters think that they could hide their past misdeeds and future bad deeds by inducing fear in the minds of others and hence they were not worthy to stay in Ashram’s holy atmosphere and if it was not possible to take them out of the Ashram due to legal problems, they should at least be shifted out of AB House so that the other inmates staying therein could be free from the bad atmosphere and live in peace. In her deposition, she says that she knew Jayashree and her sisters quite well, that they were notorious for their arrogant behaviour causing nuisance and disturbing other inmates on late nights, foisting false complaints against other inmates with police etc., that their complaint against Chandramani, Prashant, Nirmal, Santosh and others were absolutely baseless as she knew these boys very well for their good behaviour. Jayashree Prasad is her neighbour and the sisters by their bad behaviour brought in police into AB House on false complaint against co-inmates.

51. Ms. Beenapani Mohanty – She is from Orissa, 45 years old and a matriculate. She came to Ashram in 1987 and became a regular inmate in 1991/1992. She has been serving in the Dining Hall since 1987. She stays in Ambabhikshu House from 1998. In her representation (Ex. 104) she has stated that she had never had any quarrel with those brothers whose names were seen in the notice board and that she had
never seen anything negative about them. Some of them work with her and help her in her needy time. Therefore in her opinion, they are good people. One day something was found mixed in the drinking water and everyone including herself saw that. On another occasion at night time there was a commotion inside the building and when she woke up from sleep she heard the screaming of the five sisters. She says that whenever she sees the sisters on the road she will choose to go by other way. She has also narrated a personal incident which happened to her. Her birthday is on 13th July. Hence on 12th July 1989 one of her cousins came to the Dining Hall to greet her. As he was returning after meeting her, Jayashree threw a shoe upon him from behind and she scolded her brother in filthy language that he was staring at her (Jayashree) while going. Later when she told Jayashree that he was her brother and had come to see her for birthday the other people who witnessed the incident scolded Jayashree. From then on she stopped talking to her. In her deposition, she has stated that she knew the boys Chandramani, Girish, both Santosh, Shankar etc. since some of them were her associates in the Dining Hall and that they bear good character and behave like brothers. She says that she had also known the five sisters as very notorious for their rude behaviour with others and she is afraid of them and hence avoids the sisters even if she happens to see them in the Dining Hall and in other places. She says that she felt very upset about the behaviour of Jayashree when her cousin came to see her in 1989 during her birthday.

52. Mr. Ishwar Datta Pandya – He is from Gujarat, 84 years old and studied up to Matriculation. He came to Pondicherry on 15th August 1969 and became a regular inmate in 1970. Initially, he worked in Honesty Departmental Stores and thereafter in Ashram Press for 18 years. Now due to old age he is not so active but doing some
voluntary services in the AB House gate, school etc. He is in AB House for the past 10 years. He has given three representations, one in English language (Ex. 105) and two in Gujarati (Ex. 106 & 107). In the English representation he has stated that Shankar was a honest, faithful and a true sadhak who was doing good work in the night at the gate of AB House and had the capacity to watch each and every thing. Because of small misunderstanding with Krishnakumar Pandya, he had left that work though nobody was at fault. Since Shankar has a good nature to help the old sadhaks, he should be called and given cooperation so that his good services could be utilised. In one of the Gujarati representations, he has again complemented Shankar Mitra as a simple and innocent helpful person living like a yogi, that his (Shankar) parents have come from Kolkata and are sick and bed-ridden. One of his sisters is also sick. He had to bring them food regularly. Likewise, he brings food for other old people also. All these things have now come to a stop because he is shifted to another accommodation. He has therefore requested that boys like Shankar, Chandramani, Santosh, and especially Shankar are badly needed back in AB House to help the old and sick persons to live in peace and comfort. He has also requested that the Trustees should call a meeting every month to ensure that somebody is put in charge of gate-duty in AB House for at least half an hour everyday. In the other letter in Gujarati language, he has stated that whereas one Lata-ben rendering service in Nursing Home for 16 years dedicatedly has not yet been made an Ashramite, persons like Jayant Desai (serving in Harmony reception department), Subhash and Nirmal (serving in Electric Department) were trying to become Ashramites by quarrelling with everyone. He has therefore requested the Trustees that there should be no partiality in the matter of admitting persons as inmates which should be based on merits. In his deposition he has summarised the above views with special reference to Shankar Mitra as a very responsible boy.
helping his old parents, sickly sisters, and other elderly persons and that he should therefore be encouraged and properly utilised and that the other letters in the Gujarati language were mainly written for improvement in the functioning of Ashram and not with any ulterior motive against anyone.

53. Ms. Pushpita Mitra – She is from Kolkata, 45 years old, studied upto 10th Standard, came to Pondicherry in 1976, admitted as a regular inmate after a few years, giving services in the Dining Hall since then. She has become very sick due to a few operations on her stomach, leg, etc. and hence she is given lighter work. She stays in AB House for past 7 years. Her mother Padma Mitra is also an Ashramite who came to Ashram in 1970. Her age is 78 years and she is giving services in the library. She also stays in AB House. Her younger brother is Sajal Mitra alias Shankar who is also an inmate and a resident of AB House. Because of her sickness and her mother’s old age, Shankara was bringing food for them and they depended upon him for other necessities. Her younger sister by name of Lata Mitra has recently been admitted as a regular inmate and lives in another accommodation. She has deposed that the representation (Ex. 108) was written by her mother in Bengali language and was signed by her (Pushpita Mitra). She has deposed that the boys namely Girish, Santosh, Chandramani and Shankar were good friends who behaved very well with all. The complaints by Jayashree sisters against them all are totally false. Since the representation has been prepared in Bengali by the mother Padma Mitra and signed by Puspita Mitra, the daughter, the contents in the letter are in the form of a narration both from the mother and sister. It is stated therein that Padma Mitra has a son and two daughters, the elder daughter is bedridden on most of the days, Padma Mitra herself being invalid and depends only on her son Sajal Mitra alias Shankar to help them to get food from the Dining Hall and for other odd jobs.
He stays the whole day in the mother’s room and at night he goes to his room to sleep. Since a few days, Arunashree had been accusing him of urinating in her room and blaming her son and other boys with mischief. She has stated that all the five sisters were crooked, dangerous and bad characters and that the hardworking boys and elderly people should be helped from the accusation of the sisters. She has represented that the situation is very grim for the family as to who would bring food for them. She has therefore represented that the five sisters should be shifted to another accommodation for restoring peaceful atmosphere in the AB House.

