

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Saturday, 04<sup>th</sup> January 2014 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### PRESENT

- |     |  |                    |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 1.  | Professor A.K. Grover<br>Vice-Chancellor                     | ... (in the Chair) |
| 2.  | Shri Ashok Goyal   |                    |
| 3.  | Dr. Balbir Chand Josan                                       |                    |
| 4.  | Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop                                    |                    |
| 5.  | Dr. Dalip Kumar  |                    |
| 6.  | Dr. Dinesh Talwar  |                    |
| 7.  | Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath                                  |                    |
| 8.  | Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma                                      |                    |
| 9.  | Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal                                    |                    |
| 10. | Shri Jagpal Singh alias Jaswant Singh                        |                    |
| 11. | Dr. Karamjeet Singh  |                    |
| 12. | Dr. Preeti Mahajan   |                    |
| 13. | Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh                                 |                    |
| 14. | Principal Puneet Bedi  |                    |
| 15. | Shri Sandeep Kumar   |                    |
| 16. | Dr. S.K. Sharma  |                    |
| 17. | S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman<br>Director, Higher Education, Punjab |                    |
| 18. | Professor A.K. Bhandari<br>Registrar                         | ... (Secretary)    |

Shri Sandeep Hans, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh, could not attend the meeting.

### **Condolence Resolution**

The Vice-Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I would like to inform the House about the sad demise of Professor Gurdev Singh Gosal, Professor Emeritus, Department of Geography, on January 3, 2014. Before his retirement on March 31, 1987, Professor Gosal served the Panjab University on many prestigious positions in the capacity of D.U.I., D.C.D.C., D.S.W., Honorary Director, ICSSR (NWRC) and Chairperson, Department of Geography. In his death, we have lost an eminent academician and a very accomplished administrator."

**The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor Gurdev Singh Gosal and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.**

**RESOLVED:** That a copy of the above Resolution be sent to the members of the bereaved family.

Before the agenda was taken, Shri Ashok Goyal drew the attention of the Vice-Chancellor to the slogans being raised outside the Administrative Office and requested him to throw light on the same.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that some students and the members of the PUSA including daily-wagers are raising slogans. The students are demanding for their representation on the Senate. He (Vice-Chancellor) had asked them to give him a representation on the

issue and the same would be forwarded to the Chancellor for consideration. But the students have not given him anything in writing so far. Secondly, the PUSA and daily-wage employees are demanding for implementation of the regularization policy immediately.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the Committee had already made its recommendations and legal opinion on the same had also been obtained.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the recommendations of the Committee should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

### **Vice-Chancellor's Statement**

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the honourable members of the Syndicate that Professor Harkishan Singh, Professor Emeritus at the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, P.U., will be conferred the degree of Doctor of Science by the University of Sciences, Philadelphia, PA (USA) for his significant accomplishments and professional contributions to the field of Organic and Medicinal Chemistry and the History of Pharmaceutics. University of the Sciences, popularly known as USciences, was founded in 1821 as Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, the first College of Pharmacy in the USA. The honorary degree will be conferred on Professor Harkishan Singh in USA on February 20, 2014, the Founder's Day of USciences".

Professor B.S. Bhoop stated that the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) has been performing in the field of academics and research with excellence for the last several decades, and Professor Harkishan Singh, Professor Emeritus at the UIPS, has made seminal contribution in this regard. He, therefore, suggested that, the next year, Professor Harkishan Singh should be considered for the award of Doctor of Science (*Honoris Causa*) degree by the Panjab University too. Professor Harkishan Singh is being conferred with a degree of Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) from University of the Sciences in Philadelphia, a parent organization of the historic Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, which is the first College of Pharmacy across the globe but not merely in the USA. Such a recognition, therefore, is an unparalleled honor for any scientist. It was –

**RESOLVED:** That felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to Professor Harkishan Singh, Professor Emeritus at the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, P.U., who would be conferred the degree of Doctor of Science by the University of Sciences, Philadelphia, PA (USA) for his significant accomplishments and professional contributions to the field of organic and medicinal chemistry and the history of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

### **Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Mathematics**

2. Considered minutes dated 20.10.2013 (**Appendix-I**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committees under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3 in the Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Initiating discussion, Professor S.K. Sharma stated that if they look at page 14 of the bio-data of the candidate find that the candidate has not earned marks under some heads like publication of books, research projects, research guidance, etc.

They should ensure that the candidate/s must do some work before getting promotion/s; otherwise, it would send a wrong signal. He had nothing against the candidate, but as a policy, they should look into the matter and, if need be, frame guidelines for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, usually, the Mathematicians preferred to work individually. Moreover, this is her first promotion, which as per UGC guidelines, could be granted as she fulfils the requisite conditions.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, what he wanted to say had been covered by Professor S.K. Sharma. As had been said by Professor S.K. Sharma, he is also not against this promotion, but for excellence in academics, the candidate/s must do some work before getting promotion. However, as far as this promotion is concerned, there is nothing wrong in it. As such, this promotion must be approved, but as suggested by Professor S.K. Sharma, they should find out some ways to see that the teachers are encouraged or persuaded to have publications.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that whatever had been pointed out is right. He had seen in some interviews that there are certain persons, who get their articles, books, etc. published in certain journals which publish the papers by charging money. He, therefore, suggested that before awarding marks for such work, it should be got reviewed by some Professors or eminent scholars.

Professor B.S. Bhoop pointed out that, however, there are certain very prestigious journals, which also charged money (around 100 to 500 dollars) for publishing papers, etc.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there are exploiters in the market across the world, which sold dissertations, projects, etc. to the students of various Universities. They had a degree of M.Sc. (I.T.), wherein a project is to be submitted. There are many centres which sell readymade projects, that too, without attending laboratories even for a day. Such centres had connections with various Colleges and Universities. They must evolve some mechanism to curb such mal-practices and a panel of institutions/journals could be approved. As such, they must look into it that publications should be those which are needed in the academic fields and not for securing marks, promotions, etc., only.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they must ensure that only good persons are selected, who got their publications published in reputed journals.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that long time back they had suggested that any candidate, who wanted to submit his/her Ph.D. thesis, must publish at least two research papers, but the Syndicate and Senate reduced the number of papers from two to one. He suggested that they must make it two papers because every thesis had literature review which could be developed into a review article and the review articles have maximum number of citations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be very difficult for a Ph.D. candidate to write and publish good review article.

Agreeing with Professor S.K. Sharma, Professor B.S. Bhoop suggested that the number of papers to be got published by a Ph.D. candidate before submission of his/her thesis should be increased from one to two.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the candidate under consideration, i.e., Dr. Anjana Khurana, had published paper in a very reputed journal. She had been invited to give Refresher Courses in three subjects and had also been invited to give lectures at national/international level Conferences/Seminars, including Regional Olympiad Training Camp. In all, she had given 11 lectures, including MTS Programme of NBHM. It meant that she is active in academic activities.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Anjana Khurana be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Mathematics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions), w.e.f. 25.08.2013, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Item No.3, 4, 5 and 10 on the agenda were taken up for consideration together.**

**Appointment of two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance, appointment of various Committees and nomination of two jurists on the Research Degree Committee in Law**

**3.** Items 3, 4, 5 and 10 on the agenda were read out, viz. –

**3.** To appoint two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term February 1, 2014 to January 31, 2015 under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**4.** To appoint the following Committees for the period noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Committee	Enabling Regulations on the subject	Tenure of the Committee
1.	Revising Committee	Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32, P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007	Calendar year 2014, i.e., 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014
2.	Regulations Committee	Regulation 23.1 at page 33, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007	Calendar year 2014, i.e., 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014
3.	Youth Welfare Committee	Regulation 4 at pages 155-156, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e., 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2015
4.	Publication Bureau Committee	Regulation 3.1 and 3.2 at page 179, P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007	Two Calendar years, i.e., 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2015

5.	Standing Committee to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of Unfair Means in connection with the examinations	Regulation 31 at page 14, P.U., Calendar, Volume II, 2007	Calendar year 2014 i.e. 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014
----	---	---	--

**NOTE:** The following information enclosed (**Appendix-II**):

- (a) Relevant Regulations regarding composition of the Committees.
- (b) Present membership of the Committees.

**5.** To consider the formation of Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 1.1.2014 to 31.12.2014.

**NOTE:** 1. The composition of Joint Consultative Machinery is as under:

(a) Chairman	To be nominated by the Syndicate from amongst its members
(b) One member of the Syndicate	To be nominated by the Syndicate
(c) Two non-Syndic Senators	To be nominated by the Syndicate
(d) Registrar, who shall be the Member-Secretary of J.C.M.	
(e) Controller of Examinations	
(f) Finance & Development Officer	
(g) Five Office Bearers of P.U. Staff (Non-teaching) Association (PUSA)	
(h) President and General Secretary of P.U. Stenographers' Association (PUSTA)	
(i) President and General Secretary of P.U.C.C.S.A.	
(j) President of Engineering Staff Association (XEN Deptt.)	

2. The Syndicate dated 10.1.1999 (Para 6) decided that the President and Secretary, Panjab University Class 'C' Staff Association be added in the composition of J.C.M. For the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013, they remained members of the J.C.M.

**10.** To nominate two eminent jurists on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years i.e. 1.1.2014 to 31.12.2015 under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that for appointing two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance (Item 3), various Committees (Item 4), Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) (Item 5) and to nominate two eminent jurists on the Research Degree Committee in Law (Item 10), the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized. But he would like to request the Vice-Chancellor to ensure that people from all shades get represented.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, this has been the practice in the University for the last so many years that the Vice-Chancellor used to be authorized to make these Committees. But due to some unfortunate reasons, this power had not been vested with the Vice-Chancellor during the last two years and some members of the Syndicate were doing this job. Now, he was happy that the proposal had come from those, who had tried to break the practice being followed for so many years. Thereafter, last year, they had also followed the same practice. Anyhow, he was happy that they had come back to adopt the same age old tradition.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized, on behalf of the Syndicate, to –

- (1) appoint two members of the Syndicate on the Board of Finance for the term February 1, 2014 to January 31, 2015 under Regulation 1.1 at page 37 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007;
- (2) appoint the Revising Committee, Regulations Committees and Standing Committee to deal with the cases of the alleged misconduct and use of unfair means in connection with the examinations for the Calendar Year 2014, i.e., 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014, under Regulations 1.1 and 1.2 at page 32 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, Regulation 23.1 at page 33 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and Regulation 31 at page 14 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, respectively and Youth Welfare and Publication Bureau Committees for two Calendar years, i.e., 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2015, under Regulation 4 at pages 155-156 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and Regulation 3.1 and 3.2 at page 179 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, respectively;
- (3) form Joint Consultative Machinery (J.C.M.) for one-year term commencing 01.01.2014 to 31.12.2014; and
- (4) nominate two eminent Jurists on the Research Degree Committee in Law for two years, i.e., 1.1.2014 to 31.12.2015, under Regulation 2 at page 408, P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007.

**Appointment of Dean of University Instruction**

**6.** Considered the appointment of Dean of University Instruction, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date of joining, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** Regulation 1 ibid reads as under:

“The Senate, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, may, from time to time appoint one of the University Professors to hold the office of the Dean of University Instruction. The term of appointment shall be for one year which may be renewed for one year more. The \*amount and nature of the allowance to be granted to the Dean of University Instruction for performing the duties

attached to this office shall be as determined by the Syndicate at the time of appointment”.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the position of Dean of University Instruction is offered to the senior-most Professor in the University. Presently, Professor P.S. Jaswal is the senior-most Professor in the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had asked Professor P.S. Jaswal, but he had not received clear and affirmative response.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had only been asked whether he would be joining back to serve as DUI and the University had not received any reply from him. He added that, of course, Professor A.K. Bhandari, the next senior-most Professor, may take over as Dean of University Instruction, but to be correct, they must offer the position of Dean of University Instruction to Professor P.S. Jaswal first. Simultaneously, they should also take a decision that in case Professor P.S. Jaswal did not join or a refusal from him is received or no communication is received from him within a stipulated period, Professor A.K. Bhandari, the next senior-most Professor, be offered the position of Dean of University Instruction.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that Professor P.S. Jaswal be appointed Dean of University Instruction of Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date of joining, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and he be requested to join by 10<sup>th</sup> February 2014. In case Professor P.S. Jaswal did not join by the stipulated date, Professor A.K. Bhandari, be appointed Dean of University Instruction of Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one year w.e.f. the date he joins as such, under Regulation 1 at page 105 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the above decision be implemented in anticipation of the approval of the Senate.

### Confirmation of certain faculty members

7. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that –

(1) the following faculty members be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Department/ Centre/ Institute	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Ms. Savita Grover	Assistant Professor in English	P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib	12.10.1985	16.11.2011	16.11.2012
2.	Dr. Sudhansu Kumar Sarangi	Assistant Professor in Sanskrit (Darshan or Darshan Acharya)	V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., P.U., Hoshiarpur	20.07.1976	14.02.2012	14.02.2013

3.	Dr. Minto Rattan	Assistant Professor in Mathematics/ Applied Mathematics	University Institute of Engineering & Technology	04.07.1976	28.02.2012 (A.N.)	01.03.2013
----	------------------	---	--	------------	-------------------	------------

(2) the following Assistant Professors be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Department/ Centre/ Institute	Syndicate Para	Senate Para	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1	Sh. Aditya Kaushik	Assistant Professor in Mathematics/ Applied Mathematics	University Institute of Engineering & Technology	2 (xiv) 27.09.2011	(VIII) 20.12.2012	19.02.1982	04.11.2011	04.11.2012
2	Sh. Tukesh Soni	Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology	2 (i) 27.09.2011	(VIII) 20.12.2012	21.08.1975	02.12.2011	22.10.2012
3	Dr. Anurag	Assistant Professor in Pharmacology	University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences	2 (viii) 27.09.2011	(XIV) 22.12.2012	28.06.1979	10.9.2012	07.09.2013
4	Dr. (Mrs.) Neelima Dhingra	Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry	University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences	2 (ix) 27.09.2011	(XIV) 22.12.2012	08.11.1976	11.09.2012	08.09.2013
5.	❖ Mr. Abhishake Chauhan	Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering	P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur	2 (xiii) 8.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	14.08.1985	8.09.2012	16.09.2013
6.	Mr. Balwant Raj	Assistant Professor in Multi Faculty For Engg. Unit	P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur	2 (xii) 8.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	03.01.1978	19.9.2012	17.09.2013
7.	❖ Mr. Rajeev Kumar Dang	Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering	P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur	2 (xiii) 8.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	08.08.1970	27.09.2012	18.09.2013
8.	❖ Mr. Gaurav Saini	Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering	P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur	2 (xiii) 8.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	28.08.1985	18.9.2012 (A.N.)	19.09.2013

❖ **In order of Merit**

When certain mistakes in the dates were pointed out by Dr. Dinesh Talwar, it was said that the Registrar would look into the issue himself and record correct dates in the decision.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the following faculty members be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Department/ Centre/ Institute	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Ms. Savita Grover	Assistant Professor in English	P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib	12.10.1985	16.11.2011	16.11.2012
2.	Dr. Sudhansu Kumar Sarangi	Assistant Professor in Sanskrit (Darshan or Darshan Acharya)	V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., P.U., Hoshiarpur	20.07.1976	14.02.2012	14.02.2013
3.	Dr. Minto Rattan	Assistant Professor in Mathematics/ Applied Mathematics	University Institute of Engineering & Technology	04.07.1976	28.02.2012 (A.N.)	01.03.2013

- (2) the following Assistant Professors be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Department / Centre/ Institute	Syndicate Para	Senate Para	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1	Sh. Aditya Kaushik	Assistant Professor in Mathematics/ Applied Mathematics	University Institute of Engineering & Technology	2 (xiv) 27.09.2011	(VIII) 20.12.2011	19.02.1982	04.11.2011	04.11.2012
2	Sh. Tukesh Soni	Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engg.	University Institute of Engineering & Technology	2 (i) 27.09.2011	(VIII) 20.12.2011	21.08.1975	02.12.2011	22.10.2012
3	Dr. Anurag	Assistant Professor in Pharmacology	University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences	2 (viii) 08.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	28.06.1979	10.9.2012	07.09.2013
4	Dr. (Mrs.) Neelima Dhingra	Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry	University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences	2 (ix) 08.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	08.11.1976	11.09.2012	08.09.2013
5.	❖ Mr. Abhishak Chauhan	Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering	P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur	2 (xiii) 8.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	14.08.1985	8.09.2012	16.09.2013
6.	Mr. Balwant Raj	Assistant Professor in Multi Faculty For Engg. Unit	P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur	2 (xii) 8.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	03.01.1978	19.9.2012	17.09.2013

7.	❖ Mr. Rajeev Kumar Dang	Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering	P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur	2 (xiii) 8.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	08.08.1970	27.09.2012	18.09.2013
8.	❖ Mr. Gaurav Saini	Assistant Professor in Mechanical Engineering	P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur	2 (xiii) 8.09.2012	(XIV) 22.12.2012	28.08.1985	18.9.2012 (A.N.)	19.09.2013

**❖ In order of Merit**

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that since Item 56 has also been referred back to the Syndicate by the Senate for reconsideration and related to appointments, the same should be taken up for consideration after Items 8 and 9 on the agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is no provision for changing the order of business in the Syndicate. Even the argument given by the Vice-Chancellor that since these items (Items 8, 9 and 56) related to appointments did not find favour with them because the agenda had been prepared and issued under the direction of the Vice-Chancellor. If the Vice-Chancellor wanted Item 56 to be considered immediately after Item 9, he would have put the Items category-wise and Item 56 immediately after Item 9 and then they would have no objection. Now, it would send a wrong signal as to why a particular item is being preferred over so many other items, especially when there is no provision for changing the order of business in the Syndicate meeting.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath drew the attention of the House towards Regulation 4 at page 35 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, which reads - "The Vice-Chancellor shall preside at all meetings of the Syndicate at which he may be present. In his absence, the members present may elect another member to preside at such a meeting. The conduct of business and order of speaking shall be under the control of the Vice-Chancellor, or, in his absence, of the member who is presiding". He moved a resolution that Item 56 on the agenda should be taken up for consideration immediately after Item 9.

The Vice-Chancellor said that during the last year or so, there had been several occasions when they changed the order of business.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is correct that they had changed the order of business, but there are two different provisions, i.e., one for Syndicate meetings and another for Senate meetings. As per the provision pointed out by Shri Chatrath, the Vice-Chancellor had the power to determine the order in which the members would speak in the meeting and not the manner in which the business shall be conducted. He drew attention of the House towards Regulation 12 at page 30 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 relating to the Senate meetings, which says that "It shall be open to a member to move for a change in the order of business as stated in the agenda paper. If the motion is agreed to by majority of the members present at the meeting the business shall be transacted in the changed order". As far as regulation quoted by Shri Chatrath is concerned, it does not relate to change of order of business. A similar provision is made in the Senate also, i.e., Regulation 18(a) which says that "The Chairman shall determine the order in which the members may address the meeting

and the manner in which the business shall be conducted. A member shall .....after the Chairman has called for a vote". But in the Syndicate, there is no provision for changing the order of business even by moving a proposal by a member. This power does not vest with the Vice-Chancellor also because it is the Vice-Chancellor under whose direction the agenda is prepared, published and issued. Thus, the Vice-Chancellor could not say that he wanted to change the order of business. Rather, it is only the member's prerogative to move a proposal, that too, only in the Senate and not in the Syndicate. To maintain the sanctity of the regulations, let us not try to mislead the House; otherwise, what had been mentioned in the provision for Senate meetings, should have been mentioned in the provision for Syndicate meetings also.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that order of business is under the control of the Vice-Chancellor. In the Syndicate, this power is vested with the Vice-Chancellor and in the Senate, the power is with the member/s as well as the Vice-Chancellor, as he is also a member of the Senate. Usually, they do change order of business. He had moved a resolution under Regulation 4 quoted above that Item 56 should be taken up for consideration after Item 9 and majority of the members were in favour of it and the Vice-Chancellor had given his consent. He was of the opinion that it is within the competence of the Vice-Chancellor to determine order of speaking of members as well the conduct of business.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that there were nuances and precedents. So far as precedents are concerned, he did not know the history of the Syndicate meetings with microscopic details of several decades, but whichever meetings he had presided over, there had been occasions when they had considered certain items earlier or later. So it is not that order of business had not been changed at all. As far as all of them are concerned, they have to consider all the items listed in the agenda and it is not that they have to consider only some of the items. Now, there is a strong desire of some of the members, who had a long standing as Shri Goyal had, to change the order of business. They had to consider the desire expressed by some of the members that Item 56 should be taken up for consideration immediately after Item 9. Sooner or later, they have to consider all the items. If Item 56 is taken up for consideration immediately after Item 9, they would have ample time to discuss it, for as long as they wanted to.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since the agenda has been prepared by the Registrar under the direction of the Vice-Chancellor, he should have asked the Registrar to put this Item at No.2. Even if this item is considered at its turn, i.e., after one hour or so, it would not make any difference.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there is no harm in taking up Item 56 immediately after Item 9. Moreover, consideration of this item after one hour or so would not make any difference.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is not a question of one hour or so as observed by Principal Gurdip Sharma. The meeting might last till 8.00 p.m. or 10.00 p.m. What is the explanation that Item 56 needed to be considered and discussed only at 11.30 a.m. and thereafter its result/outcome would be different. His stand on majority view had already been explained by him. Therefore, the Vice-Chancellor would have to give his ruling on the basis of the discussion

which has taken place so far. He, however, was of the considered opinion that in the Syndicate meeting, the order of business could not be changed and he had also read out the relevant regulation/s for the benefit of Shri Chatrath and others. In the Senate, there is a provision for changing the order of business. Now, the Vice-Chancellor should give his ruling because he could not become a party to the decision for changing the order of business as he knew that there are so many complications involved in it.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that during his experience of more than 48 years, the Vice-Chancellor and the members had been changing the order of business in the Syndicate under Regulation 4 at page 35 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. Similarly, the order of business had also been changed in the Senate meetings by the Vice-Chancellor on the suggestion of member/s as well as on his own because he is also a member of the Senate. Thus, there is no bar under any regulation that they could not change the order of business in the Syndicate. Therefore, he suggested that this time also, the order of business should be allowed to be changed amicably so that they could have ample time to discuss Item 56. He, therefore, respectfully submitted that his suggestion to take up Item 56 immediately after Item 9 should be agreed to.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as had been told that the order of business had been changed in the Syndicate meetings on numerous occasions, it meant that there is a practice of changing the order of business in the Syndicate meetings. He, therefore, suggested that the change in order of business should be allowed and Item 56 should be taken up for consideration immediately after Item 9.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that since Items 8, 9 and 56 had been referred back to the Syndicate by the Senate, it is necessary that the presence/attendance in the Syndicate is in full/maximum when these items are considered. In the beginning, there is always maximum attendance and there had been occasions when at the end of the long meeting there is thin attendance. Secondly, this House is comprised of very important people, who had responsibilities/commitments other than attending the meetings of the Syndicate. He had practical experience of more than 17 months that there is fall in attendance as the meeting progresses, particularly after lunch, moreso, if the meeting prolonged beyond 5.00 p.m. Besides this, in view of the fact that the Senate had referred this matter to the Syndicate, it would be better if Item 56 is considered when all of them are present in the meeting. He, therefore, proposed and pleaded that, notwithstanding their reservations; they should consider Item 56 immediately after Items 8 and 9. If they accepted this plea at this stage, he felt that it would be in the spirit it had been referred back by the Senate. Though, he would not like to force the division, he would still like to plead to his Colleagues, who have reservations, to consent to consider Item 56 immediately after Item 9 so that they could have ample time to discuss it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that kindly do not misunderstand him. The Vice-Chancellor had said that Shri Chatrath has long standing as he (Goyal) had. Though he did not have standing even half what Shri Chatrath had, but the spirit is the same. In fact, Item 56 is not like other items for which the order of business was changed in the past. If today also everybody unanimously accepted to change the order of business, there would have been no problem even if there

is no provision for the same in the Syndicate. Even if one person objected and is still objecting to the change of order of business, especially to the delicate Item like Item 56, probably it would be neither in the interest of the University nor the Vice-Chancellor nor any other member of the Syndicate. Moreover, he had already told him (the Vice-Chancellor) explicitly that at least he would not like to become a party to the decision for changing the order of business for the obvious reasons which he had explained in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor. As some members had told how this item had been referred back to the Syndicate by the Senate, that could be discussed only when the item is considered and discussed. Even if the decision with regard to change in the order of business is taken by the majority vote, at least he would have satisfaction to tell himself that he is not party to the decision of changing the order of business.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that, last time, when this item was considered, Shri Ashok Goyal was a member of the Syndicate and item was taken up for consideration and discussed out of order and thereafter a decision was taken.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that those, who had reservation/s, should raise their hands.

Seven members raised their hands.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it meant 7 members out of total of 16 members present do not want to take up Item 56 after Item No.9. Meaning thereby, 9 members, i.e., majority are in favour of taking up Item 56 immediately after Item 9.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that in view of the fact that he would like all of them to discuss this item and majority of them agreed and only one member is absent. If they want to call it a ruling, his appeal to them is to discuss this item out of order, when all the members except one are present.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Chairperson's ruling is to be accepted by all.

**Issue regarding offering of appointment to the candidate on the waiting list after a period of six months**

**8.** Considered if the post of Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be offered to Mr. Suresh Thareja, who is on the Waiting List, as Dr. Raj Kumar, the selected candidate, has shown his inability to join the post on expiry of six months period of his extension.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 8.9.2012 & 6.10.2012 (Para 2(ix)) has approved the appointment of Dr. Raj Kumar, as Assistant Professor in Pharmaceutical Chemistry at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP ₹6000/-.

Dr. Raj Kumar vide his e-mail of 07.03.2013 informed the D.R.

Establishment that he cannot join the Panjab University due to some personal reasons which he had already stated in the last communication. However, he has stated that he shall be looking forward to serve the Panjab University in future, if a chance is given.

2. A detailed office note is enclosed **(Appendix-III)**.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 8.10.2013 (Para 31) had decided that the item be treated as withdrawn and suitable reply in view of the decision of the Syndicate dated 27.7.2013 (Para 31), be given.
4. Copy of the reply sent to the petitioner - Dr. Suresh Thareja in view of speaking order passed by the Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP 18711 of 2013 is enclosed **(Appendix-III)**.
5. **The Senate at its meeting held on 8.12.2013 has resolved that Item I-8 on the agenda, be referred back to the Syndicate for consideration/reconsideration.**

Professor B.S. Bhoop stated that it has been clearly mentioned in the Regulation 15 (Page 36 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007), that "A Selection Committee while recommending a candidate for appointment to a post in the University, may also prepare a Waiting List, in order of merit of not more than two persons, so that if the person appointed does not join, the person next on the waiting list may be offered the post. The waiting list, shall, however, be operative for a period of six months from the date of Syndicate meeting it was approved". What is the rationale for referring this item to the Syndicate again and again?

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter was discussed in the Senate meeting dated 8.12.2013 and the Senate had referred it back to the Syndicate for re-consideration. He, however, added that this had happened due to oversight that Dr. Raj Kumar, the selected candidate, was granted 2<sup>nd</sup> extension exactly for three months, i.e., overall extension up to six months, and not that it was the intent of the office. In fact, Dr. Raj Kumar should have been given 2<sup>nd</sup> extension up to two months or less than three months, so that Mr. Suresh Thareja, who was placed on the Waiting List, could have been offered appointment within a period of six months, as per regulation. After taking all these things into consideration, the matter was referred back to the Syndicate that if a one-time exception could be made and if a one-time exception is made, this person may be given a chance to join the University, the University would get one more teacher and the teaching faculty would be enhanced. After considering all these facts, the matter was referred back to the Syndicate.

Professor B.S. Bhoop apprehended that if Shri Suresh Thareja is allowed to be offered appointment, many more such cases would start pouring in.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they had to prevent such things. He assured that during his tenure as Vice-Chancellor he would do everything with utmost care that they never reached a stage that a person could not be offered an appointment or he is not able to join. In this case, they had reached this situation as he was away for some time and the then Dean of University Instruction, who was acting on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, perhaps, did not look into the file with that degree of carefulness which should have been and granted extension in joining period to Dr. Raj Kumar for another three months which amounted to a total of six months. The office wrote that it would be technically wrong if appointment is offered to the waitlisted candidate after a period of six months. So he became aware of this position only when the six months had already passed. He did try to contact Professor Bhandari and also made a noting that an offer of appointment be made to Shri Thareja. The candidate concerned had gone to the Court and the Court is also convinced that relief could be given to him. It was in that spirit only that the item is placed before the Syndicate for re-consideration again and again. If the relief is granted to the candidate, the society and the students would be benefitted and it would add to the faculty strength of the University. Why should one oppose to it?

Professor B.S. Bhoop intervened to say that there is no harm in re-advertising the post/s and making the selections again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the new selections are still far away. He did not know as to why they are opposing the induction of faculty member, especially when the person is willing to make contribution to this University.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, first of all, let him clarify that the Court had nowhere directed that the relief should be given to him. The petitioner in his petition had pleaded before the Court that the University had not given reply to the Legal Notice which had been served on the University. The Court had only directed the Panjab University to decide on the legal notice within a period of four weeks by passing a speaking order.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not the Government of the University. The Syndicate has been stated to be the Government of the University. So he took it to the Syndicate, and then to the higher body of the University, i.e., Senate, because the Senate is the appointing authority. If he himself was the candidate in his place, he would also have pleaded that since he had been selected for the job, the same should not be denied on the basis of a mere technicality. Why should he be denied to serve in a University, where everybody wanted to serve? He is being denied to serve a premier University of the country, because of mere oversight by the office of the University, and for getting the job back, he has the right to exhaust all the channels. So he personally found merit in the approach of Dr. Thareja. He added that once he was also a candidate somewhere for a similar position. Therefore, he could feel the anxiety and pain of the candidate. It is because of that he is bringing the item again and again, but the ball is in their court as he is not the Government of the University.

Continuing Shri Ashok Goyal stated that sometimes he felt that he is not allowed to speak even a single sentence in full.

To this, the Vice-Chancellor said that it is not true.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would again like to clarify that the Court has not given him any relief. Secondly, the matter had been brought to the Syndicate and the Syndicate had already taken the decision on the orders of the Court that in view of the specific regulation, the waiting list is operative only for a period of six months from the date of the meeting of the Syndicate in which the appointment is/was approved. When the legal notice was received by the University, he did not know why the reply was not given to the candidate that in view of this regulation, the offer of appointment could not be made to him, for which, in fact, he had to go to the Court, i.e., only to get reply to his legal notice and the Court had said that it is a fair request and why the University should not reply to it. The only thing was that the candidate should have been intimated about the decision of the Syndicate by the University. Instead of doing that, the Vice-Chancellor had again referred the matter to the Syndicate, notwithstanding the fact that neither the Syndicate nor the Senate had any power to go beyond the regulation/s. Had the power to relax the regulations been there with the Syndicate or Senate, the Vice-Chancellor himself would have given the relief to the candidate and offered the appointment to the waitlisted candidate, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and the Senate. But since the Vice-Chancellor was well aware of the fact that regulations did not permit him to take this decision as this power is not vested with the Syndicate and Senate also, instead of violating the regulation himself, he preferred to bring it to the Syndicate so that the Syndicate might violate the regulation. The Syndicate in its wisdom had already taken a decision keeping in view the regulation. The item under no provision was supposed to be placed before the Senate even for information. Since the Senate also did not have any power, it referred the matter to the Syndicate for re-consideration. The item was being placed before the Syndicate again and again thinking that maybe this time the Syndicate might violate the regulation. Though they have all kinds of sympathy with the candidate, they probably do not have any right to give any relief because they were also bound by the regulations. He remarked that Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath has double experience than him, perhaps he might be in a better position to tell them some provisions under which they could do something. He was sure that in this case nobody is going to be aggrieved except the fresh candidates, who had become eligible for this post and they might go to the Court if appointment is offered to the waitlisted candidate at this stage.

Professor B.S. Bhoop stated that Mr. Suresh Thareja, the candidate under consideration, is not sitting idle as he is already serving at the Central University, Bilaspur. If he is active in research and teaching, he would definitely stake his claim again whenever the post is re-advertised and interview is held. He, therefore, suggested that the post should be re-advertised so that the other eligible candidates could also compete.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, earlier, there used to be a provision of Panel along with the Waiting List in this University as well as other Universities. The only difference between the Waiting List

and the Panel is that the candidates placed on the Panel could be offered appointment against the vacancy which would occur in future, but later on the provision of Panel was struck down by various Courts. As such, the provision of Panel was discontinued and the provision of Waiting List only is retained. They could not violate the regulation/s in a hurry. He, however, stated that there is no time bar for a person, who is selected, to join. In fact, the selected person/s could join even after six/seven months or even after one year provided he/she is given extension. But the person placed on the Waiting List had to join within a period of six months because the spirit is that six months period is a reasonable period and if the vacancy is filled up after six months by offering appointment to the Waiting List candidate, probably, it would result into denying the benefit to the candidates, who had become eligible in the meantime and they might be better than the waitlisted candidate/s. Thus, the specific provision of six months only had been made to avoid denying a chance to a better candidate. If the waitlisted candidate applied again, he would definitely be selected next time because he had added experience to his career. But as far as offering appointment to him now is concerned, their hands are tied. Secondly, if he is offered appointment now and somebody approached the Court against their decision, what would be their stand?

Shri Jagpal Singh said that, in fact, Dr. Raj Kumar had refused to join as Assistant Professor in this University on the last date of the extension, i.e., exactly last day of the sixth month. He did so knowingly on the last day. If they allowed Mr. Suresh Thareja, the waitlisted candidate, they could take action against the official of the University, who had not brought this fact to the notice of the authorities while putting note for grant of extension to Dr. Raj Kumar for the second time that the candidate placed on the Waiting List could join only within a period of six months and extension to Dr. Raj Kumar should be given accordingly. Action should also be taken against the official concerned for not taking prompt action on the e-mail. In this way, they would ensure avoidance of such type of incidents in future.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Raj Kumar on the last date replied that he is not joining the University. The University worked at its own pace and it is not that if somebody sent an e-mail, action would be taken on it immediately. He added that the mistake is on the part of the office and the office meant the office of the Vice-Chancellor – whether it was he or the acting Vice-Chancellor, who had given extension up to a period of six months.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is not correct and the correct position is that Dr. Raj Kumar had sought extension for three months up to 8.12.2012 and instead of joining, he again sought extension up to June 2013. The office had written (page 18 of the appendix) that in case extension is granted to him up to June 2013, the total period of extension in joining time would become 9 months, i.e., beyond six months period. Dr. Raj Kumar vide his letter dated 01.12.2012 had already expressed his inability to join before six months. As such, the University knew that he could not join before June 2013.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that it is a unique case. Secondly, the rules are made for the benefit of the public and not to the detriment of the public interests. Therefore, such type of cases needed to be considered sympathetically. The candidate concerned is

not at fault and the fault lay with the office of the University. Hence, for the sake of justice and to correct their mistake, they should offer the appointment to Mr. Suresh Thareja, the candidate placed on the Waiting List. Simultaneously, action should also be taken against the University official/officer so that such incidents did not recur.

Dr. Dalip Kumar, referring to the argument given by Professor B.S. Bhoop that Mr. Suresh Thareja is already working at Central University, Bilaspur, stated that everybody wanted to work at a place/University like Panjab University. In this case, no reply had been given to the candidate by the University. If they also face such a situation, they might take different stand. In fact, they should have some policy for granting extension in joining period and should not give extension for more than 3 or 4 months under any situation so that they could stop such type of cases and offer appointment to the candidate placed on the Waiting List. He added that they are facing a similar situation in the case of Director-Professor, Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, wherein also the selected/appointed person is not joining. In case the offer of appointment is not made to Dr. Harminder Singh Bains, who had been placed on the Waiting List, they would have another similar case. He, therefore, suggested that the offer of appointment should be made to Shri Suresh Thareja as well as Dr. Harminder Singh Bains immediately.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that as per regulation, the waitlisted candidates is required to be offered appointment within a period of six months, but if the selected candidate did not join, the period of six month had to be apportioned in a reasonable manner. However, the practice is that the selected candidate/s is/are always given extension in joining period only for 3 or 4 months so that at least 2 months period is available with the waitlist candidate/s to get himself/herself/themselves relieved from his/her/their employer/s. Now, the question is – whether the waitlisted candidate could be denied of his rightful right of appointment in the University. Once the Syndicate and Senate had approved the recommendations of the Selection Committee/s, the waitlisted candidate could not be denied appointment just for the fault of the office. Shri Ashok Goyal had rightly pointed out that each waitlisted candidate had to join within a period of six months from the date his/her appointment is approved by the Syndicate. Shri Suresh Thareja, the waitlisted candidate, was willing to join within the period of six months, but could not because he was not given appointment letter. He stated that he was of the opinion that now there are three ways: (i) that since the person had gone to the Court, they may relax the condition of six months and offer him the appointment; and (ii) that a clarification might be sought from the Court whether the denial of appointment because of the fault of the office is to be compensated by the University; and (iii) that they could not offer him appointment in view of the regulations. In fact, the appointment could not be offered to him because the selected candidate had been given three months' extension twice.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that Rule 2 at page 129 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 says that “where two or more teachers are selected at the same time for appointment, their seniority shall be determined according to the ranking given by the Selection Committee, irrespective of the dates of joining the duties. Provided that the date of joining in case of a teacher who has been ranked higher is not later than six months from the date of issue of the

appointment letter to him.....". They need to amend the regulation in such a manner that if the selected candidate did not join within a period of six months, the candidate/s placed on the Waiting List, shall be given appointment.

