

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 19th July 2015 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice-Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor A.K. Bhandari
4. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
5. Principal (Dr.) Gurdip Kumar Sharma
6. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
7. Shri Jarnail Singh
8. Shri Kamlesh Kumar, Director Higher Education U.T., Chandigarh
9. Professor Karamjeet Singh
10. Shri Naresh Gaur
11. Professor Navdeep Goyal
12. Principal (Mrs.) Parveen Kaur Chawla
13. Professor Rajesh Gill
14. Professor Ronki Ram
15. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
16. Professor Yog Raj Angrish
17. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) Registrar ... (Secretary)

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, 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 –

1. Professor Ajit Singh, Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair Professor at the Department of Economics, P.U., a very eminent Economist, Emeritus Professor at Cambridge University, on June 23, 2015 in UK;
2. Professor (Mrs.) Urmi Kessar, alumna of the Department of Art History and Visual Arts and spouse of Professor S.V. Kessar of Department of Chemistry, on July 6, 2015;
3. Mr. Shashank Bhasin s/o Professor Shyam Sunder Bhasin and Professor (Mrs.) Reena Bhasin, USOL, PU, on July 11, 2015;
4. Shri Nek Chand Saini, Padma Shri Awardee and recipient of P.U. Paryatan Ratan Award, on June 12, 2015;
5. Shri Shiv Singh, well known sculptor, painter, designer and an alumnus of P.U., on June 26, 2015;
6. Sardar Anjum, a very renowned writer & poet, recipient of Padma Shri Award (1991), Padma Bhushan Award

(2005), Punjab Ratan (2001) and the Millennium Peace Award (2000), on July 8, 2015. He was associated with the Department of Urdu, Panjab University.”

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor Ajit Singh, Professor (Mrs.) Urmi Kessar, Mr. Shashank Bhasin, Shri Nek Chand Saini, Shri Shiv Singh and Sardar Anjum and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

At this stage, Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that they should welcome Shri Kamlesh Kumar, Director Higher Education, UT, Chandigarh, who is attending the meeting of the Syndicate for the first time. They should also request him to attend the meetings of the Syndicate and the Senate regularly so that the problems of the affiliated Colleges are solved amicably.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he was sorry that he forgot to welcome Shri Kamlesh Kumar, Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh. He welcomed Shri Kamlesh Kumar and requested him to attend the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate regularly.

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, “I am pleased to inform the honourable members that –

- (1) On the basis of Assessment and Accreditation exercise by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council from March 2 to 5, 2015, Panjab University has been accredited with a CGPA of 3.35 on a four point scale at A Grade for a period five years from 25.6.2015;
- (2) Getty Foundation, USA, has awarded a grant of US\$1,30,000 to conduct a study to preserve Gandhi Bhawan under conservation of Heritage buildings project. This prestigious grant has been granted under 'Keeping it Modern', major philanthropic initiative of Getty Foundation;
- (3) Professor Amrik Singh Ahluwalia has been chosen for the 'International Birbal Sahni Birth Centenary Award and Birbal Savitri Sahni Honour' by the Birbal Savitri Sahni Foundation, Lucknow, for his contributions in the field of science;
- (4) Professor Kamaljit Singh Bawa, Distinguished Professor of Biology at University of Massachusetts, Boston, who did his B.Sc. (Hons. School), M.Sc. (Hons. School) and Ph.D. (under the supervision of Professor P.N. Mehra, Department of Botany, Panjab University) has been elected as a Fellow of the Royal Society (FRS), London, in 2015. He is the founder and President of Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment (ATREE), Bangalore, a non-governmental organization devoted to research, policy analysis and education in India;

- (5) Professor Anil Kumar of University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences has been selected as CPCSEA Nominee (Committee for the Purpose of Control and Supervision of Experiments on Animals) on behalf of Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change (Animal Welfare Division) for a period of 3 years;
- (6) Dr. Kewal Krishan, Assistant Professor of the Department of Anthropology, has been elected as a Fellow of the prestigious Royal Anthropological Institute (RAI) of Great Britain and Ireland in the elections held on June 11, in London;
- (7) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Chairperson, UIPS and Mr. Sanjay Bansal have been conferred with coveted global research award 'Eudragit Award 2014' for the paper 'Quality by Design (QbD) enabled systematic development of gastroretentive multiple-unit microballoons of itopride hydrochloride' as the best paper selected in Asian continent. The award carries a citation, certificate, and cumulative cash price of Euro 1,500 for the team. The work was conducted in collaboration with Dr. Abhay Asthana of M.M. University, Mullana;
- (8) Six faculty members from institutions belonging to Chandigarh Region Innovation Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC), have been selected as Members of the National Academy of Sciences (NASI), India. Out of 51 members selected for NASI, three are from Panjab University, i.e., Professor Tankeshwar Kumar (Physics), Professor Sanjay Chhiber (Microbiology) & Assistant Professor Sangeeta Pikhwal Sah (UIPS) and remaining three from other CRIKC Institutions, viz., IIT, Ropar, Centre of Innovative and Applied Bioprocessing (CIAB), Mohali and PGIMER;
- (9) Panjab University student Mr. Namanveer Singh Brar secured a Bronze Medal in Men's Double Trap Shooting in World University Games 2015 at Gwangju in South Korea on 10th July 2015. He has also represented Indian Universities in Men's Trap Shooting;
- (10) Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), New Delhi, has sanctioned Rs.2.65 crores for a multi-institutional research project entitled 'Delineating Beta Casein Variants in Indian Cows and Potential Health Implications of A1A2 Milk' under the National Agricultural Science Fund Foundation (NASF). Professor Rajat Sandhir of the Department of Biochemistry is part of the research project. The work for the research project will be carried out jointly with the National Bureau of Animal Genetic Research (NBGAR) and National Dairy Research Institute (NDRI), Karnal;
- (11) Through an e-mail received by Renu Vig, UIET, Society of Automotive Engineers INDIA (SAEINDIA) Foundation

has informed Professor Renu Vig, Director, UIET, P.U., that our University has been selected for the Corporate Award for the year 2014-15 for valuable contribution towards promotion of SAEINDIA activities. The award shall be presented in India Habitat Centre in New Delhi on August 3, 2015;

- (12) Professor Shankarji Jha, Chairperson, Department of Sanskrit, was invited at 16th World Sanskrit Conference held at Silpakom University, Bangkok, Thailand from June 28 to July 2, 2015 to present a research paper "Nyaya" (special grammatical axioms) in Sanskrit Grammar; and
- (13) Dr. Namita Gupta, Assistant Professor in Centre for Human Rights and Duties, was invited to attend one week training program on 'Precautionary Principle: Governance of Innovation and Innovations in Governance' in Budapest(Hungary) from June 28 to July 4, 2015 organized by Central European University, Median and the European Environment. She was the only participant from India."

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that some very prestigious achievements have been made by different faculty members. One thing which is very disturbing is the information contained in the Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No.1 regarding assessment and accreditation exercise done by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), which has accredited the Panjab University with a CGPA of 3.35 on a four point scale at A-Grade for a period of five years. If his memory serves him correctly, they have slipped down from the CGPA which was awarded to them by the NAAC in 2009. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to tell them as to what were the reasons and what kind of introspection is required.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the faculty of Panjab University has carried out an analysis on the CGPA score awarded to the University by the NAAC. In fact, the criterion for scoring pattern of NAAC has recently been changed. Earlier, scoring pattern was such that scores were awarded between 1 and 4, whereas now these are awarded from zero to four. For instance, if the score was between 1 and 25, 1 point was given in the past. If the score was between 26 and 50, 2 points were given and if the score was between 51 and 75, 3 points were given. Similarly, if the score was between 76 and 100, 4 points were given. According to the new pattern, if the score is up to 20, zero point is awarded and for score between 21 and 40, 1 point is awarded, whereas earlier if the score was between 26 and 40, 2 points were awarded. Now, if the score is between 41 and 60, 2 points are awarded, whereas earlier, if the score was between 51 and 60, one could earn three points. Earlier, if the score is between 60 and 75, 3 points could be earned whereas now, limit for these points stands extended up to score of 80. Since the scoring pattern has changed, if any university remains stagnant, its score would slip by 5 to 10 per cent. However, the score of Panjab University has slipped only by 3 per cent. As such, it is not an appropriate impression that CGPA of Panjab University has drastically slipped down. Anyhow, the faculty colleagues have carried out the analysis, which according to him, has been reflected by PUTA and a copy of the same has been given to the Press.

Principal Gurdip Sharma requested the Vice-Chancellor to specify where actually they had gone down.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that, in fact, they had not improved at a rate at which they ought to have improved in the background of change of scoring pattern. They could not introduce Choice Based Credit System and their IQAC Cell had not been working properly for a long time. They also could not prepare Annual Reports of IQAC Cell in a manner as desired by the NAAC. Thus, they could not produce the IQAC report of a qualitative kind. The job of the IQAC Cell is to analyze the data continuously. The performance of the IQAC Cell is to be made known to the community which has to participate in a continuous manner. They started to function only half an year before the NAAC visit. In fact, the IQAC Cell should have started to function from the date the first NAAC report had come and University had been granted five star status. As such, they had defaulted for not having created the functional IQAC Cell, but now they are conscious that they have to create a functional IQAC Cell. Not only the University, but every College has to do it. The Colleges would receive grants under RUSA only if they are NAAC accredited. In fact, the funding agencies want proof that institutions had submitted SSR. If some money gets granted to an institution, it would probably receive the first instalment of the grant on the premise that it would submit the SSR in near future and the subsequent instalment/s would not be released if the College/s is/are not accredited.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that certain Colleges, including HMTV College and Dev Samaj College, have secured very good points. They could analyze their reports.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Principals of these Colleges were invited to a meeting by the Dean, College Development Council. They had taken it very seriously and are setting up a Cell, including enabling machinery so that every College is ready for NAAC. Day before yesterday, Joint Secretary, who is overseeing the RUSA Mission, had observed that the inputs received from Panjab University and its affiliated Colleges had not been adequately attended to. A special instrument has to be created at the national level to attend to the concerns and needs of the University campus and the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was sure that after the change of scoring pattern by NAAC, the Committee must have listed out their weak points. The report of the Committee must also have been circulated to the teachers to make them aware.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as and when the next meeting of the Chairpersons would happen, this would be presented and analyzed and they had also invited interested faculty members to perform the duties of Director, IQAC Cell. They are also going to make IQAC Cell functional and pro-active and the University has no option but to remain NAAC compliant all the time. In fact, it is not NAAC compliance alone, but it has to make analysis and take actions commensurate with the analysis. Whatever resources are required, are to be provided by re-appropriating the meagre resources available with the University. As such, they have to do all these things and have no excuse. Their faculty has become really alive. The Union Government is also quite impressed with the steps being taken by the