54. Ms. Subhashinee Mohanty – She is from Orissa, 31 years, has studied up to plus two. She came to the ashram in 1992 and became a regular inmate in 1997 and staying in AB House since then. She worked in Dining Hall from 1992 to 1997 and thereafter in the Laundry till date. She has deposed that since the behaviour of Arunashree was very arrogant and hostile and her sisters support her she thought fit to send the representation (Ex. 109) explaining in detail various incidents concerning Arunashree and Rajyashree. In her representation she has narrated a few incidences of Arunashree dashing against her in the Dining Hall, dangerously changing her direction as if to collide with her (Subhashinee) cycle on the road and whirling her umbrella with a hitting posture against her etc. A few months before, one night after 11:30 p.m. when the inmates were fast asleep, the five sisters started banging hard at the doors of the other inmates causing havoc in the whole building and screaming at the top of their voice for about an hour. She has further stated that Rajyashree enquired her in the Laundry about the filter tank, filtering system etc. in AB House as she (Subhashinee) usually looked after the maintenance of the drinking water system and she is one of the very few persons aware of its working. She has stated that she innocently explained in detail the functioning of the drinking
water supply system and immediately after less than half an hour, the whole
drinking water tank containing thousands of litres of water got turned dark yellow
and whoever happened to drink it started vomiting and became sick, a few needing
admission in the Nursing Home. Next day, when she countered Rajyashree whether
her enquiry about the water supply system on the previous day was to tamper with
it, she pretended that she knew nothing about it and questioned her (Subhashinee)
bona fides. Supplementing the representation she has stated in her deposition that
since Rajyashree was keen to know the details about the functioning of the drinking
water supply system in AB House, she strongly believed that Rajyashree and her
sisters could be responsible for the water pollution. She has further narrated that a
few days before they caused a lot of disturbance in the night and were challenging
other inmates that they (sisters) would teach all a lesson very shortly. Therefore, as
challenged, the water was found contaminated and hence the suspicion. She says
that after the water pollution incident, she considers the presence of the sisters very
dangerous to the lives of all in the Ashram.

With the depositions and the representations having brought on record with due
summarisation and documentation I shall now proceed to analyse them in respect of
the terms of reference to be answered by me.

The first term relates to the complaints of criminal intimidation, harassment, obscene
gestures, and drawings etc. alleged by the five sisters against a few co-inmates and
other Ashramites. As already stated supra, in the absence of the participation of the
five sisters and specific written complaint either to the Trustees or to the undersigned,
the accusations had to be summarised by the Enquiry Officer himself culling out from
the copies of the complaints dated 13.06.04 sent individually (Ex. 26, 27 28) by Arunashree Prasad and Jayashree Prasad to the President of the Bar Association, Pondicherry and also from the copies of the letters dated 4.08.04 (Ex. 24) and 19.09.04 (Ex. 30) addressed by all the sisters jointly to the Managing Trustee. Among them, the most serious two accusations are urination and obscene chit episodes. The first one is that Nirmal Swain, Girish Panda, Shankar alias Sajal Mitra, and Krishna Chander have been in the habit of passing urine on or near the room door on the nearby areas of the rooms of Arunashree Prasad and Jayashree Prasad. In the course of the deposition the accused persons have denied such action.

Nirmal Swain has deposed that he is staying in a different accommodation away from Ambabhikshu House and that he could see his friends in the Dining Room or Playground and need not go to Ambabhikshu house for chit-chatting. In fact the common allegation against Nirmal Swain by the sisters is that he acts as a gang-leader and abetting others to commit various acts of commissions and omissions as complained. Nirmal Swain has denied of having any gang or group supported by him to instigate any mischief against the sisters and he has totally denied all the accusations made against him by the sisters to the president of the Bar Association Pondicherry in their letter of 13.06.04. He has stated that the sisters are prejudiced against him since he is actively involved in defending the cases on behalf of the Ashram. The sisters have filed a few cases, civil and criminal, in which he is actively participating in defence of the Ashram. He sought permission to submit a comprehensive written submission separately since there were very exhaustive. He was permitted for the same and in compliance he submitted a letter dated 29.11.04 (Ex. 40) giving the details of certain cases filed by Hemlata Prasad, one of the five sisters, in her individual capacity, and other cases filed jointly by other sisters. I do not want to go into the minute details
as the written statement is taken as one of the exhibits forming part of this report. In the above said cases he has assisted the senior lawyers of the Ashram and got favourable orders. One such case is wherein the Enquiry Officer appointed by Chennai High Court has concluded that Hemlata Prasad was guilty of the misconduct charged with by the Trust.

The other persons Krishna Chander, Girish Panda, Shankar alias Sajal Mitra, have also denied their involvement in any of the acts of complaint against them, including the urination issue.

Krishna Chander has deposed that he was staying in a different building namely, New Creation, situated opposite to AB House for the last six months and before that he was staying in Oriya Nilayam near the French college. He says he had no occasion to go AB House at all since his friends are in the building New Creation itself.

Girish Panda has deposed that he has studied Sanskrit up to “Shastri” level. He says that his working hours are from 5:00m. to 10:00 a.m., 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 a.m., 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., and thereafter he goes for exercises and games. And after dinner in the Dining Hall around 9:00 p.m. he visits his sister, staying nearby and returns to his room around 10:30 p.m. and goes to sleep. He has therefore stated that he hardly has any time. In his representation (Ex. 41) he had expressed surprise as to why Arunashree was troubling him. He has narrated some incidents such as Arunashree put phenyl water in front of his room, spills water deliberately in front of his room making that area slippery, keeping the balcony light on in front of his room in the nights, singing aloud at midnight projecting herself in half-dressed pose while singing and thereby disturbing others, attempting to jostle with others in the staircase, scolding him.
in vulgar language when he is found alone, blocking his way when he goes out on his bicycle and spreading rumour that he was passing urine in front of her room. He has also accused that she (Arunashree) made vulgar drawings and spread news to others and complained to the police that he (Girish) was sending such vulgar pictures.

Shankar alias Sajal Mitra has also denied his involvement in any of the acts complained against him. He has deposed that his pet-name is Shankar and that the sisters had given a false complaint against him to the police. He has stated that he is also a massager and that one Dilip Agarwal, another Ashramite, used to take massage from him who was always in the habit of complaining to him (Shankar) about the Ashram and the Trustees to which he would not make any comment. Dilip Agarwal was also pestering him to join the Association of which he (Dilip Agarwal) was a member and presumably the five sisters too, which he refused. He had also deposed that he saw Dilip Agarwal along with the sisters accompanying the police when they visited AB House a few days before and hence he has presumed that the sisters were against him foisting bogus allegations because of his refusal to join the Association of Dilip Agarwal. He has also narrated in the deposition that the sisters were in the habit of causing harassment and nuisance to him and to other inmates by their indecent activities of shouting in the nights, putting on the lights during night, damaging his cycle and giving false complaint against him to the police. In his representation (Ex. 44) he has informed that Arunashree started throwing water in to his room about which he informed to the Trustees, who asked him to keep quiet and that they would look into that. A few days later, while going for bath, he found the police and the five sisters with their father near his room, their father accusing him of urinating in front of the rooms and questioned as to who was responsible for pushing a chit with sketches in bad taste etc. He has replied that all in AB House live like brothers and sisters and
should there be any problem, all would help to catch the culprit at once. However, a week later the sisters have registered a case with the police against him and when the police questioned, he had denied it.