Principal B.C. Josan said that since the fault lay with the office of the University and not of the candidate, offer of appointment should be given to him.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that Shri Chatrath had given three possibilities and as per the second possibility, they had to ask the candidate to request the court to give direction to the University. They could not go against the regulation as the Syndicate had no power to relax the same. He, therefore, suggested that the previous decision of the Syndicate should be reiterated. If the candidate approached the Court again and he could get relief from the Court, they could relax the regulation on the basis of the order of the Court. He further said that, in future, they should grant extension to the selected candidate/s only for a period of three-four months so that the waitlisted candidate/s could be given appointment if he/she/they did not join within the stipulated period. He also suggested that they should amend the regulation/s in such a manner that the waitlisted candidate could be offered appointment even after six months.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that last year they had conducted interview and the selected candidate got extension for a period of six months and he deliberately refused to join only on the last day so that the waitlisted candidate may not join.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that since the Syndicate is the custodian of the regulations, they should not violate the regulations under any circumstances. If they felt that there is a need to amend the regulation, they should amend the same. If they decided to offer appointment in this case, there would be many Court cases.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that there is a direction from the Senate, which is the supreme authority under Section 8 of Panjab University Act 1947, to re-consider the item. The matter went to the Senate because the Syndicate had decided not to give him appointment. He, therefore, said that the matter be considered taking in view the above fact.

Shri Sandeep Kumar said that on what basis, the appointment was denied to Shri Suresh Thareja, the waitlisted candidate. To minimize the Court cases, they should consider the case sympathetically, especially keeping in view the fact that the candidate is not at fault at all and could not be punished and offer appointment to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether any intimation was sent to Shri Suresh Thareja in terms of the decision of the Syndicate. If they had already sent the intimation to him, they could not offer him the appointment now.

Professor Karamjeet Singh observed that if they went against their own regulation/s, the court cases would increase.

Professor Preeti Mahajan said that though Shri Suresh Thareja is working at the Central University, Bilaspur, his legal notice implies

that he is interested in joining Panjab University, he should be offered appointment.

Principal Puneet Bedi said that since the fault lay with the University office, he should be offered appointment. But the same should not be quoted as precedent in future. In case he is not given appointment, it would invite court case as had been observed by some of her honourable colleagues. She suggested that, in future, while granting extension, fixed time should be given to join.

Professor B.S. Bhoop stated that whether it is the fault of the candidate or not, but once a precedent is created, it would open a Pandora's Box, which would lead to litigations and many RTIs might pour in. There were several other such cases where the waitlisted candidates have not been given appointments. He, therefore, suggested that they should stick to the regulation. If they wanted to offer appointment to the waitlisted candidates, they should make amendment in the regulation, which would be applicable prospectively. He added that since the candidate under consideration is meritorious, even if the post is re-advertised and he applied again, he would get selected. The candidate is not suffering at all because he had a respectable position in the Central University, Bilaspur. Even if the Panjab University is more respectable, they certainly could not go beyond the regulations.

Principal Gurdip Sharma reiterated that it is a unique case and the mistake is on the part of the University office, they should correct the same here and not left the case to the High Court.

S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman said that they should not go beyond the regulation; otherwise, there would be so many repercussions on the appointments being/to be made in the Colleges. Let them see what the Court says in the matter. The Court may provide him relief.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that from the discussion held so far, he could see that they did not want to put the University into trouble and at the same time, they also had sympathy that this candidate deserved to be part of the University faculty. Is it possible that a decision, in principle, be taken to offer appointment to this candidate? In the meanwhile, legal opinion be sought and also seek MHRD's view on the issue before the matter is placed before the Senate for final decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, if they wanted to get the matter legally examined, and since the Senate would meet only in the month of March 2014, after obtaining the legal opinion from 2-3 Legal Retainers, the matter should be placed before the Syndicate. As far as amendment of the regulation is concerned, Shri Chatrath would agree with him that amended regulations are to be effected only from the date of their publication in the official Gazette Notification of the MHRD. In the existing regulations, it had been specifically mentioned that the Waiting List is operative only for a period of six months. He was of the view that if they amend the regulation and thought of implementing the amended regulation, in anticipation of the approval of various University bodies, Government of India and publication of Government of India Gazette, they would stand nowhere. He, therefore, pleaded that keeping in view all this, the post should be re-advertised.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that they were all of the view that the candidate should not be made to suffer because of the fault of the office.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar intervened to say that the Vice-Chancellor had already said that it had happened through an oversight and it is not a fault of the office.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, in principle, by and large, the Syndicate had sympathized that the candidate had merit to be given appointment and that was why he was placed on the Waiting List. However, regulations as they are come in the way of giving any relief to him. That was why the matter was taken to the Senate, wherein the majority view was that the matter be referred back to the Syndicate. Now, majority of the members were also of the view that they could consider to amend the regulations in subsequent meetings. In the meantime, they would seek legal opinion as to whether the action they were contemplating is possible or not.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they could not mislead and misquote. They would have to admit that the candidate could not suffer because of the fault of the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that let they should not so emphatic. Under all circumstances, they wanted that Dr. Raj Kumar should join the University because he was a better candidate. Therefore, they gave him extension to the extent it was possible and were not interested in the waitlisted candidate. They had given long rope to the selected candidate. Why should they say that it is fault of the University in giving six months extension to the selected candidate? Either they have to take action against the guilty person or they should not mention anywhere that they had sympathy with the candidate, the fault lay with the University office, the candidate should not suffer, etc. Moreover, there is no representation from the candidate after having been intimated that the offer of appointment could not be made to him after a period of six months. It was only because of the mandate of the Senate that they are reconsidering the issue. Therefore, it should be taken to the Senate with the observation that the Syndicate considered the mandate of the Senate and it was observed that Regulation 15 at page 36 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 comes in the way and offer of appointment could not be made. However, it is being sent to the Senate for its consideration keeping in view the difficulty expressed by the Syndicate.

Principal Gurdip Sharma intervened to say that they all had sympathy with the candidate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they did not overrule the recommendations of the Selection Committee. As told by Professor B.S. Bhoop, he was happy to know that Shri Suresh Thareja is serving at Central University, Bilaspur, where the service conditions and career prospects are better than Panjab University.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that Shri Thareja is made to suffer because of the fault of the office and he should not suffer, which is the opinion of the Syndicate. He further stated that could they not relax the condition of the regulation/s. Do they not relax the regulation/s? They had already given Special/Golden chances over

and above the regulations, whereas as per regulation only two chances are permissible. As such, they relax the regulation/s.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal remarked that such chances are given to the students to appear in the examination/s and not to pass them, whereas in the instant case, they are offering him appointment by violating the regulations.

Professor B.S. Bhoop suggested that if they admit that it is their fault, punitive action should be taken against the officer/official concerned.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that alright the punitive action would come to the office of the Vice-Chancellor and he is prepared for it on behalf of someone, whom he had asked to perform duty on his (Vice-Chancellor) part. He was not afraid of any punitive action. They do feel if there was a provision in the Calendar, they would have taken a decision otherwise. If an offer to Dr. Suresh Thareja is made, they would not be overruling the sanctity of the Selection Committee, which had found him suitable to be faculty member of this University. The waiting list candidates are also fit to be the faculty members. They are on the waiting list simply because there is only one vacancy. In Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) or Indian Institutes of Science Education & Research (IISERs), where the number of vacancies are flexible, if a Selection Committee finds an additional outstanding candidate, the Director had the power to recommend to the Governing Board (IISERs) for increasing the number of vacancies. But at Panjab University, they did not have that flexibility as they are working in a different system. These facts could not be denied and they should also not be denying the same. As a Vice-Chancellor, he is happy and relieved personally to learn that the candidate concerned is serving at a Central University, where the service conditions and career prospects are better than the Panjab University. He is also heartened to learn that he (Dr. Thareja) still wants to come to the Panjab University. Maybe today the stature of Panjab University is higher, but after 15 or 20 years down the lines, when this person would reach the age of superannuation, he might be more benefitted at a Central University where the age of superannuation is 65 years. Since people live in the present, he (Dr. Thareja) is also living in the present and has shown keenness to join the Panjab University. They should be happy that they could get a good faculty member, as his learned colleague and Dean, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences has vouched that this guy is bright. Therefore, offer to Dr. Thareja would not ignore academic merits. He is happy that this man is actually in a job at present and; hence, there is no anxiety that if a decision is taken for not offering him appointment immediately, but they should be seen to be taking a correct decision. As Shri G.S. Ghuman pointed out he is presiding over as Director, Higher Education, Punjab, where he sees problem in a large context and he (Vice-Chancellor) does appreciate his concerns. He did not want to enhance his difficulties at all and also the difficulties of Dean, College Development Council. So they should tread the path cautiously, but as a Governing Body of this University, they also need to be a little flexible for academic concerns. They have been relaxing the regulations here and there once in a while, maybe in the interest of the students or academics. So, they are not always in such a water-tight or mathematical situation of zero or one, matters do get accommodated through cracks, which are opened up once in while. He on his part would also check with the Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD) as to what are

their exigencies and whether they had been confronted similar situation(s), and he would brief them about everything.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if an oversight/mistake has happened at a senior level, punitive action cannot be taken.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that as far as law is concerned, he could give them a number of judgements on this point. Firstly, no person should suffer because of no fault on his part. Secondly, nobody should suffer because of the fault of the advocate. Thirdly, nobody should suffer because of the fault of the Court, because the Court say right to be considered under Article 16(1), which is a Fundamental Right of the citizens. The denial of Fundamental Right is not only unreasonable, but it also overrules the basic structure. Fundamental Right is right to be considered equally and equally is considered. He got selected on the Waiting List and got a right of joining. They had accepted his number two position. If they say they did not accept the Waiting List, the man has no right. He, therefore, suggested that Shri Suresh Thareja, waitlisted candidate, should be allowed to be given appointment by giving relaxation as a one-time measure.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is not necessary, as per regulation, to offer appointment to the waitlisted candidate. He had not said that if they violate the regulation/s, they would commit a big sin. He had said that by violating the regulations they would run the risk of getting the same challenged by some of the candidates in the Court. As far as giving relief to the students is concerned, there is no aggrieved party. So they knew for sure that if the relief is given to the students, it did not affect anybody's right and it would not be challenged in the Court. Therefore, sometimes, they relax the regulations. Wherein it is apprehended that it could be challenged, they should avoid.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that it could only be challenged by a person, who is above him (Shri Thareja), and he is denied the right.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that no, it could be challenged by anyone.

**RESOLVED:** That legal opinion be sought from 2-3 Legal Retainers and also the views of the MHRD be sought on the issue – whether the appointment could be offered to the waitlisted candidate after the expiry of six months in view of such precedences elsewhere, that MHRD may have come across. Thereafter, the matter be placed before the Syndicate/Senate.

**Appointment of Assistant Professors in Public Administration in the Department of Public Administration and University School of Open Learning**

**9.** Considered –

- (i) minutes dated 19.12.2012 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professors-2 in the Department of Public Administration, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- (ii) minutes dated 20.12.2012 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professors-2 in Public Administration (General-1, SC-1) at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**NOTE:** 1. The Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court disposed of CWP 16056 of 2013 (**Appendix-IV**) with a direction to respondent No. 1- University to take a **final decision on this issue expeditiously but in any case on or before 31.12.2013.**

2. The grouse made in the present petition is that even though the petitioner was shown to have been selected, he was not issued an appointment letter and thereafter in response to an inquiry under the Right to Information Act he was informed that the matter is still under consideration.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.8.2013 had decided that the above item be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate along with writ petition.
4. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 8.10.2013 had noted that the item was withdrawn from the Syndicate meeting dated 27.1.2013 and the item has again been brought to the Syndicate under the orders of the Hon'ble High Court and also that the reply to the petitioner under RTI was given through oversight, and they should reiterate whatever was discussed and decided in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 27.1.2013.

**This was agreed to.**

5. Copy of the reply sent to the petitioner- Shri Anil Kumar in view of direction given by the Punjab & Haryana High Court

in CWP 16056 of 2013 is enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

- 6. The Senate at its meeting held on 8.12.2013 has resolved that above Item (I-7) on the agenda, be referred back to the Syndicate for consideration/ reconsideration.**

Initiating discussion, Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh said that one of the candidates (Dr. Nirmal Singh) for the above-said posts of Assistant Professors had made a complaint that he had not been awarded marks in the template for UGC-NET.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether any complaint had been received by the University from Dr. Nirmal Singh for not having been awarded marks for UGC-NET in the template. If yes, the representation/complaint should be examined and the details of marks, etc., in the templates for these posts should be examined again and thereafter the matter should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration and decision.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that they are not against these appointments. But since a complaint had been received and it had come to their notice that one of the candidates had not been awarded marks for UGC-NET, it meant the scrutiny for these posts had not been done properly. Therefore, the University must scrutinize all the records and take remedial measures; otherwise, tomorrow it would become a court case.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that all these appointments should be approved as the selected candidates are not at fault at all. He remarked that the rules are for the benefit of the public and not to harass them.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that, last year, the Senate had constituted a Committee, under the Chairmanship of Shri Satya Pal Jain, to consider about 49 cases of appointments. Keeping in view that background, if there is one more case, the same should also be referred to the same Committee, i.e., Satya Pal Jain Committee. But they have to analyze one thing that whether by awarding 10 marks for UGC-NET, the complainant comes in the bracket of candidates recommended by the Selection Committee for appointment or not. If the score of this candidate becomes equal to or more than the last recommended candidate, only then they should take his complaint into consideration; otherwise, not. But as far as these candidates are concerned, the Selection Committee had clearly recommended them for appointment, which is a fair observation.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that, earlier, the item was not considered because of technical reason/s. Now, since the Senate had referred back this item to the Syndicate for consideration on merit, that point has gone. As far as complaint of Dr. Nirmal Singh is concerned, it pertained to posts of Assistant Professors in the Department of Public Administration and not to the posts of Assistant Professors at USOL. Dr. Nirmal Singh had complained that he had

been denied 10 marks for UGC-NET. He had got 43 marks. Even if he would have been given 10 marks for UGC-NET, he would have got 53 marks, whereas the wait-listed candidate had secured 63 marks. Anyhow, they could authorize the Vice-Chancellor to scrutinize the record and take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Professor B.S. Bhoop pointed out that certain candidates, who have been recommended for appointment by the Selection Committee, have not been awarded marks for experience, UGC-NET, publications, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had already checked the file and found that marks for UGC-NET were awarded to Dr. Nirmal Singh at the time of scrutiny and that was why he was called for interview. The mistake for not awarding the marks for UGC-NET occurred at the time of filling up the template. He had also spoken to Dr. Nirmal Singh, who had said that he had also shown the experience certificate, but marks for the same were not awarded to him. The marks for experience could not be awarded to him due to non-availability of details of as to how much workload is to be counted, what is his minimum pay, etc. If they wanted the matter could be referred to Satya Pal Jain Committee or they should appoint another Committee for the purpose.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Satya Pal Jain Committee was constituted as per the decision of the Senate for a specific purpose, i.e., for examining all the cases of appointment which were before the Senate on that day for consideration. It was not that the appointments recommended/made during that session be referred to that Committee. Therefore, if they wanted to get it examined, let there be a Committee comprising of the members of present Syndicate because ultimately they would have to take a decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it would have been appropriate if everybody present here knew each and everything about what had been mentioned in his complaint by Dr. Nirmal Singh and how many marks he was supposed to get. Probably, he is the only person, who does not know anything about it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would consult them and give him the benefit due to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it could have been fair had that representation been placed before the Syndicate. If it was not possible to append it with the item, it should have been supplied to them later on or even on the tables. Anyway, a Committee is going to be constituted to examine the whole issue and to ensure that neither Dr. Nirmal Singh nor any other candidate suffers. He added that this item could not be considered in the year 2013 for the reasons recorded in the minutes of the meetings of the Syndicate. This time, this item is being considered for the first time and only now they are considering it on merit. Thus, they were not against any candidate. He reiterated that a Committee comprising the members of present Syndicate should be constituted to examine the whole issue and take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**RESOLVED:** That the appointments recommended by the Selection Committee be considered on merit and the representation of Dr. Nirmal Singh be referred to a Committee, to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, comprising members of the present Syndicate. The Committee could examine all the data and, in particular, the complaint of Dr. Nirmal Singh, and take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor left the House by saying that he is abstaining from the meeting and requested Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, the senior-most Syndic, to chair the meeting in his absence.

**Issue regarding appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music, Panjab University**

**56.** Considered that Professor Neera Grover, Department of Music, SNDT Women's University, Mumbai, be appointed as Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, from the date she would be able to join the Panjab University till July 31, 2015, under Regulation 5(b)(i), page 111, Chapter V(A), Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** Before the joining of Professor Arun Kumar Grover as Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University, Chandigarh, the Administrative and Academic Committee of the Department of Music considered the academic-cum-experience profile of Professor (Mrs.) Neera Grover, Head, Department of Music at the SNDT Women's University, Bombay, and vide their letter No. 1575/Music/D, dated 5/7/2012 unanimously recommended her name for an emergent appointment of Professor in Vocal Music against the vacant post of K.L. Sehgal Professor in Music for a period of one year under the relevant Regulation of the University.

Professor A.K. Grover joined as VC, PU on July 23, 2012. Prior to him, the then Vice-Chancellor had referred the recommendation of Department of Music for one year appointment to the Syndicate. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 8.9.2012 (Para 59) resolved to appoint Professor Neera Grover as Professor in the Department of Music, PU, Chandigarh for a period of one year under Regulation 5(a)(i) [to be read as 5(b)(i)] at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, and that "the letter of appointment" "be issued prior to the approval of the Senate."

Professor Neera Grover joined the Department of Music, PU, as Professor on 17.12.2012. Her appointment was ratified by the Senate at its meeting on 22.12.2013/20.01.2013 vide item I-10.

Prior to the completion of one year term of Professor Neera Grover, the Administrative and Academic Committee of the Department of Music made a recommendation to the DUI, vide their resolution dated 19/7/2013, that her term of appointment be extended for one year more. However, the Syndicate at its meeting held on 8/10/2013 resolved "not to accord approval to their recommendation in the item no. 33", without recording any reason for their non-acceptance.

On receiving the information about not acceding to the request of the Department of Music by the

Syndicate, the three senior faculty members of the Department requested again vide their communication to the DUI, Chairperson of the Department of Music, dated 20/11/2013 for extension in the services of Professor Neera Grover in their Department under rules and regulations of the University.

The decision of the Syndicate along with the recommendation of the faculty members was put to the Senate at its meeting held on 8.12.2013 as an information item I-5. The matter was discussed at length. There was a general consensus in the House that Professor Neera Grover should be given re-appointment in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh. However, with due deliberation, it was unanimously agreed by the Senate to accept and resolve: "That the issue pertaining to the extension in term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh be referred to the Syndicate for reconsideration." (**Appendix-V**).

As the term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover was till 16.12.2013 and the recommendation of the Department of Music was not accepted, on Prof. Neera Grover's request she was relieved from PU on December 13, 2013 to enable her to join her parent University at Mumbai. Thus, to reconsider the recommendation of the Department of Music, PU Chandigarh, Professor Neera Grover needs to be given new appointment from the date she would be able to join after obtaining leave etc. from her parent University.

Her new appointment may be considered as a 'couple-case' emergent temporary appointment up to 31.7.2015 under Regulation 5(b)(i), at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. In the same background, the Syndicate made the "emergent temporary appointment" in the first instance on 8.9.2012 (Para 59) – a situation emerging from the fact of appointment and joining of Professor A. K. Grover as the 12<sup>th</sup> Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University, Chandigarh, against an available post of Professor in the Department of Music of Panjab University, which had been lying vacant since 1991.

The curriculum Vitae of Professor Neera Grover is enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

Dr. Dinesh Talwar enquired for his information whether the Vice-Chancellor was authorized to propose the name of Shri Gopal

Krishan Chatrath to chair the meeting in his absence. Why can't he being the junior-most member chair the meeting?

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they may not take serious objection to Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath chairing the meeting, but they took a strong note of this that the Vice-Chancellor has proposed the name of Shri Chatrath, which he could not, because Regulation 4 at page 35 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, says 'The Vice-Chancellor shall preside at all meetings of the Syndicate at which he may be present. In his absence, the members present may elect another member to preside at such a meeting'. He urged the Chairman saying for God's sake save the Vice-Chancellor. Could the Vice-Chancellor be a member when he had already left the House and the name is to be proposed by the members present in the House? He (Vice-Chancellor) has no right to propose the name to chair the meeting in his absence.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that since his name was proposed and nobody had objected to it, he was chairing the meeting. Earlier also, his name was proposed by the Vice-Chancellor and he chaired the meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman, IAS, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, who is an ex-officio member and someone who is not participant in the electoral politics of the University, to chair the meeting in the absence of the Vice-Chancellor. S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman said that he be excused from Chairing the meeting.

A majority of the members were of the view that Shri Chatrath may chair the meeting.

Thereafter the item was again read out to the members.

Briefing the members about the background of the case under consideration, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, Chairman, stated that, earlier, Professor Neera Grover was appointed as Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, for a period of one year by the Syndicate. The item again came for her continuation, which was rejected by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 8.10.2013. Thereafter, the matter came before the Senate in its meeting held on 08.12.2013 and there emerged three opinions: (i) that she may be given extension by the Senate; (ii) that the matter be referred back to the existing Syndicate for reconsideration within a short time; and (iii) that the matter be referred back to the Syndicate for consideration in a regular meeting. Ultimately, a decision was taken that the matter be referred back to this Syndicate. When the matter was included in the Syndicate agenda, Dr. R.D. Anand challenged it in the Court and the Court had dismissed the same saying that there is only apprehension in the mind of the petitioner and they did not bother about it and dismissed the petition. Before the present Syndicate met, Dr. R.D. Anand sent a legal notice to each and every member of the Syndicate through the University, which had been received by all of them. They all are aware what Dr. R.D. Anand has written in the legal notice and he need not elaborate it. He has missed some information which is available on record. He would apprise those facts which he (Dr. Anand) has not mentioned. So far the emergent appointment under Regulation 5(a) is concerned, the Vice-Chancellor could make an emergent temporary appointment for a period not exceeding one

year and for a period exceeding one year, the Syndicate had the power under Regulation 5(b). As such, the matter is before them. It is also a fact that about five writ petitions have been filed in the Court. First such petition was filed by Shri R.K. Singla (Writ Petition No.58) of 2013 titled Dr. Rajinder Kumar Singla vs Panjab University.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that it seemed that everything had been pre-planned that Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath would chair the meeting and he (Shri Chatrath) knew each and everything about the case.

The Chairman stated that as a member of the Syndicate, he had every right to collect all the information relating to the Item. Civil Writ Petition 58 of 2013 came before Justice Rajiv Narain Raina and all those points, which had been raised in the Legal Notice, were there in the Writ Petition and were considered by Justice Raina, i.e., Professor Neera Grover happen to be the wife of the Vice-Chancellor and that her appointment deserved to be set aside on the ground that it is the result of transparent nepotism, *mala fide*, arbitrary, discriminatory, misuse of authority and autonomy and is contrary to the spirit of University Regulations. After considering all the points raised by the Petitioner, the Court had said that the present Petition is not maintainable. Secondly, the Court had observed that in Service Law, a PIL could not lie. Thirdly, the *quo-warranto* writ had also been dismissed by Justice Rajiv Narain Raina.

Copies of 4 judgements were placed on record and as demanded by Shri Ashok Goyal were handed over to him and became part of the proceedings as those were read over either by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath or Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that whatever is being told by Shri Chatrath does not find mention in the judgement. Could they get a copy of the order?

The Chairman stated that thereafter a LPA was filed which came before Justice Surya Kant and Justice R.P. Nagrath. The Division Bench said that they did not agree with the Petitioner. Then Dr. R.D. Anand requested that he wanted to withdraw the Petition and wanted to file PIL not disclosing to the Court that he had filed a PIL earlier which had come before single Judge and was dismissed. Anyhow it was dismissed as withdrawn.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether a PIL could come before a single Judge?

The Chairman replied that PIL cannot come before a single Judge. A PIL was filed by them which was disposed of by Mr. Justice Sanjay Kishan Kaul (Chief Justice) and Mr. Justice Augustine George Masih. The Division Bench had observed that as the Syndicate has not given her extension, it is declared infructuous. But the Court also said that the only direction to be passed in this matter is for the posts to be filled up expeditiously and for this Court to monitor for some time to ensure that the schedule of filling up of the posts is adhered to. Thereafter, when the matter was included in the Senate Agenda, Dr. R.D. Anand again challenged it in the Court and the Court again dismissed it. Now, the matter as to how many vacancies are there and how they were filling up these is before the Court and this information is to be given to the Court in the next hearing scheduled for

31.1.2014. With these words, Shri Chatrath requested the members to consider the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Chatrath had told that Justice Rajiv Narain Raina had dismissed the PIL but according to him, PIL is always before the Division Bench and Justice Raina sits as Single. Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, it was not a PIL but a Writ which was only a *quo-warranto* and the same was dismissed and while dismissing the *quo-warranto*, the Court had said that in this case even PIL does not lie. Probably, a LPA has been filed against this order. The Court had said that after arguing the case for some time and finding that we are not convinced on the *locus standi* of the appellant to pursue this appeal, learned counsel for the appellant seeks to withdraw this appeal with liberty to invoke PIL jurisdiction of this Court. Thus, the PIL was dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.

The Chairman requested Shri Ashok Goyal to read the whole judgement carefully. According to him, he (Petitioner) could not go against the judgement of the Single Judge even to the Supreme Court as it is binding on everybody. He is of the view that the Judgement of the Single Judge had become confirmed during observations made by the Judges under LPA and, thus, could not be challenged. He added that the Legal Notices had been served to all the members of the Syndicate, including the Vice-Chancellor, through the University, wherein he had hidden the facts from them and tried to threaten them.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that he wanted to know the present position of the case. Were they barred from taking any decision on the issue? If not, the Syndicate is competent authority to take a decision in the matter under Regulation 5 (b). It was very bad that he (Dr. R.D. Anand) had tried to hide all the facts.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he (Shri Chatrath) had given his observation while talking about PIL. The Court had observed that there could not be PIL in service matters and the *quo-warranto* had been dismissed. He further stated that Shri R.D. Anand has misled the Syndicate members, with half cooked stories and he should be sent behind the bars for threatening the Syndicate members.

The Chairman said that he would not like to recommend such a course of action against a colleague, who had been a senior member.

Shri Ashok Goyal added that Shri R.D. Anand had been a close associate of Shri Chatrath for long, his own acquaintance with him have been only as a senior colleague for lesser duration.

The Chairman said that the Court had dismissed the *quo-warranto* and the single bench had also observed that PIL does not lie in service matters.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is for the information of the House that the Single Bench has observed that PIL does not lie in service matters. However, the Division Bench after arguing the case for sometime and finding that we are not convinced on the *locus standi* of the appellant to pursue this appeal, learned counsel for the appellant seeks to withdraw this appeal with liberty to invoke PIL jurisdiction of this Court. Thereafter, a PIL was filed, which was

considered by Division Bench comprising Mr. Justice Sanjay Kishan Kaul, Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Augustin George Masih. Now, let me say that the Writ Petition had not been dismissed rather it had been disposed of. There is difference between dismissal and disposal.

The Chairman intervened to say that the Court had observed that “as of now, there is only apprehension in the mind of the petitioner as to what may transpire as there is nothing on record to show that the Syndicate has taken a different view from what was placed before us which persuaded us to dispose of the earlier writ petition, i.e. Syndicate had declined granting any extension to the wife of the Vice-Chancellor and the process of regular recruitment is on. In view of the aforesaid facts, we are not inclined to entertain this writ petition. Dismissed”.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it has been mentioned in the Legal Notice that they have to take the issue seriously because he has threatened all kind of criminal proceedings and has alleged that if this appointment is allowed, it would amount to corruption also. Earlier, a decision was taken in the Syndicate, probably in the year 2009, about the admissions to be made in the Department of Laws as per orders of the Supreme Court of India, wherein, the University had not committed any illegality and under those orders, he (Ashok Goyal) was admitted to LL.B. course. Thereafter, a complaint was filed against him with the C.B.I. under the Prevention of Corruption Act and the allegation was that Shri Ashok Goyal, being a member of the Syndicate, has been able to get the decision made by the Syndicate which was beneficial to him only. They know it very well that any such action taken is covered under the Prevention of Corruption Act and the C.B.I. kept on enquiring into the matter for almost eight months. In the meantime, newspapers carried big news in this regard.

The Chairman stated that the Parliament passed an Act that candidates belonging to OBCs should be given 27% reservation, which was challenged in the Court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India observed that since number of seats remained vacant, instead of wasting the same, the Universities and Colleges should re-advertise the vacancies and firstly the seats should be offered to the OBC candidates and if requisite number of OBC candidates are not available, the remaining seats should be offered to the General category candidates. The matter came to the Syndicate and when final order came, they advertised the seats and Shri Ashok Goyal was admitted to LL.B. course, for which no fault lay with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that had they taken this action with *mala fide* intension, it would have been covered under the Prevention of Corruption Act.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to Item under consideration, stated that it has been written “To consider that Professor Neera Grover, Department of Music, SNDT Women's University, Mumbai, be appointed as Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, from the date she would be able to join the Panjab University till July 31, 2015, under Regulation 5(b)(i), page 111, Chapter V(A), Panjab University Calendar, Volume I, 2007”. He wanted to know as to who is the author of this Item and the note. He was sure that both the item as well as the note has been prepared by the same person. Had he (Shri Chatrath) ever

seen during his such a long career an item coming to the Syndicate without anybody being its author.

On a point of order, Principal Gurdip Sharma said that this case had been referred back to the Syndicate by the Senate.

The Chairman said that the item is on the agenda of the Syndicate and it did not matter whether the name of the person, who has brought the item, is given or not. The Registrar had included the item in the agenda.

It was clarified that the item along with the note had been included in the agenda after showing it to the Vice-Chancellor.

On enquiry made by Shri Ashok Goyal about what had been referred back by the Senate for consideration, the resolved part of the item where the meeting of the Senate was chaired by Professor R.P. Bambah was read out to the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had greatest regard for Professor Arun Kumar Grover and he had no doubt about Professor Neera Grover's capabilities as she happened to be top most academician and musician not only in the country but in the world.

The Chairman requested the members to consider the item without going into the hustles and bustles of the Regulations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had made the decision of the Senate a part of the Syndicate item without the same having been confirmed by the members of the Senate. Still the minutes of the Senate along with this decision is supposed to be sent to the members as tentative minutes. The minutes are to be finalized after receiving objections from the members, if any. Meaning thereby, the decision of the Senate appended with the item is not final. Even the appended decision of the Senate is "that the issue pertaining to the extension in term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be referred back to the Syndicate for reconsideration". But the item before the Syndicate is to consider that Professor Neera Grover, Department of Music, SNTD Women's University, Mumbai, be appointed as Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that when Professor Neera Grover was not granted extension in her term of appointment, the matter had ended there. Now, the issue is of her re-appointment under Regulation 5 (b).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the case is brought to the Syndicate for fresh appointment of Professor Neera Grover and not as per the mandate of the Senate because the mandate of the Senate was to re-consider the extension in term of her appointment. Nowhere in the Senate it was stated that she would be leaving the Panjab University on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2013 and the Syndicate would get item as per discussions of the Senate for fresh appointment.

The Chairman, referring to the decision of the Senate appended with the item, said that it has been mentioned in the minutes that 'there was a general feeling in the House that Professor Neera Grover

should be given extension/re-appointment in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh’.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let them get the copies of the DVDs of the video recording of the proceedings of the Senate and see whether the proceedings confirmed by Professor R.P. Bambah have been recorded rightly. As far as he knew, the issue of re-appointment of Professor Neera Grover was not discussed in the Senate meeting and it was only and only of extension of her appointment. After seeing the video recording, they would point out the wrong recording, if any. Thereafter, the minutes of the Senate meeting dated 8.12.2013 would be treated as final.

The Chairman said that let us forget everything and go through the item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item has nothing to do with what the Senate had decided. He reserves his right to point out wrong recording of the minutes of the Senate meeting.

The Chairman said that since it was brought to the notice of the Senate that she had already left, the question of extension in her appointment did not arise.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the meeting of the Senate was held on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2013 whereas Professor Neera Grover was relieved on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2013.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that an indication was given that Professor Neera Grover would leave before the expiry of her appointment.

The Chairman stated that if extension in the term of her appointment was to be given, the Syndicate would have met before the expiry of her tenure. Now, the question is of her re-appointment under Regulation 5 (b) (i) for which the Syndicate is authorized. Under this Regulation, the Syndicate is competent authority to make emergent appointment on contract basis for a period exceeding one year. The Senate could have approved extension in the term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover but due to propriety part, the Senate referred back the matter to the Syndicate, which is competent authority, for re-consideration with certain observations, though the Senate, under Section 8 of the Panjab University Act 1947, is vested with the supreme authority of the University, whereas the Syndicate is Executive Government. To be fair on the part of the Senate, it had referred the matter back to the Syndicate. Now, as per Regulations, Professor Neera Grover could be appointed by the Syndicate for a period beyond one year. Hence, there is a proposal.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Senate in its meeting held on 8.12.2013 had given dictate to the Syndicate to re-consider the item about extension in the term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover which was declined by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 8.10.2013. The Senate has resolved that the issue pertaining to the extension in term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover be referred back to the Syndicate for reconsideration. But surprisingly, instead of re-considering the decision about extension in the term of her appointment, the item has come to the Syndicate for appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music, Panjab University,

Chandigarh. The item which was considered by the then Syndicate was for extension in term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover for a period of one year, whereas the item now before them is not for extension in her term of appointment, but for fresh appointment, that too, for the period starting from the day of her joining, if appointed, till 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015. Therefore, the item is completely different from what was resolved by the Senate. As has been ruled by the Chairman of the meeting that whatever may be the viewpoints, it is his (Chairman) opinion that the item is the outcome of the dictate of the Senate. Though specifically asked nobody had been able to guide as to who is the author of the item. So much so that Regulation 5 (b) (i) at page 111 has been mentioned under which this item is sought to be considered, but probably he did not know why? It would have been better if the provisions of the Regulation have been mentioned as had been done in the earlier meetings. The Regulation very clearly says "The Syndicate shall have authority to make emergent temporary appointment on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor for a period exceeding one year, or on contract basis for a limited period". Where is that recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor? Not only that the author of the item is not known to the Syndicate, there is no recommendation from any official, what to talk of the Vice-Chancellor. The Office Note is also completely in contravention of the stand which had been taken by the University in the Court. The Chairman himself felt that in the first writ petition, LPA and PIL, which was filed before the first Division Bench and also another PIL, the allegation which has been levelled was that Professor Neera Grover happened to be the wife of the Vice-Chancellor and that was why she had been appointed in the Department of Music, Panjab University. On this ground, her appointment was sought to be quashed, to which he was sure the University must have filed a reply in the Court by way of an affidavit or written statement. As far as his knowledge goes, he had been telling in various meetings of the Syndicate that they understand that there is some case in the court against the decision of the Syndicate for appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music, Panjab University. If any such case is there, let it be brought to the notice of the Syndicate so that the Syndicate could become wiser for future and if any Regulation/s had been violated, they should be careful in future. But instead of their numerous requests, they were not told anything. Now, it is for the first time that the orders of the Court and Writ Petitions filed in the Court have been placed before them. Neither the orders of the Court nor the stand taken by the University, affidavit/written statement filed in the Court have been shown to them till date. During discussion, it has come to their notice that the University had defended tooth and nail in the Court that the appointment of Professor Neera Grover has nothing to do with Professor Arun Kumar Grover, the Vice-Chancellor. Professor Neera Grover has been appointed because of her eminence and necessity in the Department of Music, Panjab University. The Notification regarding appointment of Professor Arun Kumar Grover as Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University was issued on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2012 and the process for Professor Neera Grover's appointment in this University was started on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2012 when the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department of Music unanimously recommended her name for an emergent appointment. To justify that stand, probably, they had explained how the workload of the Department of Music had increased and how it is the dire necessity being faced by the Department to have Professor Neera Grover appointed. They might remember that how they had opposed the appointment tooth and nail. In fact, Shri Chatrath was one of the

members who had agreed that the item had not been framed properly and the proper formation of the item was also told. It is the Registrar under whose signatures, the affidavit/written statement had been filed in the Court. To his knowledge, a written statement had been filed in the Court wherein they had tried to defend the case saying that it has nothing to do with Professor Arun Kumar Grover, the Vice-Chancellor, rather Professor Neera Grover has been appointed independently without having any consideration of Professor Arun Kumar Grover, the Vice-Chancellor. Though he would not go through the entire note, it has been mentioned in the note that “her new appointment may be considered as a ‘couple case’ emergent temporary appointment up to 31.7.2015 under Regulation 5(b)(i), at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007. In the same background, the Syndicate made the “emergent temporary appointment” in the first instance on 8.9.2012 (Para 59) – a situation emerging from the fact of appointment and joining of Professor A.K. Grover as the 12<sup>th</sup> Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University, Chandigarh, against an available post of Professor in the Department of Music of Panjab University, which had been lying vacant since 1991”. How and from where this note had come? The appointment of Professor Neera Grover was approved by the Syndicate on 8.9.2012 when Professor Arun Kumar Grover had joined this University as Vice-Chancellor. How they had misled the Court that Professor Neera Grover has nothing to do with Professor A.K. Grover, the Vice-Chancellor. In this way, they had misled the Court. They could refer to the proceedings of the Syndicate dated 8.9.2012. Now, they are accepting that the appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music is linked with Professor Arun Kumar Grover, the Vice-Chancellor, which they were earlier denying in the Court. The orders of the Court dated 13.11.2013 say “Learned senior counsel for respondents No.1 and 2 states that the first relief has really worked itself out this year as the term of respondent No.3 was only till 16.12.2013 and further term has been declined by the Syndicate. The only question which, thus, arises is as to the second direction sought to fill up the posts of Professors and other persons after re-advertising the same. In this behalf, learned senior counsel submits that steps would be taken expeditiously to fill up the posts at different levels and the current position has been placed on record as per the affidavit of 22.07.2013. We are thus of the view that the only direction to be passed in this matter is for the posts to be filled up expeditiously and for this Court to monitor for some time to ensure that the schedule of filling up of the posts is adhered to. The petition stands disposed of. List for compliance with the status report to be filed by the University three days before the next date of hearing setting-forth the schedule to fill up the posts at different levels. List on 31.01.2014”. Thereafter, when the item was taken to the Senate, another Writ Petition was filed under different name by Dr. R.D. Anand, which was dismissed by making following observations:

“As of now, there is only apprehension in the mind of the petitioner as to what may transpire as there is nothing on record to show that the Syndicate has taken a different view from what was placed before us which persuaded us to dispose of the earlier writ petition, i.e. Syndicate had declined granting any extension to the wife of the Vice-Chancellor and the process of regular recruitment is on. In view of the aforesaid facts, we are not inclined to entertain this writ petition. Dismissed”.