State of Punjab on behalf of the Universities in the State of Punjab. No other State in the country except Odissa has appointed a Coordination Committee of Vice-Chancellors. In the end, he said that they have to see that all the Colleges affiliated with Panjab University irrespective of whether Government or Government aided or self-financing have to be NAAC accredited. There would be a transparent monitoring mechanism and filing of resource utilization certificate for a period of six months at a time. No money would be released until the utilization certificate is submitted for the preparatory grant released to a given State. Since the last date is September end, State Higher Education Councils have only two to three months to spend their shares of preparatory grant. As such, they have to work at a war footing to see that they meet the requirement.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there are 2-3 points which needed to be taken care of immediately. The Committee seems to have been appointed to look into the specific weaknesses pointed out by NAAC, for instance, Against Sexual Harassment, IQAC Cell and Deficiencies in their Pre-Ph.D. Programme.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all these things are being looked into.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that some more things needed to be taken care of immediately, especially, in the case of Hostels, where the sanitation situation has worsened. He further added that unfortunately, the achievements made by certain affiliated Colleges do not find mention in the statement of the Vice-Chancellor and in the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate. He thought that they needed to encourage the Colleges, which are doing a very good work. He told them that Dev Samaj College, Ferozepur, had got number one rank in the year 2014. Neither any appreciation had been conveyed to the College by the Syndicate nor any letter was written by the University to the College in this regard. Now, again the same College along with G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector 32, Chandigarh have got amounts of Rs.4.6 crores each. Probably, Panjab University is the only University in this region, whose two affiliated Colleges have got such a grant; otherwise, one College affiliated to GNDU, Punjabi University and Kurukshetra University each has got such a grant. He, therefore, suggested that the Colleges should be appreciated and the Vice-Chancellor might consider their inclusion in his statement and send them greetings, on behalf of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as suggested by Principal Gurdip Sharma, they are already taking the services of these people. Though HMV College is not affiliated to Panjab University, it is an affiliated College of erstwhile Panjab University. He added that ranking is to be taken into consideration year-wise because they are at highest position in the years 2012 and 2013. Now, as told by the Vice-Chancellor, the criteria have also been changed by the NAAC and if some institution has secured number one position under the changed criteria, it really deserved appreciation. They must encourage their own Colleges to do better, so that the other Colleges get inspired from them to do well. The University should learn from the Colleges as to how to get maximum grant.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that this issue is being raised for the last couple of years and the same was also raised when Shri Ashok Thakur visited the University campus. He further said that there are certain Colleges, e.g., Khalsa College, Amritsar, SGGS Khalsa College, Mahilpur, GGSD College, Sector 32, Chandigarh, which were created/established by the people themselves, for imparting quality education. These Colleges are part and parcel of freedom movement. Now, it is time to make some contribution by the University to enable them to get grants from the funding agencies as they are still doing a wonderful job. It is their duty to appreciate the good work being done by the Colleges and encourage the Colleges, which are affiliated to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he simply suggested that it should be included in the Vice-Chancellor's statement that appreciation be sent to these Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is conscious of the iconic role played by Dev Samaj College, Ferozepur. He had promised to visit the said College for its Convocation, but he could not so for variety of reasons. Anyhow, he would definitely visit the College as early as he could. He suggested that at least appreciation letters should be sent by the University to such Colleges, which are affiliated to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the two Colleges, which have been awarded rank one by the NAAC, should be given minimum support by the University so that they are not denied the opportunity of admitting the students for which the grant has been given to them for the year 2015. So far as he knew, neither the syllabus has been approved nor has the inspection process been started by the University.

The Vice-Chancellor directed Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction and Professor Naval Kishore, Dean, College Development Council, to take necessary steps in this regard immediately.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are certain new Colleges which are just coming up. Unfortunately, even the Survey Committees have not been constituted by the University in their case. Admissions with the permission of Vice-Chancellor with late fee have already started, but the Colleges have not been visited by the Survey Committee even though the Colleges concerned had applied within stipulated time and had also submitted NOCs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that after the lunch, before taking up other items for consideration, they would consider this issue.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Professor Amrik Singh Ahluwalia on his having been chosen for the 'International Birbal Sahni Birth Centenary Award and Birbal Savitri Sahni Honour' by the Birbal Savitri Sahni Foundation, Lucknow, for his contributions in the field of Science;

- (ii) Professor Kamaljit Singh Bawa, Distinguished Professor of Biology at University of Massachusetts, Boston, who did his B.Sc.(Hons. School), M.Sc.(Hons. School) and Ph.D. (under the supervision of Professor P.N. Mehra, Department of Botany, Panjab University, on having been elected as a Fellow of the Royal Society (FRS), London, in 2015;
- (iii) Professor Anil Kumar of University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences on his selection as CPCSEA Nominee (Committee for the Purpose of Control and Supervision of Experiments on Animals) on behalf of Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change (Animal Welfare Division) for a period of 3 years;
- (iv) Dr. Kewal Krishan, Assistant Professor of Department of Anthropology, on his having been elected as a Fellow of the prestigious Royal Anthropological Institute (RAI) of Great Britain and Ireland in the elections held on June 11, in London;
- (v) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Chairperson, UIPS and Mr. Sanjay Bansal on their having been conferred with coveted global research award 'Eudragit Award 2014' for the paper 'Quality by Design (QbD) enabled systematic development of gastroretentive multiple-unit microballoons of itopride hydrochloride' as the best paper selected in Asian continent;
- (vi) Six faculty members from institutions belonging to Chandigarh Region Innovation Knowledge Cluster (CRIKC) namely Professor Tankeshwar Kumar (Physics), Professor Sanjay Chhiber (Microbiology) & Assistant Professor Sangeeta Pilkhwah Sah (UIPS) and remaining three from other CRIKC Institutions, viz., IIT, Ropar, Centre of Innovative and Applied Bioprocessing (CIAB), Mohali and PGIMER, on their selection as Members of the National Academy of Sciences (NASI), India;
- (vii) Mr. Namanveer Singh Brar, student of Panjab University, on securing a Bronze Medal in Men's Double Trap Shooting in World University Games 2015 at Gwangju in South Korea on 10th July 2015;
- (viii) Professor Shankarji Jha, Chairperson, Department of Sanskrit, on his having been invited at 16th World Sanskrit Conference held at Silpakom University, Bangkok,

Thailand from June 28 to July 2, 2015 to present a research paper “Nyaya” (special grammatical axioms) in Sanskrit Grammar; and

- (ix) Dr. Namita Gupta, Assistant Professor in Centre for Human Rights and Duties, on her having been invited to attend one week training program on ‘Precautionary Principle: Governance of Innovation and Innovations in Governance’ in Budapest (Hungary) from June 28 to July 4, 2015 organized by Central European University, Median and the European Environment. She was the only participant from India.
- (2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor’s statement at Sr. Nos. (1), (2), (9), and (10), (be noted and approved; and
- (3) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 20.04.2015, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Appointment of Associate Professors (General) at Centre for Microbial Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh

2(i). Considered minutes dated 17.06.2015 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor-2 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) at Centre for Microbial Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that the Syndicate in its meeting held in the month of April 2015 approved the appointment of Professor/s in the Faculty of Law. So far as the item under consideration is concerned, the Finance & Development Officer, Registrar and the Vice-Chancellor himself has given a note that in all future appointment letters a particular wording would be mentioned that this selection is in compliance of UGC Regulations, 2009 along with second amendment because unless until this certificate is not given, the audit would not clear the salary bills of the appointees. He added that the persons who had joined the University service about three months ago have not got salary in the absence of the above said certificate. He, therefore, suggested that a clause should be added in the appointment letter that this particular appointment is in compliance with the UGC Regulations, 2009 along with second amendment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first they should approve the appointments and everything relating to arising out of them could be taken care of later on.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice-Chancellor) as the Chairman of the Selection Committee should certify that the appointment of the selected candidate is in terms of UGC Regulations, 2009 as well as second amendment.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the salary of the persons, who were appointed and have joined the University service about three months ago, should be got released at the earliest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that under all circumstances, the salary of all the persons is to be released within the next month.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that they should mention the initial pay-scale in the case of Associate Professors and Professors. Secondly, so far as Professors are concerned, as per UGC revised pay-scale, the initial pay of all the Professors appointed through direct recruitment is to be fixed at minimum Rs. 43000/-. He was sorry to point out that no such clause is mentioned in the appointment letters of the Professors. He suggested that appointment letters to all the persons, who have been appointed Professor through direct recruitment, should be issued mentioning the above said clause.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the points made by Dr. Dinesh Kumar are well taken.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Associate Professors at Centre for Microbial Biotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Rohit Sharma
2. Dr. Naveen Gupta.

These recruitments would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

The competent authority could assign them teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, with the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C norms.

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. A summary bio-data of the selected candidates enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That, in future, –

- (1) a clause be incorporated in all the appointment letters that the appointment is in compliance with the UGC Regulations, 2010 and 2nd amendment; and
- (2) in the appointment letters of Professors, the minimum basic pay to be given, i.e., Rs.43,000/- be also mentioned.

Re-advertisement of the post

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 15.07.2015 of the Selection Committee for appointment of Director-Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That since none of the candidates was found suitable, the post be re-advertised.

Appointment of Associate Professor (Tourism Management) at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 15.07.2015 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor (Tourism Management-1) (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam be appointed Associate Professor in Tourism Management (General) at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

The recruitment would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

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, with the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. Ranbir Singh, be placed on the Waiting List.