Coming to the appreciation of the statements and representation in order to find out the truthfulness in the allegation it is necessary to refer to the statements and representations of a few other inmates also. Apart from the fact that Nirmal and Krishna Chander are not residents of Ambabhikshu House, there are also other materials to conclude their innocence and also of Sajal Mitra alias Shankar and Girish Panda. The statements of Kripa Anuru and Brajendranath Pati throw very important light on this issue. Kripa Anuru who stays in the 2nd floor, A Block has stated that the defiling with urine could be due to the cats and monkeys which loiter in the area and that such defiling of urination has happened in his room also on a few occasions. Brajendranath Pati has also stated that he knew about a cat causing such nuisance of urination and defiling in blocks A and B where his brother Narendra Pati and sister-in-law, Kokila Pati reside. The complainants Jayashree Prasad and Arunashree Prasad stay in block A and block B respectively. It is therefore clear that such defiling could have been caused only by the cats or monkeys loitering in that area. It is also very unlikely that any person in pursuit of Ashram life to be a sadhak could venture such things. Apart from the specific deposition from the above two inmates and of Ms. Padma, most of the deponents have also opined that the water smudge found in/near the rooms of the sisters could not be urine and it was the sisters’ own creation or concoction.

The other serious charge is about the chit found in the room of Arunashree allegedly containing some obscene drawings along with the writing of Chandramani and a few
other plain obscene drawings. While the sisters met the Trustees in the Grace Office on 26th July 2004 when the weekly meeting of the Trustees was in progress, the sisters had shown and left with the Trustees copies of series of obscene drawings and they had orally complained that they (sisters) had been harassed by the display of such drawings and through other ways. The Trustees have forwarded the copies of such obscene drawings, five in number (Ex. 23 series) and Arunashree has also sent alongwith her letter dated 13.06.2004 addressed to the President of the Bar Association, a copy of a chit containing a written message by Chandramani and some obscene drawings below that (Ex. 27). The sisters have in their letter dated 4th August 2004 (Ex. 24) confirmed their meeting the Trustee on 26.07.2004 when they have made the complaint of harassment, criminal intimidation, obscene gestures, and drawings directed against them and that they also showed and gave the obscene drawings which were in their possession. It is therefore proposed to analyse the input available with me in regard to all the obscene drawings (Ex. 23 series & 27). Whereas four such drawings were plain drawings, two exhibits are those containing a written message by Chandramani to Arunashree and some obscene drawings below that portion.

Chandramani in his representation (Ex. 39) and in his deposition has stated that he left his native village at the age of 19 in the year 1975 to join Udiaman Matri Kshetra in Orissa, a Sadhanalaya centre on Sri Aurobindo and the Mother which has a Relics Centre and a school where he stayed upto 1985. Later he joined Sri Aurobindo Ashram in Pondicherry in 1985 and became a regular inmate in 1991. He has been in AB House since 1995-96 and giving services in the Dining Hall (maintenance and procuring groceries etc.) Till his moving out to a different accommodation on 18.10.04 on account of a police complaint against him by the sisters, his permanent residence was Room no.11, 3rd Floor, Block A. He has admitted sending a chit to Arunashree
sometime in June/July 2004, that is, the night prior to the day of cleaning the overhead tank of B block wherein Arunashree is staying. He has narrated that he has known the sisters as co-inmates and that Jayashree Prasad had worked for some time in the Dining Room along with him where Arunashree used to go to meet her sister. He says that when Arunashree was ill on a few occasions he used to get vegetables, fruits, etc. at her request. Occasionally, when he meets Arunashree she used to complain to him about the Ashram and the Trustees and the difficulties experienced by her and other sisters with the administration to which he would not respond. Since he generally looks after the cleaning of the overhead water tank in A block where he stays, Arunashree used to request him whether he could get the overhead drinking water tank in her block also cleaned by him. In June 2004, he cleaned the overhead tank in A Block and on seeing the work going on in A block, Arunashree requested him to help to get the overhead tank of her block also cleaned. Conceding to her repeated requests, he said that he arranged to clean the overhead tank in her block (Block B) on a Sunday and Arunashree also offered to participate in the cleaning work. However, during the previous night when he was organising with his friends for the cleaning next day and mentioned about the willingness of Arunashree to participate in the cleaning work, they had objected to the same due to her being a lady and also her habit of making propaganda against the Ashram and the Trustees and her general tendency to pick up quarrels with others without any provocation. They therefore threatened that they would withdraw if she were to be allowed to participate. Since it was already very late in the night and cleaning had to start early in the next morning, he did not like to disturb Arunashree Prasad in her room and instead left a chit on the doorstep of her room informing her that there were enough persons for cleaning and therefore she need not come. He has stated that the chit he left was a very small piece of paper and there was nothing else except what he had written and that he had not drawn any vulgar
pictures below his writing. He says there was hardly any place available beyond his
writing. When the two papers (Ex. 23-5/5 and 27) one being the copy of what was left
behind by the sisters with the Trustees and the other being a copy of what Arunashree
herself enclosed in her letter dated 13.06.04 to the President of the Bar Association,
Pondicherry, were shown to him, Chandramani admitted only the written portion and
denied that he drew any obscene pictures below that. He deposed that he strongly
suspected that the Xerox copy might have been taken by putting an additional paper
below his chit so as to make it look that the chit was big in size and obscene pictures
were drawn by him below the writing. Alternatively, he observed that the small chit
with the message sent to Arunashree should have been pasted on a bigger paper
containing such obscene drawings in the lower portion and photocopy taken thereafter.
He has therefore suspected the hand of Arunashree herself in the episode since she is
known to be a good artist in drawing and that he had seen her paintings and drawings
in the exhibitions. He had therefore concluded that if the original chit written by him is
produced, the veracity of his statement and his innocence would be proved and
established. After the notice of enquiry was put up in the notice board of AB House by
me, I got a typed letter dated 20.09.04 (Ex. 110) addressed to my residence appearing
to have been signed by Chandramani stating that he wrote the chit to Aruna-di on
13.06.04, Girish Panda drew the dirty pictures, and Girish and Santosh were urinating
and doing other dirty things in the girls' rooms and that he was not involved. When I
encountered Chandramani with this letter, he stated that the letter was not written by
him and the signature was forged. He stated further that a similar letter was shown to
him by the police also in the police station when they interrogated him wherein he
denied the contents of the letter and the signature since it was forged. He further stated
that he was not in Pondicherry between 14.09.04 and 27.09.04 and furnish necessary
proof for that. When this was cross-checked with the Trust, the Managing Trustee
replied that Chandramani had sought permission to be away from Pondicherry from 14.09.04 till the end of September and forwarded photocopies of his request, departure register etc...(Ex. 112 and 113 series). Chandramani also gave a letter on 23.11.04 enclosing Xerox copy of a return ticket and Xerox copy of a Notice at 23.09.04 by the Secretary, Sri Aurobindo Integral Institute of Education and Research, Sambalpur (Ex. 114, 115, 116).