Meaning thereby, while dismissing the latter Writ Petition, it was observed that there is nothing brought on record contrary to what was said in the earlier Writ Petition and on the basis of that the Court had disposed of the Writ Petition. If now there were taking any decision contrary to which can be challenged, it would be in violation of the orders of the Court that they were saying something else in the Court and getting the Writ Petition disposed on that basis and thereafter taking contrary decision. Thus, it would be contemptuous and he could not run the risk of contempt at the hands of the Court. Probably, they should not go ahead with making any such appointment in this manner. There could be different viewpoints, but instead of going this way, where is the harm in seeking a clarification from the Court. He, therefore, suggested that instead of running the risk of facing the contempt, they should seek a clarification from the Court.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that as per Regulation 5 (b) (i) at page 112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, the Syndicate is competent to make emergent temporary appointment for a period exceeding one year, or on contract basis for a limited period. If they go through the details of the bio-data appended with the item, they would find that Professor Neera Grover had extra-ordinary achievements. She had already produced seven Ph.Ds. and had got several national and international awards. Further, there is a letter dated 30<sup>th</sup> September 2009 from Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Department of Personnel and Training, Government of India which *inter alia* reads as under:

In view of the utmost importance attached to the enhancement of women's status in all walks of life and to enable them to lead a normal family life as also to ensure the education and welfare of the children, guidelines were issued by DOP&T in O.M.No.28034/7/86-Estt. (A) dated 3.4.86 and No.28034/2/97-Estt.(A) dated 12.6.97 for posting of husband and wife who are in Government service at the same station. Department had on 28.3.2004 issued instruction to all Mins./Deptts. to follow the above guidelines in letter and spirit.

In the context of the need to make concerted efforts to increase representation of women in Central Government jobs, these guidelines have been reviewed to see whether the instructions could be made mandatory. It has been decided that when both spouses are in same Central Service or working in same Deptt. and if posts are available, they may mandatorily be posted at the same station. It is also necessary to make the provision at Paras 3 (iv) and (vi) of the O.M. dated 3.4.86 stronger as it is not always necessary that the service to which the spouse with longer service belongs has adequate number of posts and posting to the nearest station by either of the Department may become necessary'.

In view of the above, they should have forward approach giving status to women so that they could have stability and better performance in their job if they are placed in the respectful and dignified living. He, therefore, pleaded that Professor Neera Grover should be appointed

Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh as proposed.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that Shri Ashok Goyal knows law better as he is a man of law. But they should consider the case without going into the complexities of the case. They should not consider this case in piece meal. They should take into consideration the Syndicate decision under which extension in term of appointment of Professor Neera Grover was rejected and the Senate decision. In fact, the spirit was that all, including Shri Ashok Goyal agreed that they should reconsider this case at the earliest. When Professor Neera Grover was appointed on temporary basis for a period of one year by the Syndicate, he was a member of the Syndicate at that time and it is on record that he had suggested that she should be given appointment for the term of three years. But at that time, Shri Ashok Goyal had said that under Regulation 5 (a) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, they could not make emergent temporary appointment for a period beyond one year. In fact, the item was framed like that. Had the item been framed for making temporary emergent appointment under Regulation 5 (b) (i), the term of appointment would have been approved for a period exceeding one year as under this Regulation, the Syndicate is empowered to make emergent temporary appointments on merit for a period exceeding one year. He further stated that even on merit the Court had not barred them to take any other decision.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that certain members of the Syndicate of 2012, which had approved the emergent temporary appointment of Professor Neera Grover are present in the House. They might recall that when the item had come to the Syndicate, it was said that under Regulation 5 (a), the Vice-Chancellor was competent to appoint her for a period not exceeding one year. Had the appointment been proposed under Regulation 5 (b), the term of appointment would have been more than one year. He still remembered that Dr. P.S. Gill had suggested that the appointment of Professor Neera Grover should be made co-terminus with the term of the Vice-Chancellor. But since the appointment was proposed under Regulation 5 (a), the term of appointment was for a period not exceeding one year. Whether under Regulation 5 (b) there is any provision for considering appointment as a 'couple case', to which a reference has been made in the office note, he enquired.

S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman said that he had nothing to say on the issue.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that under Regulation 5(b)(i) the Syndicate is the competent authority to make temporary emergent appointment for a period exceeding one year. The Administrative and Academic Committees of the Department of Music had written that requirement of making emergent temporary appointment in the Department of Music is there, whereas this post is lying vacant since 1991-92. What did emergency mean? If there was any emergency why during all these years, this post has not been filled. Moreover, out of 7 faculty members, six are already working in the Department of Music. If this case is to be treated as a couple case, all the similar cases both in teaching and non-teaching categories should be considered.

Principal B.C. Josan said that both the persons were working at distant places. He suggested that Professor Neera Grover should be

given re-employment as Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, so that the Vice-Chancellor could give full attention to the University work.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that it is a sensitive matter due to which the Panjab University has got a bad name. Everyone has sympathy for it. But it did not look nice for such a learned Vice-Chancellor and the most competent faculty member or would be faculty member as the outside people know that this appointment is not as per the regulations. Now, it has been made a couple case appointment. Tomorrow, this case would definitely go to the Court, wherein they would be more insulted, which would not be in good taste. They did not know what would happen to them as they had already received a legal notice. **He, therefore, suggested that the matter should be resolved amicably and it should not be decided by voting; otherwise, it would create an embarrassing situation for all of them.** According to him, the simple case had been made a complex case, maybe, by the vested interests or ignorance. It would be a professional insult and shame for all of them. Though he did not know the directive of the Court, it is a wrong case because regulation quoted is different and the case is different. Therefore, he is not in favour of this appointment.

Principal Puneet Bedi stated that she agreed with the suggestion that the matter should be settled amicably. If done so, nothing like that. In view of the utmost importance attached to the enhancement of women's status in all walks of life and to enable them to lead a normal family life as also to ensure the education and welfare of the children, guidelines were issued by DOP&T in O.M.No.28034/7/86-Estt. (A) dated 3.4.86 and No.28034/2/97-Estt.(A) dated 12.6.97 for posting of husband and wife who are in Government service at the same station. These guidelines are also supposed to be followed by all the Universities. She, therefore, suggested that Professor Neera Grover should be appointed temporarily in the Department of Music, Panjab University up to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015.

**Professor B.S. Bhoop endorsed the overall view of the House that they had no doubt about the eminence of Professor Neera Grover as she was offered Vice-Chancellorship of a Music University in Uttar Pradesh. But the name of their learned Vice-Chancellor (Professor A.K. Grover) and his wife is being tarnished in the media.** There are several other important issues for the University, Syndicate and Senate to address, which are being sidelined. However, as suggested by Dr. S.K. Sharma, if the matter could be resolved amicably, there would be nothing like that. They should think in that direction. He added that they are learned members across different walks of life, they should not do something, which might be contemptuous and further tarnish the image of the University.

Dr. Preeti Mahajan said that Professor Neera Grover should be appointed in the Department of Music, Panjab University, as proposed. Secondly, the couple cases are being dealt with by the affiliated Colleges according to the above referred guidelines of the Government of India.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he would not like to make any comment.

Shri Sandeep Kumar said that Professor Neera Grover should be appointed in the Department of Music, Panjab University, on temporary basis up to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015.

Shri Jagpal Singh said that the appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music, Panjab University, on temporary basis up to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015 should be approved.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that if the case under consideration is to be considered as a couple case and Professor Neera Grover is to be appointed on temporary basis in the Department of Music, Panjab University, all the couple cases of the University and its affiliated Colleges posted in outstations should be accommodated in similar manner.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that there are about 500 posts which are lying vacant in this University. If they took it as a couple, as he thinks, there are about 300-400 cases, whose wives and children or husbands, are posted outstations, which have to be accommodated against these by framing a policy. Till the policy is framed and the couple cases are adjusted, no post should be advertised. If that is done, it would see the death of this University. He remarked that he knew a person, who was Dean of University Instruction of this University, and his wife, who is Ph.D. and had 20 years experience, used to go to Ambala daily, but could not be accommodated in the University. The D.U.I. is not a smaller person.

The Chairman stated that he had heard the opinions of all the members. Some of them had raised certain apprehensions. It is his duty as a Chairman of the meeting with all his experience as an Advocate to spell it. This very issue that she happened to be the wife of the Vice-Chancellor was considered by Mr. Justice Rajiv Narain Raina and the Hon'ble Judge had said that no justifiable right which could be enforced through the writ. There is a statement of the learned Counsel that the petitioner has further contended that the appointment of respondent No.3 deserves to be set aside on the ground that it is the result of transparent nepotism, mala fide, arbitrary, discriminatory misuse of the authority and autonomy and is contrary to the spirit of the University Regulations. He read out observation made by the Court which states that "Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the paper book. Before I proceed to deal with the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner, I am of the considered view that the present writ petition is not maintainable. So long as the petitioner himself is not a person vying for selection to the post, an intervention through *quo warranto* can be sought only in extraordinary circumstances where the appointment to a public post is such that it would mean gross injustice. I would not find such an exceptional situation here in this case where the Syndicate had decided to select the candidate who was working on the post of Professor & Head, (Vocal Music), Department of Music (PGSR) S.N.D.T. Women's University, Mumbai prior to the joining the University and found her eligible for the post of Professor in the Department of Music. I would rest the matter there and I think that the petitioner in the guise of public interest litigation has approached this Court for intervention through the present writ petition. Indeed, there could be no public interest litigation in service matters. The intervention sought ought to fail and the petition is liable to be dismissed". So far as the matter that Professor Neera

Grover is the wife of Professor Arun Grover, the Vice-Chancellor of the University is concerned, the Court had already decided the issue saying that they did not agree with this ground. As per Government of India directions in the case of couple cases, that is another reason to appoint her in the University. Professor Arun Kumar Grover and his wife, Professor Neera Grover, were earlier working at Tata Institute of Fundamental Sciences, Mumbai and S.N.D.T. Women's University, Mumbai respectively, before Professor Arun Grover's appointment as Vice-Chancellor of this University. Professor Neera Grover had either to resign her job at Mumbai to accompany him or had to stay there. To accompany him, it was only possible that she is appointed in this University on temporary basis. Thirdly, it is only being quoted as an example that every year several couple cases are allowed postings at the stations of their spouses and Director Higher Education, Punjab would agree with him on the issue. This is an additional ground which impelled the consideration of the case to appoint her in emergent situation, if there is a need. As far as apprehension of contempt expressed by some of the members is concerned, the Court had not barred them from taking any decision. Fourthly, PIL does not lie in service and criminal matters. He did not want to make a comment as to why this point was not taken by their advocate in the written statement? He has so many judgements of the Supreme Court saying that PIL does not lie in service matters. He can give 6-7 judgements right now, to which Shri Ashok Goyal said that let he be supplied, which he will. Moreover, as per the guidelines laid-down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, PIL cannot be filed by a person who is not aggrieved and whose rights are not violated for the welfare of others. Merely that she is the wife of the Vice-Chancellor is not a ground on the basis of which she could be denied appointment in the University.

At this point, Principal (Mrs.) Puneet Bedi said that she would like to know whether this is an appointment to be made considering the background of Professor Neera Grover as a Musician, etc. or are they making a policy for ever that whenever a couple case comes they would make such an appointment.

To this, the Chairman clarified that they are not making such a policy, to which some members said that why not as this would be cited as a precedence, to which, the Chairman agreed that yes, this could be cited as a precedence but not as a policy.

The Chairman said that he had counted the heads and found that majority view was that Professor Neera Grover be appointed Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on temporary basis for a period up to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015. Professor Karamjeet Singh and Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh neither gave their view nor participated in the discussion on the point and abstained from voting also. Besides, 5 persons also abstained. S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman did not participate in the discussion but voted for the appointment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though they dare not vote against this appointment, they also do not want to become a party to the decision that she be appointed Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on temporary basis for a period up to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015.

The following persons said that they abstain from the voting and the views expressed by them as above be noted as well:

1. Shri Ashok Goyal
2. Professor Karamjeet Singh
3. Professor S.K. Sharma
4. Professor B.S. Bhoop
5. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh
6. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal
7. Dr. Dinesh Talwar.

It was thereafter unanimously –

**RESOLVED:** That Professor Neera Grover, Department of Music, SNTD Women's University, Mumbai, be appointed temporary Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, from the date she joins the Panjab University till July 31, 2015, under Regulation 5 (b)(i), page 111, Chapter V(A), Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007.

A.K. Bhandari  
Registrar

Confirmed

**Gopal Krishan Chatrath**  
**CHAIRMAN**

Hereinafter, the Vice-Chancellor entered the House to chair the meeting again.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since there is too much cold because of the chilly weather and also that they are already exhausted, the meeting should be adjourned and reconvened on another day.

Some of the members suggested that before adjourning the meeting, they should take up the item pertaining to Ph.D. cases.

**This was agreed to.**

**Award of degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy**

**62.** Considered reports of examiners of certain candidates on the theses, including viva-voce reports, for the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.).

**RESOLVED:** That the degree of Doctor of Philosophy be awarded to the following candidates in the Faculty and subject noted against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
1.	Mr. Suresh Kumar H.No. 1623-B, ESIC Society Colony, Sector-51-B, Chandigarh	Arts/ Library & Information Science	UGC-INFONET DIGITAL LIBRARY CONSORTIUM AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH OUTPUT AMONG SELECT INDIAN UNIVERSITIES: AN IMPACT STUDY
2.	Ms. Renu Lata VPO Sunnam Tehsil Pooh District Kinnaur (H.P.) – 172110	Science/ Environmental Science	GEO-ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: A STUDY OF SORANG HYDRO ELECTRIC POWER PROJECT IN DISTRICT KINNAUR, HIMACHAL PRADESH, INDIA
3.	Ms. Komil Tyagi #1159, First Floor Sector 18-C Chandigarh	Languages/ English	TRANSGRESSING GENDER BOUNDARIES: A CRITIQUE OF MAHESH DATTANI'S SELECTED PLAYS
4.	Mr. Raghav Khanna 713, 1st Floor Sector-43-A Chandigarh	Arts/Public Administration	EMERGING LEADERSHIP IN URBAN LOCAL GOVERNANCE: A STUDY OF MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS OF PUNJAB
5.	Ms. Jasvir Kaur Dhaliwal H.No. 275, Sector-7/A, Chandigarh	Education/ Education	ATTITUDE OF WOMEN TEACHERS TOWARDS TEACHING PROFESSION AS RELATED TO VALUES SELF-ACTUALIZATION JOB SATISFACTION AND BURNOUT
6.	Ms. Payal H.No. 812, Sector-16-D, Chandigarh	Science/ Biophysics	MODULATORY EFFECTS OF ZINC ON OVERRESECTION INDUCED BONE LOSS: BIOCHEMICAL AND BIOPHYSICAL
7.	Mr. Naresh Kumar C/o #22 Teachers Flat, P.U. Campus, Sector-14, Chandigarh	Education/ Physical Education	AN ASSESSMENT OF ANTHROPOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS, PHYSICAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL PARAMETERS OF KABADDI PLAYERS IN RELATION TO THEIR PLAYING

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
			POSITIONS
8.	Ms. Shvaita Rana D/o Professor Chanderverkar Anishdeep Ramnagar Dharamsala District Kangra (H.P.)	Arts/ Women's Studies	DECLINING CHILD SEX RATIO IN HIMACHAL PRADESH: CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES AND INTERVENTION STRATEGIES

**At this stage, it was decided that the meeting be adjourned and the same be fixed for Thursday, the 16<sup>th</sup> January 2014 at 4.30 p.m.**

A.K. Bhandari  
Registrar

Confirmed

**Arun Kumar Grover  
VICE-CHANCELLOR**

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the adjourned meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Thursday, 16<sup>th</sup> January 2014 at 04.30 p.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**PRESENT**

1. Professor A.K. Grover ... (in the Chair)  
Vice-Chancellor
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Dr. Balbir Chand Josan
4. Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop
5. Dr. Dalip Kumar
6. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
7. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath
8. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
9. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
10. Shri Jagpal Singh alias Jaswant Singh
11. Dr. Karamjeet Singh
12. Dr. Preeti Mahajan
13. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh
14. Principal Puneet Bedi
15. Shri Sandeep Kumar
16. Dr. S.K. Sharma
17. Professor A.K. Bhandari ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

Shri Sandeep Hans, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh, and S. Gurdev Singh Ghuman, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor welcomed the members to the adjourned meeting of the Syndicate.

**Recommendations of the  
Regulations Committee  
dated 9.10.2013**

**11.** Considered the following recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 9.10.2013 (**Appendix-VI**) (except item nos. 13, 18, 22, 29, 30, 33, 34 and 52 to 55):

**ITEM 1**

That Regulation 2.1 for Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce at pages 369-370 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007, be amended, as under, and given effect to from the decision of the Senate i.e. 22.12.2012 in anticipation of approval of the Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
2.1 Application for enrolment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy shall be considered by a Research Board in Business Management and Commerce (hereinafter referred to as Research Board) which shall consist of-	2.1 No Change
(i) Dean, Faculty of Business	(i) No Change

<p>Management and Commerce, Ex-officio;</p> <p>(ii) Chairperson, University Business School, Panjab University (hereinafter referred to as the University Business School);</p> <p>(iii) Professors in the University Business School;</p> <p>(iv) One Reader by rotation in the University Business School;</p> <p>(v) Two members nominated by the Vice-Chancellor.</p> <p>The terms of the office of the Board shall be two years.</p>	<p>(ii) No Change</p> <p><b><u>(iii) Professors in the University Business School, University School of Open Learning, Department of Evening Studies, University Institute of Applied Management Sciences and P.U.R.C. Ludhiana falling under domain of Faculty of Business Management and Commerce.</u></b></p> <p><b><u>(iv) One Reader/Associate Professor by rotation in the University Business School, University School of Open Learning, Department of Evening Studies, University Institute of Applied Management Sciences and P.U.R.C. (Ludhiana).</u></b></p> <p>(v) No Change</p> <p>No Change</p>
---	--

## **ITEM 2**

That Regulations 15 and 18(d) for M.Pharm. (Credit Based Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12) be amended, as under, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>15. The subject of the thesis shall be approved by the Board of Postgraduate Studies in Pharmaceutical Sciences. Each student shall submit three typed/re-prographed copies of the thesis, incorporating the result of investigations at the end of Semester-IV ordinarily on <b>31<sup>st</sup> May.</b></p>	<p>15. The subject of the thesis shall be approved by the Board of Postgraduate Studies in Pharmaceutical Sciences. Each student shall submit three typed/re-prographed copies of the thesis, incorporating the result of investigations at the end of Semester-IV ordinarily on <b><u>31<sup>st</sup> July.</u></b></p>
<p>18(d) A candidate who does not submit the thesis on the due date (which ordinarily shall be <b>31 May</b>) at the end of Semester-IV, or whose thesis is rejected by the examiner or the candidate fails in the examination, shall be allowed to submit or resubmit the thesis after revision, as the case may be, after the expiry of six, twelve or eighteen</p>	<p>18(d) A candidate who does not submit the thesis on the due date (which ordinarily shall be <b>31<sup>st</sup> July</b>) at the end of Semester-IV, or whose thesis is rejected by the examiner or the candidate fails in the examination, shall be allowed to submit or resubmit the thesis after revision, as the case may be, after the expiry of six, twelve or eighteen months of the</p>

months of the due date. No candidate shall be allowed to submit the thesis, in between except on two dates in a year, which ordinarily shall be <b>31 May and 30 November</b> . If a candidate fails to submit the thesis within permissible four chances or fails to pass the examination of Semester-IV in four attempts, he/she will be debarred from continuing his/her studies for the Degree of M.Pharm.	due date. No candidate shall be allowed to submit the thesis, in between except on two dates in a year, which ordinarily shall be <b>31<sup>st</sup> July and 31<sup>st</sup> December</b> . If a candidate fails to submit the thesis within permissible four chances or fails to pass the examination of Semester-IV in four attempts, he/she will be debarred from continuing his/her studies for the Degree of M.Pharm.
--	---

### **ITEM 3**

That Regulation 1.2(ii) Master of Arts (Education) at page 314 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (from the session 2012-13), be amended, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>1.2 A person who has passed one of the following examinations from this University or from any other University whose examination has been recognized as equivalent to the corresponding examination of this University shall be eligible to join the First Year (Part-I) class of the M.A. course.</p> <p>(i) For Indian Nationals:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A Graduate in any discipline/ stream with 50% marks from recognized Indian University with B.Ed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The students who have studied Education or Philosophy or Psychology or Sociology as an elective subject or Honours course at first or second degree level with 50% marks.</p> <p>(ii) A student having 50% marks in the qualifying examination or equivalent grade from foreign University have equivalent graduate degree certified by the Association of Indian Universities (AIU).</p>	<p>1.2 No Change</p> <p>(i) No Change</p> <p>(ii) <b><u>A student from Foreign University having equivalent graduate degree (with Education or Philosophy or Psychology or Sociology) with 50% marks, certified by the Association of Indian Universities (AIU). Student should possess proficiency in English as Language of Communication.</u></b></p>

**ITEM 4**

That addition to Regulation 3.1 for Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) at page 332 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2012-13), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>3.1 The admission to the 1<sup>st</sup> year of the course shall be open to a person who has passed:-</p> <p>(i) 10+2 examination from a recognized Board/University with at least 50% marks.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) Any other examination with 50% marks recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (i).</p> <p>(iii) The students who are placed under Compartment at +2 examinations in the annual examination and cleared the Compartment examination up to last date of admission B.B.A. course in the colleges be allowed admission as per merit and other conditions for admission to B.B.A. Course.</p>	<p>3.1 The admission to the 1<sup>st</sup> year of the course shall be open to a person who has passed:-</p> <p>(i) to (iii) No change</p> <p><b>NOTE: 5% weightage be given to those students who have studied Commerce, Economics and Mathematics at 10+2 level.</b></p>

**ITEM 5**

That Regulation 9 for Bachelor of Business Administration (B.B.A.) course at page 333 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2011-12), be amended, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>9. The medium of instruction shall be English.</p>	<p>9. <b><u>The medium of instruction for B.B.A. course shall be English/Hindi/ Punjabi.</u></b></p>

**ITEM 6**

That the nomenclature of M.Phil. degree in Gandhian Studies be changed to **M.Phil. in Gandhian and Peace Studies**, as under, at page 184 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2013-14), and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT NOMENCLATURE</b>	<b>PROPOSED NOMENCLATURE</b>
M.Phil. degree in Gandhian Studies	<b><u>M.Phil. in Gandhian and Peace Studies</u></b>

#### **ITEM 7**

That addition to Regulation 3.1 for Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) at page 332 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2013-14), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>3.1 The admission to the 1<sup>st</sup> year of the course shall be open to a person who has passed:-</p> <p>(i) 10+2 examination from a recognized Board/ University with at least 50% marks.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>(ii) Any other examination with 50% marks recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent to (i).</p> <p>(iii) The students who are placed under Compartment at +2 examinations in the annual examination and cleared the Compartment examination up to last date of admission B.B.A. course in the colleges be allowed admission as per merit and other conditions for admission to B.B.A. course.</p> <p><b>NOTE: <u>5% weightage be given to those students who have studied Commerce, Economics and Mathematics at 10+2 level.</u></b></p>	<p>3.1 The admission to the 1<sup>st</sup> year of the course shall be open to a person who has passed:-</p> <p>(i) to (iii) No change</p> <p><b>NOTE: 5 percent weightage shall be given to the students who have passed qualifying examination with at least three commerce subjects e.g. Accounting, Economics, Mathematics, Business Studies, Theory of Commerce, Business Organization, Business Management, Banking and Trade, Commercial Geography, Office Management, Auditing, Computer Applications, and Information Technology.</b></p>



**ITEM 8**

That M.Sc. in Environment Science and M.Sc. in Environment & Solid Waste Management courses be merged and the nomenclature of course be **M.Sc. in Environment Science** (effective from the session 2010-11) and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/ publication in the Government of India Gazette.

- NOTE:** 1. Earlier too the Regulations Committee in its meeting held on 7.5.2012 and 28.6.2012 has considered the merger of M.Sc. in Environment Science and M.Sc. in Environment & Solid Waste Management into Master's degree Programme in Environment Science and it was resolved that the item be referred back to the Dean, Faculty of Science with the following observations:

“nomenclature of the course should be ‘Master's in Environment Science’ OR ‘M.Sc. in Environment Science’. As such, the nomenclature of the course should be relooked into”.

2. The Dean, Faculty of Science and Chairperson, Deptt. of Environment Studies has written that the exact nomenclature of the course is **“M.Sc. in Environment Science”**.

**ITEM 9**

That Regulation 11.9 at page 120 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007, be amended, as under and given effect to from the Senate decision i.e. the date when it is **finally** approved by the Senate in anticipation of approval of Government of India/ publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
11.9 If any employee overstays his leave or is otherwise absent from duty for more than a week, his post shall be liable to be declared vacant and he shall forfeit his salary during the time he so remained absent.	11.9 If any employee overstays his leave or is otherwise absent from duty for more than a week, his post shall be liable to be declared vacant and he shall forfeit his salary during the time he so remained absent <b><u>and further action would be taken against him under Part VI, P.U. Calendar Volume III, 2009 regarding Dismissal, Removal and Suspension of University employees.</u></b>

**ITEM 10**

That Regulation 1.2 for LL.M. (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), be amended, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
1.2 Odd number semester examination shall be held in November/December and Even number semester examinations shall be held in April/May each year or on such other dates as may be notified by the Controller of Examinations.	1.2 Odd number semester examination shall be held in November/December and Even number semester examinations shall be held in April/May each year or on such other dates as may be notified by the Controller of Examinations. <b><u>However, the reappear examinations of 1<sup>st</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> semesters shall be held in both April/May and November/December.</u></b>

**ITEM 11**

That addition in Regulation 4.1 Proviso (i) at page 41 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2012-13), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>4.1 (i) to (iii) xxx      xxx      xxx</p> <p>Provided that-</p> <p>(i)    to (ii) xxx            xxx    xxx</p> <p>Provided further that a student shall be eligible to offer the subject of</p> <p>(i) Computer Science at the B.A./B.Sc. level if he has passed the +2 examination with Science/ Commerce/ Economics/ Mathematics as his subject/s.</p> <p>(ii) xxx      xxx      xxx</p>	<p>4.1 No Change</p> <p>Provided that:-</p> <p>(i)    to (ii) No change</p> <p>Provided further that a student shall be eligible to offer the subject:-</p> <p>(i) Computer Science at the B.A./B.Sc. level, if he/she has passed +2 examination with Science/Commerce/Economics/ Mathematics and <b><u>Computer related subjects like Computer Science/ Information Technology, etc. as one of the Elective subjects or optional subject.</u></b></p> <p>(ii) No Change</p>

**ITEM 12**

That Regulation 1.2 for Masters in Remote Sensing & Geographic Information Systems (effective from the session 2011-12), be amended, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>1.2 The eligibility for admission to the course shall be as follows:</p> <p>(a) M.A./M.Sc. in Geography of the Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate, with at least 50 per cent of aggregate marks; and</p> <p>(b) Three months computer course.</p>	<p>1.2 The eligibility for admission to the course shall be as follows:</p> <p>(a) <b><u>B.A./B.Sc. with Geography</u></b> of the Panjab University or any other University recognized by the Syndicate, with at least 50 per cent of aggregate marks; and</p> <p>(b) Three months computer course.</p>

**NOTE:** Present Regulations are yet to be approved by the Govt. of India.

**ITEM 14**

That addition of Regulation 10 for Bachelor of Clinical Optometry (B.Optom.), B.Sc. (MLT), B.Sc. Medical Technology (X-Ray) and B.Sc. Medical Technology (Anesthesia & Operation Theatre Techniques) (effective from the admission of 2011), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

“10. The candidate shall be allowed to clear the Compartment only in two consecutive chances.

The maximum number of Compartments permitted should be only in two subjects. If a candidate has Compartment in more than two subjects he/she shall be treated as “fail”.

**ITEM 15**

That addition of Regulation 16.1 at page 94 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2011-12) regarding introduction of Open Credit System in M.A. (Journalism and Mass Communication), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette:

16.1. The Open Credit System in M.A. (Journalism and Mass Communication) (effective from the session 2011-12). The end semester results shall be computed on the basis of SGPA and CGPA. A CGPA of 6 and SGPA of 5

are required to continue in the Programme. After evaluation, each student be assigned an alphabetic grade defined in terms of Grade Points (GP) on a scale or 0 to 10 in each paper as per table given below:

Grade	Grade Points (GP)	Description
A(+)	10	Outstanding
A	9	Excellent
B(+)	8	Very good
B	7	Good
C(+)	6	Average
C	5	Below Average
D	4	Marginal
E	2	Poor
F	0	Very Poor
I	-	Incomplete
NP	-	Audit Pass
NF	-	Audit Fail
W	-	Withdrawal
X	-	Unsatisfactory (for Zero credit courses)
S	-	Satisfactory Completion (for zero credit courses)
Z	-	Courses Continuation

E and F grades be not counted in the calculation of CGPA, however, these be counted in the calculation of SGPA.

#### ITEM 16

That Regulation 6 for Bachelor of Ayurvedic Medicine & Surgery (B.A.M.S.) at page 469 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 (effective from the admissions of 2011), be amended, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p><b>6. Compulsory Internship*</b></p> <p>(a) The compulsory rotating Internship shall be completed in a recognized or Govt. Teaching Ayurvedic Hospital/ Government Ayurvedic Hospital/Dispensary in the State of Punjab or Union Territory of Chandigarh for a period of <b>12 months after passing the final examination.</b></p>	<p><b>6. Compulsory Internship*</b></p> <p>(a)(i) The compulsory rotating Internship shall be completed in a recognized or Govt. Teaching Ayurvedic Hospital/ Government Hospital/ Dispensary in the State of Punjab or Union Territory of Chandigarh for a period <b><u>of 9 months for clinical training.</u></b></p> <p>(ii) <b><u>3 months Pharmacy training in Ayurvedic PHC/Community Health Centre/District Hospital and any Hospital/ Dispensaries recognized by the Director of Ayurvedic/</u></b></p>

<p>(b) On full completion of the Internship as certified by the Principal on the recommendations of the authorities under whom the training was done by the candidate shall be eligible for the award of Ayurvedacharya (Bachelor of Ayurvedic Medicine and Surgery) Degree.</p> <p><b>*Twelve months</b> internship shall start immediately after the completion of Final Professional examination. In case of failure, this period would not be counted towards the completion of twelve months internship required under the rules. For such students, the internship shall restart from the date they complete the course in the next examination. The distribution of duties during internship shall be strictly followed as laid down by the Central Council of Indian Medicine.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>University concerned in one or more Institutions.</u></b></p> <p>(b) No Change</p> <p>No Change</p>
--	--

#### **ITEM 17**

That addition in Regulation 1.1 (c) for Ph.D. in the Faculties of Arts, Languages, Education, Science and Design & Fine Arts at page 187 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2012-13), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

<b>PRESENT REGULATION</b>	<b>PROPOSED REGULATION</b>
<p>1.1 (a) A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Arts, Languages, Education, Science and Design &amp; Fine Arts Faculties should have obtained from the University the Master's degree ordinarily in the first or second class.</p> <p>Provided that- 1 to 4</p> <p>(b) A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Women Studies should have obtained from the University the Master's degree in the first and second class in any Faculty.</p>	<p>1.1 (a) No Change</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>(b) No change</p> <p>(c) <b><u>The student who is possessing degree of M.A. in Gandhian and Peace Studies, is eligible for enrolment for Ph.D. degree in the</u></b></p>



**ITEM 21**

That Regulation 3.1 (viii) for M.A. (Gandhian and Peace Studies) at pages 79-80 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2011-12), be amended; and addition of proposed amendment in Regulation 11.1 (g) at page 92 on account of introduction of Semester System (effective from the session 2009-10), be made, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

**(A) Amendment in Regulation 3.1 (viii) at page 79-80**

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p><b>3.1 (viii) For Gandhian and Peace Studies:</b></p> <p>A candidate who has passed B.A./B.Com. obtaining 45% marks in any of the following subjects:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. History</li> <li>2. Political Science</li> <li>3. Economics</li> <li>4. Philosophy</li> <li>5. Psychology</li> <li>6. Public Administration</li> <li>7. Geography</li> <li>8. Sociology</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Diploma or Postgraduate Diploma in Gandhian Studies or M.A. examination in any of the above subjects or B.A./B.Sc./B.Com. in second class shall be eligible.</p>	<p><b>3.1(viii) For Gandhian and Peace Studies:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>A graduate in any stream having 50% marks be allowed to take admission in M.A. 1<sup>st</sup> Semester in Gandhian and Peace Studies. However, a candidate having B.A. degree in any of the following subjects with 45% marks is also eligible for admission:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gandhian Studies</li> <li>2. Economics</li> <li>3. Political Science</li> <li>4. History</li> <li>5. Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology</li> <li>6. Sociology</li> <li>7. Geography</li> <li>8. Women Studies</li> <li>9. Human Rights</li> <li>10. Philosophy</li> <li>11. Psychology</li> <li>12. Defence Studies</li> <li>13. Social Work</li> <li>14. Public Administration</li> <li>15. Police Administration</li> </ol>
<b>(B) Addition in Regulation 11.1 (g) at page 92</b>	
<p>11.1 A person who has passed one of the following examinations from the Panjab University or an examination recognized by the Syndicate as equivalent thereto, shall be eligible to join the M.A. degree course, other than in Physical Education:-</p> <p>(a) to (f) xxx      xxx      xxx</p>	<p>11.1 No Change</p> <p>(a) to (f) No Change</p> <p><b>(g) For Gandhian and Peace Studies:</b></p> <p>A graduate in any stream having 50% marks be allowed to take admission in</p>

	<p>M.A. 1<sup>st</sup> Semester in Gandhian and Peace Studies. However, a candidate having B.A. degree in any of the following subjects with 45% marks is also eligible for admission:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gandhian Studies</li> <li>2. Economics</li> <li>3. Political Science</li> <li>4. History</li> <li>5. Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology</li> <li>6. Sociology</li> <li>7. Geography</li> <li>8. Women Studies</li> <li>9. Human Rights</li> <li>10. Philosophy</li> <li>11. Psychology</li> <li>12. Defence Studies</li> <li>13. Social Work</li> <li>14. Public Administration</li> <li>15. Police Administration</li> </ol>
--	---

**ITEM 23**

That Regulation 12 appearing at page 93 for Master of Arts/Science examination (Semester System) (Revised) of Panjab University Calendar, Volume II, 2007 (effective from the session 2012-13), be added, as under and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

12. A candidate who is placed under Compartment in one subject in B.A. third year examination of this University shall be allowed to join M.A. (Semester System) class provisionally if he/she fulfils other requirements, and provided -
  - (i) the subject in which he has to re-appear is not offered for the M.A. First Year examination; and
  - (ii) if he/she fails to clear the Compartment subject of the B.A. third year examination in the next two consecutive chances immediately following the examination in which he/she was placed under Compartment, his/her provisional admission to M.A. First Year class as also his/her result of M.A. First Year (First and Second Semesters) examination shall be cancelled.