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. A summary bio-data of the selected and waitlisted candidates enclosed. It had been certified that the selected and waitlisted candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

Appointment of Assistant Professors (Hospitality & Administration) at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 16.07.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Assistant Professor-2 (General) (Hospitality & Administration) (Advt. No. 4/2014) at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that the Selection Committee has recommended five additional increments to Dr. Neeraj Aggarwal and three additional increments to Mr. Jaswinder Singh. He pointed out that since Dr. Neeraj Aggarwal has done Ph.D. in December 2013, he has only one and a half years experience. As such, the recommended five increments are on the higher side. According to him, five increments could be given to a person, who has left his previous job as Associate Professor and joins this University as Assistant Professor. Secondly, 5 additional increments could be given

to a person who has extraordinary experience and research work. The second person, Mr. Jaswinder Singh, who is equally good, has been recommended 3 additional increments. He, therefore, suggested that at the most both these persons should be given 2 additional increments. If they do some extraordinary work during their service in the University, they could be given increment/s later on. Grant of 5 additional increments at the initial stage is too much.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the performance of Mr. Jaswinder Singh in the interview was really outstanding and keeping in view that he had recommended 2 additional increments, but the Dean of the Faculty and the experts felt that they should recommend him 3 additional increments. Particularly, the Chancellor's nominee was so impressed with the performance of Mr. Jaswinder Singh in the interview as he has answered all the questions, that he insisted that Mr. Jaswinder Singh be given 3 additional increments.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired if there was any rule for grant of additional increments to the selected persons by the Selection Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever maximum they could give to the deserving candidates, he had tried that.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that 5 increments at the initial stage should only be given to those persons who have experience of more than 10 to 15 years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Dr. Neeraj Aggarwal, who has been recommended 5 additional increments by the Selection Committee, has done M.Sc. in September 2008 and Ph.D. in December 2013. Thus, he had experience of only one and a half years.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that Dr. Neeraj Aggarwal has applied for the post of Professor, but they are appointing him Assistant Professor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. Neeraj Aggarwal has applied for the post of Professor and not for Assistant Professor. How the Screening Committee has overlooked that?

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that the Screening Committee did not overlook it at all and instead had made correct recommendation/s to the Vice-Chancellor. The Screening Committee had pointed out the anomaly and sought advice/orders as to what is to be done.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested the Vice-Chancellor to ask the Screening Committee to perform their job very-very minutely. He added that the Madras High Court has observed that if the candidate of a Class 'A' did not mention the name of the post applied for correctly, he/she is not fit for that particular post.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thought that this item should not be approved as the selected person has not applied for the particular post. First the Screening Committee and Selection Committee has committed a wrong by selecting a person, who has not

applied for this particular post and now another wrong is being expected from the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the applicant had not been considered for the post of Director-Professor at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism; rather, he is being considered only for the post of Assistant Professor.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that the Screening Committee had taken a note of it and had written a separate paragraph.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have three options – (i) approve the recommendations of the Selection Committee along with the additional increments as recommended by it; or (ii) approve the appointments along with three additional increments to both the selected candidates; or (iii) approve the appointments without any additional increment/s to any of the candidate.

Shri Kamlesh Kumar, Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, said that if there is any mistake in the selection, it might result into an embarrassment at a later stage. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to check the records and in the meantime, the consideration of the item should be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, Dr. Neeraj Aggarwal had been invited for interview for the post of Assistant Professor and he has signed the attendance for the post of Assistant Professor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first question is whether they approve the recommendation of the Selection Committee regarding appointment of these persons as Assistant Professors. If they approve their appointments, then the question of grant of increments arises as to whether the selected persons be granted increments as recommended by the Selection Committee or with reduced number of increments or with no increment at all.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they should take legal opinion on the issue and till then the consideration of the item should be deferred.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the selected candidates should not be put to any kind of harassment, and whatever is due, should be given to them.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that the posts have been advertised and the Selection Committee made recommendations. She suggested that the appointments should be approved and so far as number of additional increments is concerned, the same could be reduced.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the appointments of the selected candidates should be approved.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the appointments of the selected candidates should be approved, but increments should be reduced.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the appointments of the selected persons should be approved, so far as grant of additional

increments is concerned, minimum burden should be put on the University exchequer.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she is not in favour of having this kind of numericals in this House. If there is any issue, they should resolve that and if there is any mistake, they should identify the same so that it is not repeated in future.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should examine the whole issue and till then the consideration of the item should be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that majority of the members are of the view that the appointments of the selected persons should be approved, but the number of additional increments to both the persons be reduced to two each.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it should be confirmed as to whether the Syndicate is empowered to reduce the number of additional increments recommended by the Selection Committee to the selected persons. According to him, advance increment/s can be given on the recommendations of the Selection Committee.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the prerogative of the Selection Committee is to recommend selection and not to recommend increment/s.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Selection Committee keeping in view the academics, experience, research and performance in the interview, could recommend additional increments to the selected persons.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the Syndicate elected by this very Senate during the last 2-3 years has accepted the recommendations of the Selection Committees, including grant of additional increments. The Syndicate has also granted increments even when the Selection Committees have not recommended the same. The Syndicate has been taking value judgements on whatever is happening. The recommendation to Syndicate come from different Selection Committees/bodies, the Syndicate has to act as a kind of normalizing body. It is his judgement that the Syndicate could take a call that in view of so many things and in view of having repository of larger information, it could take appropriate decision. Therefore, it is his judgement that the Syndicate is competent to take a call on the recommendations of the Selection Committee as the Syndicate is the Government of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there has not been even a single precedent where any increment recommended by the Selection Committee has been undone by the Syndicate because it is specifically provided in the regulation that the advance increment/s can be given on the recommendation of the Selection Committee/Syndicate. That meant, if the Selection Committee has not recommended increment/s, the Syndicate can still give the same but there is no such regulation which says that the increments recommended by the Selection Committee could be undone. If he (Vice-Chancellor) wanted to arrange services of somebody, he could do so but they are not in a position to protect his salary, especially when somebody is coming from industry. However, keeping in view the academic merit, experience, research and performance in the interview, the Selection

Committee is empowered to recommend additional increments and if the Selection Committee has not recommended, the Syndicate could grant additional increments. But he was sure that from the inception of this University to till date, never ever any additional increment recommended by the Selection Committee has been undone by the Syndicate. In fact, personal judgements are not important and important is what is written in Panjab University Calendars. Tomorrow, if somebody objected to reduction of additional increments recommended by the Selection Committee by the Syndicate saying that the Syndicate is not empowered to reduce the increments, then it would be difficult to reply.

The Vice-Chancellor reiterated that the Syndicate has to see that certain normalization is to be done when it comes to recommendation in different subjects. In view of that Syndicate is a competent body to normalize and reduce the number of additional increments, if need be.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Syndicate is not empowered to cut down the additional increments recommended by the Selection Committee. His simple question only is – could the Syndicate reduce the number of increments recommended by the Selection Committee.

Shri Kamlesh Kumar, Director, Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, said that the Selection Committee could only recommend selection of the candidates and not the number of additional increments.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Assistant Professors (General) (Hospitality & Hotel Administration) at University Institute of Hotel Management & Tourism, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/-:

1. Dr. Neeraj Aggarwal
2. Mr. Jaswinder Singh.

The pay of both the above persons be fixed according to rules of Panjab University and each of them be granted two additional increments.

The recruitments would be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No.17501 of 2011.

The competent authority could assign them teaching duties in the same subject in other teaching Departments of the University in order to utilize their subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied Department/s at a given point of time, with the limits of workload as prescribed in the U.G.C.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the following persons, in order of merit and specialization, be placed on the Waiting List:

1. Mr. Abhishek Ghai
2. Mr. Himanshu Malik.

- NOTE:**
1. The score chart of the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. A summary bio-data of the selected and waitlisted candidates enclosed. It had been certified that the selected and waitlisted candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the letters of appointments to the persons appointed under Item **C-2(i), C-2(iii) and C-2(iv)** be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 9.07.2015 regarding adoption of MHRD circular dated 13.10.2014 pertaining to deputation/lien for a period of 10 years

3. Considered recommendation dated 09.07.2015 (**Appendix-V**) of the Committee that the circular F.No.8-9/2008-TS.1 dated 13.10.2014 (**Appendix-V**) issued by Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Higher Education, Technical Section-I, Government of India, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi, with regard to deputation/lien for a period of 10 years to take up academic assignments at the newly established Central Education Institutions (CEIs), be adopted.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the Government of India has set up many new Institutions, which are of national character and centres of excellence and had very good service conditions, etc. All these institutions wanted to attract very best talent available within India, but all of them have to conform to Government of India guidelines; however, there is no provision of pension in these institutions. They wanted to make appointment attracting the people already working in the institutions/Universities where pension is available. Government has reduced the service for making one eligible for pension to 20-25 years. In order to attract and encourage people to move to newer institutions, the Government has made a provision of transfer of Provident Fund/General Provident Fund from newer employer to old employer so that the persons could get pension from the previous employer. Panjab University is not a Central Institution, but *de facto* it is a Central Institution. They also have to conform to the norms and cannot give pension to the newly appointed persons at their own because their pension fund is in a very precarious condition. Panjab University is an institution which existed even before the formation of Government via elections in 1952. Since they are neither a part of the State system nor of the Central, their condition is very precarious. Whatever, they have to do for themselves, the same could be done by the (Syndicate) body and by the higher body (Senate) that has to adopt the letter under consideration. This would benefit them in two ways, i.e., if the persons who are entitled to pension in Panjab University join another institution like IISER, Mohali, where pension is not available, they could transfer their PF/GPF of the requisite number of years to Panjab University so that they could get pension from here. Similarly, if certain persons join Panjab University service after retaining their lien in pensionable institutions, they could get their PF/GPF of requisite number of years to their previous employers so that they could get pension from there. This is, in fact, the spirit of the DOPT document.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that, no doubt, they should adopt the circular under consideration. So far the explanation given by the Vice-Chancellor is that if the persons who are entitled to pension in Panjab University join another institution like IISER, Mohali, where pension is not available, they could transfer their PF/GPF of the requisite number of years to Panjab University so that they could get pension from here, it is okay. So far the second part is concerned, they have to change their regulations, as merely adoption of this circular of Government of India would not serve the purpose. He suggested that if they really want to help their own people, they should amend their regulations on the basis of the above said circulation of the Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Dr. Dinesh Kumar is well taken. They could form a small Committee of the Syndicate to look into the whole issue.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the Regulation and Rules for Pension needs to be amended in such a manner, making a provision of accepting the Provident Fund/General Provident Fund of the employees for 5-10 years, who have joined some other Universities/Institutes provided they had joined the service before 01.01.2004. The provision for grant of pro-rata pension is not there for those, who come from other Institutes/ Universities as the pension set up in the University is not that which is available in other Government Institutions. They are not giving pension even to their own employees, who have joined the University service before 01.01.2004 as they have not opted for the same.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the scheme under consideration is that, if someone has a service in other Institution where pension is available for more than 12-15 years, if he/she joins this University, his Provident Fund/General Provident Fund could be transferred to his previous employer from where he/she could get pension after his/her retirement. Similarly, if their own employees, who are entitled to pension, join other Institution, their contribution towards Provident Fund/General Provident Fund for 10 years or so should be allowed to be accepted so that they could get pension from here after their retirement. If they adopted this scheme, it would become very attractive. The persons irrespective of whether they come here or go from here would remain in the pension scheme of their own organizations without any extra financial burden to their respective organizations. This clause is person specific, for movement of people for their personal career progression. When Principal Gurdip Sharma enquired, the Vice-Chancellor said that this scheme would not have any additional financial burden on the University exchequer. However, it might entail certain changes/amendments in the Pension Regulations. Therefore, they could form a Committee which would look into the matter carefully and make recommendations to the Syndicate. They, however, the Syndicate could accept this, in principle.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that so far as he understood the Item under consideration is to adopt circular F.No.8-9/2008-TS.1 dated 13.10.2014 issued by Ministry of Human Resources Development, Department of Higher Education, Technical Section -I, Government of India. The subject of the letter is "Mobility of faculty and non-faculty personnel to the newly established Central Educational Institutions (CEIs)". The mobility of teachers from