The above statement of Chandramani Patel is further corroborated by Girish Panda who in his deposition has alleged that Arunashree makes vulgar drawings and spread the news that he (Girish) was drawing all the vulgar pictures. Assuming that Chandramani Patel and Girish Panda are interested parties being the persons complained against by the sisters in the police complaint, the deposition of Sudhir Mahapatra has given clinching decisiveness. He is a 53 years old person, a graduate in Economics and Political Science, and has been an inmate of Ashram from 1986, and lives in AB House since 1991 in block B, 3rd floor. He has deposed that he was one of the members in the team organised by Chandramani to clean the tank in block B at the request of Arunashree. He has corroborated telling that when the cleaning work schedule was being organised the previous night, he and the other members in the cleaning team objected to the participation of Arunashree and threatened that they would abstain if she were to be associated. He says that Chandramani therefore decided to inform Arunashree through a written message as it was late in the night. He has stated that he himself saw the chit in which Chandramani informed Arunashree advising her not to come and that there was nothing else in the chit except the writing of Chandramani. Thereafter when Arunashree complained to the other inmates in their floor and showed a Xerox copy of a bigger paper containing the writing and the obscene drawings, he objected to her stating that he had seen personally
Chandramani’s letter to her when he wrote it and that it was in a small chit and except the writing there were no such drawings. He was scolded by Arunashree that he was supporting Chandramani because of the Orissa connection. When he was shown the two exhibits with the writing and the obscene drawings below (Ex. 23 and 27) he has confirmed only the written portion as what he saw, and that the chit was a smaller one and there were no vulgar drawings when Chandramani wrote it and put it near the door of Arunashree’s room.

Sri Birabhadra Rout, another deponent, also from Orissa, a graduate in Political Science and History and an ITI (Electrician) certificate holder, 32 years, in the service of Ashram since 1996, staying in AB House had deposed that on 13/10/04, when he had to come to his room urgently to pick up his swimming dress to take part in a swimming competition, he was confronted on his return by Hemlata with a police and the police showed him three small chits containing naked drawings. All the three were originals in ball point containing different kinds of drawings and there were no writings. He confirmed that they were not the ones showed to him taken as exhibits (23 series and 27) in this enquiry as what he saw was very small chits of 4x2 inches size without any writings. He said that the police took his signature as a witness in a printed sheet.

Sripati Das also has deposed that Nivedita showed a small bit of paper containing some vulgar drawing and it was not the ones as was shown to him in Ex. 23 series.

Sajal Mitra alias Shankar has deposed that the police showed him copies of the papers with writings and other drawings like the exhibits in the enquiry (Ex. 23) and he told
police that he was in no way involved and requested them to show the original, which they did not.

The statements of Sudhir Mahapatra and Birabhadra Rout, even leaving aside Chandramani’s and Girish Panda’s, gives lot of credence to the statement of Chandramani that what he sent to Arunashree was only a small chit containing only the written message and there were no vulgar drawings. Moreover, in the two exhibits (Ex. 23-5/5 & 27) though they look similar and identical, there is a substantially tangible variation between the two. In the exhibit (Ex. 23-5/5) the copy forwarded to me by the Managing Trustee, besides the writing of Chandramani, there are only five drawings of obscene pictures below that leaving the entire portion on the left-side margin blank, whereas, in the exhibit (Ex. 27) the copy forwarded by Arunashree Prasad to the President of the Bar Association, Pondicherry, alongwith her letter dated 13.06.04, on the left-side margin below the word “come”, a circle has been drawn inside which there are some writings “as if I offered to clean the tank”. The meaning obviously could be understood that it is a remark of Arunashree. Therefore with the specific denial by Chandramani duly supported by the depositions of Sudhir Mahapatra, and Birabhadra Rout, and palpable difference in the two exhibits and significantly in the absence of the production of the original, even by the Police, who has entertained the complaint from the sisters, the obvious conclusion could only be that some mischief was being played against Chandramani and others to incriminate them.

As regards the other exhibits containing only the obscene drawings, it has also been specifically denied by all the persons complained against by the sisters. Moreover, all the deponents have stated that the boys complained against were of good character. Even those who admitted that they did not know much about the sisters have stated
that they knew the boys complained against to be of good character and for decent behaviour with all particularly ladies.

The rest of the other complaints in the letters dated 13.06.04 by Arunashree Prasad and Jayashree Prasad (Ex. 26 & 28) such as the meetings on 9.06.04 and 12.06.04 to conspire harassment and abusing the sisters in vulgar words, gestures, obscene pictures etc., damaging their cycle, indecent behaviours towards them, removing the wire mesh, attempting to physically touch/assault, breaking of the locks, tripping of electricity, etc. have been specifically denied by all those complained against.

Kabitanjali has stated in her representation (Ex. 42) that Rajyashree, Nivedita, Hemlata, were her neighbours and often gave her and other inmates a lot of trouble. Once they disturbed everyone on the floor by knocking at everyone’s door at midnight, and another time, water in the overhead tank was found contaminated. Arunashree deliberately ran into her that she was about to fall. In her deposition she has stated that she is a resident of Ashram from 1987, and that she knew the sisters to some extent as co-residents of AB House. She has denied the accusations made against her by the sisters. She has described the allegation of any indecent connection made against her by the girls. She knows all these boys quite well as they were all from the same state (Orissa) and that Girish’s cousin sister was her good friend, she also being a devotee.

Santosh Sahoo in his representation has stated that he knew the sisters as co-residents and otherwise he is neither friendly nor inimical. He doesn’t understand as to why the sisters have given a complaint against him. On the contrary he has narrated in his representation (Ex. 43) and deposition that the sisters were in the habit of harassing
him and other inmates by causing lot of nuisance and inconvenience by their loud gossiping, shouting, putting on the lights, making noise in the night, disturbing their sleep, throwing water on the passage, and in front of their own rooms, and complaining that somebody had passed urine and lodging false complaints with police etc. He has specifically denied all the allegations made against him by the sisters. He also stated that the police showed him copies of a few papers with some writing and obscene drawings like the exhibits, but had informed the police that he was in no way involved.

Sri Nishith Banerjee has sent a representation (Ex. 45) stating that he came to understand that Jayashree Prasad and Arunashree Prasad had mentioned his name in their complaint and that he had not done anything to them and not speaking to them. He therefore wants that the sisters should be driven out of AB House. In his deposition he has stated that he is from Kolkata, 65 years old. His father being a freedom fighter and associated with Sri Aurobindo in the freedom struggle, settled in Pondicherry. He was brought to Pondicherry in 1945 when he was five years old, had his education in Ashram school, knew various languages, Bengali, English, French Hindi, and Tamil. He was admitted as a regular inmate at the age of six itself and stays in AB House for 8 years, as one of the senior most occupants. He heads the Ashram Department in charge of pillow, mattresses, and umbrella repairing etc. When encountered by complaints against him by Arunashree and Jayashree Prasad, he denied of any such indecent behaviour, and said that the sisters could be of his daughter’s age. He mentioned that though he didn’t have any acquaintance with the sisters except as co-residents, since a few months he had heard through newspapers and other members of the Ashram that the sisters were indulging in the habit of false propaganda against the Ashram and the Trustees and approaching police with false complaints. He says that he saw police entering Ashram premises for the first time in his entire Ashram life of 60 years and
therefore informed the Managing Trustee over phone about the incident and when Sajal Mitra came into his room for asylum during police search for arrest, he comforted him that he would render all possible assistance. Because of such unpleasant incidents caused by the sisters, he feels that they should be sent out of AB House.