**ITEM 24**

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Chemical Analysis of Food (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation

of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 25**

That the Regulations for M.F.C. (Semester System) in place of Annual System (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 26**

That Regulations for M.Com. (Semester System) (through University School of Open Learning) (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 27**

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Child Guidance and Family Counselling (effective from the admissions of 2010), be approved, **as per Appendix** and in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**ITEM 28**

That Regulations for M.A. (Community Education and Development) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 31**

That Regulations for M.Com. (Business Innovations) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/ Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 32**

That Regulations 3 and 9 for B.Sc. (Tourism Management) (effective from the session 2010-11); and B.Sc. (Hospitality and Hotel Administration) (effective from the session 2011-12), be amended, **as per Appendix 'A' & 'B' respectively** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**NOTE:** The pages of the Calendar have not been mentioned in the item as the Regulations for the above said courses have been sent to the Govt. of India for its approval.

**ITEM 35**

That Regulations for Special Advanced Diploma in Fine Arts for Deaf, Dumb and Mentally Challenged Persons (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/ publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 36**

That Regulation 2.1 for B.P.Ed. (One-Year Course) (Semester System) and M.P.Ed. (Two-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix 'A' and 'B'** respectively, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 37**

That Regulations for M.A. (Education) Semester System (effective from the session 2009-10), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 38**

That Regulations for M.Ed. (General), M.Ed. (Guidance and Counselling) and M.Ed. (Educational Technology) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2010-11), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 39**

That Regulations for Postgraduate Diploma in Computer Education (Teacher Education) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 40**

That Regulations for B.Ed. (Special Education with Specialization in Learning Disability) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendix** and in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**ITEM 41**

That Regulations for the following Diploma courses in Hotel Management (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, **as per Appendices** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

1. Diploma in Food Production (DFP)

2. Diploma in Bakery and Confectionary (DBC)
3. Diploma in Food and Beverages (DFB).

#### **ITEM 42**

That Regulations for M.Sc. Microbial Biotechnology (2-Year Course) (Semester System) (effective from the session 2008-09), be approved, **as per Appendix**, and amendment in the eligibility conditions (effective from the session 2009-10), and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

#### **ITEM 43**

That addition of specialization in the title of B.Sc. Home Science and Regulation 11.3 (effective from the admissions of 2009) at page 57 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007, be approved, **as per Appendix**, and given effect to in anticipation of approval of various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

#### **ITEM 44**

That Regulations for 5-Year Integrated B.Sc./M.Sc. in Fashion and Lifestyle Technology course (effective from the session 2008-09), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

#### **ITEM 45**

That (i) Regulation 1 (effective from the session 2009-10) and (ii) Regulations 2, 8 and 9 and addition of Regulation 11 (effective from the academic session 2010-11), for Five Year Integrated Programme in Economics, be amended/made, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

#### **ITEM 46**

That Regulations for M.Com. (Hons.) Course introduced from the academic session 2011-2012 in place of M.Com. (E-Commerce), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

#### **ITEM 47**

That Regulations for the following courses (effective from the session 2011-12), be approved, as **per Appendices** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette:

1. M.B.A. (Retail Management)
2. M.B.A. (Banking & Insurance Management)
3. M.B.A. (Information Technology and Telecommunication Management)
4. M.B.A. (Infrastructural Management)
5. M.B.A. (Pharmaceutical Management)

## 6. M.B.A. (Hospital Management)

**ITEM 48**

That Regulations for M.Pharmacy (Credit Based Semester System) course (effective from the session 2010-11), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**ITEM 49**

That Regulations for B. Pharmacy (Credit Based Semester System) course (effective from the session 2010-11), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**ITEM 50**

That Regulations for M.Pharmacy (Semester System) course (effective from the session 2009-10), be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Government of India/publication in the Government of India Gazette.

**ITEM 51**

That Regulations for (i) Master of Science in Fashion Designing & Management (MFDM) and (ii) Master of Science in Cosmetology & Health Care and addition of these nomenclature along with eligibility conditions at page 104-106 of Panjab University Calendar Volume II, 2007, be approved, **as per Appendix** and given effect to in anticipation of approval of the various University bodies/Govt. of India/publication in the Govt. of India Gazette.

**Referring to Sub-Item 9**, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that similar provision of Punjab Agriculture University (PAU), Ludhiana was stuck-down by the court on the ground that if a person is absent for a week, he/she could not be automatically treated as dismissed. In fact, he/she has to be served a notice. This has been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Jai Shankar V/s State of Rajasthan. They should make the amendment in the Regulation in accordance with the judgement of the full bench in the cases of P.A.U. V/s Roop Singh Roopa and Jai Shankar V/s State of Rajasthan.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the proposed amendment is self-explanatory as it had already been mentioned that if any employee overstays his leave or is otherwise absent from duty for more than a week, his post shall be liable to be declared vacant and he shall forfeit his salary during the time he so remained absent **and further action would be taken against him under Part VI, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 regarding Dismissal, Removal and Suspension of University employees.**

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that PAU had also adopted the same regulation, but they left it later on, on the direction of full

bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Jai Shankar V/s State of Rajasthan.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the existing regulation is "if any employee overstays his leave or is otherwise absent from duty for more than a week, his post shall be liable to be declared vacant and he shall forfeit his salary during the time he so remained absent". "Liable to be declared vacant" and "declared vacant" are two different things. According to him, this regulation meant that whosoever overstays his leave for more than a week, his services goes automatically. But how that liability is to be taken care of, had been covered under the proposed regulation. It is not only in the case of PAU Vs Roop Singh Roopa but there are thousands and thousands judgements on the issue, wherein it is clearly mentioned that without giving proper opportunity as per law, they cannot punish anybody, especially where major punishment is to be awarded. There are regulations which also say that if any employee overstays his leave or is otherwise absent from duty for more than a week, his post shall be liable to be declared vacant and **he shall forfeit his salary during the time he so remained absent.** But to initiate disciplinary action against the employee concerned, it has to be added in the proposed regulation in terms of Rules contained in Chapter IV (vii) (Part-VI), P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, that if somebody overstays his/her leave, keeping in view the circumstances explained by him/her, they could take a decision whether the post is to be declared vacant or he/she can be given any lesser punishment.

**Referring to Sub-Item 11**, Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that earlier a student who had studied arts subjects at +2 level was eligible to take Computer Science as an elective subject at B.A./B.Sc. level, which did not exist in the proposed Regulation. He added that in the Senate also, they had approved anybody having studied arts subjects would be eligible for taking computer science as an elective subject. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to verify this.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Principal Gurdip Sharma would be verified and if need be, they would go back.**

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that according to the present Regulation, only that student is eligible who has passed +2 examination with Science/Commerce/ Economics/Mathematics as his subject/s. But they had come here with the proposed regulation that a student shall be eligible to offer the subject of Computer Science at the B.A./B.Sc. level, if he/she has passed +2 examination with Science/Commerce/Economics/Mathematics and Computer related subjects like Computer Science/Information Technology, etc. as one of the elective subjects or optional subject. Of course, the proposed regulation is effective from 2012-13 and they had already implemented the same from the academic session 2012-13, the session which had already expired and the examinations had also been conducted. Now, they are in the next session. Principal Gurdip Sharma had said that they had been allowing those students to take Computer Science subject, who had studied arts subjects at the +2 level in spite of the fact that the present regulation allows the admission to only those students, who had studied Science/Commerce/Economics/Mathematics and Computer related subjects. How the Colleges had allowed the students, who had studied Arts subjects, e.g. History, Political Science, etc., to take Computer Science subject?

Principal Gurdip Sharma reiterated that the Senate had already allowed the students with arts subjects to take Computer Science subject at the B.A./B.Sc. level.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if the Colleges had allowed the arts students to take Computer Science subject, it is in violation of the present regulation. He wondered how the University had been accepting the returns of the students and conducting their examinations. Either the regulation is correct or whatever Principal Gurdip Sharma had said is correct, but both the things could not be correct. If they had not allowed earlier, they could allow them now, but whatever could be done would be effective from the prospective date.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they should explore this possibility and allow the students, who had studied Arts subjects at +2 level, to take Computer Science subject at the B.A./B.Sc. level.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that amendment in Regulation was proposed by one-two members of the Senate, which was considered by the Regulations Committee. However, there did not exist any provision under which any student having studied Arts subjects could take Computer Science as one of the elective subjects at B.A./B.Sc. level.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that on one side they were going to follow open credit system and on the other side, they were not allowing Arts students to take Computer Science subject.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if admissions are made by certain affiliated Colleges contrary to the Regulations, those admissions should not be approved, because it is bad on the part of the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they had many members in the Syndicate now from the affiliated Colleges, they might know whether they have been doing this or not. It might be just an apprehension. If they were doing so, they were violating the regulations and such things should be avoided in future. If need be, the regulations might be amended accordingly.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that since Computer Science subject is being taught at the secondary level, there is no student who did not know computer.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, ironically, the students, who had studied the subject of Computer Science or Information Technology at +2 level, were not earlier eligible to take Computer Science as an elective subject at B.A./B.Sc. level. Amendment was suggestions only to cover those students, who, in fact, were most eligible to take the subject of Computer Science.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that they are approving amendment in the Regulations from 2009-10 onwards, i.e., four years later, which might create problem for them in future. He suggested that amendment in Regulations should be taken seriously and sent to the Government of India for approval immediately after approval by the University bodies.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath clarified that decisions regarding amendment of Regulations were taken by the Syndicate and Senate and thereafter the same are placed before the Regulations Committee for giving regulatory wording.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that the Regulations Committee should meet more frequently so that there is no delay in processing the amendments in Regulations.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that, in fact, this year the Regulations Committee met twice in a couple of months and cleared so many items pertaining to amendment of regulations.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the Regulations Committee should meet as much frequently as possible.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would check as to what is the backlog of Regulations Committee and thereafter, they would make a plea to the Regulations Committee to clear the entire backlog.

**Referring to Sub-Item 21**, Shri Jagpal Singh stated that as per proposed Regulation, a graduate in any stream having 50% marks had been allowed to take admission in M.A. (Gandhian and Peace Studies) provided he/she had studied any of the following subjects at B.A. level:

Gandhian Studies, Economics, Political Science, History, Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, Sociology, Geography, Women Studies, Human Rights, Philosophy, Psychology, Defence Studies, Social Work, Public Administration and Police Administration.

There are several students who had done M.A. in Gandhian and Peace Studies and had also done M.Phil., Ph.D. and had also cleared UGC-NET, did not get placement anywhere. He, therefore, pleaded that all such students should be made eligible for the post of Assistant Professor in the subject of History.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not a part of today's agenda. Shri Jagpal Singh should put up a note to him in this regard, so that the same could be examined.

**RESOLVED:** That the above recommendations of the Regulations Committee dated 9.10.2013 (**Appendix-VI**), be approved.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 2.8.2013 regarding appointment of Guest Faculty/Part-time Teacher**

**12.** Considered if the following recommendations of the Committee dated 2.8.2013 (**Appendix-VII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the system of appointment of Guest Faculty/Part-time teacher against vacant post/s and to streamline their payment process, be approved in anticipation of the approval of the Board of Finance:

“That the Departments may be allowed to appoint up to three guest faculty/part-time teachers concurrently against one vacant post subject to the following conditions:

- (a) That the total emoluments to be paid to guest faculty/part-time teachers shall remain within the

budget provision of the concerned vacant sanctioned post i.e. pay including GP and DA as admissible from time to time.

- (b) The total emoluments paid to individual guest faculty/part-time teacher appointed against such vacant post shall not exceed the maximum permissible amount of Rs.25,000/- per month.

The Establishment Section (Teaching) shall get the approval of appointment of Guest faculty/part-time teacher keeping in view the above arrangement.

That the above recommendations be given effect from the academic session 2013-14.”

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that this provision of recruitment of Guest Faculty should also be extended to the affiliated Colleges and direction in this regard may be issued to the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would extend this provision of Guest Faculty to the affiliated Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired is this Committee meant only for the University? Secondly, what is the background of this?

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever he understood, there was concern that against a post only one person as Guest Faculty was appointed. This issue is yet to be resolved in the case of affiliated Colleges, for which a Committee comprising members from the University as well as affiliated Colleges could be formed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it looked very odd when people demanded that it should be extended to the affiliated Colleges also. Whenever any such Committee is constituted, it should comprise of members from the University as well as affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Shri Ashok Goyal is well taken and would be taken care of, in future.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the workload for Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor is 12, 14 and 16 hours per week, respectively.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pleaded that the total emoluments of all the three persons appointed as Guest Faculty against a post should be Rs.25000/- per month each.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that if the workload is less, could they appoint three persons as Guest Faculty against a post. According to him, the appointment of number of persons as Guest Faculty is linked with the workload.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the integrated expenditure on the salary of Guest Faculty against a vacant post should not increase beyond Rs.75,000/- p.m. as the salary of the Associate Professor or Professor is near about Rs.75,000/- p.m. or above. He, however,

added that the appointments of Guest Faculty are made as per the requirement of the University.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that, in fact, the audit had raised an objection and observed that only one person could be appointed as Guest Faculty against one post.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are just making it a little bit liberal so that the needs of the University are met without unduly much expenditure.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that the total emoluments should not exceed the salary of the person against which the person/s as Guest Faculty is/are appointed.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that almost all the vacant posts in the University are of Professors, which could not be filled for the last so many years. The salary of a Professor is around Rs.1 lac and even if three persons as Guest Faculty are appointed against a post of Professor at an emolument of Rs.25,000/- p.m. each, they would still save some money. He remarked that the teaching workload in several departments had increased due to number of specialized options.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, as per the recommendations of the Committee, one person as Guest Faculty could be appointed against one post. But in view of the specializations and options, three persons as Guest Faculty at maximum emolument of Rs.25,000/- p.m. together, i.e., at a salary between Rs.6,000/- p.m. and Rs.8,000/- p.m. each on lecture basis, could be appointed against a vacant post; otherwise, there would be audit objections. The Audit had observed that they could not appoint more than one person as Guest Faculty against one vacant post. If they followed the Audit, their requirement would not be fulfilled. Therefore, they should meet their requirement of teaching workload of a post within the amount of Rs.25,000/- p.m.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that it could only be done if the options are deleted or course/s is closed down and if that is done, the students would agitate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar remarked that the University had designed its own system for advertising the vacant post while appointing Guest Faculty.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the requirement of Guest Faculty is assessed by the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department concerned.

It was said that if the affiliated Colleges are allowed to appoint teachers as Guest Faculty against the vacant posts, the Colleges would never appoint teachers on regular basis on one pretext or the other.

To this, Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as per provisions of UGC, the Guest Faculty could not be more than 10% of the total teaching positions.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that let this item be dealt with for appointment of Guest Faculty in the University alone and should not be clubbed with the affiliated Colleges. For appointing Guest Faculty in the affiliated Colleges against sanctioned posts, a concrete proposal in view of the UGC Regulations should be brought to the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let this item be approved. If they wish to extend this facility to the affiliated Colleges, a reasonable proposal should be mooted so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the following recommendations of the Committee dated 2.8.2013 (**Appendix-VII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review the system of appointment of Guest Faculty/Part-time teacher against vacant post/s and to streamline their payment process, be approved, in anticipation of the approval of the Board of Finance:

“That the Departments may be allowed to appoint up to three guest faculty/part-time teachers concurrently against one vacant post subject to the following conditions:

- (a) That the total emoluments to be paid to guest faculty/part-time teachers shall remain within the budget provision of the concerned vacant sanctioned post i.e. pay including GP and DA as admissible from time to time.
- (b) The total emoluments paid to individual guest faculty/part-time teacher appointed against such vacant post shall not exceed the maximum permissible amount of Rs.25,000/- per month.

The Establishment Section (Teaching) shall get the approval of appointment of Guest faculty/part-time teacher keeping in view the above arrangement.

That the above recommendations be given effect from the academic session 2013-14.”

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That a Committee comprising Principals B.C. Josan, Gurdip Sharma & Puneet Bedi, Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Dinesh Talwar be constituted to evolve a concrete proposal, for appointing teachers as Guest Faculty in the affiliated Colleges against the vacant sanctioned posts, for placing the same before the Syndicate.

### **Pro forma and norms for recognition of Research Centres**

**13.** Considered minutes dated 18.9.2013 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the requirements (as pointed out by the members during the Syndicate dated 27.1.2013 (Para 35)), and to review the *pro forma* and lay down norms for the recognition of Research Centres.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that as far as Recognition of Research Centre in the affiliated Colleges is concerned, lot of Committees had been constituted during the last two years. They all had looked into

this particular programme. Still, if they look at recommendation 6 (i) of the Committee (Page 49 of the Appendix), they would find that the teachers of the affiliated Colleges had been recommended to be allowed to “supervise maximum of two candidates up to July 2017. During this period, all such Supervisors would have to publish two research papers independently or a book other than textbook or edited book. Those who fail to meet the afore-said requirement by July 2017, would be ineligible for enrolling more students”. However, there is no such condition in the University/U.G.C. Regulations. The University teacher could guide 8 Ph.D. students straightaway but the College teachers could supervise the Ph.D. students after attaining five-year experience of teaching postgraduate classes. How the College teachers enhance their abilities academically with respect to his area of specialization and add new dimensions to his knowledge while imparting education to the students? Moreover, nowadays a lot of subsidy is being given to the College teachers by the Dean, College Development Council for attending, participating and presenting papers in the Seminars/Conferences at national and international levels, but no weightage is being given to them. This particular condition that if the teacher concerned is having five years experience of teaching at postgraduate level for guiding Ph.D. students, that too two students, is not in good taste, especially for the academic enhancement of the teachers. The ranking of Panjab University is higher than other Universities. If the College teachers are also allowed enhancement both in academics and research, the ranking of the University would be further enhanced.

Continuing, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that the University is not still clear about over and above one seat allocated to the teachers for guiding College teachers towards Ph.D. In one of the cases put up by the office, the Dean Research had remarked that the College teachers are exempted from entrance test only. They will, however, have to compete in the merit list prepared of all eligible candidates for admission to Ph.D. programme. The University had already issued a Circular on 28.2.2013 conveying the decision of the Syndicate dated 15.12.2012 (Para 5) and Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para LII) stating *inter alia* that (i) the approved permanent (regular for Government Colleges) teachers of the Panjab University and Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University with two years experience be exempted from Entrance Test/s for admission to enrolment for Ph.D.; and (ii) one seat, over and above the prescribed limit of 8 (eight) Ph.D. students to be supervised by a faculty member, be reserved in each University teaching department/approved Research Centre for regular teachers of Colleges affiliated to Panjab University/UGC Rajiv Gandhi National Fellow for pursuing Ph.D. degree. He further stated that it has been mentioned in the recommendation of the Committee (page 50 of the Appendix) that the College should purchase fresh books worth Rs.20,000/- and books worth Rs.10,000/- every year in the subject concerned. He enquired what the definition of fresh books is. It has been further recommended that vide number 7 (Page 51 of the Appendix) that from the session 2013-14, M. Phil. course be allowed to be started in the Postgraduate affiliated Colleges in the subjects in which they are/shall be recognized as approved Research Centres by the Panjab University. The modalities for implementation of this decision would be the same as are for Ph.D. programme. Though several Colleges had been inspected for the purpose of Recognition of Research Centres, no letter had been issued to them so far.

On a point of order, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that though his College (Gobind National College, Narangwal, Ludhiana) had been recognized as a Research Centre for Ph.D. in the subject of Physical Education two-year back, the inspection for allowing M.Phil. course had not been done by the University so far.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these issues are all arising out of discussion. He urged the members to first focus on the agenda items and such things could be taken up later on.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that though he was a member of this Committee, he could not attend one of the meetings of the Committee. Consensus could not be arrived at a meeting which was attended by him. In fact, consensus could not be reached because the viewpoints of 2-3 members were different. That was why he did not attend the second meeting of the Committee under protest. He pleaded that the conditions for supervising Ph.D. candidates should be same both for the University teachers as well as teachers of the affiliated Colleges. A teacher who joined Panjab University as Assistant Professor could guide 8 students towards Ph.D. degree after a period of one year whereas the College teachers could not as they have to gain five years experience of teaching at postgraduate level. The sword always kept hanging on them. He enquired whether the condition of experience of five years at postgraduate level was also applicable in the case of University teachers. If not, the condition which is applicable in the case of University teachers should be made applicable in the case of College teachers also. According to him, there is ample number of College teachers who are capable of guiding Ph.D. students, but due to bureaucratic and autocratic attitude of some persons, they were not able to do so. This issue is hanging on for the last ten years. He had moved a Resolution in this regard in the year 2003. He failed to understand as to why the Resolution had not been implemented in spite of it being approved by the Syndicate and Senate. Restrictions should not be imposed on the College teachers alone. Referring to recommendation (6)(i) and (6)(iv) at pages 49 and 50 of the appendix, he stated that these recommendations are contradictory to one and other. In fact, the experience desired under recommendation (6)(i) should have been that the College teachers, who are Ph.D. and have two years experience (instead of five years) of teaching postgraduate classes, are eligible to guide as many as Ph.D. students as the University teachers could. All those facilities should be given to the College teachers which are given to the University teachers because they also wanted to contribute at the same level. In this way, the College teachers would be able to secure 400 points needed for their promotion.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that all those facilities which are available to the University teachers should be extended to the College teachers. He drew the attention of the House towards column 12 of the *Pro forma* (page 54 of the appendix) wherein it has been mentioned "whether Ph.D. degrees have been awarded during the last 10 years". What is the meaning of this column? Referring to the item, he said that the item has been framed wrongly as according to him, the Committee had recommended the *Pro forma* for Recognition of Research Centres and had not laid down any norms for the Recognition of Research Centres.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, referring to the statement of Dr. Dinesh Talwar, stated that, in fact, this was the recommendation of the Department at that time. Now, the U.G.C. had permitted the College teachers to supervise Ph.D. candidates and the condition is that he/she should be Ph.D. himself/herself. If the teacher concerned produced Ph.Ds., his/her kitty would increase. In nutshell, he said that they needed to change their attitude towards the teachers of the Regional Centres and of the affiliated Colleges, and after proper evaluation make maximum facilities available to them so that they could keep their standard high.

Principal Puneet Bedi stated that, as far as experience at post graduation level for College teachers is concerned, the syllabi of the University as well as the Colleges are the same. The College teachers are teaching and evaluating the students on the same pattern as the University teachers are. She further stated that if they see the Colleges of the Delhi University, they would find that the Colleges enjoyed the same respect. If they allowed College teachers to supervise Ph.D. students, it would add to the total number of the Ph.D. students produced by the University and would add to the value of the University in research. It would also add more variety to the research, particularly keeping in view the fact that the University teachers are already over-burdened with guidance of Ph.D. candidates and could not cope up with the entire requirement. There is no harm in sharing the Ph.D. candidates.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that they were 100% sure that the College teachers should share the load of research guidance with the University teachers. Referring to the viewpoint expressed by Principal Puneet Bedi that the Colleges of Delhi University enjoyed the same status which the University enjoyed, Professor S.K. Sharma stated that the Delhi University had Colleges like St. Stephen's College and Panjab University should also have such Colleges and there is no reason as to why they could not have such Colleges. The item under consideration is relating to *pro forma* and they are 100% sure that the Colleges should come up for research. There are good and innovative teachers in the Colleges/Regional Centre, who had the ability to do research. It would be better if patent is also included in the *pro forma* at Sr. No.6. Similarly, at Sr. No.7, the number of M.Sc., M.Phil. and Ph.D. dissertations/theses guided by the faculty should be mentioned. They should ask them if the M.Phil. students are admitted and if yes, they should be given preference. At Sr.No. 13, the number of Seminars, Workshops, Conferences, etc. attended by the faculty during the last five years should also be mentioned. In this way, they must encourage the College teachers to go and attend/present papers in the Seminars, Conferences, etc. because with this, their horizon would become better. This *pro forma* is very important because it gives them guidelines and the same should be taken as a positive step. Hence, they should add all those things which would make Colleges of Panjab University better.

Professor B.S. Bhoop said that it would be better if the affiliated Colleges take initiative in organizing Seminars, Conferences, etc.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, referring to recommendations 3 and 4, enquired that if two neighbouring Colleges found to have

requisite infrastructure for having research centre jointly, which of the two would be recognized as Research Centre. Earlier, an issue had come in the Senate that the pre-Ph.D. courses should be run at P.U. Regional Centres. He pleaded that the Regional Centres should be recognized as Research Centres only if they run postgraduate courses. Since certain Regional Centres of the University (P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, and P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni) did not have postgraduate classes, how they could be recognized as Research Centres or equated with teaching departments of the University. At P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, only MBA course is being offered at post graduation level, whereas the district of Ludhiana needed subjects like Punjabi, History, Political Science, English, etc. Earlier, it was also said that the assistance pertaining to resource persons, etc. of neighbouring Colleges, if available, be sought for the smooth running of pre-Ph.D. courses. As assured earlier, the amount of remuneration @ Rs.1000/- per lecture to be made to the teachers for pre-Ph.D. course work and other expenditure incurred for the purposed should be met from the College Development Fund. In this way, the research would be promoted.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they should monitor the research being/to be carried out in the affiliated Colleges, the way the IITs are monitoring the new Engineering Institutions. This would improve the quality of research.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, the norms were already recommended by the earlier Committee which were discussed in the Syndicate meeting dated 27.1.2013 wherein certain apprehensions were expressed by him that if those Colleges have also applied for Research Centre, which do not have any regular faculty but claimed that they would call Guest Faculty for conducting the Pre-Ph.D. Course Work, but would the University do. To avoid that only, he had suggested that a small Committee be appointed to ensure that only those Colleges be allowed to be recognized as Research Centres which had sufficient regular faculty to teach undergraduate and postgraduate classes. If a College had appointed only five teachers against the requirement of ten teachers, would it be feasible to recognize it? In fact, under that impression, it was suggested that in case a College did not have the requisite/sufficient infrastructure for having a Research Centre, two or more Colleges could obtain the same jointly. There are certain Colleges where both the undergraduate and postgraduate classes were being taught only by engaging the Guest Faculty. The University had taken a conscious decision to see that the Colleges are encouraged to have Research Centres and did not have any feeling as if they are being discriminated, but at the same time, they must have requisite/sufficient teachers for the courses being offered by them including Pre-Ph.D. Course Work. In nutshell, he said that Research Centre should only be given if the College concerned had requisite/sufficient number of regular teachers.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that, why they always constitute the Committee under the Chairmanship of the Dean of the Faculty concerned, which comprises nominee of the Vice-Chancellor, Subject expert and a Principal of an affiliated College, for inspecting the College for the purpose of recognizing it as Research Centre. When such Committee/s has/have already ensured that the College had requisite faculty and infrastructure, he did not think any additional thing is required.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that Sr. No.5 of the *Pro forma* devised for Recognition of Research Centre for pursuing the research work leading to Ph.D. degree should be amended as “faculty strength required and faculty strength actually possessed by the College/Institute in the subject concerned”, which would at least give them an idea to evaluate whether the College/Institute to be recognized as Research Centre or not.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar suggested that the *Pro forma* should be approved and if there are some small loopholes, the same could be plugged later on. The Committees for inspecting the Colleges/Institutes for recognizing them as Research Centres are constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, comprising intellectuals, should verify the infrastructure as well as other requirements including teachers and make recommendations accordingly. He did not apprehend any problem in it, therefore, it should be approved and implemented immediately.

Principal Gurdip Sharma remarked that Shri Ashok Goyal had said that they should see the strength of the teachers of that subject only for which the College had applied for grant of Research Centre.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that many amendments have been proposed by the members and some of them were quite useful, which would be incorporated. The recommendations of the Committee, which amounted to policing, should be removed. Similarly, the conditions of running M.A./M.Sc. programme for at least 4 years for having Research Centre and five years experience for teaching postgraduate classes for becoming eligible to guide Ph.D. students should be removed. They should focus on obtaining data of those subjects for which the Research Centre is sought. If certain Colleges had some strength for guiding research, few weaknesses should not come in their ways. He was sure that the condition like purchase of books or journals in place of books, would not make a huge difference.

Professor Preeti Mahajan suggested that subscription about on-line journals, computer laboratory, internet facility and INFLIBNET should be imposed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that while forming a Committee he should see that since they had adequate number of Research Centres in the affiliated Colleges, he should appoint some members from those Colleges. He would like to compliment Professor Naval Kishore, who had worked hard, to put a proposal to the Punjab Government for creating the three P.U. Regional Centres in form of clusters. If it is successful, the University would be known, in addition to the University Campuses in Sectors 14 and 25, by its Campuses at Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur and Sri Muktsar Sahib also.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the Panjab University had been successfully running four Regional Centres (P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni and Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur), in addition to the P.U. Campus. Now, the Punjab Government had, in principle, decided to give five acres land to the Panjab University for P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib and asked the University to start the work of constructing the building.

**RESOLVED:** That the following Committee be constituted to make additions/deletions as suggested by the members in the recommendations of the Committee dated 18.2.2013 pertaining to *Pro forma* and norms for Recognition of Research Centres; and the Committee should make its recommendation preferably within a week:

1. Professor Karamjeet Singh
2. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
3. Dr. Dalip Kumar.

The Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of the above-said Committee, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**Resignation of Dr. Stellina Jolly, Assistant Professor in Law, UILS**

**14.** Considered if the resignation of Dr. Stellina Jolly, Assistant Professor in Law, University Institute of Legal Studies be accepted w.e.f. 21.7.2013 under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007 reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968 shall give at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: Long Leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-IX**).

**RESOLVED:** That the resignation of Dr. Stellina Jolly, Assistant Professor in Law, University Institute of Legal Studies, be accepted w.e.f. 21.7.2013, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**Letter F.No. DEB/QMC/2013 dated 23.8.2013 of the UGC, New Delhi, regarding Territorial jurisdiction of the Universities**

**15.** Considered that letter F.No. DEB/QMC/2013 dated 23.8.2013 (**Appendix-X**) received from Director Admn., UGC Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi regarding Territorial jurisdiction of the Universities and also offering of programmes through Off Campus/Study Centers etc., be adopted.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that certain Colleges got affiliation from the Panjab University when there was no requirement

of land, map, ground, etc. Thereafter, they opened Study Centres of other Universities, e.g., IGNOU, PTU, etc., in the same buildings. Such Colleges are offering several courses of other Universities and are making admissions. The University have to check and take care of all such activities of the Colleges in view of the UGC Regulations, Rules, Guidelines, etc., which are binding. They must take action against such Colleges in accordance with the UGC Regulations.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that the people are making private business through distance education amounting to about Rs.2,000/- crore. There are Study Centres in every State. Some of these Study Centres had put in banners stating that on the payment of Rs.10,000/- to Rs.20,000/-, they would get the degree awarded to the student concerned. Some of them even get the students admitted in certain private Colleges affiliated to Panjab University and these private Colleges are also making a lot of money. Resultantly, the admissions in other Colleges are going down. This is a serious issue and the same should be taken care of.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that there might be some bogus academies, through which the students took admissions in private Colleges.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that in the banners of such academies, it is written that they are recognized academies and are affiliated to Panjab University. He suggested that all the Colleges, where the Study Centres of other Universities are existing, should be identified and action should be taken.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that, in fact, the students took admissions in the private Colleges through such academies and actually studied in the academies only, which is blot on the Panjab University.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that it had been observed that in the areas of Abohar, Fazilka, Bathinda, several students from fake Universities are coming and taking admissions in the Colleges to higher classes. It is astonishing that the University is recognizing the degrees of those fake Universities. At least, 20 Study Centres of such Universities are operating in that region. The students just pay the fees, appear in the examinations on the internet and get degrees. Since the Panjab University is recognizing the degrees of those Universities, they had no alternative but to give admission to the students in higher classes.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the item before the Syndicate is to adopt the above-said letter of the UGC through which all the Universities have been requested not to conduct any programme by distance mode outside the jurisdiction of the University. In the other sense, they are already adopting this because neither they could go out of their jurisdiction nor could allow other Universities to enter in our jurisdiction and the rest of the things are ancillaries.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, of course, they would make the Principals of all the Colleges aware about these things. While doing that, in order to send the benefits of discussions or the suggestions, which had come, a letter would be written to the Principals of all the affiliated Colleges stating that they should not indulge in such practices, which the University wishes to discourage.

They should also write that if people volunteered to take action on their own; otherwise, the University would be compelled to take suitable action against the affiliated Colleges which are found to indulge in such practices. Secondly, it would also be uploaded on the Website of the University.

**RESOLVED:** That letter F.No. DEB/QMC/2013 dated 23.8.2013 (**Appendix-X**) received from Director Admn., UGC Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi regarding Territorial jurisdiction of the Universities and also offering of programmes through Off Campus/Study Centers etc., be adopted.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 26.9.2013 and 7.10.2013** of **16.** Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 26.9.2013 and 7.10.2013 (**Appendix-XI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review/examine the facilities being provided to the disabled candidates during Panjab University examination with the following changes or deletions in the existing rules and regulations:

Sr. No.	Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Deptt. of Disability Affairs	The existing position/recommendations of the Committee for providing facilities to the persons with disabilities
I	There should be a uniform and compressive policy across the country for persons with disabilities for written examination taking into account improvement in technology and new avenues opened to the persons with disabilities providing a level playing field. Policy should also have flexibility to accommodate the specific needs on case-to-case basis.	There should be a uniform and compressive policy across the country for persons with disabilities for written examination taking into account improvement in technology and new avenues opened to the persons with disabilities providing a level playing field. Policy should also have flexibility to accommodate the specific needs on case-to-case basis.
II	There is no need for fixing separate criteria for regular and competitive examinations.	Both types of examinations are being conducted with the same criteria.
III	The facility of Scribe/Reader/ Lab. Assistant should be allowed to any person who has disability of 40% or more if so desired by the person.	The facility of Scribe should be allowed to a person whose dominant hand, right and left, as the case may be, is not in the position to write. A person suffering from a disease such hemiplegic, other disabling paralysis deformity of Spine or other orthopaedic disorder, congenital heart disease or any other conditions due to which he is unable to perform the normal movement of body and who is blind. (Volume-II, 2007 Page-36 Point 8.1 Sub Point vii (a&b). <b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee recommended that already reasonable facilities/ relaxation has been granted on need basis. However, due care is being taken before allowing a scribe to the person with 40% disability.
IV	The candidate should have the discretion of opting for his own Scribe/Reader/Lab. assistant or request the Examination Body for the same. The examination body may	Provision is already going on smoothly. Candidates are free to opt their scribe as per their choice/discretion.

Sr. No.	Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Deptt. of Disability Affairs	The existing position/ recommendations of the Committee for providing facilities to the persons with disabilities
	also identify the Scribe/ Reader/Lab. Assistant to make panels at the District/ Division/State level as per the requirement of the examination. In such instances, the candidates should be allowed to meet the scribe a day before the examination so that the candidate gets the chance to check and verify whether the scribe is suitable or not.	<b>Recommendation:</b> Steps be taken to prepare a panel of scribe by the University.
V	Criteria like educational qualification, marks scored, age or other such restrictions for the Scribe/ Reader/ Lab. Assistant should not be fixed. Instead, the invigilation system should be strengthened, so that the candidates using Scribe/Reader/ Lab. Assistant do not indulge in malpractices like copying and cheating during the examination.	Under the rule of P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2009, Chapter XXX Page 381, there is already a provision to allow the person with disability to have his/her scribe shall be a lower grade of education but he/she must not have secured more than 50% marks.  <b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee has recommended to waive off the condition of 50% marks. This will facilitate the disabled person to find out the scribe easily.
VI	There should also be flexibility in accommodating any change in Scribe/Reader/ Lab. Assistant in case of emergency. The candidates should also be allowed to take more than one Scribe/ Reader for writing different papers especially for languages.	Rules and Regulations of Panjab University are silent in this regard.  <b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee recommended that the disabled person should be allowed more than one scribe for writing different papers especially in different languages.
VII	Persons with disabilities should be given the option of choosing the mode for taking the examinations i.e. in Braille or in the computer or in large print or even by recording the answers as the examining bodies can easily make use of technology to convert question-paper in large prints, e-text, or Braille and can also convert Braille text in English or regional languages.	This system is not prevailing in the University at present.  <b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee members felt that these facilities can only be incorporated, if University is able to set and evaluate papers in the said module.
VIII	The candidate should be allowed to check the computer system one day in advance so that the problems, if any in the software/system could be rectified.	<b>Recommendation:</b> The candidate should be allowed to check the computer system one day in advance so that the problems, if any in the software/system could be rectified.
IX	The procedure of availing the facility of scribe should be simplified and the necessary details should be recorded at the time of filling up of the forms. Thereafter, the examining body should ensure availability of question-papers in the format opted by the candidate as well as suitable seating arrangement for giving examination.	Already a very simple and effective procedure is being followed to provide scribe and seating arrangement at the Centre.  <b>Recommendation:</b> With regard to the format of the question paper opted by the candidate can only be considered, if University is able to adopt VII.