pensionable institutions to the newly established central institutions is okay. As per this rule, the teachers of this University could join one of the newly established central institutions and could get pension from Panjab University itself, but teachers of other universities/institutions could not join Panjab University and get pension from their previous employer because this scheme is only for mobility of faculty and non-faculty personnel to the newly established central educational institutions. As such, this is only one way and not two ways as elaborated by the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal, supplementing Professor Karamjeet Singh, stated that Panjab University is not covered in this letter of Government of India. It pertained to mobility of faculty and non-faculty personnel to the newly established Central Educational Institutions (CEIs) from Central Educational Institutions. It is not for mobility of teachers from any other University but only from Central Universities or Central Educational Institutions. He did not know whether they accept that Panjab University is a Central University. Cases have been fought up to the level of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India for considering Panjab University as a Central University or Centrally Funded University and the Central Government has taken a stand that Panjab University is not a Central University. For this purpose, they at their own, in spite of the fact that the Government of India has not addressed the letter to them, they are adopting it. The letter clearly says that the letter is to the Directors of All Central Educational Institutions, under the administrative control of the Ministry of HRD. In Para 2 of the letter, it has been written "In relaxation of the relevant rules/orders, all deputationists who join the identified posts of faculty or non-faculty in such CEIs, on deputation/foreign service from Central Government or Central Autonomous Bodies. They are not a Central body. Frankly speaking, this circular is not applicable to Panjab University as it is neither a Central Educational Institution nor Central Autonomous Body or Centrally Funded University. That is why, they have written to meet the shortfall of the experienced faculty in the Central Educational Institutions which have come into existence after 01.01.2004. Though the Vice-Chancellor had clarified that pension is probably not the consideration at all, according to them (Government), pension is their only consideration. They have specifically written that the problem being faced by the Central Educational Institutions under the administrative control of Department of Higher Education, which came into existence after 01.01.2004 in attracting senior faculty and experienced non faculty personnel from Central Government/Central Autonomous Bodies, including Universities and State for their effective functioning and growth, due to introduction of New Pension Scheme in these institutions that have been engaging attention of the Government for some time. Meaning thereby, people did not want to join these institutions by leaving/surrendering their pensionable job. The Government says that the existing institutions should make a policy in such a way that their people should be allowed to move to the other Central Educational Institutions without losing their pensionary benefits which they are drawing at their existing/present institutions. A leverage has been given that after a period of ten years with the consent of the lending institution, the employee so deputed could opt for permanent absorption there also. By that time, maybe after ten years he/she completes minimum service required for becoming eligible for pension and might also be ready to vacate his/her lien. Anyhow, this circular certainly is not applicable to them (Panjab University). They are going a step further to open the base for

coming to Panjab University on the same terms and conditions, which might not be the case as rightly pointed out by Professor Ronki Ram that unless and until the relevant Regulations are not amended they could not do anything. The Vice-Chancellor also said that they had lost good candidates not only for faculty positions, but also for non faculty positions because they could not tell them that their pensionary service could be counted here and their amount for payment of pension at their previous institution could be transferred to this University. Now, what do they want – whether they want to help those Central Educational Institutions which have come into existence after 1.1.2004 and that too, without being asked by the Government of India? Government of India has nowhere asked the Panjab University to help them in giving the experienced faculty to serve those institutions where people are not coming owing to non availability of pension after 1.1.2004. As such, decision is to be taken in the light of the above. Yes, it is good for their teaching faculty. Therefore, instead of adopting this circular, which is not meant for them, a decision can be taken independent of this circular, because he knows that the situation changes from Vice-Chancellor to Vice-Chancellor. He would not like to name, there was a Vice-Chancellor who was not in favour of sending a teacher in deputation even for a period of one year because in his personal judgement he was convinced that it is nothing but brain drain of Panjab University. He said that they could not afford to make Panjab University a nursery for other institutions and could not afford to transfer their experienced faculty to get very good name and turn Panjab University into only a lending institution. To that, a counter argument could be given that if they did not allow employees to go on deputation, it would compel them to resign. They could not afford temporary brain drain but are ready to afford permanent brain drain. Though he was not averse to what he (Vice-Chancellor) said, adoption of this circular probably was not within the ambit of Panjab University. In this very circular they had not said that vice versa people could not go on deputation from those Central Educational Institutions, which had come up after 01.01.2004 to other Central Educational Institutions. They have allowed only one way to promote the newly established Central Educational Institutions because they are lacking experience faculty. If at all, they have to adopt this circular, instead of mentioning it, they should make the rule/s that Panjab University would send persons on deputation, and the names of the Institutions should also be mentioned or if the wisdom of the Syndicate is that they could send persons as Shri Kamlesh Ji has said that it should be open to all and wherever anybody wanted, he/she would be allowed to proceed. The Vice-Chancellor also knew that there were a lot of counter questions that they have to decide about the deputation period to other Universities, where certain persons have gone even as Vice-Chancellors. The University was hesitating that they would not allow persons beyond 3 years or 5 years. So there are different views. His simple submission in this regard is that unless and until, the regulations of Pension are amended, they should not think of even bringing anybody or committing as told by the Vice-Chancellor that they had lost somebody, who was appointed at P.U. Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur. Even he felt bad that such a good candidate has been lost, but as Vice-Chancellor, he could not commit to anybody that it would be done as he is bound by the regulations/rules. Therefore, according to him, this is to be considered by the Syndicate leaving aside the circular as well as the recommendation/s of the Committee. The Committee has recommended only one way that from here one could go to other

Central Educational Institutions. There is no question to discuss here whether the people could come from other side also.

Responding, the Vice-Chancellor stated that their Institution is very unique, which is existing from a very long time, but there are Institutions where pension has been allowed only in recent years. Institutions like them, would be very few in India. Since they are not a Central Institution, this circular did not apply, but because they had pension, they are like newly created institutions, whereas they are an old institution. In the newly created institutions, there is no pension scheme, but in their Institution (Panjab University), there is a pension scheme. Since pension scheme is there at Panjab University, their people would like to have pension when they go to other institutions. So this is a very unique situation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that people are entitled/eligible to get pension only from the lending institutions.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar intervened to that this circular is meant only for those Central Educational Institutions, which came into existence after 01.01.2004. This is a direction to those Institutions that if somebody is coming on deputation, they could be given pension by the lending institution.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that it is direction to even those which existed even before 01.01.2004, where pension is available.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is direction to those for sending people to those Institutions, which came up after 01.01.2004 and that is why, they have said that from Central Institutions to newly established Central Educational Institutions because the Institutions, which existed before 01.01.2004 all have pension. As such, they have found a way out of moving the experienced faculty from Central Institutions to the newly established non-pensionable Central Educational Institutions without surrendering the benefits of pension.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in that sense it did not apply to them (Panjab University) as it is not a Central Educational Institution. Their faculty members are reluctant to go elsewhere as pension is not there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they really wanted to benefit their own teachers, they should amend the regulations without getting the support of this circular.

The Vice-Chancellor said that something had to be figured out as he could not open up the discussion without any supporting document as he was not conscious whether such thing could be done. Later on, it figured in his mind that such things are being permitted by the Government of India by issuing this circular. As such, this formed a basis in the thought process in his mind. If they could not adopt it because it did not apply to them, it is well taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that this circular should be withdrawn and a proposal on the similar lines, i.e., the faculty members of this University could be sent to other Institutions, for consideration by the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not only to send the faculty but also receive the faculty.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that how could they receive the faculty when they are not able to give them the pension.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are not giving them the pension, they are just transferring their Provident Fund/General Provident Fund. At the moment they could not transfer the Provident Fund/General Provident Fund of anybody. If a person from the Central University, where one becomes eligible for pension after completion of service of 20 years, joins Panjab University after 15 or 16 years, his Provident Fund/General Provident Fund should be transferred to that University so that after completing the minimum requisite service, he could get pension from there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that since there is a difference between pension and Provident Fund/General Provident Fund, they, in fact, have to contribute pension and not Provident Fund/General Provident Fund.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if the University could definitely transfer the amount of Provident Fund/General Provident Fund, but not the pro rata pensionary benefits to the Institutions from where the persons have come as they did not have this facility.

It was clarified that since they already have deputation rules, they could have persons on deputation even now. In those deputation rules, there is a provision that the borrowing institution (Panjab University) could transfer the pro rata contribution also. So far as adoption of this circular is concerned, they just needed to amend their regulations/rules. As per the provision, they could transfer pro rata contribution towards pension for a period of five years, which they could extend to ten years. As such, they could have persons on deputation even now and transfer the pro rata pensionary benefits as well as leave benefits to the lending Institutions. Further, there is a provision for leave without pay, i.e., extraordinary leave, and if the teacher goes on such kind of leave to take academic assignment, in that case, there is no requirement to have even pro rata pensionary benefits. In that case, the teachers would also be allowed normal annual increments in due course and the service would also qualify for pension without any kind of contribution for that period.