Sri Ashok Kundu in his representation (Ex. 46) and in his deposition has stated that in mid-June 2004, Dr. Dilip Dutta, one of the Trustees, called him and read out a complaint against him by Arunashree that he attempted to misbehave with her and sought his explanation. He denied the whole thing. He has deposed that he is from Orissa, 56 years, and a BSc. B.Ed., has been an Ashramite from 1972, giving services since then in Gloria farm in Pillayarkuppam, near Pathukannu, which is about 17 kilometres from Pondicherry and stayed in the farm itself. Since February 2004, he has been serving in the Ashram garden in Murungapakkam and stays in AB House A block, 3rd floor. Because of his very recent stay in AB House, for just a few months, he didn’t have much knowledge about Jayashree Prasad and her sisters and other inmates except Chandramani with whom he used to have discussion about the milk/vegetable supply when he was in Gloria Farm. He has dismissed the allegation attributing it to some psycho problem of the complainant and prayed in his representation for her well-being and has aspired that the Divine should help her for that.

Sri Prashant Choudhury in his representation (Ex. 47) has stated that Jayashree and Arunashree act in a very unacceptable manner by giving bogus complaints to the police, switching on the corridor lights even after the official switch-off time of 10:30 p.m. pouring liquid near the room and accusing the neighbours of having urinated and when questioned behave foul and using abusive language. In his deposition he has stated that he is from Orissa, 51 years old, came to Pondicherry in 1971 and a regular
Ashramite since then for over 33 years. He manages the soap factory inside the premises of AB House, has been saying in Ambabhikshu Garden (as it was called then) since 1971 and was given a permanent room in block A, Ground floor, immediately after its construction. Due to his longest stay in the premises and the soap factory also being there, he functioned as the caretaker of AB House because of his availability either in his room or in Soap Unit. When encountered with the complaint made against him, he has denied his involvement in any indecent or aggressive behaviour with the sisters and to his knowledge, no body in AB House were harassing the sisters and the actual situation is the other way about. He confirmed the allegations against the sisters listed out in his representation (Ex. 47) and says that the sisters have brought disrespect to the Ashram by bringing police and Sun TV people by making false complaints against co-Ashramites.

Santosh Nayak in his representation (Ex. 48) has listed out similar demeanours of the sisters and that they had also given a false police complaint against him at Muthialpet Police Station. In his deposition he has stated that he is from Orissa, 37 years old, studied up to Intermediate, an Ashramite since 1987, working in Dining Hall, staying in AB House from 1995. He says that he knew Jayashree Prasad as she worked for some time in the Dining Hall. However his acquaintance with the sisters was very limited. He has denied all the allegations against him by the sisters in the letters dated 13.06.04 and 4.08.04 (Ex. 24, 26, 28) and on the contrary the sisters are of quarrelsome nature and in the habit of causing nuisance to the co-residents by disturbing in the night, passing bad comments about others etc. He confirmed his statement in the representation and since he was arrested by the police and now on station bail, he had moved to a different Ashram accommodation for fear of the sisters implicating him further.
In his representation (Ex. 49), Mr. Bhagawan Das Swain has expressed surprise to see his name in the complaint by the sisters. He is a devotee of the Mother and Sri Aurobindo from early 1960s and stays in Pondicherry after retirement in 1995. He is not an inmate, has nothing to do with the complaining sisters, who were like his children. In his deposition, he has stated that he is from Orissa, 70 years old, studied upto matriculation, and wanted to offer voluntary services in the Sri Aurobindo Ashram. Therefore, after his retirement as sub-postmaster in Bhubaneshwar in 1995, he shifted his stay to Pondicherry in 1996 and stays in Garden House. He is not an Ashramite, but gives voluntary service in the reception in the Ashram and in Garden Guest House. His son Nirmal Swain is an Ashramite and living separately. Since he was surprised when his friends in the Ashram said that his name was found in the notice board of AB House about this enquiry, he sent a representation. He has denied the allegation that he was ever involved in any meeting with others to harass Arunashree or her sisters with obscene pictures or that he was instrumental in damaging her cycle and he had expressed sadness as the complaint is from the girls who were like his children.

Chandramani has said in his representation (Ex. 39) and deposition that he had always respected the sisters and he helped Arunashree on a few occasions with fruit and some purchases for her when she was sick, addressed her ‘Aruna-di’ (‘di’ meaning elder sister) and used the words ‘please’ etc. in his chit.

Nirmal Swain has also denied the allegations and says that the sisters are prejudiced against him.
Krishna Chander, Girish Panda and Sajal Mitra alias Shankar have also denied the allegations and their statements have been discussed already.

From the representations and the statements from the above persons, it is seen that the persons complained against have not only denied the allegations but also expressed surprise as to why the sisters should attempt such tirade. Sri Bhagawan Swain is a man of 70 years, not a resident of AB House, settled in Pondicherry as a retired pensioner, giving voluntary services out of devotion and considers the sisters as his children. Sri Ashok Kundu, 56 years, has been in AB House only for a few months, and before that for about 32 years he was 18 kilometres away serving and staying in Gloria Farm. He does not even know about the inmates in AB House except Chandramani because of previous connection. Prashant, 51 years, has been an Ashramite for 33 years and acts as caretaker. Nishith Banerjee, 65 years, an Ashramite for about 60 years does not have much acquaintance with the sisters, except as co-residents, the sisters being of his daughter’s age. As regards Sajal Mitra, credential to his qualities from another very senior Ashramite of 84 years, Sri Ishwar Datt Pandya, explaining his devoted service to his old and sick parents and sister and to other elderly people will suffice. Krishna Chander stays in the opposite building and deposed that he had no occasion to go to AB House at all. Considering the above circumstances and the deposition from all the complainants specifically denying their involvement, it is quite clear that the complaints do not have any merit or substance.

Leaving behind the first term for a while before the final conclusion, I shall take the second term of reference for analysis.
All the nine complaints relate to an incident which happened in the late night of 22/07/04, about the behaviour of the sisters disturbing the other inmates by banging the room doors, shouting, screaming with allegations of somebody passing urine near one of the sister's rooms. Their common complaint was that the action of the sisters at such a late hour was unbecoming of a disciplined Ashramite which has caused unpleasant situation affecting the inmates' peace and harmony. They did not believe the complaint of the sisters to be true, as well. Since the statements and representations have been discussed at length in earlier paragraphs, I do not want to repeat them again for the sake of brevity. However, even at the cost of repetition, I feel that the statements of Jayanti Tripathy, Sripati Das, and Simachal Panda should be discussed briefly.

Jayanti Tripathy from Orissa, 52 years old, M.A. B.Ed., has stated that on the night of 22/07/04, she was disturbed twice at 10:30 p.m. and 11:00 p.m. by the sisters. Sripati Das also from Orissa, 68 years old, an inmate of Ashram for 42 years, has also felt disturbed and found no substance. Simachal Panda felt disturbed by the disturbances caused by the sisters so badly that he moved to another accommodation at his own request on August 2004 because of his being the driver/attendant of Medical Services in the Ashram. All the nine persons in the deposition have confirmed about the erratic behaviour of the sisters, their screaming, abusing with filthy language, threatening to call police and about the other intimidatory behaviour.