Sr. No.	Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Deptt. of Disability Affairs	The existing position/recommendations of the Committee for providing facilities to the persons with disabilities
X	The disability certificate issued by the competent medical authority at any place should be accepted across the country.	<p>As per P.U. Cal., Vol-III, 2009, Page 381, Point iv, sub Point 1 (iii). The candidate shall produce a certificate from a Professor of the specialist concerned of a Medical College, and where there is no Medical College from the Chief Medical Officer of the District concerned, to the effect that the candidate is unable to write his answer-books because of the temporary disablement.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee felt that the present procedure of Medical Certificate is satisfactory but in case of issuance of Medical certificate by a private practitioner/private clinic, as many candidates from the rural areas approach the University at the eleventh hour with the plea that he/she does not have any Medical College or CMO of the District near to their residence. If this certificate is accepted then the verification of the CMO, P.U. Health Centre may be considered as recommendatory.</p>
XI	The word "extra time or additional time" that is being currently used should be changed to "compensatory time" and the same should not be less than 20 minutes per hour of examination for persons who are making use of Scribe/ Reader/ Lab. Assistant. All the candidates with disability not availing the facility of scribe may be allowed additional time of minimum of one hour for examination of 3 hours duration which could further be increased on case to case basis.	<p>Presently half an hour extra time is given to the disabled candidates. Further the Syndicate has the power to allow one hour extra time for a paper of three hours duration. (As per P.U. Calendar, Vol II, 2007 Regulation at Page 35, Para 8.1, Sub Para (ii) (a)).</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee members felt that to change the nomenclature from "Extra Time" to "Compensatory Time" and to give 20 minutes per hour extra time to all the disabled students during the examination.</p>
XII	The candidates should be allowed to use assistive devices like talking calculator (in case where calculators are allowed for giving exams.), tailor frame, Braille slate, abacus, geometry kit, Braille measuring tape and augmentative communication devices like communication chart and electronic devices.	<p>At present as per PU Cal. Vol.-III, 2009, Page 381, Point iv, Sub Point 8, use of non-programmable scientific pocket calculator is allowed only in the subject of Physics and Mathematics for undergraduate classes. The students should bring their own calculators in the examination hall and no borrowing will be permitted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> With regard to other facilities the matter may be considered, only if VII is introduced.</p>

Sr. No.	Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Deptt. of Disability Affairs	The existing position/recommendations of the Committee for providing facilities to the persons with disabilities
XIII	Proper seating arrangement (preferably on the ground floor) should be made prior to the commencement of the examinations to avoid confusion or distraction during the day of exam. The time of giving the question-paper should be marked accurately and timely supply of Supplementary papers should be ensured.	Already being taken care of in view of the following Rule:- As per PU Cal., Vol-III, 2009, Page 381, Rule iv, Para 4, the Superintendent shall arrange for a suitable room for the disabled candidate and appoint an Assistant Superintendent for him out of the list supplied by the office and he should be changed daily.
XIV	The examining body should also provide reading material in Braille or e-text or on computers having suitable screen reading softwares for open book examinations. Similarly on-line examinations should be in accessible format i.e. websites, question-papers and all other study material should be accessible as per the international standards laid down in this regard.	This system is not prevailing in the University at present.  <b>Recommendation:</b> Will be introduced only when adopted by regulatory bodies.
XV	Alternative objective questions in view of descriptive questions should be provided for Hearing-Impaired persons, in addition to the existing policy of giving alternative questions in view of questions requiring visual inputs, for persons with Visual Impairment.	This system is not prevailing in the University at present.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that these were the guidelines of Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment and has been examined by the Committee. The Committee had done a lot of work and had made 15 recommendations. He pointed out that though there were recommendations almost in all the cases except Para I, II, XIII and XV. If possible recommendations in these four paras should also be incorporated.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that there is a recommendation that the disabled persons should be given some extra time to complete the examination.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar briefing the members stated that since he was a member of this Committee and had gone through the letter of the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment. It is astonishing that an individual had written a letter. The University had neither conducted the examination nor any of its agencies. Another University had conducted the examination and the Panjab University had only given its premises to set up the centre for conducting the examination. On the basis of that examination, the Committee had done this exhaustive exercise and had made the recommendations. He, however, pointed out that the disability had not been defined anywhere for which the disabled persons are to be given facilities. The Committee had only said that whosoever is disabled, he/she should be given all these facilities. If somebody is handicapped of hands, vision problem, etc., he/she could be provided these facilities, but not a person who had problem in his leg, etc. which did not come in the way

of writing in the examination. All such things have been examined by the Committee and made recommendations accordingly. The Committee was not to change the things on its own, rather the Syndicate had to take a decision whether the recommendations of the Committee are to be accepted or not. He added that the Panjab University had already allowed disabled students a writer in the examination, but the writer should be one degree less than the candidate in which he/she is appearing.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 26.9.2013 and 7.10.2013 (**Appendix-XI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to review/examine the facilities being provided to the disabled candidates during Panjab University examination, with the following changes or deletions in the existing rules and regulations, be approved:

Sr. No.	Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Deptt. of Disability Affairs	The existing position/ recommendations of the Committee for providing facilities to the persons with disabilities
I	There should be a uniform and compressive policy across the country for persons with disabilities for written examination taking into account improvement in technology and new avenues opened to the persons with disabilities providing a level playing field. Policy should also have flexibility to accommodate the specific needs on case-to-case basis.	There should be a uniform and compressive policy across the country for persons with disabilities for written examination taking into account improvement in technology and new avenues opened to the persons with disabilities providing a level playing field. Policy should also have flexibility to accommodate the specific needs on case-to-case basis.
II	There is no need for fixing separate criteria for regular and competitive examinations.	Both types of exams. are being conducted with the same criteria.
III	The facility of Scribe/Reader/ Lab. Assistant should be allowed to any person who has disability of 40% or more if so desired by the person.	The facility of Scribe should be allowed to a person whose dominant hand, right and left, as the case may be, is not in the position to write. A person suffering from a disease such as hemiplegic, other disabling paralysis deformity of Spine or other orthopaedic disorder, congenital heart disease or any other conditions due to which he is unable to perform the normal movement of body and who is blind. (Volume-II, 2007 Page-36 Point 8.1 Sub Point vii (a&b).  <b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee recommended that already reasonable facilities/ relaxation has been granted on need basis. However, due care is being taken before allowing a scribe to the person with 40% disability.
IV	The candidate should have the discretion of opting for his own Scribe/Reader/Lab. Assistant or request the Examination Body for the same. The examination body may	Provision is already going on smoothly. Candidates are free to opt their scribe as per their choice/discretion.

Sr. No.	Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Deptt. of Disability Affairs	The existing position/ recommendations of the Committee for providing facilities to the persons with disabilities
	also identify the Scribe/ Reader/Lab. Assistant to make panels at the District/ Division/State level as per the requirement of the examination. In such instances, the candidates should be allowed to meet the scribe a day before the examination so that the candidate get the chance to check and verify whether the scribe is suitable or not.	<b>Recommendation:</b> Steps be taken to prepare a panel of scribe by the University.
V	Criteria like educational qualification, marks scored, age or other such restrictions for the Scribe/Reader/Lab. Assistant should not be fixed. Instead, the invigilation system should be strengthened, so that the candidates using Scribe/Reader/ Lab. Assistant do not indulge in malpractices like copying and cheating during the examination.	Under the rule of P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2009, Chapter XXX Page 381, there is already a provision to allow the person with disability to have his/her scribe shall be a lower grade of education but he/she must not have secured more than 50% marks.  <b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee has recommended to waive off the condition of 50% marks. This will facilitate the disabled person to find out the scribe easily.
VI	There should also be flexibility in accommodating any change in Scribe/ Reader/Lab. Assistant in case of emergency. The candidates should also be allowed to take more than one Scribe/ Reader for writing different papers especially for languages.	Rules and Regulations of Panjab University are silent in this regard.  <b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee recommended that the disabled person should be allowed more than one scribe for writing different papers especially in different languages.
VII	Persons with disabilities should be given the option of choosing the mode for taking the examinations i.e. in Braille or in the computer or in large print or even by recording the answers as the examining bodies can easily make use of technology to convert question-paper in large prints, e-text, or Braille and can also convert Braille text in English or regional languages.	This system is not prevailing in the University at present.  <b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee members felt that these facilities can only be incorporated, if University is able to set and evaluate papers in the said module.
VIII	The candidate should be allowed to check the computer system one day in advance so that the problems, if any in the software/system could be rectified.	<b>Recommendation:</b> The candidate should be allowed to check the computer system one day in advance so that the problems, if any in the software/system could be rectified.
IX	The procedure of availing the facility of scribe should be simplified and the necessary details should be recorded at the time of filling up of the forms. Thereafter, the examining body should ensure availability of question-papers in the format opted by the candidate as well as suitable seating arrangement for giving examination.	Already a very simple and effective procedure is being followed to provide scribe and seating arrangement at the Centre.  <b>Recommendation:</b> With regard to the format of the question paper opted by the candidate can only be considered, if University is able to adopt VII.

Sr. No.	Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Deptt. of Disability Affairs	The existing position/ recommendations of the Committee for providing facilities to the persons with disabilities
X	The disability certificate issued by the competent medical authority at any place should be accepted across the country.	<p>As per P.U. Cal., Vol-III, 2009, Page 381, Point iv, sub Point 1 (iii). The candidate shall produce a certificate from a Professor of the specialist concerned of a Medical College, and where there is no Medical College from the Chief Medical Officer of the District concerned, to the effect that the candidate is unable to write his answer-books because of the temporary disablement.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee felt that the present procedure of Medical Certificate is satisfactory but in case of issuance of Medical certificate by a private practitioner/ private clinic, as many candidates from the rural areas approach the University at the eleventh hour with the plea that he/she does not have any Medical College or CMO of the District near to their residence. If this certificate is accepted then the verification of the CMO, P.U. Health Centre may be considered as recommendatory.</p>
XI	The word "extra time or additional time" that is being currently used should be changed to "compensatory time" and the same should not be less than 20 minutes per hour of examination for persons who are making use of Scribe/ Reader/ Lab. Assistant. All the candidates with disability not availing the facility of scribe may be allowed additional time of minimum of one hour for examination of 3 hours duration which could further be increased on case to case basis.	<p>Presently half an hour extra time is given to the disabled candidates. Further the Syndicate has the power to allow one hour extra time for a paper of three hours duration. (As per P.U. Cal. Vol-II, 2007 Regulation at Page 35, Para 8.1, Sub Para (ii) (a)).</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The Committee members felt that to change the nomenclature from "Extra Time" to "Compensatory Time" and to give 20 minutes per hour extra time to all the disabled students during the examination.</p>
XII	The candidates should be allowed to use assistive devices like talking calculator (in case where calculators are allowed for giving exams.), tailor frame, Braille slate, abacus, geometry kit, Braille measuring tape and augmentative communication devices like communication chart and electronic devices.	<p>At present as per PU Cal. Vol.-III, 2009, Page 381, Point iv, Sub Point 8, use of non-programmable scientific pocket calculator is allowed only in the subject of Physics and Mathematics for undergraduate classes. The students should bring their own calculators in the examination hall and no borrowing will be permitted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> With regard to other facilities the matter may be considered, only if VII is introduced.</p>

Sr. No.	Guidelines issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Deptt. of Disability Affairs	The existing position/ recommendations of the Committee for providing facilities to the persons with disabilities
XIII	Proper seating arrangement (preferably on the ground floor) should be made prior to the commencement of the examinations to avoid confusion or distraction during the day of exam. The time of giving the question-paper should be marked accurately and timely supply of Supplementary papers should be ensured.	Already being taken care of in view of the following Rule:-  As per PU Cal., Vol-III, 2009, Page 381, Rule iv, Para 4, the Superintendent shall arrange for a suitable room for the disabled candidate and appoint an Assistant Superintendent for him out of the list supplied by the office and he should be changed daily.
XIV	The examining body should also provide reading material in Braille or e-text or on computers having suitable screen reading softwares for open book examinations. Similarly on-line examinations should be in accessible format i.e. websites, question-papers and all other study material should be accessible as per the international standards laid down in this regard.	This system is not prevailing in the University at present.  <b>Recommendation:</b> Will be introduced only when adopted by regulatory bodies.
XV	Alternative objective questions in view of descriptive questions should be provided for Hearing-Impaired persons, in addition to the existing policy of giving alternative questions in view of questions requiring visual inputs, for persons with Visual Impairment.	This system is not prevailing in the University at present.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 4.4.2013**

**17.** Considered the minutes dated 4.4.2013 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider the following sub-clause 9.3 of clause 9.0 of UGC Regulations 2010:

“9.3 Those possessing Post-graduate degree in the Professional course such as LL.M./M.Tech./M.Arch./M.E./M.V.Sc./M.D. etc. recognized by the relevant statutory body/council shall also be entitled to 2 non-compounded advance increments at the entry level”.

- NOTE:**
1. The above Committee has decided that the steps may be initiated to implement the recommendations of the Committee made at its meeting held on 14.12.2012 (**Appendix-XII**) which has also been approved by the Vice-Chancellor.
  2. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 15.5.2013/29.6.2013 (Para 15) has **resolved that the consideration of the Item, be deferred and the item be placed before the Syndicate again along with the detailed office note as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal.**
  3. A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 15.5.2013/29.6.2013, the consideration of the item was deferred on his suggestion because he had expressed his apprehension that it is very odd that Syndicate and Senate take the decisions and the RAO puts objection/s to which the in-built reply/replies is/are already available. In that light, he had suggested that a detailed office note should be got prepared and appended with the item. He was sorry to point out that the item had come back to the Syndicate after a gap of 9 months. Though it had been mentioned at page 74 that a detailed office note is enclosed, unfortunately no detailed office note had been enclosed.

It was clarified that the detailed office note is available at pages 79-82 of the appendix.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar pointed out that in the professional postgraduate degrees, M.Pharmacy is missing.

When Shri Ashok Goyal said that all these are professional degrees, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that he was 100% sure that M.Pharmacy is also a professional degree.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that M.D.S. is also missing. In fact, it is a very good proposal and the same should have been approved much earlier. Earlier, the item could not be approved because it was said that if there is/are essential qualification/s to have postgraduate degree for appointment, what for the advance increment/s is/are to be given. The same thing was discussed perhaps in the meeting/s of the Syndicate held in the months of May/June and suggested that the item should be brought back along with a detailed office note irrespective of the fact whether essential qualifications are there or not, e.g., in the case of appointment of Assistant Professors in Law, LL.M. is the essential qualification.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that at one point of time it was said that they (candidates for the post of Assistant Professors in Law) did not need to qualify the UGC-NET even.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, anyway, now they are giving advance increment/s for possessing the above-said qualifications.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that though the Committee had recommended MDS, unfortunately it is missing in the item.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That two non-compounded advance increments at the entry level be granted to all those teachers, who possessed postgraduate degree in the professional course such as LL.M./M.Tech./M.Arch./M.E./M.V.Sc./M.Pharma./MDS, including M.D. recognized by the relevant statutory body/council, as is being given to the teachers holding similar degrees in Punjab Engineering College and other neighbouring Engineering Institutions.

**Recommendations of the Faculty of Medical Sciences dated 29.10.2013**

**18.** Considered the minutes of the Faculty of Medical Sciences dated 29.10.2013 (**Appendix-XIII**) that the following recommendations of the Committee dated 6.5.2013 constituted by the

Faculty of Medical Sciences dated 22.3.2013 to examine the PG regulations of the Medical Council of India for appointment of Internal Examiners of MD in Government Medical College and Hospital, be approved:

1. There will be two internal examiners in every examination. Out of these two, one examiner would be a Professor and the other examiner will be eligible (as per MCI norms) PG teachers, including the HOD. These examiners should be rotated every two years but one examiner out of the two should always be a Professor. In case, there is no Professor in the Department, both the examiners could be non-Professor, but eligible PG teacher, following the Principle of rotation.
2. The senior internal examiner will be the main coordinator of the entire examination. However, the internal assessment should be, if any, indicated through HOD.
3. The above recommendations be implemented from the date of approval of the competent authority.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate at its meeting held on 27.7.2013/13.8.2013 (Para 17) has resolved that the item be referred to the Faculty of Medical Sciences for consideration in the first instance.

**RESOLVED:** That the following recommendations of the Faculty of Medical Sciences dated 22.3.2013 regarding PG regulations of the Medical Council of India for appointment of Internal Examiners of MD in Government Medical College and Hospital, be approved:

1. There will be two internal examiners in every examination. Out of these two, one examiner would be a Professor and the other examiner will be eligible (as per MCI norms) PG teachers, including the HOD. These examiners should be rotated every two years but one examiner out of the two should always be a Professor. In case, there is no Professor in the Department, both the examiners could be non-Professor, but eligible PG teacher, following the Principle of rotation.
2. The senior internal examiner will be the main coordinator of the entire examination. However, the internal assessment should be, if any, indicated through HOD.
3. The above recommendations be implemented from the date of approval of the competent authority.

**Recommendations of the  
Committee dated  
6.11.2013**

**19.** Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 6.11.2013 (**Appendix-XIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to frame new rules regarding change of name cases received from the male/female candidates registered with Panjab University as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal, Syndic in the meeting of Syndicate dated 15.4.2013 and 25.4.2013 (Para 18):

Suggestion given by Shri Ashok Goyal, Syndic	Recommendations of the Committee
He desired that after change of name only	Only new name of the candidate should be

<b>Suggestion given by Shri Ashok Goyal, Syndic</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Committee</b>
<p>new name of candidate should be written in the University record/DMC.</p>	<p>written in the University record/DMC but while submitting the application form for change of name the applicant has to submit an affidavit mentioning as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>(i)</b> that he/she was not engaged in any criminal activity/ies or has not been convicted by any criminal court;</li> <li><b>(ii)</b> that no civil or criminal proceedings are pending against him/her in any court of law;</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOTE:</b> In case any applicant submits an affidavit mentioning that he/ she was engaged in criminal activity or has been convicted or some civil or criminal proceedings are pending against him/her in any court of law, then his/her name will be changed as per the old system i.e. new name alias old name.</p> <p>The application form should be forwarded/ attested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>(iii)</b> through the Head of the Institution/Department/ College if the applicant is studying in any institution/ department/ college at the time of submission of application form;</li> <li><b>(iv)</b> through the employer if the applicant is employed at the time of submission of application form; and</li> <li><b>(v)</b> through a Gazetted Officer or the Principal of an affiliated college or an officer of the University not below the rank of an Assistant Registrar in case of applicant is neither studying nor is in employment at the time of submission of application form.</li> </ul>

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had raised this at that time also when the item was placed before the Syndicate earlier. Now, the item is also placed before the Syndicate in the same form. As he had pointed out that they had been following one system that they asked for submission of affidavit from everybody whosoever gets admission in the University or in a College, if the candidates had gap year/s. In the Department of Laws, every year irrespective of whether the candidate concerned is IAS, IRS, IPS, PCS, etc., whosoever gets

admission, is asked to submit an affidavit that he/she is not involved in any criminal activities during the period of gap year/s and no case is pending against them in any Court. They say that since they had qualified the qualifying examination years back, there is gap of years, they had to submit the said affidavit that they had good conduct and nobody wanted to understand the spirit behind the submission of affidavit, instead they go by whatever is written. He, therefore, suggested that in the case of serving employees, a certificate from the employer should be sufficient to say that he/she bears a good moral character.

**This was agreed to.**

**RESOLVED:** That the following recommendations of the Committee dated 6.11.2013 (**Appendix-XIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to frame new rules regarding change of name cases received from the male/female candidates registered with Panjab University as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal, Syndic in the meeting of Syndicate dated 15.4.2013 and 25.4.2013 (Para 18), be approved:

<b>Suggestion given by Shri Ashok Goyal, Syndic</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Committee</b>
<p>He desired that after change of name only new name of candidate should be written in the University record/DMC.</p>	<p>Only new name of the candidate should be written in the University record/DMC but while submitting the application form for change of name the applicant has to submit an affidavit mentioning as under:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) that he/she was not engaged in any criminal activity/ies or has not been convicted by any criminal court;</li> <li>(ii) that no civil or criminal proceedings are pending against him/her in any court of law;</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOTE:</b> In case any applicant submits an affidavit mentioning that he/ she was engaged in criminal activity or has been convicted or some civil or criminal proceedings are pending against him/her in any court of law, then his/her name will be changed as per the old system i.e. new name alias old name.</p> <p>The application form should be forwarded/ attested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(iii) through the Head of the Institution/Department/ College if the applicant is studying in any institution/ department/college at the time of submission of application form;</li> </ul>

Suggestion given by Shri Ashok Goyal, Syndic	Recommendations of the Committee
	<p>(iv) through the employer if the applicant is employed at the time of submission of application form; and</p> <p>(v) through a Gazetted Officer or the Principal of an affiliated college or an officer of the University not below the rank of an Assistant Registrar in case of applicant is neither studying nor is in employment at the time of submission of application form.</p>

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 21.10.2013**

**20.** Considered the following recommendation of the Committee dated 21.10.2013 (**Appendix-XV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in pursuance of the Syndicate decision dated 15.4.2013 (Para 14) to look into the shortcomings/deficiencies/ambiguities pointed out by the members of the Syndicate in the amended guidelines for Ph.D. Registration, approval of candidacy, appointment of Supervisor, Pre-Ph.D. Course Work, etc., recommended by the Committee dated 11.2.2013:

That the Guidelines for Ph.D. – Registration, approval of candidacy, appointment of Supervisor, Pre-Ph.D. Course Work, etc., be approved, as per (**Appendix-XV**).

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that under Guideline 24, the examiners for evaluation of Ph.D. thesis could not be repeated within a period of six months. But since in most of the subjects, the strength of faculty members in almost all the Universities is decreasing day by day, this condition should not be imposed. Referring to Guideline 26, he pleaded that the restriction for appointment of examiners for evaluation of Ph.D. thesis from amongst the Professors and Associate Professors should be removed and the Assistant Professors, who had done Ph.D. and had produced Ph.Ds., should also be allowed to be appointed examiners for evaluation of Ph.D. thesis. Referring to Guideline 27, Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that it had already been approved that the faculty members could take one additional candidate from the College teachers over and above the fixed limit of 8 candidates. There are many Departments in the University, including University Business School & Department of Psychology, which are not clear about this decision. As per the above-said decision, the College teachers who wanted to do Ph.D. have to compete amongst themselves and not with the other candidates, i.e., JRF and qualifiers of University Entrance Test in the subject concerned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Dinesh Talwar should give the problem in writing so that he could examine the same and take appropriate decision on the issue.

Referring to Guideline 35(iii), Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that the condition of five years' teaching experience of postgraduate classes had been imposed for the College teachers for becoming eligible for appointment as Supervisor of a Ph.D. candidate, the teachers of the University could become Supervisor straightaway, i.e., just after their appointment in the University. He pleaded that the conditions which

are applicable to the University teachers should be made applicable in the case of College teachers. Referring to Guideline 34(4), Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that it should not be deleted. He added that the Department of Psychology is refusing all the cases whichever is referred to it. Similarly, though Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal is already a Ph.D. degree holder, the School of Punjabi Studies had not allowed Dr. Gosal to become a Supervisor of a Ph.D. candidate by saying that his research work is not up to the mark, whereas Principal Gosal had not submitted any research work for evaluation to the School of Punjabi Studies.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Dr. Dinesh Talwar is well taken.

Referring to Guideline 35(4), Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that it had been written that the conduct of examination/evaluation of Pre-Ph.D. course work would be done in the University Teaching Department. He enquired why the examination/evaluation could not be done in the affiliated College/s which is/are recognized Research Centre/s.

Professor S.K. Sharma, referring to Guideline 6, said that only Environment Study had been mentioned in the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary subjects. The subject of Energy did not find mention in which they had already done a lot of research. He, therefore, pleaded that the Energy subject should also be included in interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary subjects. Referring to Guideline 17, he stated that it had been mentioned that "However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate". He enquired what is that research, which is still valid after 8 years' gap. As suggested by Dr. Dinesh Talwar, Guideline 34 (4) at page 106 should not be deleted. Similarly, Guideline 34(10) should also not be deleted.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that though Guideline 2 says that every year, a letter be written to the Heads of all the University Teaching Departments/Institutes/Schools/ Centres, etc., whether Entrance Test for Ph.D. in respect of their respective Departments/Institutes/Schools/Centres, etc., is to be conducted and the recommendation in this regard should come through the Administrative & Academic Committees. He pointed out that in the University Business School, for the last three years not even a single candidate had been allowed to do Ph.D.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such issues should be raised separately.

Dr. Dalip Kumar, referring to Guideline 27, stated that even though they had already given one additional seat to the faculty members for guiding College teachers for doing Ph.D. over and above the existing 8 students, one of the Chairpersons had asked a particular teacher to compete with the other candidates, who are aspirants for doing Ph.D. on the basis of JRF, Entrance Test conducted by the University, etc. For the last four months, the teacher concerned is suffering on this count. Since the seat for the College teachers is over and above the limit of 8 seats, the College teachers had to compete amongst themselves rather than with the candidates of other categories.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if he wanted that these things to be considered, he had to give them in writing so that he could bring a proper item on the issue.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that if somebody had been denied his right, they should point it out to the Vice-Chancellor. Two years back, all the P.U. Regional Centres were approved by the Syndicate and Senate as equivalent to University Teaching Department, but somebody had created hurdles in the implementation of the said decision. They needed to check this as they felt insulted. Three years back, a Committee under his chairmanship had approved all these issues and not again they are back to square one.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar suggested that a letter should be issued to each and every Department/School/Institute of the University stating that the faculty members are allowed to take one additional candidate for Ph.D. (from the College teachers) over and above the limit of 8 candidates.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the letter regarding reservation of seat for doing Ph.D. by the College teachers should be issued by Monday, the 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2014.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would ask the Dean of University Instruction to attend to it.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that as per Guideline 34 (Norms for appointment of Supervisors/Joint or Co-Supervisors), there are conditions that the teacher concerned should have submitted research project, published research work, 5 years' experience of teaching at postgraduate level for becoming eligible for appointment as Supervisor or Joint Supervisor or Co-Supervisor. He had submitted two major projects, one minor and had published three books. Still the School of Punjabi Studies had disallowed him to become a Supervisor/Joint Supervisor/Co-Supervisor of a Ph.D. candidate. When the Syndicate and Senate had framed the Regulations/Rules, why the Vice-Chancellor had appointed a Committee to look into his request? Under which Regulation/Rule, the 5-member Committee had been constituted, especially when there existed a Standing Committee as also the Dean Research? The Administrative Committee of School of Punjabi Studies had said that his (Principal Gosal's) research work is not up to the mark, whereas he has not submitted any research with his request. Secondly, if his work is to be got evaluated, it should be got evaluated from outside experts and not from the experts of this University. He had got major project on the study of Guru Teg Bahadur, which had already been completed and had another major project on Pakistani Punjabi Sahitya. Earlier, he had got one minor research project. The minutes of the meeting of the Administrative/Academic Committees were not supplied. Secondly, the Administrative Committee comprised one retired teacher. Therefore, first of all, the formation of the Administrative Committee is wrong. In fact, they did not want to allow the College teachers to become Supervisors/Joint Supervisors in spite of the decision of the Syndicate and Senate. He, therefore, pleaded that these recommendations of the Committee pertaining to guidelines for pursuing Ph.D. degree, for appointment of Supervisors/Joint Supervisors, etc. should only be approved, if these are to be implemented; otherwise, not. Also a satisfactory reply should be given to him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would respond to him shortly.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he wanted to point out certain additions and deletions in the proposed Standard and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree in conformity with UGC (Minimum Standard and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree) Regulation 2009. He, referring to Guideline 3, stated that it had been mentioned that 'preference would be given to the candidates, who have qualified JRF from University Grants Commission/CSIR, etc.' He suggested that preference to JRF should only be given in case there is a tie between two or more candidates. Similarly, under Guideline 6, it had been mentioned that the Supervisor must be invited to the meetings of the Research Degree Committee, RMC, etc., whereas there is no such provision under the Regulation. He, therefore, suggested that Supervisor should be invited to the Academic and Administrative Committees' meetings and not to the Research Degree Committee meetings.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that even if the Supervisor, who is Associate Professor or Assistant Professor in the same Department, as per prevailing Regulations is not invited to the Research Degree Committee meetings and if he is not invited to the Research Degree Committee meetings in spite of the fact that he is the Supervisor of the candidate, how in the inter-disciplinary subjects, he/she could be invited?

Professor Karamjeet Singh, referring to Guideline 11, suggested that the maximum period for approval of candidacy should be 2½ years in the subjects where the pre-Ph.D. course work is of 1 year instead of 6 months. Similarly, the last line of Guideline 12 should read as "This process, in any case, should not take more than **20** working days". He further stated that the provision under Guideline 17 "However, under exceptional circumstances condonation of delay beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate" also needed to be examined.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had taken note of the point raised by the members, he would consult Professor Karamjeet Singh while making changes in these guidelines.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that any request of a candidate, who wanted to get the delay of more than 8 years condoned, should be first considered by the Research Degree Committee concerned, and if recommended by the Research Degree Committee only then the same should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

Professor Karamjeet Singh, referring to Guideline 20, said that the provision that "one of the examiners may be from the outside the country", should be deleted.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that the cases in which somebody is interested to delay the evaluation would be sent to examiners outside the country.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this provision should be corrected and mentioned as "There shall be no bar if examiner/s from outside the country is/are appointed".

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that already a lot of delay has taken place. They should show magnanimity and approve these guidelines and get these implemented at the earliest so that the College teachers are able to guide Ph.D. students.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to take necessary steps which hinder implementations of these guidelines, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that whenever any extension is to be granted to any candidate or delay is to be condoned in exceptional cases by the Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate, all such request/s should be routed through the Supervisor/s of the candidate/s. He added that there were certain cases, where the Supervisor/s did not even know that his student had made request for extension/condonation of delay.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that there are also certain cases, where the candidates are willing to submit their theses, but the Supervisor did not allow him to do so. As such, there is already a lot of exploitation of the candidates.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there are candidates, who did not show up for years and when they returned, they get extension straightaway from the University authorities and show the same to the Supervisor. When the Supervisor asked them where he/she was during all these years, they levelled allegations against the Supervisor/s that they are not cooperating.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that there are attendance registers wherein the research scholars marked their attendance. How could the Supervisor say that he/she had not shown up during the year/s.

Professor Preeti Mahajan said that such things could be taken care by the Research Monitoring Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they are dealing with a large number of Ph.D. cases. Let them not think so negative about the picture of the University Ph.D. programme. Last year, about 350 Ph.D. degrees were awarded, and this year, the number might be about 400. In this large number, there might be 10-15 cases wherein there might be some problems, which are being pointed out by the members. They must attend to such problems and the Syndicate, which meets once in a month, is a good forum. They should discuss those things by taking a reasonable view and decide the case on merit. Let him assure, an Hon'ble member of the Syndicate, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, that as to why he had appointed a Committee to look into his case. He had appointed the Committee because he does not want to take a unilateral decision in a given case of a given Department. He is not an expert in every subject and if he wanted to take a viewpoint contrary to what the experts say, he needed some backing. He wanted to attend to his concern and also ensure that nothing unfavourable is done to him. There had been delay in attending to his concern, but he was pained about what had happened to him. He would see to it and get some rectification done and get it happened as quickly as possible.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if something has not been submitted to the Department for evaluation, on what basis the report had been given that his work is not up to the mark. But at the same time, if somebody had done something to intentionally pain somebody, those people should also be taken to task.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there must be some time frame for the Committee.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired whether the Committee would see his research work or regulations & rules of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had appointed the Committee to have strength on the basis of which he could take action/decision.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to make corrections/additions/deletions in the Guidelines for Ph.D. – Registration, approval of candidacy, appointment of Supervisor, Pre-Ph.D. Course Work, etc., on behalf of the Syndicate, in consultation with Professor Karamjeet Singh and DUI/Dean Research.

**Issue regarding exemption from implementing Point 3 of the revised guidelines of the UGC adopted by the Syndicate dated 27.2.2010 with regard to appointment of Guest Faculty**

**21.** Considered –

1. that the exemption from implementing Point 3 of the revised guidelines of the UGC adopted by the Syndicate dated 27.2.2010 (Para 23) with regard to appointment of Guest Faculty in the University, approved by the Syndicate/ Senate dated 29.6.2010 (Para 66) and Senate meeting dated 10.10.2010 (Para XXXIII), respectively, be allowed to be followed as continued from the session 2010-11 onwards.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate meeting dated 29.6.2010 (Para 66) and Senate meeting dated 10.10.2010 (Para XXXIII), respectively had approved the following recommendation of the Committee dated 15.6.2010:

xxx                      xxx                      xxx

d) exemption

- (i) from implementing Point-3 (Selection Procedure for appointing Guest/ Part-time teachers should be the same as for regularly appointed teachers) for the current session i.e. 2010-2011.
- (ii) for in-service/retired/re-employed teacher outside expert (in case of specialization) from Point-

3 (Selection Procedure for appointing Guest/Part-time teachers should be the same as for regularly appointed teachers.

2. That, in future, as and when the requirement of Guest Faculty arises, the department concerned may invite applications by putting notice on the Notice Board of the department concerned at the University and University website and then send the proposal/recommendations for approval of the competent authority. The Academic and Administrative Committee of the department can also propose the names of serving teachers of other departments of the University/Colleges for appointment as guest faculty.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the exemption from implementing Point 3 of the revised guidelines of the UGC adopted by the Syndicate dated 27.2.2010 (Para 23) with regard to appointment of Guest Faculty in the University, approved by the Syndicate/ Senate dated 29.6.2010 (Para 66) and Senate meeting dated 10.10.2010 (Para XXXIII), respectively, be allowed to be followed as continued from the session 2010-11 onwards; and
- (2) in future, as and when the requirement of Guest Faculty arises, the department concerned may invite applications by putting notice on the Notice Board of the department concerned at the University and University website and then send the proposal/recommendations for approval of the competent authority. The Academic and Administrative Committee of the department can also propose the names of serving teachers of other departments of the University/ Colleges for appointment as guest faculty.

**Re-advertisement of the post**

**22.** Considered minutes –

- (i) dated 1.10.2013 of the Selection Committee **(Appendix-XVI)** for appointment of Technical Officer (IT/CSE), at University Institute of Engineering & Technology in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+Grade Pay of Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules in the Panjab University, Chandigarh.
- (ii) dated 3.10.2013 of the Selection Committee **(Appendix-XVI)** for appointment of Senior Technical Officer in the Department of Physics in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+Grade Pay of Rs.7600/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules in the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the posts be re-advertised.

## **Appointments on compassionate grounds**

**23.** Considered minutes dated 13.12.2013 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

Professor Karamjeet Singh, referring to appointment of Mr. Lalit Kashyap as Peon, suggested that he should be appointed as Peon as and when he attains the age of 18 years in the pay-scale of Rs.4900-10680 plus Grade Pay of Rs.1650/- (initial pay of Rs.6950/-) plus allowances admissible under the rules or whatever pay-scale prevalent at that point of time.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 13.12.2013, be approved, as per (**Appendix-XVII**), with the modification that Mr. Lalit Kashyap be appointed as Peon as and when he attains the age of 18 years in the pay-scale of Rs.4900-10680 plus Grade Pay of Rs.1650/- (initial pay of Rs.6950/-) plus allowances admissible under the rules or whatever pay-scale prevalent at that point of time.

## **Recommendations of the Committee dated 8.8.2013**

**24.** Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 8.8.2013 (**Appendix-XVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that –

- (1) The cases for condonation of shortage of lectures be sent directly to the D.U.I. office by the concerned Department and later on, the same be sent to the Vice-Chancellor/ Syndicate to avoid delay in the processing of the case;
- (2) The case of the candidates, who do not fulfil the minimum requirement of 30% or 33% lectures (according to the Criteria of each department), will not be considered for condonation of shortage of lectures;
- (3) D.S.W. (Men) and D.S.W. (Women) be directed to ensure that list of students, who participate in cultural programme, be sent to the concerned Department after the 15 days of the organization of the event;
- (4) The supporting document for condonation of shortage of lectures be deposited to the Head of the Department within 15 days (calendar days) after joining the Department after availing leave due to illness or any other reason; and
- (5) That the existing rules which are applicable as per Senate decision taken in its meeting held on 12.10.2003 and 31.01.2012 be strictly implemented for the cases of the condonation of shortage of lectures.

Initiating discussion, Professor Karamjeet Singh, referring to the submission of list of students, who participated in cultural programme, by the D.S.W. (Men) and D.S.W. (Women) to the concerned Department after the 15 days of the organization of the event, stated that it should be within 15 instead of after 15 days.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that, in fact, it is a backdoor entry of the students, who did not attend the classes regularly. If they allowed the students to appear in the examinations like this, there would be no limit/end as the students would ask for condonation on one pretext or the other. According to him, they had prescribed the minimum attendance of 75% and all those extracurricular activities are to be there within the remaining 25%. On the other hand, 10% lectures are given by the Head of the Department concerned and another 10 by the Vice-Chancellor and thereafter another 10 by the Syndicate, whereas there is no limit with the DSW. Resultantly, the students, who did not attend even a single lecture, were being allowed to appear in the examination by the Syndicate, which is a frivolous practice and should be curbed; otherwise, there would be no sanctity of the Regulations prescribing minimum 75% attendance of lectures.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that the students, who did not attend at least 33% of the lectures delivered, should not be allowed to appear in the examinations at all.

Principal Puneet Bedi stated that they in the Colleges are also facing similar problems. The teacher concerned did not allow condonation of shortage of lectures of the students even for really participating in rehearsals of various events. She pleaded that some clear-cut directions/instructions should be issued to the affiliated Colleges in this regard so that the students could participate in the rehearsals of various events; otherwise, the students concerned could not be present at both the places at the same time.