Shri Kamlesh Kumar, Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh, said that since it is a global time, they would encourage free movement of teachers. There should also be free movement of teachers two-way up to a period of 10 years. He suggested that the teachers should be allowed to go on deputation and if need be, the regulations/rules should be amended.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that there is already a provision of extraordinary leave (EOL) without pay for five years. If they allowed deputation 10 years, it would become 15 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a useful thought and is a thought which is keeping them up to the time while they exist as a part of the University. If the consensus is, a small Committee, comprising of Dean of University Instruction, as Chairman, two three Syndics and President, PUTA, should be formed which should come

up with a proposal and the proposal should be placed before the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That a Committee, comprising Syndicate members, 1-2 teachers representatives, be constituted under the Chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction, to look into the issue in its entirety, and make a proposal for consideration by the Syndicate.

Request of Shri Kuldip Singh, Assistant Commandant, C.R.P.F., for counting his previous service of 17 years for pension benefit

4. Considered request dated 20.06.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) (through e-mail) of Shri Kuldip Singh, Assistant Commandant, C.R.P.F., for counting his previous service of 17 years for pension benefit, in pursuance of letter No.8-9/2008-TSI dated 28.12.2011 (**Appendix-VI**) of MHRD, Department of Higher Education. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-VI**) was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE**
1. Appointment letter issued by A.R. (Estt.) vide Endst. No.10697-709/Estt. dated 15.05.2015 to Shri Kuldip Singh for the post of Chief of University Security enclosed (**Appendix-VI**).
 2. Shri Kuldip Singh vide No.13553 dated 29.06.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) was granted extension in joining time up to 31.07.2015 with clear understanding that no further extension will be granted to him under any circumstances.

Briefing the members, the Vice-Chancellor stated that it was a request from the person, who has been offered the appointment to the post of Chief of University Security. The person has 17 years of service and he has requested that his 17 years of service with the previous employer should be counted for pension benefits. Right now, the issue is whether they could count his 17 years of service rendered by him at his previous employer and if he comes over here he should be allowed to retain the lien for a period of two years. Had they adopted the circular of Government of India dated 28.12.2011, they could have transferred his benefits, including pro rata pensionary benefits, transferred for a period of three years to Central Reserve Police Force CRPF. Since he has 17 years' service, two years period would not suffice as the minimum service required for pension is 20 years. Had the provision of three years been there at (CRPF), he would have got his benefits transferred from Panjab University and got the pension from CRPF. But Panjab University is not a Central Institution. If they allow transfer of his benefits to the CRPF for a period of three years as an exception, he would go and plead with the Defence Secretary of Union Government that they should accept money transferred to them by the Panjab University for a period of three years for payment of pension to Shri Kuldip Singh, Assistant Commandant, CRPF, who would join Panjab University as Chief of University Security. If the Government permitted them, they would allow Shri Kuldip Singh. In the end, he said that if they permitted him, he would go and talk to the Defence Secretary.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they could transfer the Provident Fund benefits, but could not transfer the pro rata matching amount to CRPF for grant of pension.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matching amount could be paid by the person concerned. As such, if they permit him to talk to the Defence Secretary, he would go and talk to him; otherwise, not. His Institution (TIFR, Mumbai) has allowed him to deposit pro rata amount. Similarly, his wife has also been allowed by the SNTD. However, he would go to the Defence Secretary only if he is permitted to do so. Whosoever joins the University after 2004 could not be given pension unless and until the regulations of pension are not amended. He added that more than 250 such cases of teachers are pending in the University. Though this issue is being raised in the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate time and again for the last about 4 years, nothing could be done. They should not make any false commitment as they could not do anything in the matter till the regulations are not amended.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that they have not to give pension and it is only about transfer his Provident Fund for a period of three years.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that the item is counting of his 17 years service for pension benefit.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that the request of the candidate should be rejected and he be informed accordingly.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the thing which is not possible, how could they allow that? So far as Provident Fund or depositing of Provident Fund is concerned, he could seek permission from them (CRPF) at his own level that he should be allowed to deposit his share of Provident Fund and that is between him and his Institution. After taking permission from them, he has to apply in the borrowing institution that his share of Provident Fund should be sent to them (CRPF). Not that they have to go and meet the Defence Secretary, but simply have to reply to his query. Second more important question is – whether his pensionable service of 17 years would be counted here for the purpose of pension. They have written a letter to him that they could not grant him extension beyond 31st July 2015. The relevant question which needed to be answered through another communication is that it is repeated that the rest of the conditions are mentioned in the appointment letter and as far as counting of 17 years past service is concerned, since there is no pension scheme for him in the Panjab University, Panjab University regrets its inability to accede to the request. If he still wants to join by negotiating with his employer, he could do so.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he contacted few people, who had served in the Ministry of Defence, Government of India and they told him that if the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University makes a proposal to the Defence Secretary stating that they have selected this person and this person has concern, if the Defence Ministry agreed to accept his Provident Fund contribution from Panjab University, then the Defence Secretary, who is at the highest level, could permit him as an exceptional request that he (Shri Kuldip Singh) goes to Panjab University in quasi deputation.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired is he so extraordinary a person, for whom the Vice-Chancellor of this University is willing to go to meet the Defence Secretary. In fact, he is a waitlisted candidate, but they

are taking a lot of pain to ensure that in one way or the other, the person must join the service of Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they did not have the Chief of University Security for quite some time.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that it has been mentioned in the office note that "In response, the University informed him on 5.6.2015 that his existing pay & grade pay will be protected as per University rules, his pension benefits will be considered only when the necessary amendments in the University Regulations are made in pursuance of notification issued by the Government of India (Ministry of Personnel & Pension Department)". As such, everything has been made clear to him by the University.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they did not have overwhelming consensus as to what they should do in this matter. If the person joined the University service as Chief of University Security, it would be good and if not, they would re-advertise the post. He just wanted to make whatever efforts he could do to see to the selection go through and if with a small extra effort on his part, the University gets a full time Chief of University Security, which they did not have for quite some time, it would be good for the University. He remarked that as Vice-Chancellor of this University he did not consider anything less important.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it has been mentioned in the office note on page 16 that "However, an option is also made available to him to join on deputation basis, provision of unfurnished accommodation is already made in his appointment letter.....". Could they invite him on deputation?

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is for him (Shri Kuldeep Singh) to seek deputation from his parent organization.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out if they correctly interpret the above quoted sentence, they would find that an option has been given to him to join the University on deputation. Could they appoint a person on deputation, whose appointment is recommended by the Selection Committee and approved by the Syndicate/Senate?

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the last para of the office note page 16 says that Shri Kuldeep Singh in his letter dated 10.6.2015 has informed the University that he will join as Chief of University Security as early as Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA/CRPF) relieves him either on deputation He enquired if his department allows him to join the University on deputation, would they permit him to do so?

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that possibility of deputation was there, but when he routed his application, it was with an NOC. He has not routed his application that he being deputed to apply for the post of Chief of University Security in this University. However, after his selection he has explored the possibility of his deputation and the answer from his organization is probably 'No'.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the request of Shri Kuldip Singh, Assistant Commandant, C.R.P.F., for counting his previous service of 17 years for pension benefit, be **not** acceded to.

Amendment of Pension Regulations

5. Considered the minutes dated 22.04.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Sub-Committee constituted by the Pension Committee to prepare the draft amendment in the certain existing Pension Regulations appearing at pages 180-191 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had submitted a letter to the University and had mentioned it in earlier two meetings about the Pension Regulations. If he is not wrong, he had submitted the said letter probably in December 2011 or 2012 and after that the Pension Committee meeting had taken place once or twice. He had also come to attend one of the meetings, which could not take place. Thereafter, when he came to attend one such meeting, he was told that the said issue is being referred to the Legal Retainer for legal opinion. Everything was finalized, but the minutes of that meeting were not recorded because eventually they said after discussing the issue for more than two hours that the quorum for the meeting was not complete. Professor R.K. Kohli, the then Dean of University Instruction, was chairing the meeting. Probably, one of the members had requested that they should decide the issue in the meeting, and he (Professor Kohli) would come and sign the proceedings. He did not know, as to why he refused to sign the minutes thereafter. Now, he read the proceedings of that meeting and found that it has been written that the letter written by Shri Ashok Goyal would be considered only when he is present in the meeting. He did not know whether he is an accused or complainant or he has written in such a language, which could not be understood by the Committee. Why it should be discussed in his presence only. Not that he did not want to attend the meeting of the Committee, but it has become a culture in the University because most of the members are available at the Campus it is very easy to fix the meetings at shortest notice, i.e., on the same day or the next day, but for somebody like him it is not possible to attend the meeting if sufficient notice is not given. Maybe because of that he could not afford to attend those meetings also, which he should have. But this kind of observation by the Committee has come for the first time that this letter would be discussed only when he (Shri Goyal) is present. Why because that letter also relates to interpretation of existing regulations. According to him, because of wrong interpretation by some of the people in the University, some people are being denied the benefit of pension, which they are otherwise entitled to. Therefore, his request to the Vice-Chancellor is that he takes personal interest and go through the said letter and see whether some logical conclusion could be made.

Principal Gurdip Sharma enquired if they could follow the regulation/rule of the Central Government according to which 20 years qualifying service is required for grant of pension.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he was surprised that in the University where everything was happening proactively with everybody's pressure, why the norms of 6th Pay Commission that pension should be given after the qualifying service of 20 years has not been operative. Though they are entering into the 7th Pay

Commission, but they have not resolved the issues, which they should have resolved long ago. As such, they have lagged behind.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that Regulation 1.6 says that they could adopt the Punjab Civil Services Rules without amending the regulation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Principal Gurdip Sharma has raised a very valid point and to take care of that, whenever this Regulation is amended next time, they should substitute Punjab Civil Services Rules with that of Central Government.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that considering their unique status, before 01.01.2016 arrives, they should form a Salary Committee on behalf of the University, which should bring out some proposals so that they are ready with the proposal. The University must do some thinking so that they could submit their proposal to the MHRD at the earliest. As such, they should start working now and not after 1st January 2016. He requested Professor Karamjeet Singh to set up a small Group (think Tank) comprising 2-3 Syndics, Finance & Development Officer, Presidents, PUTA and PUSA, which would make a proposal, after studying/monitoring the progress of 7th Pay Commission.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they could reduce the minimum service to 25 or 20 years as per the rules of Punjab Government or Central Government, but the problem is that they did not have enough money. They could not even allow commutation of pension as per the orders of the Court. Secondly, the provision of Rs.10 crore to be deposited in the Pension Corpus every year would also go this year and from next year, as per the decision of the Government of India, the capping would apply. As such, their pension status is very unique and could not implement each and every decision of the Government about the pension benefits.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that firstly they have to identify their problems. Few people have to get together and start thinking about their interests and how to protect them in the 7th Pay Commission.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that such issues are not resolved only on the basis of emotions. Their endeavour should be as to how they could bring maximum people in the ambit of Pension Scheme. Whether they failed or succeed, does not matter, but their endeavour should be to convince the Government of India that these are their practical difficulties and he is sure that they would get some relief.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that they are depending on the Central Government for meeting their deficit and have difficulties in meeting the deficit under the present conditions. Therefore, without talking to the Government of India no matter could make progress. The Joint Secretary, who has been given the responsibility to attend to their (University) concerns, day before yesterday, had accepted that their (University) problems are unique and Government has taken a call to see their problems. As such, the Government has taken cognizance that their (University) problems are unique, but until recently they were not ready to admit that their (University) problems are unique.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Sub-Committee, constituted by the Pension Committee, to prepare draft amendment in certain existing Pension Regulations appearing at pages 180-191 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Issue/s arising out of PUCASH report and submissions made by the University to MHRD and UT Police