In the circumstances explained and the reason for the behaviour of the sisters on the night of 22/07/04 mostly being the urination and vulgar drawing issue, what has been discussed supra is sufficient and amply proves the content and purpose of the complaints made by nine inmates namely, Itishree Bal, Bhabani, Mousoumi, Simachal
Coming to the third term of reference, it is noted that 69 persons have sent representations including a few covered by the first and second terms of reference. The representations and the statements of all the persons have been summarised exhaustively. Most of the persons have accused the sisters of erratic and arrogant behaviour, a few describing even certain personal experiences. A couple of others who had stated that they had no occasion to know the sisters so well, have all gone on record to vouchsafe for the decent behaviour of other inmates against whom the sisters have complained either to the Managing Trustee or to the police. The deponents are in various age-groups from both sexes, the youngest being Bhabhani (24 years), Samikhshya Samant Singh (26 years), Luminarua Ravikanti (27 years), Priti Chandak (29 years), and Krishna Chander (28 years) and Sunil Patnaik (29 years), and the eldest being Mr. Iswar Datt Pandya (84 years), Mr. Michelle Neville (73 years), Bhagwan Swain (70 years), Nishith Banerjee (65 years) and Ms. K. Padma (83 years).

As stated earlier, even though the statements and representations of all the persons have been summarised to great length, I feel that it would be worthwhile to discuss the statements made by a few even at the cost of repetition for appropriate findings in respect of all the terms of reference.

Mr. Michelle Neville, 73 years old, British national turned Ashramite for about 40 years and teaching in the International Centre of Education in the Ashram since 1983, has stated that he along with Nishith Banerjee, Prashant Choudhary, and Chandramani Patel work as a group in the maintenance of AB House, and that as far as he knew any
allegations against the co-residents by the Prasad sisters could not be true as they (other inmates) were well-mannered and responsible.

Mrs. K. Padma, an 83 year old lady from Mumbai and an inmate from 1960 has narrated in her representation (Ex. 95) in very strong terms about the behaviour of the five sisters.

Sri Debashish Mukherjee has attributed the vindictive nature of the sisters as the cause for their behaviour in order to cover up certain lapses on their side, particularly from Hemlata for her violation of a very important Ashram code concerning the personal character of an inmate which became scandalous and well-known to the entire Ashram community. He has therefore stated that reasons for the mischievous behaviour of the sisters are more personal and vindictive than real. In fact Nirmal C Swain and a few others have also stated that the sisters were prejudiced and hence they tried to create such problems to other co-inmates. When Nirmal was permitted to file a separate written submission, he has given the same (Ex. 40) giving instances of a few cases filed by the sisters against the Ashram wherein he has assisted the Ashram lawyers to defend successfully in the court. Apart from Nirmal Swain and Debashish Mukherjee, others who made similar observation are Swapan Kumar Banerjee, Brajendra Nath Pati, and Annapurna Mohanty who have felt that the reason for the undesirable conduct of the sisters was with a view to cover up their faults and misdeeds. The charge of prejudice being very vague, I had to call for certain additional details from the Ashram Trust in regard to the cases so as to ascertain the veracity and reason for the presumptions of prejudice, vindictiveness, covering up etc. In compliance, the Trust furnished me a copy of the report of Sri N.P.K. Menon, an Enquiry Officer appointed by the High Court of Madras in connection with a case between Hemlata and the
Trustees. The Enquiry Report has been taken as exhibit (Ex. 117) in which the Enquiry Officer has held that Ms. Hemlata was guilty of the misconduct charged with after analysing the evidence of professional experts. The charge was obviously a very serious and scandalous one and hence adds credibility to the surmise of Debashish Mukherjee and the element of prejudice claimed by Nirmal and others. In the same report Sri Menon has also discussed about the allegation of Jayashree Prasad that she was beaten up on 9.01.01 by Krishna Chander in the Dining Hall and despite her complaint no action was taken by the Ashram management. He has found out in his enquiry that the said allegation was enquired into by one Ms. Chitra Sen, a senior Ashramite of the Ashram and the administrator of Tresor Nursing Home who has held both Jayashree Prasad and Krishna Chander guilty and had recommended that Jayashree should be shifted to some other place of work and Krishna Chander reprimanded. The enquiry officer has therefore held that the allegation of Jayashree that the Trustees had not taken any action on her complaint about the incident of 9.01.01 in the Dining Hall was not correct.

As regards another charge listed out in the joint letter dated 4.08.04 (Ex. 24) that on 3.08.04 at about 10 p.m. when Arunashree was returning to her room after fetching water from the common drinking water filter, Chandramani who was coming in the opposite direction blocked her path and tried to touch her by trying to put his arm around her, Chandramani Patel in his deposition has stated that he was staying in the 3rd floor A Block and Arunashree in B Block, that each block has all the basic amenities, such as drinking water, hot water, common wash area, staircase etc. independently, and that all rooms have attached bathrooms except hot water and drinking water facility. Normally all the inmates used to avail the hot water and drinking water facility from their respective blocks only and he specifically denies that
he ever tried to obstruct the path of Arunashree and tried to touch her on the night of 3.08.04 or any other day. He says that such an incident never occurred and the allegation was total falsehood. He was not knowing why Arunashree was making allegations against him even though he used to help her to get vegetables, fruits etc. whenever she fell sick and had always respected her, citing that even in the chit he had addressed her as ‘Aruna-di’, used polite words such as please etc...

A few inmates have even expressed fear and danger to the lives of the residents of the AB House as they suspect the hand of the sisters in the drinking water pollution incident. The statement and representation of Subhashinee Mohanty proves a lot on the issue. She has stated that she usually looked after the maintenance of the drinking water system and she is one of the few who knew its working. One of the sisters has asked her about the functioning of the system. Immediately after about half an hour of her explaining, the drinking water was found to be contaminated. Bishwanath Panda has also deposed that he had heard that one of the sisters enquired somebody regarding the storage and supply of the drinking water system. He says that he also suspects the hand of the sisters when the water was found polluted. Others who have expressed similar sentiment are Kabitanjali, Mruganka Sekhar Dash, Priti Chandak, R. Vishwanath, Nilakantha Das, Sarojini Panigrahi, and Gitanjali Padhy.

Among the various letters I received as representations from inmates, I got a letter purported to have been sent by one Nilakantha and Bishwanath but unsigned, stating that whatever complaints have been made about the girls were not correct but guided by the Trustees and that these two had done as guided because they want to stay in AB House (Ex. 111). Both Biswanath Panda and Nilakantha Das when encountered by me with this letter denied their role. Mr. Biswanath said that his name was Biswanath and
not Bishwanath as typed in the exhibit and the letter was also not signed and anonymous. Therefore the other R. Viswanath from Kerela was questioned about this and he also denied his involvement stating that he had been to Himalayas, Benares, Ayodhya, Rishikesh etc. on pilgrimage between 11/09/04 and 10/10/04 whereas the letter has been received by me on 10/10/04. Nilakantha Das also denied the same and dismissed it as an anonymous one with a false statement and suspecting it as a mischief by somebody as it is not signed. He had deposed that he stood by the letter sent by him in his own handwriting (Ex. 81).