Professor Preeti Mahajan said that not only DSWs are recommending condonation of lectures of the students, but Directorate of Sports also. If the student could not attend the classes, how he/she could attend the ground.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that cultural and sports activities are part of the academic activities.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he could give hundreds such examples where the University had allowed students to appear in the examination without attending a single class and also without getting any condonation done from the DSW, Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate because the innovative people come with the idea of coming out of the prevailing Regulations/Rules. There is another category of Colleges which took money for condonation of lectures and condoned the same at their own level, and never send the cases of the students for condonation of shortage of lectures to the University. Now onwards, the DSW has to ensure that list of students, who participate in cultural programme, be sent to the concerned Department after the 15 days of the organization of the event. The student concerned has to produce Medical Certificate for getting shortage of lecture condoned and, thereafter, the Sports Department may give lectures for the same period. Though, they should encourage cultural activities, there should be some limit for condoning the lectures for cultural activities. As per his personal opinion, there should not be any condonation of shortage of lectures but if there is any, the same should be met as per UGC or Bar Council of India (BCI). They should have a will to implement it in its true spirit and take care of that large group of people who are bent upon to break the Regulations/Rules.

Professor S.K. Sharma remarked that there should be minimum threshold (number of lectures) for appearing in the University examinations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should approve the recommendation of the Committee and if somebody wanted strict norms of attendance for Professional Courses, they should bring a separate proposal so that the same could be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the cases for condonation of shortage of lectures be sent directly to the D.U.I. office by the concerned Department and later on, the same be sent to the Vice-Chancellor/Syndicate to avoid delay in the processing of the case;
- (2) the case of the candidates, who do not fulfil the minimum requirement of 30% or 33% lectures (according to the criteria of each department), be not considered for condonation of shortage of lectures;
- (3) D.S.W. (Men) and D.S.W. (Women) be directed to ensure that list of students, who participate in cultural programme, be sent to the concerned Department within 15 days of the organization of the event;
- (4) the supporting document for condonation of shortage of lectures be deposited to the Head of the Department within 15 days (calendar days) after joining the Department after availing leave due to illness or any other reason; and
- (5) the existing rules, which are applicable as per Senate decision taken in its meeting held on 12.10.2003 and 31.10.2012, be strictly implemented for the cases of the condonation of shortage of lectures.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 13.11.2013 regarding adoption and implementation of RUSA Scheme**

25. Considered minutes dated 13.11.2013 (**Appendix-XIX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to chalk out a plan/proposal regarding adoption and implementation of the scheme RUSA (Rashtriya Uchatar Shiksha Abhiyan) by the Panjab University, Chandigarh and submission of its details to the Department of Higher Education, Government of Punjab for further necessary action.

Initiating discussion, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that it is a very good scheme of the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India. All of them had made much practice and prepared their cases. But nobody is taking their cases (cases of private Colleges). When they approached Dean, College Development Council, he asked them to go to Director, Higher Education (DHE) (Punjab), and the DHE (Punjab) told them that he did not have order. He had orders only to accept the cases of State

Universities and Government Colleges. Thus, he could not take the cases of private Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that the item pertained to the University alone (Panjab University Regional Centres and P.U. Constituent Colleges) and not to the affiliated Colleges. Secondly, no member from the affiliated Colleges had been associated with the Committee.

It was clarified that item related to P.U. Regional Centres and P.U. Constituent Colleges and the affiliated Colleges should submit their proposals to the DHE (Punjab) directly.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that this issue was brought to the notice of the Principal Secretary (Punjab) on 8<sup>th</sup> January 2014. In fact, the concept is of "College Cluster University" and if it is made, they would have no say on academic, administration, examination, etc. How could they think of upgradation of Regional Centres? No doubt, they would have Rs.55 crore grant for each centre, which is a handsome amount, but they should think of the quality also. The concept of MHRD is that of "College Cluster University", under which, there is a provision for the creation of 208 new Universities.

It was said that whatever Dr. Dalip Kumar has said is correct, but the University has to create a Cluster of Regional Centres and Constituent Colleges and it had been discussed with the Principal Secretary, Punjab.

Continuing, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that there are 3-4 components. The research innovation plan which amounted to Rs.120 crore and the same is also being got by the U.T., Chandigarh; hence, they should attach the campus with the U.T., Chandigarh. The amount of Rs.20 crore which is for infrastructure, should also be taken from the U.T., Chandigarh. Similarly, there is a provision of Rs.15 crore for vocationalization of higher education, which would also be given to U.T., Chandigarh. For faculty improvement, there is a provision of Rs.10 crore. Then there is faculty recruitment support, which is not for filling up existing posts, but for creation of 5,000 new vacancies all over India. For this, Rs.5.8 lac per post had been earmarked and the additional burden would be borne by the State Government. As far as the problem raised by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal is concerned, there are three provisions, i.e., (i) 65:35% for State Universities and Government Colleges, (ii) 50:50% it is very point which is taken into consideration that 50% is to be given by the State Government as a result of CSR contribution, Industrial Partnership & PPP mode. 25% is to be contributed by the State Government. Now, the Punjab Government is hesitating that if they start giving 50% to the private Colleges, and only 35% to the Government Colleges, there would be reversal. There is no provision for un-aided Colleges in this Scheme. A point had been raised over there whether 50% could be contributed by the Managements. According to him, only a few Managements, e.g., DAV, Dev Samaj, etc. could participate in it, but every management could not. In the end, he suggested that the private Colleges must be included in this scheme by impressing upon the Punjab Government that they should try to make efforts to contribute 25% through CSR and PPP mode.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that they should take the money by treating itself a UT University. If they treated themselves as a University of Punjab, they would not be able to get any money. Even the P.U. Regional Centres and P.U. Constituent Colleges would also not get any money under this Scheme.

It was clarified that the Punjab Government had started entering of data of the Colleges, which had submitted their proposals and they are going to make a case accordingly.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that 3-4 persons should collectively prepare note in this regard and place the same before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the last date for submission of proposal is 30<sup>th</sup> January 2014 and thereafter there would be no extension as the date had already been extended from 18<sup>th</sup> January 2014 to 30<sup>th</sup> January 2014.

It was clarified that the cases of all the Universities of the State would be put together. Thereafter, the money would be sanctioned. Then there is State Education Commission of which the Vice-Chancellor of this University is also a member.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendation/s of the Committee dated 13.11.2013, as per **Appendix-IX**, be approved.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 17.09.2013 regarding incorporation of rules in the Handbook of Information**

**26.** Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 17.09.2013 (**Appendix-XX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the following specific rules be incorporated in the Handbook of Information at Page xlvi and General Refund of Fee Rules at page 581 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III to the students for ongoing classes:

1. No fee be refunded to the ongoing student/s who left the course in the mid of the course i.e. 2<sup>nd</sup> semester and thereafter including those who were admitted with late fee/charges in any course in the Teaching Department/ Institute and its Regional Centre & later wished to withdraw or left his/her seat in the 'mid of the course'.
2. The 'Excess Fee' deposited by the ongoing student/s shall be refunded after a deduction of Rs.500/- (Five hundred) as administrative charges as in case of freshly admitted students under rule no. 2 xlvi in the Handbook of Information Rules for Admission.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that since everybody does not purchase the Handbook of Information, all the information available in the Handbook of Information should be displayed on the Website of the University at the time of counselling.

The Vice-Chancellor said the information available in the Handbook of Information would be put on the University Website.

**RESOLVED:** That the following specific rules be incorporated in the Handbook of Information at Page No. xlvi and General Refund of Fee Rules at page 581 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III to the students for ongoing classes:

1. No fee be refunded to the ongoing student/s who left the course in the mid of the course i.e. 2<sup>nd</sup> semester and thereafter including those who were admitted with late fee/charges in any course in the Teaching Department/ Institute and its Regional Centre & later wished to withdraw or left his/her seat in the 'mid of the course'.
2. The 'Excess Fee' deposited by the ongoing student/s shall be refunded after a deduction of Rs.500/- (Five hundred) as administrative charges as in case of freshly admitted students under Rule no. 2 xlvi in the Handbook of Information Rules for Admission.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That, at the time of counselling, the information contained in the Handbook of Information be displayed on the Website of the University.

**Recommendation of  
the Committee dated  
30.09.2013**

**27.** Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 30.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXI**) of College Development Council:

1. That as only one application from the interested colleges was to be considered for holding of the Seminar/Symposium/ Conference/Workshop, and as the Principals of the Colleges, who had earlier submitted more than one proposals on different topics for holding the Seminar/Symposium/Conference/ Workshop have now re-submitted and restricted their proposals to single topic, as per decision of the Standing Committee, consequent upon which the revised list of the Colleges in the matter has been prepared and circulated for information of the members of the College Development Council.
2. That the College which has availed of the grant in the immediate last two years, be not considered for grant of the subsidy.
3. That Financial Subsidy @ Rs.31,000/- be paid to each of the eligible Colleges (**Appendix-XXI**) including those Colleges from which the applications were received beyond the date.
4. The amount would be given to the College on lump sum basis without any bifurcation/ demarcation of heads for its expenditure. The expenditure over and above the sanctioned amount would be spent by the College from its own sources.
5. Payment of TA/DA to resource person and mode of travel should be followed strictly as per Panjab University rules.

6. The College should submit Utilization Certificate on the format **(Appendix-XXI)** for the financial subsidy duly signed by the Principal of the College and passed by the CA on the format.
7. The College Development Council decided that Financial Subsidy be granted to all the teachers who had applied for attending the Seminar/Symposium/Conference/Workshop (Outside India/Within India)**(Appendix-XXI)**.
8. That the teachers attending Seminar/Symposium/Conference/Workshop **within India will be granted Financial Subsidy once in two years and outside India once in three years.**

Principal Gurdip Sharma and Dr. Dalip Kumar jointly stated that the teachers should be granted financial subsidy for presenting paper/s in the Seminar/ Symposium/Conference/Workshop and not for only attending the Seminar/Symposium/Conference/ Workshop.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar enquired as to why the financial subsidy be not granted to teachers for attending the Seminar/Symposium/Conference/Workshop.

Dr. Dalip Kumar clarified that since there is not enough money, the financial subsidy should be granted to the teachers for presenting papers in the Seminar/Symposium/Conference/Workshop.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that, last year, he was a member of the College Development Council and he knew that the amount of grant was increased by them at the spot.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that financial subsidy to the teachers is always given for presenting papers in the Seminar, Symposium, Conference, Workshop, etc. and not for attending.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that this decision had been taken on the pattern of UGC, but the condition of two years for grant of financial subsidy to the teachers for attending Seminar/Symposium/Conference/Workshop at national level is not there in the University Grants Commission. However, for international level the condition of once in three years is there.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that with this, more teachers would be able to get financial subsidy; otherwise, every year same persons would continue to get the financial subsidy. They should ensure that the Colleges should improve in research and they should try to help as many teachers as possible.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the amount earmarked is Rs.25,000/- only. He pleaded that the amount of financial subsidy for participating in Seminar, Symposium, Conference, Workshop, etc. within India and outside India should be increased from Rs.7,500/- and Rs.25,000/- to Rs.10,000/- and Rs.30,000/-, respectively.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the following recommendations of the Committee dated 30.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXI**) of College Development Council be approved:

1. That as only one application from the interested colleges was to be considered for holding of the Seminar/Symposium/ Conference/Workshop, and as the Principals of the Colleges, who had earlier submitted more than one proposals on different topics for holding the Seminar/Symposium/Conference/ Workshop have now re-submitted and restricted their proposals to single topic, as per decision of the Standing Committee, consequent upon which the revised list of the Colleges in the matter has been prepared and circulated for information of the members of the College Development Council.
2. That the College which has availed of the grant in the immediate last two years, be not considered for grant of the subsidy.
3. That Financial Subsidy @ Rs.31,000/- be paid to each of the eligible Colleges (**Appendix-XXI**) including those Colleges from which the applications were received beyond the date.
4. The amount would be given to the College on lump sum basis without any bifurcation/ demarcation of heads for its expenditure. The expenditure over and above the sanctioned amount would be spent by the College from its own sources.
5. Payment of TA/DA to resource person and mode of travel should be followed strictly as per Panjab University rules.
6. The College should submit Utilization Certificate on the format (**Appendix-XXI**) for the financial subsidy duly signed by the Principal of the College and passed by the CA on the format.
7. The College Development Council decided that Financial Subsidy be granted to all the teachers who had applied for attending the Seminar/Symposium/ Conference/Workshop (Outside India/Within India) (**Appendix-XXI**).
8. That the teachers attending Seminar/ Symposium/ Conference/Workshop **within India will be granted Financial Subsidy once in two years and outside India once in three years**, but the preference would be given to the teachers, who presented the paper/s.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 11.10.2013**

**28.** Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 11.10.2013 (**Appendix-XXII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that a

resolution on the following lines be sent to the Government of Punjab to lift ban on recruitment of staff imposed in July 2005, which has seriously affected the working of these Colleges:

1. These Colleges have played a stellar role in imparting higher education in the State and nearly 90 percent of enrolment in higher education is in these Colleges. These Colleges are expected to contribute in achieving the desired targets of Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER), improvement in quality of education and research of the Country, which has been acknowledged to be critical for the sustainable economic and social development of the State and the Country.
2. In the absence of qualified and competent staff, the quality of higher education has gone down, adversely affecting the employment of the youth with consequential social problems.
3. For India, to sustain its growth momentum and to strengthen its competitiveness, a world class higher education system is an important prerequisite. Global experiences indicate a positive correlation between GER and economic growth in a Country and point to the need for a minimum of 30% GER to sustain economic growth.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate meeting dated 16.3.2013 (Para 5) has resolved that a properly worded resolution would be drafted by a Committee comprising Shri Satya Pal Jain, Principal R.S. Jhanji, Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon, Dr. Jagwant Singh and Dr. I.S. Sandhu. The resolution so prepared would be placed before the Senate with a request to pass.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that one line should be added that in order to implement Semester System in the Colleges, which is a mandatory requirement under Rashtriya Uchatar Shiksha Abhiyan (RUSA), they should sanction these posts. A resolution be sent to the Government of Punjab to lift ban imposed on filling up of various teaching positions.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that, now, a judgement of the High Court had come and under that judgement, the Government is bound to fill up the vacant posts and the Government had also submitted an affidavit in the Court.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the Principal Secretary of Punjab Government had submitted an undertaking on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2013 and thereafter they had been included in the RUSA in the meeting of 6.11.2013. The Government had already given in writing that they had lifted the ban on recruitment of teachers.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that in 2005 the Government said that since the ban had been imposed on recruitment of teachers in the Government Colleges, it is applicable to the private

Colleges. Though the ban had been lifted from the Government Colleges, it still existed in the private Colleges.

**RESOLVED:** That a resolution on the following lines be sent to the Government of Punjab to lift ban on recruitment of staff imposed in July 2005, which has seriously affected the working of these Colleges:

1. These Colleges have played a stellar role in imparting higher education in the State and nearly 90 percent of enrolment in higher education is in these Colleges. These Colleges are expected to contribute in achieving the desired targets of Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER), improvement in quality of education and research of the Country, which has been acknowledged to be critical for the sustainable economic and social development of the State and the Country.
2. In the absence of qualified and competent staff, the quality of higher education has gone down, adversely affecting the employment of the youth with consequential social problems.
3. For India, to sustain its growth momentum and to strengthen its competitiveness, a world class higher education system is an important prerequisite. Global experiences indicate a positive correlation between GER and economic growth in a Country and point to the need for a minimum of 30% GER to sustain economic growth.

**Letter dated 5.8.2013 from the Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Govt. of Punjab, with regard to maintain the standard of Higher Education in Universities & Colleges**

**29.** Considered letter dated 5.8.2013 (**Appendix-XXIII**) received from the Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Govt. of Punjab with regard to maintain the standard of Higher Education in Universities, Govt. Aided Private Colleges situated in Punjab State, the UGC notification dated 30.6.2010 and 14.6.2013 regarding API Score for making the appointment and promotion of Principal/Professor/Associate Professor/Assistant Professor be adopted with the following changes:

1. The tenure of the appointment of Principal in Private Colleges will be 10 years instead of 5 years.
2. For the selection of the Principal and Assistant Professor covered under (grant-in aid) scheme, the DPI (Colleges) Punjab or his nominee be appointed on the Selection Committee.

**NOTE:** The Senate dated 20.1.2013 (Para LXXXV) has resolved that the decision of the Syndicate dated 29.8.2011 (Para 38) and Senate dated 20.12.2011 (Para XIV) regarding appointment of Principals and Assistant Professors in the affiliated Colleges in terms of UGC Regulations 2010, be rectified as under:

“Guidelines regarding composition of Selection Committee for the Selection of Principals and Assistant Professors etc. as contained in the UGC guidelines in question be implemented in letter and spirit only after these are adopted by the Punjab Government.”

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that the latest decision is in the pipeline and it would come out within a few days and the UGC & MHRD is going to give some flexibility in the capping of five areas. Now, they could participate in any two areas. He, therefore, suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred till the second amendment come.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that, at this stage, they could defer the item, but since it is mandatory, they have to adopt the same ultimately.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that, as per UGC, the age of superannuation for the teachers is 65, whether they had adopted the same.

It was said that if they deferred the item, there would be problems as in the case of grant-in-aid posts; the Director Higher Education (DHE) would not allow selections. It is a fact that wherever the DHE nominee goes for selection, none found suitable is written in the minutes of the Selection Committees. Earlier, they had passed in the Syndicate and Senate that when the Punjab Government appoints a DPI nominee in the Selection Committee, the University would implement this. Now, the Punjab Government had started appointing DPI nominee in the Selection Committees and these orders have also been received. If they did not adopt this, no appointment against the grant-in-posts would be allowed to be made by the Punjab Government.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that on the one side, perhaps, they are adopting this letter today and on the other hand they did not know when they would implement the new guidelines for approval of Research Centre and norms for appointment of College teachers as Supervisors of Ph.D. candidates. Secondly, they had imposed a condition of 400 API score for becoming eligible for the post of Principal. Would any teacher in any affiliated College become eligible for the post of Principal? Earlier, the University had advertised the posts of Principals in its Constituent Colleges and only two eligible candidates were found. On the one side, they did not allow teachers of the Colleges to do research and on the other hand, they expect them to fulfil the condition of 400 API score. If this letter is adopted, all the Colleges would be without regular Principals and those who are already working would be shunted out after serving 5-10 years.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that, for the time being, it should be deferred till the 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment come. However, they could adopt the first part of the letter.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that deferring meant they wanted to stay away from the decision for some time. Why not to stay away for

all times to come by rejecting the adoption of the above-said letter of Punjab Government.

It was again clarified that if they did not adopt this letter of Punjab Government, all the posts of Principals covered under Grant-in-Aid would be left unfilled. Since the parameters for all the affiliated Colleges are the same, they have to implement 400 API score in all the Colleges including unaided Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as far as his knowledge goes, he was sure that all the Principals of the affiliated Colleges, including affiliated to Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar and Punjabi University, Patiala must be knowing that they have taken a formal decision in their respective bodies to meet the shortfall of the Principals on account of this 400 API score. They are also allowing the Principals to continue even after the age of superannuation, i.e., up to the age of 65 years though the State Government does not approve of that. So, for the purpose of D.D.O., they are giving the names of the senior-most teachers as officiating Principals to the office of the DHE, Punjab, but for the purpose of University, the superannuated persons, who had been allowed to continue till the age of 65 years, are Principals. As such, they had taken care of this problem already in advance and if they have discretion to reject the afore-said letter, he is for rejection, but if they have no discretion and if the consequences are as explained by him are inevitable, they have to accept it. Even if it is deferred for a few months (2-3 months) and the deferment also leads to the same consequences, are they doing something good for the University?

On a point of order, Principal Gurdip Sharma said that since the final decision is in process as the MHRD is going to change this API score at least for the Principals, they should wait for the said decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they should ask for information from those two Universities and on the same line that if the Principals are not available, the Managements be allowed on the same pattern as other Universities are doing.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they did not have the two DHEs present in today's meeting, they are deferring the consideration of the item.

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to the statement of one of the members that the MHRD is going to revise the condition of API score, said that as far as he knew the MHRD is perhaps revising the condition from Assistant Professors to Associate Professors, but from Associate Professor to Professor, they are going to reiterate its old decision.

To this, Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the MHRD is also revising the condition of 400 API score for the post of Principals in the Colleges. He added that they had already passed a resolution in the Syndicate and Senate that once an appointment is approved, it is approved for all times to come. They should write a letter to both the DHEs, i.e., DHE (UT, Chandigarh) and DHE (Punjab) endorsing the said decision of the Syndicate and Senate.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that this meant that those who had already been appointed as Principals and their appointments had been

approved, if they wanted to shift to another College and apply for the same, they did not need to fulfil the condition of 400 API score. But for the new persons, this condition would be mandatory. How could it be possible? Why not to provide the same opportunities to all the candidates for the same post?

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is their take on this item?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had only two options, i.e., either they adopt this letter or reject it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the consequences of rejection had already been told to them.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if this letter is adopted by the University, he could give in writing that in case 10 posts are advertised, they would not be able to get candidates having 400 API score.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that even if they did not adopt this letter and appoint the Principals as per the existing system, the DHE would not give approval to the appointment/s.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that, as earlier clarified, they had no option but to adopt this letter.

It was clarified that whether they adopt it or not would not make much difference as the Government had already adopted it. Two months before, an interview at Mukerian was held and though the person was eligible, he/she was rejected because of lack of 400 API score, even though the candidate had experience of 15 years. However, if they did not adopt it, in the case of un-aided Colleges, they would continue to give panel and selections would be made accordingly. But in the case of aided Colleges, no Principal would be appointed. As such, an ambiguity would be created.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the University had 600 cases of appointment of teachers in the affiliated Colleges, which have not been approved by the University so far.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that they should wait for one month more and there is no harm in it.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if they did not adopt it today, then they have to give permission to the private Colleges to appoint the Principals without API score, but the Government would not approve it. As such, they would be in a problem.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that if they did not adopt this letter, the unaided Colleges would continue to appoint Principals without 400 API score and if they are approved by the University, there would be a number of cases in the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is not that they have any discretion. In fact, the item had wrongly been brought to the Syndicate for consideration whether to adopt it or not. Rather it is binding as it is written there that it had been implemented and so much so not only in the Panjab University, but also in other Universities, including U.T., Chandigarh, wherein they had asked the

DPI (Colleges) to inform the affiliated Colleges. Thus, it had already been implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should wait for the two DHEs to be present in the meeting of the Syndicate and he would make sure that both the DHEs attend the next meeting of the Syndicate. In case, they did not attend the next meeting, the Syndicate would adopt this letter. He added that this is a very important matter because it pertained to the Heads of affiliated Colleges. So it is not a trivial matter and at the moment whether they adopt it or not, it is a kind of directive. In practice, the Government is not giving approval. In order to avoid unnecessary division amongst the members of this House, let it be deferred until the next meeting where he would try that the DHEs are present in the meeting and in case they did not come, then his recommendation is that they would automatically adopt this letter.

**This was agreed to.**

**Revised rules for admission of foreign students to various programmes, including Ph.D. programme**

**30.** Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 9.10.2013 (**Appendix-XXIV**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the rules and guidelines for admission of foreign students to various courses offered by the Panjab University and its affiliated Colleges; and

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. to facilitate and encourage the inflow of foreign students to Panjab University, the rules and regulations of the University governing admission of foreign students to various courses need revision so as to make them more user friendly and to facilitate the admission process at Panjab University without compromising on the standard and quality of the academic standards of the University;
2. the revised rules for admission to Ph.D. programme and other courses as per **Annexure A** and **Annexure B**, respectively, be approved;
3. till proper functioning of the International Student's Hostel, one block in one of Boys Hostels and one block in one of Girls Hostels be reserved for foreign students for their smooth and comfortable stay;
4. as and when International Student's Hostel starts functioning; the mess of the same be run by the students themselves on co-operative basis;
5. all students in the first year be accommodated in the University hostels; and
6. creation of Single Window System in the office of Dean International Students: In addition to the existing staff, two additional administrative staff members be provided, so as to enable the DIS

office to cope up with additional workload and to attend to the problems and queries of the foreign students properly. In the first stage, all applications for admission, both on-line as well as by post, need to be handled by the Dean International Students Office.

**Issue regarding keeping in abeyance the Certificate Course in Art Appreciation**

**31.** Considered the recommendation of the Board of Studies in Fine Arts dated 31.07.2013 (Item No. 1) (**Appendix-XXV**) that the Certificate Course in Art Appreciation be kept in abeyance from the session 2013-14.

**NOTE:** (i) The Dean, Faculty of Design and Fine Arts, had approved the above said recommendation on behalf of the Faculty, as per authorization given by the Faculty of Design and Fine Arts at its meeting held on 23.3.2013.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor had approved the above recommendation on behalf of the Academic Council, as per authorization given by the Academic Council in its meeting held on 19.6.2013 under item XXIII.

**RESOLVED:** That the Certificate Course in Art Appreciation be kept in abeyance from the session 2013-14.

**Inspection Reports**

**32.** Considered if the –

(i) provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Malwa College, Bondli, Samrala for Diploma Add-On course in Information Technology as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-Finance for the session 2013-14.

**NOTE:** Inspection Report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

(ii) provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Guru Nanak College for Girls, Tibbi Sahib Road, Sri Muktsar Sahib for Advance Diploma Add-On course in Communicative English as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-Finance for the session 2013-14.

**NOTE:** Inspection Report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

(iii) provisional extension of affiliation be granted to J.C.DAV College, Dasuya for Certificate Add-On course in Journalism & Management as per UGC guidelines under UGC/Self-Finance for the session 2013-14.

**NOTE:** Inspection Report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that RSD College, Ferozepur City, had applied for extension of affiliation for an Innovative Add-On course to the University on 1.05.2013, but the University did not grant the same on the plea that the College had applied late. In the case of Innovative Add-On course, there is no date for applying; rather, application for affiliation/extension of affiliation for these courses are submitted as and when the sanction for the same is received from the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Principal Gosal should give him the data so that the same could be examined.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that, as per existing Scheme of the UGC, the duration of all the Innovative Add-On courses is five years. Now, the UGC is not giving any new scheme. He, therefore, pleaded that extension of affiliation to all the Colleges wherein such Innovative Add-courses are being offered should be granted.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that how the College/s had made admissions to these Innovative Add-On courses without getting affiliation/extension of affiliation from the University?

The Vice-Chancellor stated that during the last one year, they had resolved so many times that no item should be considered on the tables and no *ad hoc* decision should be taken. In the case under consideration, he would take a reasonable view and take appropriate decision.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Malwa College, Bondli, Samrala, for Diploma Add-On course in Information Technology, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Finance for the session 2013-14;
- (2) provisional extension of affiliation be granted to Guru Nanak College for Girls, Tibbi Sahib Road, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for Advance Diploma Add-On course in Communicative English, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Finance for the session 2013-14; and
- (3) provisional extension of affiliation be granted to J.C. DAV College, Dasuya, for Certificate Add-On course in Journalism & Management, as per UGC guidelines, under UGC/Self-Finance for the session 2013-14.

**Sanction for a sum of Rs.7,28,900/- for landscaping**

**33.** Considered if a sum of Rs.7,28,900/- for landscaping in newly constructed Girls Hostel No. 9 in Panjab University South Campus, Sector 25, Chandigarh, be sanctioned out of Development Fund Account.

**NOTE:** The Rough cost estimate submitted by Divisional Engineer (H) enclosed (**Appendix-XXVII**).

**RESOLVED:** That a sum of Rs.7,28,900/-, be sanctioned out of Development Fund Account for landscaping in newly constructed Girls Hostel No. 9 in Panjab University South Campus, Sector 25, Chandigarh.

**Rates for loading and unloading of furniture (iron tables and chairs)**

**34.** Considered following recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that:

- (i) the sanction of Rs.2/- per set for loading and unloading charges of University furniture (iron tables and chairs) be made to the 'C' Class employees of the Colleges/ Departments to meet the audit objections raised during the Annual 2013 examination; and
- (ii) the rates from Rs.2/- per set to Rs.5/- per set for loading and unloading the University furniture (iron tables and chairs) to the 'C' class employees be enhanced with effect from the Annual Examination of 2014.

**NOTE:** An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the sanction of Rs.2/- per set for loading and unloading charges of University furniture (iron tables and chairs) be made to the 'C' Class employees of the Colleges/ Departments to meet the audit objections raised during the Annual 2013 examination; and
- (2) the rates from Rs.2/- per set to Rs.5/- per set for loading and unloading the University furniture (iron tables and chairs) to the 'C' class employees, be enhanced with effect from the Annual Examination of 2014.

**Revision in the salaries of Medical Officer (Full-time contract), Medical Specialists and Visiting Consultant**

**35.** Considered if the following recommendations of the Committee dated 23.7.2013 (**Appendix-XXIX**) pertaining to the revision of salary for the post of Medical Officer (Full time contract), Part time Medical Specialists, Radiologist and the honorarium for the post of Visiting Consultants, at Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved as under, in anticipation of approval of Board of Finance:

1. The salary of Medical Officer (Full time contract) be enhanced to Rs.45,000/- p.m. (consolidated).
2. The salary of Part-Time Medical Specialists including pediatrician, ophthalmologist and Radiologist be enhanced to Rs.20,000/- per month.
3. The honorarium of visiting consultant be enhanced to Rs.25,000/- per month.

Dr. Dalip Kumar, referring to recommendation 2, stated that the salary of Part-time Medical Specialists including pediatrician,

ophthalmologist and Radiologist should be at par with the Visiting Consultant, i.e., Rs.25,000/- p.m. instead of Rs.20,000/- p.m.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the difference between Part-time Medical Specialists and Visiting Consultants and what is the procedure for appointing them. There might be some ground/valid reasons for recommending Rs.20,000/- per month to Part-time Medical Specialists including Pediatrician, Ophthalmologist and Radiologist and Rs.25,000/- per month to the Visiting Consultants. From the Item, it looked that the Visiting Consultants must be spending lesser time than the Part-time Medical Specialists, but in their case (Visiting Consultant), the Committee had recommended Rs.25,000/- per month and those who are spending more time had been recommended lesser amount. Further, the existing emoluments of neither Part-time Specialists nor Visiting Consultants have been mentioned anywhere. Had the existing emoluments of Visiting Consultants and Part-time Medical Specialists been Rs.20,000/- per month and Rs.15,000/- p.m. respectively, they would have understood the matter.

It was said that they assess the working hours of the Visiting Consultants and Part-time Medical Specialists & also the existing emoluments and revised emoluments of both the Visiting Consultants and the Part-time Medical Specialists accordingly.

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that the terms and conditions for both the Visiting Consultants and the Part-time Medical Specialists should be finalized and it should be determined as to how many hours they have to sit at Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision in the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

**Item 36 on the agenda was taken to Items for Ratification (Item 64-R(xxxvii)).**

### Withdrawn Item

**37.** The following Item 37 on the agenda was withdrawn:

**37.** To rectify the following decision (Item 8) (iii) of the Board of Finance dated 19.7.2013 approved by the Syndicate dated 24.8.2013 (Para 5) and Senate dated 29.9.2013 (Para LX), respectively:

<b>Existing decision of the B.O.F. (approved by the Syndicate/Senate)</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<p><b>Item 8</b></p> <p>That in view of Punjab Govt. Notification No. 38/11/80-FR (9) dated 22.2.1980 &amp; 30.4.1980 <b>Appendix – V</b>, the posts of Store-Keepers held by the employees in the Construction Office, Deptt. of U.I.E.T., Dental College and U.I.H.M.T. Panjab University, Chandigarh be converted/merged in the strength of Clerks and accordingly</p>	<p><b>Item 8</b></p> <p>That in view of Punjab Govt. Notification No. 38/11/80-FR (9) dated 22.2.1980 &amp; 30.4.1980 <b>Appendix – V</b>, the posts of Store-Keepers held by the employees in the Construction Office, Deptt. of U.I.E.T., Dental College and U.I.H.M.T. Panjab University, Chandigarh be converted/merged in the strength of Clerks and accordingly their pay band</p>

their pay band may be changed to Rs.10300-34800+ GP 3200 from Rs.5910-20200+ GP 1900 on following conditions:-	may be changed to Rs.10300-34800+ GP 3200 from Rs.5910-20200+ GP 1900 on following conditions:-
(i)           xxxx           xxxx xxxx	(i)           xxxx           xxxx xxxx
(ii)           xxxx           xxxx xxxx	(ii)           xxxx           xxxx xxxx
(iii)        They will be given seniority in the Clerical cadre after the last confirmed Clerk.	(iii)        They will be given seniority in the Clerical cadre after the last Clerk appointed on regular basis <b>instead of last confirmed Clerk.</b>
(iv)           xxx           xxx xxx	(iv)           xxx           xxx xxx
(v)           xxx           xxx           xxx	(v)           xxx           xxx           xxx
(vi)           xxx           xxx           xxx	(vi)           xxx           xxx           xxx

**NOTE:** An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).

Professor S.K. Sharma suggested that when the above item 37 is again brought to the agenda, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology and Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, should also be included in it because all these are professional institutions; otherwise, there would be some representations from certain persons from these institutions.

**Modification in the decisions of the Syndicate meetings dated 08.10.2013 and 05.12.2013 (General Discussion), respectively.**

**38.** Reconsidered Syndicate decision –

- (i) dated 8.10.2013 (General Discussion) with regard to instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 8% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.1.2013, be released/paid to the University employees, in anticipation of the announcement of release of said DA instalment by the Punjab Government and Board of Finance on the analogy of U.T. Administration with the following modification:

Existing Decision	Proposed Modification
The instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 8% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.1.2013, be released/paid to the	The instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 8% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.1.2013, be released/paid to the University employees,

University employees, in anticipation of announcement of release of the said DA instalment by Punjab Government and Board of Finance on the analogy of U.T. Administration.	in anticipation of approval of the Board of Finance.
---	--

**NOTE:** The Punjab Government vide notification No.3/2/97-FP1/2039 dated 25.10.2013 regarding enhancement of Dearness Allowance (DA) to the employees as well as pensioners from 72% to 80% has released the **instalment of DA @ 8% from 1.7.2013 and not from 1.1.2013**. The decision with regard to balance payment due from 1.1.2013 to 30.6.2013 shall be taken later on by the Punjab Government.

- (ii) dated 5.12.2013 (General Discussion) with regard to instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 10% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.7.2013, be released/paid to the University employees as and when the grant is received, in anticipation of the announcement of release of the said DA instalment by the Punjab Government and Board of Finance on the analogy of U.T. Administration with the following modification:

<b>Existing Decision</b>	<b>Proposed Modification</b>
The instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 10% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.7.2013, be released/paid to the University employees as and when the grant is received, in anticipation of the announcement of release of the said DA instalment by the Punjab Government and Board of Finance on the analogy of U.T. Administration.	The instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 10% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.7.2013, be released/paid to the University employees as and when the grant is received, in anticipation of approval of the Board of Finance.

**NOTE:** The Punjab Government has not yet released the instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) to the employees as well as pensioners w.e.f. 1.7.2013.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the above-said instalments of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 8% w.e.f. 1.1.2013 and (DA) @10% w.e.f. 1.7.2013 released by the Central Government to its employees had been released/paid to the pensioners.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if this benefit had not been extended to the pensioners, the same should be given to them at an early date as it is very necessary for them to survive.

It was informed that the D.A. instalments are being released to the pensioners also.

**RESOLVED:** That the decisions of the Syndicate dated 8.10.2013 and 05.12.2013 (General Discussion) with regard to instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 8% and 10% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.1.2013 and 1.7.2013, respectively, be modified as under (proposed):

<b>Existing Decision</b>	<b>Proposed Modification</b>
<b>8.10.2013</b>	<b>8.10.2013</b>
The instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 8% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.1.2013, be released/paid to the University employees, in anticipation of announcement of release of the said DA instalment by Punjab Government and Board of Finance on the analogy of U.T. Administration.	The instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 8% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.1.2013, be released/paid to the University employees, in anticipation of approval of the Board of Finance.
<b>05.12.2013</b>	<b>05.12.2013</b>
The instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 10% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.7.2013, be released/paid to the University employees as and when the grant is received, in anticipation of the announcement of release of the said DA instalment by the Punjab Government and Board of Finance on the analogy of U.T. Administration.	The instalment of Dearness Allowance (DA) @ 10% released by the Central Government to its employees w.e.f. 1.7.2013, be released/paid to the University employees, in anticipation of approval of the Board of Finance.

**Change in nomenclature of Government College for Women, Ludhiana**

**39.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor, that the nomenclature of Government College for Women, Ludhiana be changed to Government College for Girls, Ludhiana.

**NOTE:** The Principal, Government College for Girls, Rakh Bagh, Ludhiana vide Memo No. 8554 dated 31.08.2013 (**Appendix-XXXI**) had informed that Higher Education and Language Department of Punjab Government vide its letter No. 12/140/12-Edu.Cell/1864 dated 19.11.2012 had changed the name of the College from Government College for Women, Ludhiana to **Government College for Girls, Ludhiana.**

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that a copy of such decisions should be sent by the University at its own level to the Under Secretary, Coordination, Planning & Policy, U.G.C., so that these are implemented at the earliest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Dean, College Development Council, would send a copy of the decision to the Under Secretary, Coordination, Planning & Policy, U.G.C.