6. Considered the matter arising out of PUCASH report and submissions made by the University to MHRD and UT Police in response to specific requirements asked by MHRD & UT Police regarding a complaint made by a member of Syndicate/Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that in recent past, there have been some sad incidents and the matter has been looked into at several levels. The Registrar of the University had to make certain submissions to the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India and the U.T. Police. If they had matters arising out of it, they could consider and discuss the same. If they did not have any remarks, the report would be forwarded to the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that it is unfortunate that these sad incidents had happened. However, since there is internal mechanism, instead of rushing to the higher authorities, the member concerned should have seen that the grievances are taken care of at the University level.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that they have internal mechanism for resolving the grievances and he had full faith in their internal mechanism. The University had appointed two Committees – one under the chairmanship of Professor Ronki Ram and another under the chairmanship of Professor S.S. Johl, which comprised persons of different shades. Sometimes a colleague felt that perhaps full justice would not be given to him/her. He agreed with the reports. However, it is unfortunate that they could not resolve the issue amicably at the initial stage. The police report is also before them. He felt that they should try to evolve such a mechanism that everybody has full faith in the internal mechanism of the University, though difference of opinion is always there. Whatever reports have been submitted during the last 3-4 months on the issue, he fully agreed with them.

Principal Parveen Chawla stated that whatever has been said by Professor Yog Raj Angrish, she agreed with that. It is really an unfortunate incident, which has occurred in the University. Earlier also, this issue was discussed and she was of the view that this matter should be resolved through the internal mechanism. In the end, she said that let the past be buried and try to resolve the matter through internal mechanism, and if need be, 2-3 members of the Syndicate should volunteer to resolve the matter.

Principal Sanjeev Kumar Arora was also in favour of resolving the matter through internal mechanism.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that they should still try to resolve the matter amicably and internally as one of their respected members of the Syndicate and Senate and the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor are

involved in it. The matter should not be stretched any further, so that the image of the University is not tarnished.

Principal Gurdip Sharma felt that this could be resolved amicably if both sides agreed to.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that it is a sensitive issue as on the one side the prestige of woman is involved and on the other side, the prestige of Head of the Institution is at stake. If they ask him individually as to what is the merit in the case, his views are definitely different. However, he would also request the Hon'ble member to rethink and if there could be a resolve, at least their University is definitely losing on that account. They had already lost much, but should not allow more damage.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that the issue should not have gone outside; rather, it should have been resolved internally.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that since they had internal mechanism, they could resolve it through that. In fact, they had tried their level best to resolve the matter through internal mechanism, which is provided in the Calendar. Now, since the matter has gone to the Secretary, UGC, MHRD and certain other quarters, chances are very bleak to resolve it internally. However, in future, if such an incident occurred, they should resolve the matter through internal mechanism. This House should take every necessary step so that the matter should not go outside in future. If this House resolves this issue also, they would be nothing like that.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that he agreed with Dr. I.S. Sandhu. They tried their level best to resolve the matter amicably through the Committees and the Syndicate as well. Since the entire episode is bringing a bad name to the University and the prestige of both the parties is involved, they should find a way to resolve the matter amicably; rather than lingering on the issue. The things are not improving, which is not in good taste.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he has not been able to understand the item. The item is to consider the matter arising out of PUCASH report, but he did not find any report of PUCASH because the report is prepared only after the enquiry. Though a report is there, it is not the report of PUCASH. In fact, the PUCASH has refused to enquire into the matter. How could it be the report of PUCASH? He would like to know from the Vice-Chancellor that by referring to the Syndicate in this form, what are his expectations from the Syndicate because nothing is clear from the item. The item is to consider the matter arising out of PUCASH report. The suggestions, which have been given by other members, are very good. Even if there is no PUCASH report, Police report or UGC documents, all would have said that it is very unfortunate and it would have been good, had the matter been resolved amicably. But here they are discussing the item, which has come for consideration before the Syndicate. Unless and until they understand as to what is to be considered, he did not think that person like him could speak. He, therefore, requested the Vice-Chancellor to help them in understanding the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that so far as he is concerned, he is presiding over the apex office of this University. Though all of them are experienced, it is his duty to make all of them aware of the

submissions, which are being made on behalf of this University. They are the Government of this University and the Government of this University, as per the Regulation Book of the University, is unable to handle such an unprecedented situation.

Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say whether these are the submissions made on behalf of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the MHRD asked the Registrar whether there is internal Committee and other mechanism, and if yes, they should be informed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have only asked "You are once again requested to examine the matter and furnish the interim Enquiry Report. They asked for something else and they supplied something else.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that whatever the University had, had been supplied. It is his (Shri Goyal) impression that what they had, had been supplied to MHRD. The effective position is – whatever they (MHRD) asked had been provided to them. The Police has told them that a complaint has been lodged against the Vice-Chancellor by a sitting member of the Syndicate and Senate and the Vice-Chancellor has come to know about this only a few days ago. In fact, the complaint is dated 28th of May 2015 and the Syndicate had met on 31st of May 2015. So the Calendar has no way to handle a situation that a sitting member of the Syndicate and Senate could lodge a complaint of such a serious nature to the police without going through the internal mechanism of the University. Internal mechanism of the system has not been able to handle the situation and the matter is arising out of this. In the University, could a sitting member of the Syndicate and Senate go and lodge a complaint of such a serious nature against the Vice-Chancellor to the Prime Minister, MHRD and certain other quarters. So this is the larger view. They should forget about the individuals. Since the matter has gone very far, they and he could not do anything as the matter has gone out of the internal system. As a Governing Body of this University, they have to think whether something could be done within the University Calendar. As such, they needed to ponder over the issue and come up with the suggestion/s in the next Syndicate meeting as to what is to be done. In the mean time, they could defer the consideration of the item till next meeting of the Syndicate. At the moment, they had 44 items more on the agenda and the University *per se* is interested to have the decisions on the remaining items on the agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the item is there on the agenda because within the existing provisions of the Calendar, there is nothing which can take care of such a situation. That is why, he (Vice-Chancellor) has brought the item to the Syndicate for a deliberation and some solution, if at all, there could be. He, therefore, opined that the item should be framed in such a manner that since this situation is not covered under any regulation, it is placed for consideration of the Syndicate. He further stated that why PUCASH, for one reason or the other, has expressed its inability to look into the matter, but they have not specifically mentioned that they are giving findings in the case. Could there be any report without findings. That is why, probably the item has not been properly framed. So far as discussing the matter in the next meeting is concerned, he (Vice-Chancellor) is right that it is going to take a very long time.

Even if the matter is to be sorted out, it could not be done unless and until the misgivings, misunderstandings or allegations and counter allegations are resolved. So they should try to put their endeavour in finding a permanent solution that no such thing happens in future. But he does not know and it is for him (Vice-Chancellor) to enquire that along with agenda item it has been mentioned that all the documents sent to MHRD, Police, etc. by the University along with the complaint of the complainant has been annexed, but the response of the Vice-Chancellor which had been submitted to the Committee has not been annexed. No problem, because the Vice-Chancellor said that he had appeared before the Committee and it is for the Committee to see as to which documents are to be annexed and which not. In that case, the complaint of the complainant should also not have been annexed. If the complaint has been annexed, the reply of the Vice-Chancellor should also have been annexed. He did not know as to why the Vice-Chancellor wanted keep it away from the Syndicate for one reason or the other. But unfortunately, something which is not placed before the Syndicate has been selectively leaked to the Press. He is sure that the Vice-Chancellor could and would not do it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to answer this as this is not the matter under consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not want any answer but then what is the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want further discussion on the matter. It is a matter arising out of it and he did not want to be put to cross questioning. He is not subjecting himself to cross questioning.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not questioning the Vice-Chancellor, but could he not request the Vice-Chancellor to enquire as to why the matter has been leaked to the Press. How a letter written by the Vice-Chancellor has gone to the Press? Could certain member of the Syndicate and Senate criticize anything, whereas on certain people it has been alleged that it is nothing but group politics of the Syndicate and Senate? It has also been alleged that it is being instigated by people of one particular group, which is not towing the lines of the Vice-Chancellor. He is not casting aspersions on anybody, but he is trying to say is that if that is the misgivings in the mind of anybody, it is not. Unless and until such misunderstandings are removed, probably he has no hesitation in saying that none of them sitting in this House is at all serious towards the University. They have to do introspection as to where they had gone wrong. He did not say that the Vice-Chancellor had gone wrong and also that Professor Rajesh Gill had gone wrong, but definitely something has happened due to which the matter has reached at such a stage.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the internal mechanism was put into operation to handle the case. The internal mechanism was not as if it could not resolve the matter. However, without exhausting the internal mechanism, the matter has gone outside. They had to find ways and means that such a situation did not arise in future. What is needed to be looked into is where they have gone wrong. Are there some lacunae in their mechanism? Since the Syndicate is the Governing Body of the University, it should not sit like that and have to come out with a solution so that such situations do not arise in