All the deponents categorically stated that they had sent the representations and made the statements to me on their own free will and not at the instigation of anybody and with the main purpose of restoration of amity, peace and harmony in Ambahikshu House and in the Ashram which they felt hampered badly and seriously on account of the conduct of the five sisters. I was also deprived of the version of the sisters since they abstained despite giving adequate chances. They had attributed that the enquiry was an empty formality and would be an exercise in futility. They had also charged that Mr. Matriprasad had been appointed to control and influence the enquiry in favour of the Trustees and against them and that they have no faith or confidence in him. The above apprehension in my opinion is rather unfortunate and I have not associated Mr. Matriprasad at any stage of the proceedings except for the copies of documents and the infrastructure I wanted for the purpose of the enquiry.

The total number of inmates in AB House is 166 comprising of 87 males and 79 females. Out of them, 73 persons gave statements. Two others, namely, Nirmal Swain and Bhagwandas Swain, though not living in AB House, also gave statements, being the persons complained against. Thus out of 75 deponents 42 are males, and 33 are
females. Even very senior sadhaks and those from the female group have chosen to deposing before me in support of the representations explaining the mischievous behaviour of the sisters with some specific instances, personal and general, and at the same time, expressing good opinion about the other inmates complained against. Except a few, the period of Ashram life of others ranges from 10 years to 60 years, from school education to sadhak\textregistered \textdagger life. All of them have also in clear terms stated that their action was voluntary and they did not bear any personal bias or animosity against the sisters, their only concern being following the teachings of Sri Aurobindo and the Mother for which they have joined the Ashram and to restore peaceful and harmonious atmosphere hitherto prevailing and now hampered due to the activities of the sisters. 

To sum up, despite the sisters choosing to abstain and expressing grave doubts, I had framed the charges on my own on the basis of the material made available to me, as to what could be the allegations of the sisters against the other co-inmates in respect of the term number one. Adequate opportunities were given to the sisters and all other inmates of AB House to represent and statements were taken from all those represented. The representations and statements are appended as part of the report and to a great extent they have also been summarised in the body of the report. After analysing all the above material I conclude that

i) the complaint of harassment, criminal intimidation, obscene gestures, and drawings alleged by Jayashree Prasad, Arunashree Prasad, Rajyashree Prasad, Nivedita Prasad, and Hemlata Prasad against Sarvashree Nirmal C. Swain, Krishna Chander, Girish Panda, Kavitanjali, Prashant, Nishith Banerjee, Santosh (Dining Room), Santosh (Electric Department), Chandramani Patel, Sajal Mitra alias Shankar, Bhagawan Das Swain, and Ashok Kundu are not true;
ii) the complaint made against Jayashree Prasad, Arunashree Prasad, Rajyashree Prasad, Nivedita Prasad, and Hemi Prasad by the other inmates of AB House namely, Itishree Bal, Bhabani, Mousoumi, Simachal, Sunil Patnaik, Sarojini Panigrahi, Gitanjali Padhy, Jayanti Tripathy, and Sripati Das in different petitions have been duly established and are true;

iii) the veracity of the complaints in the form of representations and statements from the inhabitants of AB House which were received by me directly in the above matter has been established which has proved the undesirable demeanour of the five sisters rendering them unsuitable for being inmates of the Ashram, on account of which most of the deponents have expressed that the five sisters should be sent out of the Ashram if possible, or at least shifted out of AB House in order to ensure peace and harmony in the Ashram and Ambabhikshu House.

Dated at Pondicherry this 10th day of January 2005.

Encl: List of Deponents
List of Exhibits
Depositions and Exhibits
List of Deponents

1) Chandramani Patel 39) Matruprava Dwivedi
2) Nirmal C. Swain 40) Pragyan Shila Mallik
3) Girish Panda 41) Swapan K Banerjee
4) Krishna Chander 42) Rabi Sasmal
5) Kabitanjali 43) Ramachandra Mahapatra
6) Santosh Sahoo 44) Rashmi Das
7) Sajal Mitra alias Shankar 45) Debashish Mukherjee
8) Nishith Banerjee 46) Kokila Pati
9) Ashok Kundu 47) Tripti Das
10) Bhagwan Das Swain 48) Jayaram Das
11) Prashant Choudhury 49) Nilakantha Das
12) Santosh Nayak 50) Rita Kanungo
13) Itishree Bal 51) Arati Kar
14) Bhabhani 52) Jyothsna Rani Parida
15) Mousoumi 53) Mruganka Shekhar Dash
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17) Sunil Patnaik 55) Govinda C. Mahapatra
18) Sarojini Panigrahi 56) Michael Neville
19) Gitanjali Padhy 57) Nirupama Sahu
20) Jayanti Tripati 58) Vibhu Prasad Subuddhi
21) Sripati Das 59) Pabitra Mohan Sahoo
22) Sheshadev Kar 60) Brajendranath Pati
23) Birabhadra Raut 61) Samikshya Samant Singh
24) Ila R. Joshi 62) Bishwanath Panda
25) Jahnvi Ravikanti 63) K. Padma
26) Priti Chandak 64) Sushila Ojha
27) Gopal Naik 65) K. Rama Rao
28) Datta Naik 66) Sudhir Mahapatra
29) Ajit Reddy 67) Suranjika Pradhan
30) Narendra Pati 68) Rangalata Dora
31) R. Viswanath 69) Jagabandhu Rout
32) Niranjian Jena 70) Reena Barik
33) Arupananda Das 71) Annapurna Mohanty
34) Madan Mohan Sahoo 72) Beenapani Mohanty
35) Manas Chand 73) Ishwar Datta Pandya
36) Luminaura Ravikanti 74) Pushpita Mitra
37) Ushma Choksi 75) Subhashini Mohanty
38) Jayashree Das
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<td>Letter dated 28/10/04 addressed jointly by the sisters to the Enquiry Officer (series of three letters with envelopes)</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex.14</td>
<td>Notice of Enquiry dated 10/11/04 by the Enquiry Officer sent individually to all the sisters</td>
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</tr>
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Ex.22 – Copy of letters (series of five) dated 31/07/04 addressed by Managing Trustee to the five sisters individually

Ex.23 – Copies of obscene drawings (series of five)

Ex.24 – Copy of letter dated 4/08/04 sent jointly by the sisters to the Managing Trustee

Ex.25 – Copy of letter dated 2/08/04 from Sri Bhaktavathsalam (President, Bar Association, Pondicherry) to the Managing Trustee

Ex.26 – Copy of letter dated 13/06/04 by Arunashree Prasad to the President, Bar Association, Pondicherry

Ex.27 – Copy of the chit with obscene drawings enclosed by Arunashree Prasad with exhibit 26

Ex.28 – Copy of letter dated 13/06/04 by Jayashree Prasad to the President, Bar Association, Pondicherry