**RESOLVED:** That the nomenclature of Government College for Women, Ludhiana be changed as **Government College for Girls, Ludhiana.**

**Nomenclature of District Muktsar as Sri Muktsar Sahib**

**40.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the name of District Muktsar be written as Sri Muktsar Sahib with all the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh, situated in the District Muktsar.

**NOTE:** As per notification (**Appendix-XXXII**) issued by the Finance Commission (Revenue) and Secretary (Revenue and Rehabilitation) Govt. of Punjab, vide its letter No. 9965-10084 dated 13.07.2010, the Punjab Government had changed the name of the District Muktsar to Sri Muktsar Sahib.

**RESOLVED:** That '**District Sri Muktsar Sahib**', be written with all the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh, situated in this District, instead of District Muktsar.

**Promotion of certain Programmers working at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur**

**41.** Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 24.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor; and

**RESOLVED:** That Ms. Daisy Puri and Ms. Nishi Goyal, Programmers Computer Unit, and Mr. Vrajesh Sharma, Programmer SSGPURC, Bajwara (Hoshiarpur), be promoted from Step-1 to Step-2 (Programmer/System Programmer/System Analyst) (Senior Scale) w.e.f. their date of eligibility as per promotion policy duly approved by the Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate dated 10.2.2006, 22.2.2006 and 26.3.2006, respectively.

**Condonation of delay in submission of Medical Reimbursement bill**

**42.** Considered request dated 3.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) received from Smt. Krishna Rani W/o Late Shri Shambhu Ram, Carpenter, Construction Office for delay in submission of Medical reimbursement bill amounting to Rs. 35430/- be condoned and payment be made to Smt. Krishna Rani.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 29.5.1992 (Para 16) has resolved that all claims against the University, except T.A. bills, be entertained for payment, if received in the Accounts Branch within a period of three years, from the date of payment became due.
  2. The bills of medical reimbursement of Late Shri Shambhu Ram was received by the Accounts Branch vide No. 645/A1 dated 13.9.2013. The treatment period of the bills from 25.3.2010 to 27.8.2010 & bills were barred by the limitation on 24.3.2013.

**RESOLVED:** That the delay in submission of Medical Reimbursement Bill/s amounting to Rs. 35430/- on the part of Smt. Krishna Rani W/o Late Shri Shambhu Ram, Carpenter, Construction Office, be condoned and payment be made to her.

**Assignment of Fellow  
to the Faculties**

**43.** Considered and

**RESOLVED:** That the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against her name in anticipation of the approval of the Senate:

Smt. Preet Kaur Hon'ble Minister of State for External Affairs Government of India South Block New Delhi	1. Law 2. Science 3. Education 4. Business Management & Commerce
---	--

**Recommendation of the  
Committee dated  
13.9.2013 regarding  
allowing University  
Director of Physical  
Education, Asstt. Director  
of Physical Education to  
act as Independent  
Supervisors**

**44.** Considered following recommendation of the Committee dated 13.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXV**) constituted by the Syndicate dated 30.4.2011 (Para 19), regarding issue of allowing the University Director of Physical Education, Deputy Director/Directress of Physical Education & Sports, Assistant Director of Physical Education to act as Independent Supervisor for Ph.D. research work in Physical Education:

“That since the University Director of Physical Education, Deputy Director/Directress of Physical Education & Sports, Assistant Director of Physical Education are not in teaching Department but has been coaching the students of Physical Education in practical subject, they are already allowed to become co-supervisors, as per University Regulations/ Rules.”

**NOTE:** The Syndicate at its meeting held on 30.4.2011 (Para 19) has resolved that the matter be referred to the Committee for consideration and the Committee be requested to submit the report at the earliest so that the same could be placed in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is a very good proposal. He enquired whether they are not filling up the post of University Director of Physical Education.

It was clarified that since they forget to mention the API score in the advertisement which was mandatory as per UGC, they could not go ahead with the selection process.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that they accept that the API score is mandatory.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that if they treated University Director of Physical Education, Deputy Director/Directress of Physical Education & Sports and Assistant Director of Physical Education as non-teacher, the 400 API score is not applicable to them and if they treat them as teachers, 400 API score is applicable to them and they could be appointed full-fledged Supervisors of Ph.D. candidates.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that since the other persons were of the opinion that they are not teachers, they should not be allowed to guide Ph.D. students. However, since there is a provision in the Calendar under which the non-teachers could be appointed joint/co-supervisors, the Committee had recommended that these persons should be allowed to be appointed as joint/co-supervisors.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that when the item came first in 2011 proposing that they should be allowed to become independent Supervisors by treating them as teachers, the proposal was opposed by certain members. Secondly, when there was already a provision for guiding Ph.D. students by the non-teachers, why the Committee was appointed? If they are non-teachers, how the condition of 400 API score could be made applicable to them. If the API score is to be applied on these persons, then they should adopt the letter of the Punjab Government regarding API score for making appointments and promotions of Principals/Professors/Associate Professors and Assistant Professors.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, in fact, it is Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal from whom he came to know, but the item for their consideration is to allow University Director of Physical Education, Deputy Director/Directress of Physical Education & Sports and Assistant Director of Physical Education to act as independent Supervisors and within inverted commas it is written that they are already allowed to become co-supervisors. As such, the Committee has not recommended anything new. They have only said in the form of note that they are already working as co-supervisors. Now the Syndicate has to consider whether they be allowed to act as independent Supervisors. If on the one hand, the 400 API score is required, as per UGC Regulations there is no chance at all for them to say that they could not be allowed to act as independent Supervisors. Therefore, the Syndicate should allow them to act as independent Supervisors. As far as the post of University Director of Physical Education is concerned, he did not know how it slipped out of the minds when the advertisement was issued because these conditions were there much before the advertisement was issued. At the same time, if the 400 API score is mandatory as per UGC, just fifteen minutes back they had said that they should defer the adoption of Punjab Government letter for the next meeting.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath clarified that there were four members on the Committee. Principal S.S. Sangha had conveyed that he would not attend the meeting but he was in favour of allowing them to become independent Supervisors. The other member, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he does not recommend them to become as independent Supervisors. Principal Gurdip Sharma, who was also the Chairman of the Sports Committee, also said that he was not in favour of allowing them to become independent Supervisors. Under these circumstances, how he could recommend that these persons be allowed to act as independent Supervisors?

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the University Director of Physical Education, Deputy Director/Directress of Physical Education & Sports and Assistant Director of Physical Education, be allowed to be appointed as independent Supervisor/s.

**Deferred Item**

**45.** Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the educational qualifications and experience and criteria of selection for the post of Driver in the University, be approved, as under:

**Educational Qualification**

1. Matriculation from recognized Board
2. Should hold license for driving heavy and light vehicles.

**Experience**

Experience of driving for 2/3 years.

The candidates have to qualify the skills test as follows:

- (a) Road Sign test
- (b) knowledge of driving vehicle in which a physical driving test will be conducted. The candidate will be asked to drive the vehicle on roads and the committee observes his driving.
- (c) Knowledge of First-Aid
- (d) Written test.

**NOTE:** An office note enclosed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that on the one side they had proposed that the candidates should be matriculate from a recognized Board and, on the other side, the candidates should hold license for driving heavy and light vehicles and experience of driving for 2/3 years. It is for the first time that instead of going by the approved qualifications, the Vice-Chancellor had appointed a Committee and after the Committee's recommendations, the office had proposed something. At least during his experience in the University, such a thing had happened for the first time that the office had proposed something over and above the recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor. Now, the question is – what about those Drivers, who are already working in the University for the last so many years and are not matriculates, but are efficient Drivers and had license for driving light vehicles. Rather for practical purposes, some of them had not studied anywhere, but had valid license for driving heavy/light vehicles and had been driving the vehicles of the University for 16 hours to 20 hours daily. If these qualifications are approved, all such persons would be thrown out. They would meet the same fate as that of certain Lecturers, who were BDS at the time of appointment, at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, wherein they had appointed persons in dire need, but could not accommodate them because of revision of qualifications from B.D.S. to M.D.S. in the meantime, even though they were able to establish the Dental Institute only on the basis of their contribution. He opined that they should first think as to how the services of all those Drivers, who are already working in the University, could be regularized, and thereafter, they should think for appointing Driver with new qualifications.

Principal Puneet Bedi said that, normally, in such cases, as there are so many categories, they regularize the services of such

persons without facing the interview as they are already familiar with their work and conduct.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that they should find some way out without breaking the law.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that, in fact, it is wrongly mentioned, it should have been mentioned as the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor instead of office proposal.

Continuing, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that all those drivers who have been driving heavy as well as light vehicles of the University for the last so many years, should be made eligible to apply on the basis of existing qualifications.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had seen in this University that though some persons are on the rolls of the University, are being paid salaries from different budget heads, which are subject to audit, and did not get reflected anywhere. He suggested that all the persons working in the University for the last so many years should be treated at par for all practical purposes, irrespective of their being paid salaries, should be considered for regularization of their services or whatever benefits they are to be given. Referring to the condition of 5 years valid Driving License of Heavy Transport Vehicles and 3 years valid Driving License of Light Transport Vehicles, he suggested that they should take a decision keeping in view the interests of the existing drivers irrespective of the fact whether they are working on *ad hoc* basis or temporary basis or two years or six years or 20 years. He added that one of the drivers, who was driving the official car of the Vice-Chancellor earlier, perhaps was not even 8<sup>th</sup> pass.

The Vice-Chancellor said that nowadays no Government servant is being employed if one did not have a school leaving certificate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Government appointed persons on daily-wage or temporary or *ad hoc* basis only if they fulfilled all the conditions for appointment on regular basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what to do with the existing employees is a big problem for them. But as far as recruitment norms are concerned, they had to move with the time. When they appointed Clerks recently, did they not adopt what the peers were doing?

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that whenever the new posts of drivers are advertised by the University, the persons who are already working in the University, should be made eligible to apply for the said posts.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is mandatory and where there is no discretion, they have to accept under the mandate of the Government/MHRD or the University Grants Commission, there they are trying to escape by deferring or by rejecting or by not implementing, but where there is no mandate, they are implementing just because the Government had prescribed the same. According to him, there is no compulsion for the University to adopt the qualifications of Punjab Government for the posts of Drivers. Even for the posts of Clerks, they had their own qualifications.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that they should obtain the qualifications for the post of drivers from the Punjab Government and U.T. Administration, Chandigarh.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are still Departments, which render the matriculates ineligible for the Class-IV posts, because they say whosoever is matriculate, he/she is not going to serve the way, they wanted to.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, nowadays, the regular Government employees/public sector employees derive handsome salaries and the lowest ranked employee is getting a minimum of Rs.25,000/- p.m. The level of salary is going up due to inflation.

Professor S.K. Sharma urged that a way out should be found.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the whole issue should be got examined through a Committee, to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, so that everything is made crystal clear, and in the meanwhile the consideration of the item should be deferred.

**This was agreed to.**

**Issue regarding allowing non-teaching employees to send one application during the probation period**

**46.** Considered, if the following decision of the Syndicate dated 25.02.1989 (Para 9), be allowed in the case of Non-Teaching employees:

“that a faculty member **appointed on probation for one year** be permitted to send **one application** during the period of probation for an outside assignment. If selected he shall have to resign.”

**NOTE:** An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there is a lot of difference between teaching and non-teaching employees. If they restrict the non-teaching employees, who are on probation, to apply once or twice during the probation would it not be unfair to them? He did not think that there could be any bar for the non-teaching employees to apply anywhere else. Just because some of the institutions/organizations asked the candidates to route their applications through proper channel, they could not say that they would not allow. In the case of teachers, a faculty member appointed on probation for one year could be permitted to send one application during the period of probation for an outside assignment. As far as non-teachers are concerned, there should not be any limit because in the case of non-teaching employees, it is an on-going process. But for teachers, since the classes are disturbed, there is a restriction of applying once during the probation. In no Department, there is any restriction for applying in other institutions/organization for non-teaching employees.

**RESOLVED:** That there be no restriction for non-teaching employees to apply (through proper channel) anywhere else during probation period.

### **Ranking list of newly appointed Clerks**

**47.** Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 25.9.2013 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) constituted by the Syndicate dated 27.7.2013 (Para 15) that the ranking list (**Appendix-XXXVII**) of newly appointed Clerks be approved.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 27.7.2013/13.8.2013 (Para 15) has resolved that a Committee comprising Shri Ashok Goyal, Dr. Dinesh Talwar, Dr. Jagwant Singh and President PUSA be constituted to examine the whole issue and make recommendation.
  2. The Committee has found list prepared by office in order.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that he wanted to say only one thing that person/s, who is/are/was/were appointed earlier, should be senior to those, who is/are/was/were appointed later.

**RESOLVED:** That the ranking list of newly appointed Clerks, as per **Appendix-XXXVII**, be approved.

### **Donation for institution of an Endowment**

**48.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Ms. Prerna Tandon, 301 Brigade Heritage 2/4, Cookson Street, Richards Town Bangalore-5, be accepted. The investment of Rs.1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment 'Gold Medal' in the memory of her revered father Late Dr. M.L. Tandon. On receipt of the interest from the amount the topper of the M.Com. programme, every year be awarded Gold Medal during the Panjab University Convocation on the following terms and conditions:

1. Endowment will be named as 'Late' Dr. M.L. Tandon Gold Medal.
2. Gold Medal to be awarded to the topper of the M.Com. programme every year during the Panjab University Convocation.

**NOTE:** An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVIII**).

After some discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That donation of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Ms. Prerna Tandon, 301 Brigade Heritage 2/4, Cookson Street, Richards Town Bangalore-5, be accepted. The investment of Rs.1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment 'Gold Medal' in the memory of her revered father Late Dr. M.L. Tandon. On receipt of the interest from the amount, the topper of the M.Com. (Hons.) programme, every year be awarded Gold Medal during the Panjab University Convocation on the following terms and conditions:

1. Endowment will be named as 'Late' Dr. M.L. Tandon Gold Medal.

2. Gold Medal to be awarded to the topper of the M.Com. (Hons.) programme every year during the Panjab University Convocation.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the thanks of the Syndicate be conveyed to the Donor.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 11.11.2013 regarding B.Com. LL.B (Hons.) 5-Year Integrated course at Rayat and Bahra College of Law, Railmajra**

**49.** Considered minutes dated 11.11.2013 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate dated 24.8.2013 (Para 5) to look into the issue of affiliation and recognition by Bar Council of India to B.Com. LL.B. (Hons.) course 5-year Integrated course being run by Rayat and Bahra College of Law, Railmajra.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 11.11.2013, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

**Recommendation of the House Allotment Committees-I & II (joint meeting) dated 23.8.2013**

**50.** Considered the recommendation of the Joint meeting of the House Allotment Committee I & II dated 23.8.2013 (**Appendix-XL 'x' on page 486**) that criteria of seniority in terms of length of service rendered by an employee for change of house in the same category be followed and the priority be considered at the time of allotment.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar stated that during the University games (e.g. cross country relay) held at the Panjab University Campus – whether Inter-Colleges or Inter-Universities, the Physiotherapist needed to be present in the Ground at 4.30 a.m. as the events like cross country stated at 4.30 a.m., i.e., early in the morning as someone might need the physiotherapy immediately. But the Physiotherapist appointed by the University resides outside the campus. Keeping in view the fact that the services of Physiotherapist are required at the odd hours, he should be allotted accommodation at the Campus by the Vice-Chancellor by using his discretionary powers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person concerned should make an application for the purpose.

When pointed out that the person concerned had already applied and his request had been referred to the Registrar, the Vice-Chancellor asked the Registrar to examine the case again.

**RESOLVED:** That criteria of seniority in terms of length of service rendered by an employee for change of house in the same category be followed and the priority be considered at the time of allotment.

**Withdrawn Item**

**51.** The following Item 51 on the agenda was withdrawn:

- 51.** To consider if Mrs. Meenakshi, Sr. Draftsman, Architect Office, be granted voluntary retirement w.e.f. 05.02.2014 (A.N.) as requested by her, under Regulations 17.5, 17.8 and 17.9 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and she be sanctioned following retiral benefits, Gratuity and Leave encashment etc. as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007, Mrs. Meenakshi, has 27 years qualifying services in her credit:

1. **Gratuity:** as admissible under Regulation 15.1 as amended at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar Volume I, 2007.
2. **Encashment of Earned Leave:** as may be due but not exceeding 300 days or as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 96 of Panjab University Calendar Volume III, 2009.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 27.8.2013 regarding hike in room rents of University Guest House, Golden Jubilee, Faculty House and Teachers' Holiday Home at Shimla**

52. Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 27.8.2013 constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to hike in the existing rent of the rooms in the University Guest House, Golden Jubilee, Faculty House and Teachers' Holiday Home at Shimla (**as per Annexure 'A' of the Appendix-XLI**).

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the recommendations 2 and 3 of the Committee that 'one room, instead of Faculty House as presently reserved for Doctor for emergency duty, be provided in the Health Centre itself', should be implemented immediately. As far as recommendation 3 that is concerned, only one room could be used as Store and 2<sup>nd</sup> room should be spared. This would maximize the utility there.

It was clarified that the item before the Syndicate is only pertaining to hike in the existing rent of the rooms in the University Guest House, Golden Jubilee, Faculty House and Teachers' Holiday Home at Shimla. And for the rest of the recommendations of the Committee, another Committee had been constituted.

Continuing, Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that there seemed no rationale in enhancing the rates of room rents as somewhere these had been recommended to be enhanced from Rs.35/- to Rs.70/- and somewhere from Rs.50/- to Rs.70/-, i.e., somewhere the increase is 100%, somewhere 50% and somewhere 75%.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for everything there is no mathematical formula. The Committee had representatives from different spheres and they might have recommended these rates by taking into consideration some rationale.

Principal Gurdip Sharma pointed out that the University gave Rs.160/- to the Fellow and took back Rs.70/- as room rent and Rs.75/- for meal at one time. Earlier, at one point of time, Shri Ashok Goyal had suggested that the accommodation and meal should be provided to the Fellows free.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Senators on the meetings of the University could be given absolutely free and there is no issue at all.

It was clarified that if the Fellows are provided rent free accommodation, then they could not claim Daily Allowance (DA).

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that neither the members of the Syndicate/Senate reside in the University Guest House/Golden Jubilee Guest House nor their relatives.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to remark that it used to be called the 'Kothi of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath'.

Continuing, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that they are not salary paid members. They gave 3-4 days in the month to the University free of cost. They should be given at least this respect that the rooms which are meant for Syndics and Senators, should be provided to them or their guests at the cheapest rates. Earlier, the University Guest House was known as Guest House for the Senators. He had seen a time when only Senators or their guests or the guests of the University used to stay in the University Guest House. At one point of time, there used to be not even a single room reserved for the Vice-Chancellor and in Room No. 1, Room No.2 and Room No.6 used to be occupied by D.C. Sharma, Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon and he himself (Shri Chatrath), respectively. He urged that the consideration of the item should be deferred and rethinking should be done on the revision of these rates.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that this amount is a very small amount in comparison to the services offered by the Syndics and Senators to the University. In fact, the services rendered by the Syndics and Senators to the University could not be compensated and this is just a small add-on. They are already making huge sacrifices in terms of time, energy, etc. without any expectation.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that if they have to increase the room rent, they should enhance it a little bit and not to the proposed extent.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that they had huge property at Dalhousie and Shimla, which is in dilapidated state, but have never worked out a plan to renovate them. He suggested that they should make a concrete plan to renovate these buildings.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that they should construct parking at Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla, which would enable them to earn a lot of income.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these rates are lowest in comparison to rates of other Universities.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they had earned a sum of Rs.33 lacs, which had been deducted from the remuneration of teachers @ 5%, i.e., paper-setting, evaluation, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to reiterate once again that the members on the meetings of the University could be given absolutely free, but all their guests could not be accommodated free. Whatever might be their electoral compulsions, it could not be made free.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the proposed hike from Rs.300/- to Rs.500/- should be reduced to Rs.400/-.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that since they had made 100% hike in room rents 3 years before, it should not be more than 30%.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that though they had increased the room rent three years ago, the room rent for the Fellows were not increased at all. They, therefore, suggested that the proposed enhancement should be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal, referring to the explanation that if the Fellows are provided rent free accommodation, they could not claim D.A., stated that D.A. had three components – (i) Lodging (50% for having food); (ii) Boarding (25%); and (iii) Out of pocket expenses (25%). Therefore, if free of rent accommodation is provided to the Fellows, then only 25% amount from the DA could be deducted. Secondly, the approach on the part of the University that from the Guest Houses or Holiday Homes, they have to generate revenue to meet the maintenance expenses probably would not be in order because these are sort of welfare activities. Not that he had any objection to the hike even if it is increased to Rs.1000/-, he would be the last man to ask for reduction. Shri Chatrath had explained his difficulties and similar difficulties could be faced by the Senate members who are residing at Chandigarh. As already told by him, these are sort of welfare activities and probably in those welfare measures even the members of the Senate could also be covered; even if they are not employees or drawing any salaries, that is no ground for getting any concession. To see that what is revenue, he had told once earlier also that there should be some mechanism while revising the rates/rents so that they could see what is the occupancy, what is the expenditure on the Guest House/s, what is the rent received, etc. and if they increase the rent to Rs.500/- what would be the income generated by the University. If another Rs.2 lac is generated per year, he did not think that it is worth annoying a senior Senator like Shri Chatrath. But if the revenue is enhanced to the tune of Rs.1 crore, then they could see that it would meet some deficit of the University. Same is the case with Teachers' Holiday Home, Shimla and Students' Holiday Home, Dalhousie or anywhere else. There is another category, which Shri Chatrath had forgotten to point out, though they are not bargaining, to which the reduction in room rent from Rs.500/- to Rs.400/- has been sought. One more category had come, i.e., suites at the Guest House and the proposed rate for the suites is Rs.750/-. He was 100% sure that the maximum pressure on people like Shri Chatrath would be that instead of room, he/she would like to stay in the suite. Hence, some logic has to be given why there are different rates for rooms and suites so there should be some differentiation that rooms would be allotted to such and such category of people and suites to only such and such category of people. Further, it had been recommended by the Committee that two suites and two rooms be placed at the disposal of the Vice-Chancellor instead of four rooms in the Guest House as at present because it is also apprehended that the Vice-Chancellor also might be needing suites as well as rooms. Had this exercise been done that this increase would result into this much increase in revenue and would reduce this much deficit of the University Budget, the hike could have been justified. The way the item had been presented, it was presented last time also in 2010-2011 and at that time also the decision was taken by way of bargaining only. He suggested that they should do this exhaustive exercise and see whatever minimum possible increase could be made without affecting the efficiency and position of the University and that exercise should be done by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath himself. He, however, said that this should be kept in mind that Guest Houses should not be seen as revenue generating machines.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as suggested by Shri Ashok Goyal, they would have this revenue exercise done. The consideration of the item be deferred.

Shri Jagpal Singh said that instead of deferring the item, it should be approved because as and when they come from outside and require accommodation in the Guest House, they did not get the same and face a lot of difficulties.

Professor Preeti Mahajan said that earlier the linen charges were not there, now the same had been included.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the linen charges are there right from the very beginning.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that people face lot of difficulties during the months of February-March every year because majority of the teaching departments of the University organized Seminars/Lectures/Conferences, etc. during these months and almost all the rooms of the University Guest House were booked by them.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the way the academic functions (workshops, seminars, conferences, etc.) in the country are held in the month of February and March because generally money from the funding agencies is received late. Anyhow, he had proposed that a new A.C. Guest House comprising 15-20 rooms in a Tower Block adjacent to the University Guest House exclusively for the academic guests of the University, wherein the parking facility would be provided at the ground floor. When the same is built, the present Guest House could be reserved only for the Fellows.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that if they allow them to make a wing in the Golden Jubilee Guest House of the University, they would get sufficient fund from the Indian Institute of Chemical Engineers and they would require only two rooms for them as and when they would come here. On their behalf, he could commit Rs.30 lac at this moment and another Rs.30 lac by the end of the year. He, therefore, pleaded that the Indian Institute of Chemical Engineers should be allowed to build a block and ultimately the accommodation could be used by the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would discuss the proposal made by Professor S.K. Sharma later. As of now, they had two options – they defer the consideration of the item and workout a revenue model or they do not increase room rents for the Fellows.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the item be deferred, and a revenue model be worked out so that appropriate enhancement in revenue so generated, by increasing the room rents, become available.

**Items 53 and 61 on the agenda were taken up for consideration together.**

**Issue regarding allowing Mr. M. Baskar, a Research Scholar, to submit his Ph.D. thesis before 31.3.2014**

**53.** Considered if Mr. M. Baskar, a Research Scholar, Department of Biophysics, be allowed to submit his thesis before 31.3.2014, as a special case, w.e.f. the date of communication after the decision or the date for submission of Ph.D. thesis.

**NOTE:** 1. The Regulation 13.1 at page 193, P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, is reproduced below:

13.1. A candidate who is unable to complete research work and thesis within the time allowed by these Regulations may apply through his Supervisor and Head of the Department concerned for grant of extension.

Extension may be granted by the Joint Research Board up to a maximum of two years, i.e. every candidate must submit his thesis on the expiry of a total period of five years from the date of enrolment of application.

Provided that –

- (i) extension shall not be granted for more than a year at a time;
- (ii) every application for grant of extension shall be accompanied by a fee prescribed by the Syndicate/ Senate from time to time.

**If the thesis is received after the prescribed period of five years, the delay may be condoned by the authorities named below:**

- i) Up to 3 months – Dean of University Instruction.**
- ii) Up to one year – Joint Research Board.**
- iii) Beyond one year up to three years – Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Joint Research Board, under special and exceptional circumstances to be recorded.**

**A fee of Rs.2000/- per year or an amount to be decided by the Syndicate/Senate from time to time shall be charged for condonation of delay in the submission of Ph.D. thesis after expiry of the period of five**

**years from the date of enrolment.**

**Provided that the maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis would be eight years from the date of enrolment, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: two years and condonation period: three years after which enrolment and registration of the candidate shall be treated as cancelled automatically.**

2. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLII**).
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.1.2013 (Para 43(xvi)) had extended the last date for submission of Ph.D. thesis up to 30.6.2013.

**Issue regarding allowing Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Lecturer in Civil Engg. At CCET, Chandigarh, to submit his Ph.D. thesis up to 07.04.2014**

**61.** Considered if Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Lecturer in Civil Engineering, CCET, Sector 26, Chandigarh, be allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis up to 7.4.2014 in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, as recommended by the Dean Faculty of Engineering & Technology, in anticipation of the approval of the Research Board.

**NOTE:** 1. Shri Rajesh Kumar, a candidate for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, CCET, Sector-26, Chandigarh, vide his letter dated 08.11.2013 (**Appendix-XLIII**) addressed to the Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, had stated that he had submitted print out copy of Ph.D. thesis to his supervisor/s for final checking and shortly it would be ready for submission. He had requested to allow him to submit his thesis by **giving him an opportunity for submission up to 7.4.2014. The Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, had recommended extension, in anticipation of the approval of the Research Board.**

2. Regulation 11 at page 446, P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007, which is reproduced below:

“11. Such application for extension must be submitted to the University before the expiry of date for submission of thesis. Such extension will be granted for one year at a time subject to a maximum of three years, beyond which, ordinarily no further extension will be granted by the Research Board”.

3. The Research Board had already granted three years extension up to 22.8.2012 on one year basis to Shri Rajesh Kumar and

accordingly **he was informed vide this office letter dated 27.12.2011 that extension is granted for not more than three years and he would have to submit the thesis on or before 22.8.2012.**

4. The Syndicate dated 27.1.2013 (Para xvi) had extended the last date for submission of Ph.D. thesis under **special chance up to 30.6.2013** for all candidates enrolled under old/new Regulations, which had already lapsed and the said candidate failed to avail this opportunity.

**The last date for submission of Ph.D. thesis was 22.8.2012.**

5. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLIII**).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that certain Research Scholars were facing difficulties/problems for the last 4-5 months because they could not submit their Ph.D. synopses within the stipulated time due to the circumstances beyond their control. They were late just by a few days. When he brought this problem to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor, he had assured that he would take care of this issue. But he was sorry to point out that the problem had not been taken care of till date. He handed over the representation/s of the Research Scholars to the Vice-Chancellor on the floor of the House.

**The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Karamjeet Singh to remind him and see that the problem pointed out by Shri Ashok Goyal is taken care of.**

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) Mr. M. Baskar, a Research Scholar, Department of Biophysics, be allowed to submit his thesis before 31.03.2014, as a special case, w.e.f. the date of communication after the decision or the date for submission of Ph.D. thesis; and
- (2) as recommended by the Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Lecturer in Civil Engineering, CCET, Sector 26, Chandigarh, be allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis up to 7.4.2014, in anticipation of the approval of the Research Board.

**Issue regarding declaration of result of students of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46, Chandigarh**

**54.** Considered following recommendation of the Committee dated 11.12.2013 (**Appendix-XLIV**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that:

- (i) the result of the students of 2010-11 batch of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46, Chandigarh, be declared provisionally forthwith. This will be subject to the outcome of any litigation/dispute/ approval pending either with the Government of India or in any Court of Law.

- (ii) for other matters connected with this College the appropriate bodies including Syndicate/ Senate may take any appropriate decision as it may deem fit.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that they were declaring the results of the students of 2010-11 batch of Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital, Sector 46, Chandigarh, under pressure. He thought that something must be done in this regard; otherwise, every other day one would threaten that he would go to the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are directives from the Court and also from the regulatory body and several other things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it would have been better, had all such things, as narrated by the Vice-Chancellor, been annexed with the item.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that two Committees had visited Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital – one headed by Professor D.V.S. Jain and another by Dr. Krishan Gauba. There are other reports and documents which have been received during the last two days. He had talked to and discussed with Professor Naval Kishore. They had also enquired and found that Shri Dhanwantry Ayurvedic College & Hospital was given land by the U.T. Administration to promote this College. As such, the College is there to serve a purpose to the society. Since the land had been given by the U.T. Administration, the Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, needed to look into whether the College is performing the functions for which the land had been given. Therefore, there should be a Committee, comprising Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, 1-2 representative/s of the U.T. Administration, Professor D.V.S. Jain, Dr. Krishan Gauba, Professor Naval Kishore, some members of the present Syndicate and maybe 1 or 2 persons more. All the documents should be made available to the Committee so that they could bring up something for the consideration of the Syndicate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar pointed out that whatever papers had been sent to the Government of India, had never been responded to.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that Dr. Dalip Kumar possessed certain papers, which they did not have.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the report of Jain Committee must be given to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had taken all the papers which were placed on the table during the last meeting of the Syndicate held on 04.01.2014. He had confirmed information that people sitting on his right side had got certain papers, which were not made available to them and this kind of step-motherly treatment on the part of the office is not acceptable to them. Last time also, they came to know later on that somebody had complained to the office of the Chancellor about some appointments. For obvious reasons, the Chancellor's Office had sought comments from the University. The reply to the said letter was sent by the University to the office of the Chancellor and he came to know subsequently that his friends sitting on the other side had got copy of that reply. Not only that while discussions were taking place, one of his friends was reading from those papers and they have yet not been given copies of those papers.

He wanted to believe that it was not done intentionally. Intentionally or unintentionally, but the same could not be appreciated by anyone. He would request the Vice-Chancellor to please get the matter enquired into as to how some specific documents were accessible to some selected members of the Syndicate and were not given to some of the members of the Syndicate.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that there were no such papers. In fact, it was a note prepared by Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath himself. Hence, no such papers were provided to them by the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he did not say anything which could not be proved by documentary evidences. He just said that the matter should be enquired into as to how and under what circumstances the papers were provided to certain selected members of the Syndicate and if the information is found to be correct, some serious steps have to be taken. In case his allegation is proved to be wrong, he was ready to undergo any kind of punishment at the hands of the Syndicate and the Senate.

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor comprising Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, 1-2 representative/s of the U.T. Administration, D.V.S. Jain, Dr. Krishan Gauba, some members of the present Syndicate and maybe 1 or 2 persons more to look into the matter in totality and make recommendations.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 19.11.2013 regarding quashing of result of Shri Joga Singh, Roll No.101525, B.A. III Examination (April 2012)**

**55.** Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 19.11.2013 (**Appendix-XLV**), constituted by the Controller of Examinations and approved by the Vice-Chancellor, that the result of Shri Joga Singh S/o Shri Chanan Singh, Roll No. 101525, B.A.III Examination, April 2012, be quashed as the photo printed on the degree does not match with that of April and September 2011 examination forms, under Regulation 5.1 at page 16 of P.U. Cal. Volume II, 2007.

**NOTE:** Regulation 5.1 at page 16 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007 reads as under:

5.1. If a candidate, after admission to an examination –

- (a) commits an immoral act; or
- (b) is discovered to have committed an immoral act which in the opinion of the Syndicate is such that had it come to their knowledge in time, they would have excluded him from the examination;

the Syndicate may –

- (i) cancel his candidature for that examination and order that his result be not declared; and/or
- (ii) disqualify him permanently or for a specified period.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this Committee had been constituted by the Controller of Examinations and it had been discussed on occasions more than once that the authority to constitute Committee/s is with the Vice-Chancellor. Secondly, the proceedings of the meeting of the Committee have also not been recorded properly. The proceedings should have been recorded the way, the proceedings of other meetings are recorded. Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the operative part is that, as per regulations, the item should have come to the Syndicate straightaway. He did not know for what purpose the Committee had been constituted and how the Committee had recommended quashing of the result of the candidate, which did not match with the provisions of the regulations. Referring the matter to the Committee meant, as if without the recommendations of the Committee, the Syndicate is not empowered to exercise its powers vested under the Regulations. In future, when the regulations are explicitly clear, the Controller of Examinations or for that matter whosoever is the concerned Officer/Official, he/she should straightaway recommend to the Vice-Chancellor that, as per regulations, the matter be taken to the Syndicate or whichever authority is.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that, in fact, this is the prerogative of the Standing Committee constituted to deal with unfair means cases.

It was clarified that since the impersonation had been detected at a later stage, i.e., after declaration of result, it could not be referred to the Standing Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) the result of Shri Joga Singh S/o Shri Chanan Singh, Roll No. 101525, B.A.III Examination, April 2012, be quashed as the photo printed on the degree does not match with that of April and September 2011 examination forms, under Regulation 5.1 at page 16 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007; and
- (2) Shri Joga Singh S/o Shri Chanan Singh be disqualified for appearing in the examination/s for five years, i.e., 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16, under Regulation 5.1 at page 16 of P.U. Calendar, Volume II, 2007.

**Item 56 on the agenda was taken up for consideration after Item 9 on the agenda.**

**Agenda Items 57 and 58 being Ratification and Information Items, these be read under Items 64 and 65.**

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 27.12.2013 regarding qualifications for the post of Registrar**

**59.** Considered minutes dated 27.12.2013 (**Appendix-XLVI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, for determining the qualifications for the post of Registrar, Panjab University.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that they should adopt those qualifications which are laid down in the provisions of the UGC. He said that he also wanted to make one reference that if they see page 3,

it has been prescribed that “at least 15 years of experience as Assistant Professor in the AGP of Rs.7000/- and above including experience as Lecturer (Senior Scale) along with experience of **Administration in the field of Higher Education**. Similarly 15 years had been demanded as Lecturer/ Assistant Professor with at least 8 years of service in the AGP of Rs.8,000/- and above {including experience as Lecturer (Selection Grade)/ Reader} and including as Associate Professor along with experience of **Administration in the field of higher education**. He pleaded that they should go strictly by the UGC qualifications.

It was clarified that probably this point was raised in the meeting of the Committee by one of the members so that somebody like D.P.I. (Schools) might not become eligible for the post of Registrar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the words ‘Administration in the field of higher education’ would be replaced by **‘Educational Administration’**.

When some of the members insisted that they should go strictly by the UGC, the Vice-Chancellor stated that there are many Universities in India, which are permitting people from different spheres to come and compete in the open. The Committee had also given thought to it and had suggested this and the Syndicate should consider approving it. Even Delhi University has an Officer from Central Services, who had been appointed as Registrar. In fact, this provision had been suggested so that the person from the Central Services, who had experience of Academic Administration, could compete in the open and come for four years’ term as a Registrar on deputation. In this way, they had wider spectrum to choose.

Professor S.K. Sharma said that he fully agreed with Dr. Dalip Kumar that they should go by the guidelines prescribed by the UGC.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the experience of Kurukshetra University for appointing an IAS Officer as Registrar has been very disheartening and they would not like to have that bitter experience. He, therefore, suggested that they should strictly go by the UGC qualifications for the post of Registrar.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that when they had UGC qualifications, why did they constitute the Committee and bring recommendations thereof.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they should take the recommendations of the Committee seriously and make some recommendations. Earlier, though they had adopted the UGC in toto, they made Ph.D. candidates eligible for the posts of Assistant Professors without UGC-NET. As such, it is not that they always go by the UGC. Sometimes they consider something slightly different from the UGC. If necessary, they may add/delete the condition/s and those things be approved by this Body. Now, a proposal has been put to them and the purpose of the proposal is to wider the choice. If they think that it is not necessary to have a wider choice, he would accept their decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when they had already adopted the UGC qualifications, what was the need of making a Committee?