future, if they are unable to find a solution, then they have to introspect as to where they have gone wrong. The issue is not of individuals, but of the Institution.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that, according to her, even though the matter has gone to the Chancellor, they could still avoid reaching the matter outside and write that the matter has been resolved amicably.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the matters are not resolved when there is no will to resolve and instead of resolving one indulged in blaming each other and then probably the things become complicated. He did not know, who is the one, who has put in efforts to resolve the issue. Though all of them are concerned about the issue and the glory of the University, none of them has come forward to resolve the issue for the last two months.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if no effort has been made so far, they could still make efforts.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that instead of moving in the direction of resolving the issue, there was mud-slinging on the members of the Syndicate and Senate. He said that he is nowhere involved in any of the allegations and in any of the content of the complaints, but he has no hesitation to say that his name has been mentioned hundred times that he (Shri Goyal) is the one who is getting all this done. He (Vice-Chancellor) should tell them that unless and until they had a meeting ground, how could they resolve the issue? Secondly, unless and until they resolve the issue, how could they write to the UGC, MHRD, etc., that the issue has been resolved amicably? However, the Vice-Chancellor has specifically said that he has nothing to say.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a matter arising out of PUCASH Report. If they wanted to have a discussion on it, they could do so in the next meeting of the Syndicate as they have still about 44 items on the agenda. If they have a proposal to tackle such issues, they should come out with the concrete proposal so that the same could be considered and discussed in the next meeting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the item should be brought to the Syndicate in its next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Goyal) should propose the item and he would place the same before the Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when a member says that an allegation has been leveled against him/her and the other members say that allegations have been levelled against them, then it is said that the number game is being played in the Syndicate/Senate. This issue had not cropped up for the first time. Such issues are part and parcel of the Syndicate and Senate because the Syndicate and Senate work on the basis of groups. Though groups are good for maintaining democracy, the groups should work for the welfare of the institution and not against. They could not absolve themselves by simply making allegations against each other as it is their moral duty to resolve the issue. In the end, he said that though the matter has gone out of the internal mechanism, still they could resolve the issue by sitting together. At the same, they need to find out as to why the matter has

gone out without exhausting the internal provisions because they have to take the University forward.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that a few members of the Syndicate and, if need be, a couple of members from the Senate should volunteer to resolve the issue amicably.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever they wanted to do, could do at their own level. He is not proposing anything nor could he do so.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she appreciates the concerns shown by the Hon'ble and the learned members. She is sorry to say that nobody is sympathizing with the woman. Is it easy to make a complaint for a woman? Nobody wanted to go into the merit of the case. She only wanted fair investigation and nothing else. Imagine the torture, which has been done to her. It is a pity that nobody is bothering about the merits of the case. She just wanted fair investigation. They should see her plight. To which internal mechanism they were talking about? Internal mechanism has not been able to give her justice. She is not speaking as the matter is before the UGC committee.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue is not being discussed on merit as told by the Vice-Chancellor, but he (Vice-Chancellor) has made an observation that before the internal mechanism was exhausted, she preferred to approach the Police. However, the fact is other way as the incident is of 15th April 2015 and Committee headed by Professor Ronki Ram met probably on 16th April and immediately submitted its report. Who says that internal mechanism was not exhausted? She went to the Police only on 28th May 2015. Though the Vice-Chancellor has not said anything, it is Professor Ronki Ram, who has suggested that they have to find some way out to handle such incidents so that such a situation did not arise in future. Is there any constitutional provision, under which they could debar anybody from complaining to the competent authorities outside the University System?

Professor Ronki Ram clarified that they are not questioning anybody. This House is not saying that it is stopping somebody from approaching the higher authorities outside the University System. They have only suggested that they should try their level best to resolve the issue amicably. The Syndicate is the governing body of the University, but not so powerful as the Government is, as it has its own limitations. Whatever is being done by it, it is being overlooked by the Government.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that it is very difficult for a female or a male to undergo such a trauma. To say that it is very difficult for females only, is not true. Therefore, they have to discuss the issue threadbare and resolve it within themselves. Since they all are learned persons, they should try to resolve the issue without presence of affected persons.

Principal Sanjeev Kumar Arora, endorsing the suggestion put forth by Principal Chawla, said that they should definitely try to resolve the issue.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should break for lunch.

When the meeting resumed after the lunch, the Vice-Chancellor said that if anybody has anything to say, he could do so; otherwise, they would move to the next item and put it before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is his humble submission that they should withdraw/defer item 6.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not permitting that. He has placed the matter for their consideration and that's it. It was his duty to place the matter before them for their consideration.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired as to what consideration the matter was placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter arising out of it was placed before the Syndicate and they have discussed it. If they did not want to proceed with it, it is okay. The discussion has been recorded and there is no resolved part in it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that since the matter is already under the consideration of the UGC Committee, they should wait for the outcome.

Request of Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow, for supplying DVDs of proceedings of Senate and Syndicate meetings since September 2012

7. Considered the request dated 17.06.2015 (**Appendix-VIII**) of Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow, P.U., for supplying her DVDs containing proceedings of Senate and Syndicate meetings since September, 2012 to till date.

- NOTE:**
1. Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow, vide letter dated 13.03.2015 requested to provide DVDs of Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 and 8.03.2015. She was supplied 7 DVDs of the proceeding of Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015 and informed that DVDs of 08.03.2015 will be supplied after the finalization of minutes vide letter No.ST.2517 dated 25.03.2015. Later on, 5 DVDs of the proceedings of the Syndicate dated 08.03.2015 were also supplied to her vide letter No.ST.3128 dated 11.04.2015 (**Appendix-VIII**).
 2. Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow, vide e-mail dated 20.04.2015 requested to provide DVD of meeting of Syndicate dated 20.04.2015. She was informed that the DVDs of 20.04.2015 will be supplied after confirmation of minutes by the Vice-Chancellor vide Email dated 22.04.2015 (**Appendix-VIII**).
 3. Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow, vide e-mails dated 29.04.2015, 07.05.2015 and 13.05.2015 to provide DVDs of Senate dated 29.03.2015/26.04.2015 and DVDs of Syndicate meeting from September, 2012 to till date. She was informed vide

Letter No.ST.3907 dated 14.05.2015 that the minutes of meeting of Senate dated 29.03.2015/26.04.2015 are yet to be prepared thus DVDs will be supplied in due course (**Appendix-VIII**).

4. Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow, vide e-mails dated 17.05.2015 and 19.05.2015 and letter dated 02.06.2015 requested to supply DVDs of Senate dated 29.03.2015/26.04.2015 and DVDs of Syndicate meeting from September, 2012 to December, 2014 as it involves just click of a button. vide letter No.1202/R/DS dated 08.06.2015, she was informed that the re-writing 290 DVDs would involve a tedious process and labour which cannot happen in a click of a button (**Appendix-VIII**).

The Vice-Chancellor stated that a lot of cost and time is involved in it and his proposal to this is that they would create a Server, which has already these things included. Anybody could visit and look the same. If anybody wanted, he should specify the same, instead of giving bulk directive, and the same would be provided to him/her. They would put a limit, e.g., that the DVD of the last few months would be provided and the other could be seen from the Archive. The desirous person could come and have a look at it and make specific request, which would be provided at the earliest possible. If they are not agreeable to it, it is okay with him and he would employ somebody to do this job.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is provided in the Calendar that any member of the Senate may write to the Registrar for the purpose of obtaining information.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that to make DVDs available is not a part of the Calendar.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that it is a part of the Calendar that any member of the Senate may write to the Registrar for the purpose of obtaining information and the Registrar is supposed to provide that. He felt that their right/s should not be curtailed.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that Regulation 7 at page 35 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 says that "All proceedings at the meetings shall be recorded by the Registrar and countersigned by the Vice-Chancellor or Chairman. Any Fellow of the University shall be entitled to inspect in the University office, during office hours, the proceedings at any meeting of the Syndicate". However, so far as DVDs are concerned, nothing has been mentioned in the Calendar. They would create a Server where anything about the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate would be made available. The members could come and see and, if required, a specific request should be made, they would provide the same; otherwise, they could pass a Resolution that along with the tentative minutes, all the DVDs of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate be provided to the members, which would be given to them on a 32 GB stick. Let there be additional expenses on the governance of the University. He did

not want to withhold any information. It was only about the practicability. At the moment, if they say that all these old DVDs be provided, the same would be provided even if they have to employ somebody for the purpose, the same would be done. Though it is a non-trivial job, it would be got done. However, if it is once or twice, it would be provided to Professor Rajesh Gill and there is no issue at all. Though it would take a little while, these would be provided to Professor Rajesh Gill. However, if everybody started demanding DVDs in such a bulk, it would be difficult for the office.

Professor Ronki Ram suggested that the video recording of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate should be put on the Server and, in future, the video recording of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate should be provided to the members.

The Vice-Chancellor again said that, in future, the video recording of the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate would be provided to the members on 32 GB stick along with the tentative minutes of the meeting.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that at page 40 of the Appendix, it has been mentioned in a letter dated 17th June 2015 written by Professor Rajesh Gill that "Further, I can provide a Hard Drive to ease the process of copying these DVDs, in which case it will take only two (2) hours". Even if somebody is ready to provide a Hard Disk, the recordings are not being provided.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if somebody is ready to get by copying from them, it is okay with them. However, their office feels that this job could not be done within two hours.

It was clarified that audio could be copied within such a short time, but video could not be copied within such a short time as copying of 4 GB takes more time.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that when he asked them to provide him the details of all the Committees, which were constituted to deal with the Ph.D. cases along with pending cases, the office took at least two months in compiling the data. He is not saying that the DVDs should be provided within a day, but these should be provided at least within a month or so. Usually, these are mostly not demanded by every member. This is a case of one-time and for one-time, they could not curtail the right of the member/s. Secondly, the Vice-Chancellor is already proposed, but that would be applicable for future.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it is a very serious issue. Is there any decision till date that the members of the Syndicate and Senate, if they demand the DVDs of the video recording of the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate meetings, they would not be provided the same? If there is not such decision, under what authority the Registrar has written that these DVDs would not be supplied as these could not be written with a click of mouse. He could have understood had the Registrar written that it would take two months to write this much number of DVDs. Telling them that writing of DVDs takes a lot of time, who suggested them that they should engage only one video recorder to get the DVDs re-written. They could see as to how many copies could be re-written within a few minutes at the Computer Centre/Department of Computer Science & Applications where latest

technology is available. Thirdly, he would have appreciated, had the demand been met first and thereafter, the problem had been brought before the Syndicate that this is the problem they are facing, they (Syndicate) should tell them as to what is to be done. By denying, they had done nothing but inflamed the issue which is of a sensitive nature. It has not happened with her alone. He did not know under what authority it was said, when he also demanded the DVDs, that the DVDs would be provided only after the confirmation of the minutes as if there would be some change/s after the confirmation of the minutes. Though there was no such decision, the Vice-Chancellor at that time had said that such things should be supplied only after the confirmation of the minutes. When the Vice-Chancellor has made a statement in the meeting of the Senate, under what provision the request of Professor Rajesh Gill has not been acceded to. He thought that the issue is of almost two months before, but they are still discussing whether they should give the DVDs or not. He further said that he would like to point out as a member of the Syndicate that this Registrar has been overstepping his authority.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to use proper tone as the meeting is to be conducted in certain decorum.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that has he said anything insulting. If he is trying to emphasize his point in a particular tone, why should he feel offended? He is saying that this Registrar is habitual of offending the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor strongly objected to it.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he was also of the same opinion, which has been expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he has every right to express his opinion, to which the Vice-Chancellor might not agree to. Therefore, he should be allowed to express his opinion.