Ex.29 – Letter dated 10/08/04 by the Managing Trustee to Sri Bhaktavathsalam

Ex.30 – Copy of letter dated 19/09/04 sent jointly by the sisters to the Managing Trustee

Ex.31 – Copies of letter dated 23/09/04 (series of five) by the Managing Trustee to the five sisters individually

Ex.32 – Copy of complaint dated 23/07/04 by Mr. Sripati Das to the Managing Trustee

Ex.33 – Copy of complaint dated 23/07/04 by Mrs. Jayanti Tripati to the Managing Trustee

Ex.34 – Copy of complaint dated 23/07/04 given jointly by Sarojini Panigrahi and Gitanjali Padhy to the Managing Trustee

Ex.35 – Copy of complaint dated 23/07/04 by Mr. Sunil Patnaik to the Managing Trustee with English translation

Ex.36 – Copy of complaint dated 23/07/04 by Mr. Simachal to the Managing Trustee with English translation

Ex.37 – Copy of complaint dated 23/07/04 by Ms. Mousoumi to the Managing Trustee

Ex.38 – Copy of complaint dated 23/07/04 given jointly by Ms. Itishree Bal and Ms. Bhabhani to the Managing Trustee
Ex.39  – Representation from Mr. Chandramani Patel to the Enquiry Officer with English translation
Ex.40  – Letter from Mr. Nirmal C. Swain to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.41  – Representation from Mr. Girish Panda to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.42  – Representation from Ms. Kabitanjali to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.43  – Representation from Mr. Santosh (Electrical) to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.44  – Representation from Mr. Sajal Mitra alias Shankar to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.45  – Representation from Mr. Nishith Banerjee to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.46  – Representation from Mr. Ashok Kundu to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.47  – Representation from Mr. Prashant Choudhary to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.48  – Representation from Mr. Santosh Nayak (Dining Hall) to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.49  – Representation from Mr. Bhagwan Das Swain to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.50  – Representation from Ms. Itishree Bal to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.51  – Representation from Ms. Mousoumi to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.52  – Joint Representation from Ms. Sarojini Panigrahi and Gitanjali Padhy to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.53  – Representation from Ms. Jayanti Tripati to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.54  – Representation from Mr. Sheshadev Kar to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.55  – Representation from Mr. Birabhadra Raut to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.56  – Representation from Ms. Ila R. Joshi to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.57  – Representation from Ms. Jahnavi Ravikanti to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.58  – Representation from Ms. Mousoumi to the Enquiry Officer (copy of 51)
Ex.59  – Representation from Ms. Priti Chandak to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.60  – Joint representation from Mr. Gopal Naik and Ms. Datta Naik to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.61  – Representation from Mr. Ajit Reddy to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.62  – Representation from Mr. Narendra Pati to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.63 - Representation from Mr. R. Viswanath to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.64 - Representation from Mr. Niranjan Jena to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.65 - Representation from Mr. Arupananda Das to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.66 - Representation from Mr. Madan Mohan Sahoo to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.67 - Representation from Mr. Manas Chand to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.68 - Representation from Ms. Luminaria Ravikanti to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.69 - Representation from Ms. Ushma C. Choksi to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.70 - Representation from Ms. Jayashree Das to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.71 - Representation from Ms. Matru Prabha Dwivedi to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.72 - Representation from Ms. Pragyan Shila Mallik to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.73 - Representation from Mr. Swapan Kumar Banerjee to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.74 - Representation from Mr. Rabi Sasmal to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.75 - Representation from Mr. Ramachandra Mahapatra to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.76 - Representation from Ms. Rashmi Das to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.77 - Representation from Mr. Debashish Mukherjee to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.78 - Representation from Ms. Kokila Pati to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.79 - Representation from Ms. Tripti Pati to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.80 - Representation from Mr. Jayaram Das to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.81 - Representation from Mr. Nilakantha Das to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.82 - Representation from Ms. Rita Kanungo to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.83 - Representation from Ms. Arati Kar to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.84 - Representation from Ms. Jyostna Rani Parida to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.85 - Representation from Mr. Mruganka Shekhar Dash to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.86 - Representation from Mr. Kripa Anuru to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.87 - Representation from Mr. Govinda Chandra Mahapatra to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.88 - Representation from Mr. Michael Neville to the Enquiry Officer
Ex.89 – Representation from Ms. Nirupama Sahu to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.90 – Representation from Mr. Vibhu Prasad Subuddhi to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.91 – Representation from Mr. Pabitra Mohan Sahoo to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.92 – Representation from Mr. Brajendra Nath Pati to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.93 – Representation from Ms. Smikshya Samant Singh to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.94 – Representation from Mr. Biswanath Panda to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.95 – Representation from Ms. K. Padma to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.96 – Representation from Ms. Sushila Ojha to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.97 – Representation from Mr. K. Rama Rao to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.98 – Representation from Mr. Sudhir Mahapatra to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.99 – Representation from Ms. Suranjika Pradhan to the Enquiry Officer (with English Translation)

Ex.100 – Representation from Ms. Rangalata Dora to the Enquiry Officer (with English Translation)

Ex.101 – Representation from Mr. Jagabandhu Rout to the Enquiry Officer (with English Translation)

Ex.102 – Representation from Ms. Reena Barik to the Enquiry Officer (with English Translation)

Ex.103 – Representation from Ms. Annapurna Mohanty to the Enquiry Officer (with English Translation)

Ex.104 – Representation from Ms. Beena Pani Mohanty to the Enquiry Officer (with English Translation)

Ex.105 – Representation from Mr. Ishwar Datta Pandya to the Enquiry Officer in English

Ex.106 – Representation from Mr. Ishwar Datta Pandya to the Enquiry Officer in Gujarati (2 sheets) (with English Translation)

Ex.107 – Representation from Mr. Ishwar Datta Pandya to the Enquiry Officer in Gujarati (1 sheet) (with English Translation)

Ex.108 – Representation from Ms. Pushpita Mitra / Padma Mitra to the Enquiry Officer (with English Translation)
Ex.109 – Representation from Ms. Subhashini Mohanty to the Enquiry Officer (with English Translation)

Ex.110 – Letter dated 20/09/04 purported to be from Mr. Chandramani and the postal envelope to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.111 – Unsigned letter purported to be from Mr. Nilakantha and Mr. Bishwanath

Ex.112 – Letter dated 9/11/04 from the Enquiry Officer to the Managing Trustee

Ex.113 – Letter dated 10/11/04 from the Managing Trustee to the Enquiry Officer along with a copy of request letter from Mr. Chandramani and relevant pages from the register maintained by the Trust (series of 4)

Ex.114 – Letter dated 23/11/04 by Mr. Chandramani Patel to the Enquiry Officer

Ex.115 – Copy of journey-cum-reservation ticket

Ex.116 – Copy of notice dated 23/09/04 from Secretary Sri Aurobindo Integral Institute of Education and Research, Sambalpur

Ex.117 – Copy of the report of the Enquiry Officer Mr. M.P.K. Menon submitted to Chennai High Court.

Ex.118 – List of inmates in AB House