The Vice-Chancellor stated that in one of the meetings of the Syndicate last year, it was said that qualifications for the post of Registrar would be prescribed by the Syndicate.

The members endorsed that they should strictly adhere to the qualifications prescribed by the UGC for the post of Registrar in the University, and the same be approved.

**This was agreed to.**

**RESOLVED:** That the qualifications for the post of Registrar, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be strictly as prescribed by the UGC for the post of Registrars in the Universities.

**Appointment of Medical Officers at Bhai Ghanayia Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**60.** Considered minutes dated 29.10.2013 (**Appendix-XLVII**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Medical Officers-2, at Bhai Ghanayia Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+Grade pay of Rs.5400/-+NPA (with initial pay of Rs.21000/-) plus allowances admissible under the University Rules.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons, in order of merit, be appointed as Medical Officers at Bhai Ghanayia Ji Institute of Health, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + Grade Pay of Rs.5400/- + NPA (with initial pay of Rs.21,000/-) plus allowances admissible under University Rules, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. (Ms.) Rupinder Kaur
2. Dr. (Ms.) Rimpi Singla.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That Dr. (Ms.) Ramandeep Kaur be placed on the Waiting List.

**NOTE:** Certified that the selected and waitlisted candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the posts.

**Item 61 had been taken up for consideration along with Item 53.**

**Item 62, relating to Ph.D. cases, was approved in the Syndicate meeting held on 04.01.2014.**

At this stage, Professor S.K. Sharma stated that they need to change the procedure a little bit because if they look at the reports of the examiners of Ph.D. candidates, there are certain pertinent questions which have been asked and in the viva, it had been written that the questions have been asked and the candidate answered the same. In the IITs, whatever questions are asked, they along with their answers are mentioned in the report. In one of the cases, the examiner had desired that the topic of the thesis needed to be revised and in the office note, it had been mentioned that everything had been taken care of. He felt that there should be some seriousness because in some cases, the reports are coming very catchy and in certain other cases, there are many remarks. It appeared that everything is in a mess. He is not against anybody, but the reports should be read by the Dean Research and he should ensure that each and every question posed by the examiner/s is answered and the proof is attached with the report.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, now, they had the office of Dean Research and Research Promotion Cell. **He would constitute a Committee to look into the matter and make suggestions.**

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 1 to Assistant Professor Stage 2, under CAS, at UILS**

**63(i).** Considered minutes dated 8.1.2014 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) at the University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Jasneet Kaur Walia be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) (Law) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) (Law) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 19.09.2012, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 2 to Assistant Professor Stage 3, under CAS, at UILS**

**63(ii).** Considered minutes dated 8.1.2014 (**Appendix-XLIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) at the University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Shruti Bedi be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) (Law) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) (Law) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 05.10.2013, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 2 to Assistant Professor Stage 3, under CAS, at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana**

**63(iii).** Considered minutes dated 8.1.2014 (**Appendix-L**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. (Ms.) Aman Amrit Cheema nee Ranu be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) (Law) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) (Law) at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 26.07.2013, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 1 to Assistant Professor Stage 2, under CAS, at UIAMS**

**63(iv).** Considered minutes dated 8.1.2014 (**Appendix-LI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) at the University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) at University Institute of Applied Management Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 05.04.2009, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 2 to Assistant Professor Stage 3, under CAS, in the Department of Biochemistry**

**63(v).** Considered minutes dated 8.1.2014 (**Appendix-LII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. (Mrs.) Navneet Agnihotri be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 27.08.2013, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 2 to Assistant Professor Stage 3, under CAS, in the Department of Physics**

**63(vi).** Considered minutes dated 8.1.2014 (**Appendix-LIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- |    |                   |
|----|-------------------|
| 1. | Dr. (Mrs.) Sunita |
|    | : 24.08.2013      |
| 2. | Dr. Jangvir Singh |
|    | : 23.10.2012      |
| 3. | Dr. Vipin         |
|    | : 24.08.2013      |

4.

Dr. Ashok Kumar :  
24.08.2013.**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 2 to Assistant Professor Stage 3, under CAS, in the Department of Geography****63(vii).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh.**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Gaurav be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3) in the Department of Geography, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 03.01.2013, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 1 to Assistant Professor Stage 2, under CAS, in the Department of Defence & National Security Studies****63(viii).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department of Defence & National Security Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.**RESOLVED:** That Shri Jaskaran Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department of Defence & National Security Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 04.01.2013, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.**Promotion from Assistant Librarian (Sr. Scale) (Stage-2) to Deputy Librarian (Stage-3), under CAS, at A.C. Joshi Library****63(ix).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage-2) to Deputy Librarian (Stage-3) at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh.**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Jivesh Bansal be promoted from Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage-2) to Deputy Librarian (Stage-3) at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 20.06.2012, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Librarian (Stage-1) to Assistant Librarian (Sr. Scale) (Stage-2), under CAS, at A.C. Joshi Library**

**63(x).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LVII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Librarian (Stage-1) to Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage-2) at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Librarian (Stage-1) to Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage-2) at A.C. Joshi Library, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- |    |        |                                  |
|----|--------|----------------------------------|
| 1. |        | Dr. Payare Lal :<br>01.04.2010   |
| 2. |        | Ms. Leena Khullar:<br>01.04.2010 |
| 3. | Khanna | Ms. Sunaina<br>: 01.04.2010      |

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Librarian (Stage-1) to Assistant Librarian (Sr. Scale) (Stage-2), under CAS, in the Department of Anthropology**

**63(xi).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LVIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Librarian (Stage-1) to Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage-2) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Professor Preeti Mahajan enquired whether Ms. Ranjna had been awarded 40 marks for Refresher Course/s only. If yes, she is to be promoted w.e.f. 01.04.2011 instead of 01.04.2010.

It was clarified that the candidate had claimed 40 marks, but the Committee had awarded her 30 marks.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how do they know that the 30 marks had been awarded for Refresher Course/s or something else.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would check and take decision in the matter accordingly.

**RESOLVED:** That Ms. Ranjna be promoted from Assistant Librarian (Stage-1) to Assistant Librarian (Senior Scale) (Stage-2) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her. However, before issuing the letter of promotion, the point raised by Professor Preeti Mahajan be verified

and the date of her promotion be decided by the Vice-Chancellor accordingly.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 1 to Assistant Professor Stage 2, under CAS, in the Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies & Development**

**63(xii).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LIX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies & Development, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Rajesh Kumar Chander be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department-cum-Centre for Women Studies & Development, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 08.11.2012, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor (ECE) Stage 1 to Assistant Professor (ECE) Stage 2, under CAS, at UIET**

**63(xiii).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (ECE) (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (ECE) (Stage-2) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (ECE) (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (ECE) (Stage-2) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- |    |              |                     |
|----|--------------|---------------------|
| 1. |              | Ms. Charu :         |
|    |              | 07.10.2013          |
| 2. |              | Ms. Preeti Gupta :  |
|    |              | 06.10.2013          |
| 3. |              | Ms. Preeti D/o Shri |
|    |              | : 26.09.2013        |
| 4. | R.K. Sangwan | Ms. Neeraj Sharma : |
|    |              | 06.10.2013          |
| 5. |              | Ms. Nidhi :         |
|    |              | 17.10.2013          |
| 6. |              | Ms. Sarpreet Kaur : |
|    |              | 07.10.2013.         |

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor (EEE) Stage 1 to Assistant Professor (EEE) Stage 2, under CAS, at UIET**

**63(xiv).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LXI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (EEE) (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (EEE) (Stage-2) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Mrs. Preetika Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (EEE) (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (EEE) (Stage-2) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 06.10.2013, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage 1 to Assistant Professor Stage 2, under CAS, in the Department of Environment Studies**

**63(xv).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LXII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. (Mrs.) Suman Mor be promoted from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) in the Department of Environment Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. 30.08.2010, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor (Mech. Engg.) Stage 1 to Assistant Professor (Mech. Engg.) Stage 2, under CAS, at UIET**

**63(xvi).** Considered minutes dated 15.1.2014 (**Appendix-LXIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) for promotion from Assistant Professor (Mechanical Engineering) (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Mechanical Engineering) (Stage-2) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (Mechanical Engineering) (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Mechanical Engineering) (Stage-2) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (subject to fulfilment of UGC conditions) w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- |    |        |                                    |
|----|--------|------------------------------------|
| 1. | Wadhwa | Mr. Amandeep Singh<br>: 04.09.2013 |
| 2. |        | Mr. Prashant Jindal:<br>22.09.2013 |
| 3. | Singh  | Mr. Harbhinder<br>: 29.08.2011     |

4. Mehta Mr. Jaswinder Singh  
: 04.09.2013.

**NOTE:** The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.

**Agenda Items 57 and 58 being Ratification and Information Items, these be read under Items 64 and 65.**

**Routine and formal matters**

**64.** The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xxxvii)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

- (i)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. (Mrs.) Professor Bimla Nehru, Department of Biophysics, P.U., on contract basis w.e.f. 02.12.2013 with one day break on 01.12.2013, up to 15.12.2018 i.e. completion of 65 years of age, as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

**NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (ii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Professor A.K. Bhati, Department of Physics, P.U., on contract basis w.e.f. 03.10.2013 with one day break on 01.10.2013 (02.10.2013

being holiday) up to 02.09.2018 i.e. completion of 65 years of age, as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.
2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (iii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. (Mrs.) Madhu Raka, Professor, Department of Mathematics, P.U., on contract basis up to 18.11.2018 (i.e. the date of her completion of 65 years of age) w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of

every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Cal. Vol. III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Rajinder Jindal, Professor, Department of Zoology, P.U., on contract basis w.e.f. the date he will start to take classes up to attaining the age of 65 years i.e. 31.08.2018, as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), on fixed emoluments to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of Syndicate, has granted extension in re-employment period of Dr. N.K. Ojha, Professor, Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, on contract basis, up to 12.11.2015 i.e. the date of his attaining the age of 65 years, on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI). Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

**NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus,

he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (vi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved re-employment of Mrs. Manoranjan Gurbux Singh, Associate Professor, Department of French & Francophone Studies, P.U. Chandigarh, on contract basis, w.e.f. 05.11.2013 to 01.10.2018, i.e., the date of her attaining the age of 65 years, as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or C.P.F. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.
2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

**(vii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of Syndicate, has granted extension in re-employment period of Professor S.Ojha, Department of Biochemistry, on contract basis till the date of completion of 65 years of age i.e. 26.09.2015, as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI).

**NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Manju Jaidka, Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies, on contract basis up to 23.10.2018 (i.e. completion of 65 years of age) w.e.f. the date she joins as such after one day break as usual, as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 (Para 58) and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.
2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

**(ix)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. Rajan Gaur, Professor, Department of Anthropology, on contract basis w.e.f. 03.10.2013 with one day break 01.10.2013 (02.10.2013 being holiday) up to attaining the age of 65 years i.e. 02.09.2018 as per rule/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved re-employment of Mrs. Poonam Goel, Associate Professor in Economics, University School of Open Learning, P.U. Chandigarh, on contract basis up to 15.10.2018 (i.e. her attaining the age of 65 years), w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or C.P.F. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

**NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2

months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (xi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of Syndicate, has approved extension in re-employment period of Dr. H.S. Bajwa, Professor, Department of Education, on contract basis upto 10.11.2015 i.e. the date of his attaining the age of 65 years, as per rules/regulations of Panjab University and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 and Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

**NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year in re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

2. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (xii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the recommendations of the Selection Committee dated 27.8.2013 regarding appointment of the following persons:

- (i) as Part-time Assistant Professor in Law on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for

teaching 12 hour a week) in the Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib for the Academic Session 2013-14 w.e.f. the date he starts work:

**Part-Time Assistant Professor in Law**

Dr. Rajneesh Kumar Mutneja

**Waiting List**

1. Parmod Kumar Sharma
2. Manjinder Kaur
3. Nirmal Kaur.

- (ii) as Guest Faculty at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib on payment of honorarium of Rs.1000/- per lecture subject to ceiling of Rs.25000/- p.m. w.e.f. the date they start work for the academic session 2013-14 against the vacant posts in the Department or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier:-

**Name of the person/s**

1. Parmod Kumar Sharma
2. Manjinder Kaur
3. Nirmal Kaur.

- (xiii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Prabhdeep Kaur, Assistant Professor (temporary) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology w.e.f. 11.12.2013 by waiving off the condition of giving one month notice under Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

**NOTE:** Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

- (xiv)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Gurjot Kaur, Assistant Professor in Sociology (Temporary), at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. 27.07.2013(A.N.), under Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

**NOTE:** Rule 16.2 at page 83, P.U. Calendar, Vol.-III, 2009, reads as under:

“the service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

- (xv)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Shri Yogesh Sharma, Assistant Professor (Temporary), at UIET, w.e.f. 20.08.2013. He may be asked to deposit salary in lieu of falling short of one month notice period under Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

**NOTE:** Rule 16.2 at page 83, P.U. Calendar, Vol.-III, 2009, reads as under:

“the service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

- (xvi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Gaganpreet Walia, Assistant Professor in English (Temporary) at Baba Balraj P.U. Constituent College, Balachaur, District Nawanshehar, w.e.f. 27.09.2013, under Rule 16.2 at page 83, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

**NOTE:** Rule 16.2 at page 83, P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2009, reads as under:

“the service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

- (xvii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Mr. Harpreet Singh, Assistant Professor in Physical Education (Temp.) at P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. 13.07.2013 (F.N.) under Rule 16.2 at page 83, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

**NOTE:** Rule 16.2 at page 83, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009, reads as under:

“the service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority”

- (xviii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has granted extension in the Extraordinary Leave without pay to Dr. R.K. Kohli, Professor, Department of Botany, w.e.f. 11.10.2013 to 20.12.2013 under Regulation 11 (G) at page 139-140 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. I, 2007 enabling him to continue to perform duty as Vice-Chancellor of D.A.V. University, Jalandhar.
- (xix)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has ordered that Dr. R.K. Gupta, Honorary Director, UIHMT, Panjab University, be paid honorarium @ Rs.2000/- p.m. & telephone facility at his residence as per University rules w.e.f. 4.7.2013 i.e. the date on which he has taken the charge.
- (xx)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Yog Raj Angrish, Professor, Department of Punjabi, PU as Programme Co-ordinator (NSS), PU in place of Dr. Ashwani Koul, till further orders.
- (xxi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Sh. Kishori Lal Kaundal, Sr. Tech. (G-II), as Laboratory Superintendent (G-I), in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400 with initial pay Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the Department of Chemistry. His pay will be fixed as per University Rules.

**NOTE:** All other terms and conditions of service and rules of the discipline and conduct as contained in the University's Calendar, Volumes I & III and other rules and instructions framed thereunder from time to time shall be applicable.

- (xxii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Mr. Om Parkash, Programmer, Computer Centre, Panjab University for further period of three months w.e.f. 29.08.2013 to 25.11.2013 with one day break on 28.08.2013 or till the advertised post is filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms and conditions.

**(xxiii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional CMO, BGJ Institute of Health, PU for further period of six months w.e.f. 25.10.2013 to 24.04.2014 with one day break on 24.10.2013 or till the regular Doctor joins his duty, whichever is earlier on the previous terms and conditions.

**(xxiv)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Shri Mohinder Singh Negi, Programmer, Computer Unit, PU for further period of three months w.e.f. 18.9.2013 to 12.12.2013 with one day break on 17.9.2013 or at least till such time all examination results are declared during this session, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions.

**(xxv)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Shri Mohinder Singh Negi, Programmer, Computer Unit, P.U. for further period of three months w.e.f. 14.12.2013 to 12.3.2014 with one day break on 13.12.2013 or at least till such time all examination results are declared during this session, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & Conditions.

**(xxvi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the last date for submission of application forms for Inter College Migration for Post Graduate Classes from 15.10.2013 to 15.11.2013 for hardship cases of the following students:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Migration Sought</b>	<b>Reason</b>
1.	Jasneet Kaur Bhandari	From G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana to S.C.D. Govt. College, Ludhiana.	Transfer of Parents
2.	Heena Narula	From G.H.G. Khalsa College, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana to S.C.D. Govt. College, Ludhiana.	Resident far from the College
3.	Chander Mohan	From Guru Nanak Khalsa College, Abohar to S.C.D. Govt. College, Ludhiana.	Business shifted from Abohar to Ludhiana
4.	Karamjit Kaur	From Govt. College Hoshiarpur to P.G. Govt. College for Girls, Sec-42, Chandigarh	Medical

**(xxvii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of Syndicate, has allowed provisional admission to M.Phil. students in Ph.D. course, whose viva-voce is yet to be conducted, subject to clearance of their M.Phil. course.

**(xxviii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved that those M.Phil. Students, who were admitted after clearing the Entrance Test conducted by the

relevant Departments of Panjab University, are exempted from appearing in Ph.D. Entrance Test for Registration/ admission to Ph.D. within a period of two years from the declaration of their M.Phil. Entrance Test result.

(xxix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has enhanced the following rates of 'C' Class Employees Uniforms as recommended by the Committee dated 08.01.2013:

Sr. No.	Name of Livery Articles	Rates approved in June, 2011	Rates approved by the Committee on quality basis in 2013
1	Ladies & Gents Shoes Bata/Liberty	Upto Rs. 700/-	Ladies: Rs.832/- each Gents: Rs.832/- each
2	Khaki Terricot and Blue Terricot for Ladies and Gents	Upto Rs. 100/- per Meter	Khaki Terricot: Rs.102/- per meter Blue Terricot: Rs.98.70 per meter
3	Khaki and Blue Woolen Serge	Upto Rs. 150/- per Meter	Khaki Serge: Rs.158/- per meter Blue Serge: Rs.158/- per meter
4	Woolen Jersey for Ladies	Upto Rs.300/- each	Ladies Jersey: Rs.214/- each
5	Woolen Shawls	Upto Rs. 200/- per shawl	Rs.260/- each.
6	Khaki Jean (dangri)	Upto Rs. 60/- per meter	Rs.54.90 per meter.
7	Khaki Jean (matty)	Upto Rs. 150/- per meter	Rs.165/- per meter.
8	Black Terricot	Upto Rs. 80/- per meter	Rs.106/- per meter.
9	Blue Blazer	Upto Rs. 135/- per meter	Rs.155/- per meter.

#### Livery Articles for Security Staff

Sr. No.	Name of Livery Articles	Rates approved in June, 2011	Rates approved by the Committee on quality basis in 2013
1	Security cap	Upto Rs.50/- per Cap	Rs.52.39 each

#### Livery Articles for Drivers and Mukh Sewadars

Sr. No.	Name of Livery Articles	Rates approved in June, 2011	Rates approved by the Committee on quality basis in 2013
1	Bata Shoes	Upto Rs. 700/-	Rs. 832/- each

(xxx) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed that the admission to BDS Course for the session 2014-15 at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Sector-25, Chandigarh be made on the basis of all India Pre-Medical/Dental Examination to be conducted by the CBSE. This has also been approved by the Faculty of Medical Sciences on 9.12.2013.

**(xxxii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of the appointment of the following part-time Doctors working in the BGJ Institute of Health, PU for further period of six months w.e.f. 31.8.2013 to 27.2.2014 with one day break on 30.8.2013, on the previous terms & conditions:

<b>Name of Doctors</b>	<b>Designation</b>
Dr. Vikramjeet Singh	Part-time Radiologist
Dr. (Mrs.) Virpal Kaur	Part-time Gynecologist

**NOTE:** The Previous Terms and Conditions are as under:

1. Duty hours are adjustable as per the needs of the Health Centre.
2. 20 days Casual Leave is available for the service put in for 12 months during the calendar year on proportionate basis.
3. The selected candidates duly approved by the Vice-Chancellor shall be required to report on duty by the date stipulated in the letter of appointment.
4. Candidate must be registered with the respective State/ Central Medical Council.
5. Candidates with experience will be given preference.

**(xxxiii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has ordered that in cases of Secretaries to Vice-Chancellor, Earned Leave be granted to them in lieu of their service as Secretary to Vice-Chancellor under Regulation 12.2 (A) at page 124-125 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, and Professor S.K. Sharma, Ex Secretary to Vice-Chancellor be paid encashment of Earned leave for 97 days as already allowed by the Syndicate Vide Para 40(xxvii) at its meeting held on 04.08.2012.

**(xxxiiii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has granted the extension in Extra Ordinary Leave without pay for one year w.e.f. 01.08.2013 to Dr. Anupama Goel, Associate Professor, Department of Law, P.U., under Regulation 11 (G) at page 139-140 of P.U., Calendar, Vol.-I, 2007, to enable her to work as Associate Professor (Law) on contract basis at National Law University, Dwarka, New Delhi.

**(xxxiv)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the revised guidelines **(Appendix-LXIV)** for special incentives for the outstanding sports persons who are studying in P.U. Campus, Chandigarh/Institutes of P.U. Regional Centres to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information 2014 of Panjab University.

**(xxxv)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the revised guidelines **(Appendix-LXV)** for admission under the 5% seats for reserved category of sports to be incorporated in the Handbook of Information 2014 of Panjab University as well as Department of University Business School.

**(xxxvi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed exemption of fee of Rs. 1600/- after one and a half year for submission of Synopsis to those candidates who were enrolled on 14.11.2011 for Ph.D. programme in Business Management & Commerce.

**(xxxvii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the validity date of advertisement No.18/2010 for filling up various non-teaching posts for six months from the date of lapse of advertisement, i.e., from 09.01.2014.

**NOTE:** An office note enclosed **(Appendix-LXVI)**.

**Referring to Sub-Item 64-R-(xxiii)**, Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that two Medical Officers have been appointed by the University at Bhai Ghanayia Ji Institute of Health and both are Gynaecologists. Since the University had not appointed any Medicines Specialist during the last 3-4 years, Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional CMO (Retd.) should be allowed to continue and his salary be charged against the vacant post of Doctor or Part-time Doctor.

Professor S.K. Sharma stated that Dr. B.S. Lal is a very good Doctor and is the only Cardio Specialist. Keeping in view the large number of patients belonging to heart related diseases, Dr. Lal should be allowed to continue till a new Cardio Specialist is appointed at Bhai Ghanayia Ji Institute of Health.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever could be done should be done to allow Dr. B.S. Lal to continue.

**Referring to Sub-Item 64-R-(xxvi)**, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that no class had been mentioned for which migration had been allowed. If it is B.Com. Part I, then it is wrong because centralized admissions were made to B.Com. Part I on the basis of merit.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired - is there any such provision under which the last date for submission of application forms for Inter-College Migration could be fixed? If it is in the rules, then those rules are *ab initio* illegal. There are certain specific courses like LL.B., which are offered in specific Colleges and University Teaching Departments, where the last date for submission of application forms for migration is fixed to make the merit of the candidates, who have applied for migration. But for Inter-College Migration, there is no provision for fixing the last date. There could not be any last date for

migration because if somebody's parent is transferred in the month of December, how he/she could apply within the stipulated date. Therefore, the fixing of last date for Inter-College Migration did not seem to be palatable.

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Item 64 – R-(i) to R-(xxxvii)** on the agenda, be ratified, with the modification that Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional CMO, BGJ Institute of Health, Panjab University, be allowed to continue to work as such till a new Doctor (Medicines/Cardio Specialist) is appointed and his salary be charged against the vacant post of Doctor or Part-time Doctor.

## **Routine and formal matters**

**65.** The information contained in Items **I-(i) to I-(xvi)** on the agenda was read out and noted, i.e. –

- (i)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Selection Committee (Walk-in Interview) dated 29.8.2013 for appointment of Assistant Professor in Commerce at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur (subject to the approval of the Punjab Govt./UGC) (**Advertisement No. 5/2013**), has appointed Mr. Mohd. Sazid as Assistant Professor in Commerce at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur (subject to the approval of the Punjab Govt./UGC), purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the post/s are filled in on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Selection Committee enclosed (**Appendix-LXVII**).

2. The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

- (ii)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Selection Committee (Walk-in Interview) dated 17.10.2013 for appointment of Assistant Professor in Physical Education-1 (reserved for SC category) at Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib (**Advertisement No. 6/2013**), has appointed Ms. Seema, as Assistant Professor, in Physical Education (SC) at Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus other allowances admissible as per University rules, under regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Selection Committee enclosed (**Appendix-LXVIII**).

2. The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

**(iii)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Selection Committee (Walk-in Interview) dated 17.10.2013 for appointment of Assistant Professor in Punjabi-1 (Reserved for SC category) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib (**Advertisement No. 6/2013**), has appointed Shri Hardip Singh, as Assistant Professor, in Punjabi (SC) at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP of Rs.6000/- plus other allowances admissible as per University rules, under regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Selection Committee enclosed (**Appendix-LXIX**).

2. The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/ specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Selection Committee (Walk-in Interview) dated 30.8.2013 for appointment of Assistant Professor in Mathematics/Applied Mathematics at University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh (**Advertisement No. 5/2013**), has appointed Shri Gurjinder Singh, as Assistant Professor, Mathematics/Applied Mathematics, in the University Institute of Engineering and Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the regular posts are filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus other allowances admissible as per University rules, under regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Selection Committee enclosed (**Appendix-LXX**).

2. The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Selection Committee (Walk-in Interview) dated 20.10.2013 for appointment of Assistant Professor in Physics/Applied Physics-1 (Reserved for SC category) at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur (**Advertisement No. 6/2013**), has appointed Shri Jaskaran Singh, as Assistant Professor, Physics/Applied Physics (SC) at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, against the post lying vacant there, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the posts are filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP of Rs. 6000/- plus other allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Selection Committee enclosed (**Appendix-LXXI**).

2. The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Selection Committee (Walk-in Interview) dated 27.8.2013 for appointment of Associate Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University (**Advertisement No. 5/2013**), has appointed Dr. (Ms.) Neeraj Sharma, as Associate Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the post is filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.8600/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Selection Committee enclosed  
(**Appendix-LXXII**).

2. The competent authority could assign her teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize her subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

**(vii)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Selection Committee (Walk-in Interview) dated 27.8.2013 for appointment of Senior Assistant Professor in Oral Pathology at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University (**Advertisement No. 5/2013**), has appointed Dr. Simranjit Singh, as Senior Assistant Professor in Oral Pathology at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, purely on temporary basis for the academic session 2013-14 or till the post is filled in on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs. 15600-39100+GP of Rs. 7000/- plus allowances admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Selection Committee enclosed  
(**Appendix-LXXIII**).

2. The competent authority could assign him teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize his subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, within the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor has appointed, Dr. Jatinder Grover, Assistant Professor, University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, as Campus Co-ordinator (NSS), P.U.

**(ix)** The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Surinder Kumar Sharma be continued to act as Advisor Cultural Activities up to 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2014 on the previous terms & conditions.

**(x)** The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that –

- (i) Professor Ravi K. Mahajan, USOL, PU be appointed as Honorary Director, Coaching Centre for IAS & Other Competitive Examinations for SC/ST & Other Categories, PU in place of Professor Rajan Gaur w.e.f. 01.10.2013 to till further orders.
- (ii) Professor Rajan Gaur be allowed to continue offering his services for IAS Centre to teach the students.

**(xi)** The Vice-Chancellor has:

- (i) allowed Smt. Shanti Devi, Cleaner, Girls Hostel No. 2 to retire voluntarily from the Panjab University service w.e.f. 30.06.2013 by waiving off the notice period which falls short of three months notice, under Regulation 17.5 at page 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
- (ii) sanctioned the following retirement benefits to Smt. Shanti Devi, Cleaner, Girls Hostel No.2 on her voluntarily retirement on 10.06.2013:
  1. Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 15.1 and Regulation 17.8 at page 131 & 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
  2. Encashment of Earned leave as may be due but not exceeding 300 days as admissible under Rule 17.3 at page 94 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

**(xii)** The Vice-Chancellor, has approved the following recommendations of the Committee dated 20.9.2013 **(Appendix-LXXIV)**, with regard to sanction of funds for renovation/rewiring, purchase of equipments etc. in connection with the forthcoming 50<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention of Chemists on December 2-5, 2013 to be hosted by the Department of Chemistry:

1. a sum of Rs. 6.65 lacs has been sanctioned/allocated out of the Budget Head 'Equipments' of the UGC XII plan grant for purchase of items required by the Department i.e. LCD, UPS, foldable screen etc. after following due purchase procedures.

2. a sum of Rs.23.78 lacs has been sanctioned out of the 'Electricity and Water Fund A/C No. 1044979074' in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate for execution of work by the SDE (Electrical) as per the estimates/ proposal and administrative approval as well as permission to invite tenders/ quotations has also been accorded for providing Electrical Panels and cables etc. for the Department.
3. a sum of Rs. 13.71 lacs has been sanctioned out of the Budget Head 'AR&MI' (Non-Plan) for renovation of Gents and Ladies toilets as per XEN's estimates and administrative approval for execution of said work as well as permission to invite tenders/quotations for the said work by the XEN has also been accorded.

**(xiii)** The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to refund the Admission fee of Rs.20,227/- to Ms. Jaskiran, B.Sc. (Tourism Management), as she has deposited the fee twice through the S.B.I. online system on 30.7.2013.

**NOTE:** Ms. Jaskiran got admission in 5<sup>th</sup> Semester in B.Sc. (Tourism Management) and she deposited admission fee i.e. Rs.20,227/- through SBI online on 30.7.2013 against Bank reference No. DU01205358, but all of sudden, the transaction failed, then, she again deposited the fee of Rs.20,227/- on the same day i.e. 30.7.2013 against the Bank reference No. DU01205369. The introduction of new online system in the Panjab University and sudden Technical snag in the computer system, the candidate has deposited her admission fee Rs.20,227/- in duplicate. The Bank statement and the report of the Income Section that the candidate has deposited the twice.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. R.K. Chhabra Professor & Chairperson Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology	02.01.1974	31.07.2013	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Dr. A.K. Bhatti Professor Department of Physics	10.07.1984	30.09.2013	
3.	Dr. Rajan Gaur Professor Department of Anthropology	02.08.1979	30.09.2013	
4.	Dr. (Ms.) Manju Jaidka Professor Department of English & Cultural Studies	01.10.1984	31.10.2013	
5.	Dr. Manohar Lal Sharma Professor Department of Gandhian & Peace Studies	01.10.1984	30.11.2013	
6.	Dr. (Mrs.) Bimla Nehru Professor Department of Biophysics	06.09.1984	30.11.2013	
7.	Dr. (Mrs.) Madhu Raka Professor Department of Mathematics	23.11.1978	30.11.2013	
8.	Dr. R.K. Kohli Professor Department of Botany	11.11.1980	31.12.2013	
9.	Ms. Poonam Goel Associate Professor in Economics University School of Open Learning	01.09.1977	31.10.2013	

**NOTE:** The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Ms. Shashi Bala Kataria Deputy Registrar UIET	08.10.1971	31.08.2013	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Bikram Singh Deputy Registrar General Branch	15.09.1979	30.11.2013	
3.	Smt. Sushma Anand Assistant Registrar CET Cell	01.01.1975	31.12.2013	
4.	Ms. Krishna Sabharwal Assistant Registrar Examination Branch-II	22.06.1976	30.09.2013	
5.	Ms. Surinder Rani Rana Assistant Registrar Re-evaluation Branch	01.11.1973	31.10.2013	
6.	Shri Vinod Kumar Grover Deputy Librarian A.C. Joshi Library	19.04.1979	31.12.2013	
7.	Dr. Payare Lal Assistant Librarian A.C. Joshi Library	02.08.1978	31.12.2013	
8.	Shri Tara Chand Superintendent Establishment Branch-III	10.12.1979	31.01.2014	
9.	Shri Bhuwan Singh Rawat Superintendent Office of the Controller of Examination	10.10.1973	31.01.2014	
10.	Ms. Santosh Sharma Superintendent Computer Unit	19.12.1975	31.12.2013	
11.	Sh. Subhash Chander Senior Assistant Academic Staff College	17.07.1977	31.12.2013	
12.	Ms. Veena Malhotra Junior Assistant Examination Branch-I	20.05.1978	30.11.2013	
13.	Shri Surinder Kumar Foreman (Technical Officer) Department of Chemistry	04.12.1979	31.12.2013	

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
14.	Smt. Kamlesh Mittal nee Kamlesh Gupta Superintendent DUI's Office	11.02.1982	31.12.2013	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
15.	Shri Vinod Kumar Sachdeva Senior Scientific Officer Grade-I Department of Chemistry	16.05.1983	31.10.2013	
16.	Ms. Raj Rani Restorer Gandhian and Peace Studies	10.08.1978	31.10.2013	
17.	Shri Ram Murti Work-Inspector Construction Office	24.08.1987	30.11.2013	
18.	Shri Dilbag Singh Library Restorer University Business School	29.08.1972	31.12.2013	
19.	Shri Bikram Singh Driver Vice-Chancellor's Office	01.04.1973	31.8.2013	
20.	Mr. Dalip Singh DMO-Cum-Daftri Conduct Branch	14.11.1969	30.09.2013	
21.	Mr. Dharam Chand Security Guard Girls Hostel No. 4	03.06.1995	30.09.2013	
22.	Mr. Madho Ram Security Guard W.H. No. 2, P.U.	14.07.1965	30.09.2013	
23.	Shri Khat Singh DMO-cum-Daftri University Business School	03.10.1972	30.11.2013	
24.	Shri Madho Singh Machine Operator Department of Mathematics	08.07.1972	30.11.2013	
25.	Shri Pritam Chand Peon Department of Economics	05.02.1970	30.11.2013	

**NOTE:** The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned terminal benefits to the members of the families of the following employees, who passed away while in service:

Sr. No.	Name of the deceased employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of death ( while in service)	Name of the family member/s to whom the terminal benefits are to be given	Benefits
1.	Late Shri Surjeet Singh Library Restorer-cum-Messenger Department of Life Long Learning & Extension	09.10.1978	02.09.2013	Smt. Parveen Lata (Wife)	Gratuity and ex-gratia grant admissible under the University Regulation and Rule.
2.	Late Shri Nathu Ram Mali-cum-Chowkidar PURC, Ludhiana	09.09.1992	08.05.2011	Smt. Sheela Devi (Wife)	
3.	Late Shri Baleshar Cleaner Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital	05.03.1986	26.09.2013	Smt. Bimla (Wife)	
4.	Late Shri Jai Nath Head Groundman Directorate of Sports	05.11.1982	11.08.2013	Smt. Dhan Pati (Wife)	

After decisions on the agenda items were taken, the members started general discussion.

(1) Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the U.T. Administration, Chandigarh, had increased the emoluments of Library Assistants appointed on *ad hoc*/temporary basis. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to revise the emoluments of the Library Assisants accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the salary of Library Assistants should be enhanced in accordance with the U.T. Administration because ultimately it had to go to the Senate. So it should be incorporated that what had been done by the U.T. Administration, Chandigarh, they had already done in August 2013. Now, their salaries should be revised in accordance with the latest enhancement.

(2) Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they had taken a decision about reserving a seat in each course for a single girl child. Later on, the category was changed from 'single girl child' to 'only girl child' and somebody challenged the same in the Court by a family who had two girls. They had taken a decision that the name of the category be changed to 'only girl child' and the said decision somehow could not be implemented. Since the ensuing session is going to start, they should amend their rules/guidelines for admission keeping in view the afore-

mentioned decision of the Syndicate (replace 'single girl child' with '**only girl child**') at the earliest because there are certain courses for which the last date for applying is probably in the month of February/March/April.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to make amendment in the rules/ guidelines for admissions to various courses in accordance with the above suggestion, on behalf of the Syndicate.

- (3) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal stated that there are 43 subjects for which the members of Boards of Studies are nominated by the Syndicate. But in the Calendar, there is also a provision that if a subject is being offered in two or more affiliated Colleges, the members of the Board of Study in that subject is to be elected. Presently, members of Boards of Studies of about 48 subjects are being nominated and out of them 10 subjects are like Physical Education, Computer Science, Fine Arts, Home Science, Music, Biotechnology, Bioinformatics, Law, etc., which nowadays are being offered in several affiliated Colleges. In fact, when the Calendar was framed, these subjects were offered in one or two affiliated Colleges. But now these subjects are being offered in several affiliated Colleges. Therefore, as per Calendar, there should also be election to elect members of Boards of Studies in these subjects as is being done in the case of other subjects.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal to give him a note on the issue so that he could examine the issue.

- (4) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that one more representation had come to him as well as to the Vice-Chancellor from Mr. Nidhi Chand stating that though he had four publications, he had been awarded only one mark.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter would be examined.**

- (5) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the Innovative Add-On Course, which RSD College, Ferozepur, had applied, should be allowed to that College.

- (6) Principal Puneet Bedi said that keeping in view the ensuing General Elections, the Delhi University had postponed its examinations. What the Panjab University is planning in this regard?

The Vice-Chancellor said that perhaps keeping in view the fact that Delhi is the epic centre of politics, the Delhi University had postponed the examinations. Since Chandigarh or Punjab is not so, they did not need to take such a step.

- (7) Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the University had started issuing notices in the newspapers about the schedule of various Entrance Examinations every year. In fact, the people wanted to know the whole schedule, i.e., when the prospectuses would be available, last date of submission of applications, etc., which the University subsequently gave. He, therefore, suggested that they should give an exhaustive notice in the newspapers, which would also save their lot of money.

A.K. Bhandari  
Registrar

Confirmed

**Arun Kumar Grover**  
**VICE-CHANCELLOR**