The Vice-Chancellor again said that the meeting has to be conducted in certain decorum.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that what decorum. Is he saying anything unparliamentary?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he objected to the tone and the words used "this Registrar is habitual". Clarifying the situation, he said that the matter under consideration at the moment is this item only and he (Shri Goyal) could not use this item to cast aspersions on the office of the Registrar.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that just because the item says the Registrar without any jurisdiction has refused to supply the DVDs, he needed to add what else he (Registrar) has done by defying the Syndicate. He (Vice-Chancellor) could not deny the opportunity of speaking.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever decorum is to be maintained, should be maintained.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the item before the Syndicate "To consider the request dated 17.06.2015 of Professor Rajesh Gill,

Fellow, P.U., for supplying DVDs to her containing proceedings of Senate and Syndicate meetings since September 2012". This is a very unusual request asking for so many DVDs, that too, relating to years back. If 90 members started demanding DVDs, it would take a lot of time of the office and University machinery to prepare DVDs in hundred numbers. As such, they have to see whether such kinds of requests are reasonable or not for the efficient working of the University and also whether the University should incur that these kinds of expenses and time as well as manpower. If they think that these requests are reasonable and the University should incur that these kinds of expenses, time as well as manpower, then it is okay with him as they are the Government of the University and could pass a Resolution. In this particular case, at least as a Vice-Chancellor of the University, he has already conceded that all the DVDs would be supplied to Professor Rajesh Gill and has also proposed that for the efficiency of the University, a Server would be created on which these be loaded. Anybody could come and see and make a specific demand, and the same would be met. However, this thing could not be utilized at the moment to say things against the office of the Registrar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in spite of writing by the office of the Chancellor to the Registrar that these particular DVDs be provided to Professor Rajesh Gill, even that orders of the Chancellor's office have not been complied with.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could only say that this is not the matter under consideration at the moment. He could come back to it listing the things in a chronological order.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that even the orders of the Chancellor had not been complied, which is a very serious matter.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, at the moment, he could not answer these things. He has to collect all the facts and for that, they have to give him reasonable time.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired as to why the item has been brought in.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the item is what is before them and not all the matters arising out of it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that while dispersing for the lunch, he (Vice-Chancellor) has said that after lunch they would start with Zero Hour discussion, but immediately after lunch they started with Item 6/7. Now, when they are raising related issues, he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying that they could not do so.

The Vice-Chancellor said that first they have to take decision on Item 7 and thereafter, they could start Zero Hour discussion.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that Item 7 is over and he would like to ask why the DVDs have not been supplied to Professor Rajesh Gill till date. If he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying that these would be supplied, would it not entail that much labour, which it would have two months earlier.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had already given them answers and could not give answers more than that.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what answer has been given that he (Vice-Chancellor) thought that it is not advisable to supply the DVDs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would not state anything more.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice-Chancellor) has not yet replied as to why the DVDs have not been supplied to Professor Rajesh Gill. He (Vice-Chancellor) simply asked that if tomorrow 90 members asked for the DVDs, what would they do?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to get into the argument with him (Shri Goyal).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as Chairman of the Syndicate, he has to satisfy the Syndicate. Just by shielding a man, who is his Officer, does not suffice.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Registrar) is not his Officer, instead he is the Registrar of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that mean, he is their Officer also. Then did he say that he (Registrar) is one of his Officers and they could not use this tone.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that he only said that they could not level such accusations against the Officer of the level of Registrar.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that this issue is very important because according to the Media the UGC Committee has been supplied with some DVDs of the proceedings of Syndicate and Senate meetings saying that Professor Rajesh Gill and her group has been forcing them to take wrong decision. She challenged that she would be present at any public forum, news channel, mode of media, along with the Vice-Chancellor, wherein it should be probed that she has ever forced to take a wrong decision in any of the meeting of the Syndicate and Senate. Hence, it is important to take the copies of the DVDs because she also needed evidence/s for her defence.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that she has also given in writing that she is ready to bear the charges, if any. Even then she has not been provided the information.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she has even given in writing that she is ready to provide an external hard disk for the purpose.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that when anybody demands the DVDs, every time a reply is given that the minutes of the meeting are yet to be confirmed. What is the link between the supply of DVDs and the confirmation of the minutes? Whether the DVDs are to be changed? In the reply to Professor Rajesh Gill in response to her letter demanding DVDS of 20.04.2015 meeting of the Syndicate, it has been written that the minutes are yet to be drafted and confirmed by the Vice-Chancellor. What does it mean? When the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate are being videographed, what is to be confirmed by the Vice-Chancellor? He has also demanded DVDs of the two meetings, including Syndicate meeting dated 8.3.2015, but the same have not been supplied to him so far and they have entered

into 4th week of July. It meant they had some apprehensions that something could go against them. He has also been given the same reply, which has been given to Professor Rajesh Gill. He should be informed in which book it has been written that the DVDs would only be supplied to the members after the confirmation of the minutes. Very senior members are sitting here in the meeting and if there is any such decision, he should be informed. When action is being taken against the Professor/s for approaching the Chancellor directly, why the same is not being taken against the Registrar for doing wrong things? The Syndicate has also been empowered to take action against the Registrar as it is the Governing Body of the University.

Professor Ronki Ram said that now, when it has been proposed that all the information relating to the DVDs would be put on the Server, no issue is there. Had the DVDs been denied, the issue would have definitely been there. Secondly, they had not said that the DVDs would not be supplied and instead had only said that they needed sufficient time to re-write such a large number of DVDs.

To this, Shri Naresh Gaur said that other persons were supplied the DVDs, but when Professor Rajesh Gill demanded, this reply has been given.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that as per the letter written by the Registrar to Professor Rajesh Gill on 8th June 2015, i.e., about one and half months earlier, he understands that till date the DVDs have not been supplied. In the above-said letter, it has been written that "In view of the above you are requested that kindly specify the particular Senate/Senate meeting and provide sufficient time so that this office may be able to retrieve the specific record and provide a copy of same of you". But even one and half months after, he has not supplied a single copy. Secondly, it has been reported in the newspapers that all the DVDs, which have been demanded by Professor Rajesh Gill, have been supplied. Though he did not contest that because it is for the media to report whatever they wanted to, what they had done during the last 87 days. Nothing is related with the draft minutes. Yes, the Pen Drive containing the video recording of minutes of the Syndicate should go with the draft/tentative minutes, but if any member demands a copy of the DVD even before the tentative minutes are circulated, it could not be denied because it could not be linked with the draft/tentative minutes and the same was decided by them five years earlier also when it was decided to introduce the videography of recording of meetings of the Syndicate and Senate, but he did not know under what conditions, it has been discontinued. So much so when he (Vice-Chancellor) came and an issue arose, a legal opinion was sought whether they could deny the supply of DVDs to the public under RTI Act, it was felt that it is a very bad reflection on the University, the way they discuss in the meetings of the Syndicate/Senate, at that also it was never asked whether they have to give them or not. But after giving the DVDs, it was discussed here and legal opinion was taken, which said that they could not deny the DVDs even to the public. The only difference is that for public they had fixed the price and it was also decided that if the Fellows demand, these would be supplied to them free of cost. Under what circumstances, this decision has been taken. He could understand in view of the voluminous, for 292 DVDs, it could have been reasonably said that they required at least one month time to supply the DVDs, but she has been made to wait for the meeting of the Syndicate, which was supposed to be held after one and a half months. Is it not

harassment? Then Sir, whatever decisions are taken, e.g., the Vice-Chancellor orders something in writing on 3rd June 2015, the file is still pending with the Registrar. It meant, he (Registrar) is not following the orders of the Vice-Chancellor. If the Registrar is not following the orders of the Vice-Chancellor, what is it? The Syndicate in its meeting held in the month of April passed a specific Resolution, but the Registrar, who is the Secretary of the Syndicate, in complete disregard to the decision of the Syndicate, puts up a note taking a U-turn against the decision of the Syndicate. He could count 1-5 such cases and if he says please try to understand the anguish rather than look to his tone, what is wrong in it. Where should they go? If they go to the Registrar, he says that since he is a man of army, he knew how the wars are fought. If they go to the Vice-Chancellor, he says change his (Goyal) tone. Has he ever contacted him (Vice-Chancellor) or the Registrar? The only forums are Syndicate and Senate, where he could express genuine opinions/concerns not only of Ashok Goyal, but maybe of the whole House, and if here also he is stopped from expressing the same and also if he (Vice-Chancellor) feels that they have no right, it's alright.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that this issue is really important because they had written record of proceedings of Syndicate and Senate. Though the record is there, it could not be copied within stipulated time as the record is bulky. Probably, that might be the reason for not supplying the DVDs to Professor Rajesh Gill. But now, since already about 2 months have passed, they should have expedited the copying of DVDs process and easily supplied to Professor Rajesh Gill.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that this matter of DVDs has already been discussed quite in detail in the last meeting of the Senate. They could go and read the proceedings of the last meeting of the Senate, wherein this issue was taken up and discussed at what time and stage the DVDs should be released. This matter was discussed at some length. He urged the members to go and read that proceedings of the Senate. The matter could be sent back to the Senate. Let the larger body of the University consider and take appropriate decision. He said that this would be sent in verbatim as well as DVDs containing video recording of the meeting to the members along with agenda papers of the Senate meeting as and when the same is fixed, and the Senate could resume the discussion on the matter from where the discussion was left on the previous time. In the meantime, all the DVDs as requested by Professor Rajesh Gill would be made available to her. Their Senate and Syndicate meetings go on for many-many hours. Hence, it is not easy task to write the minutes. Minutes writing is not an easy task. So many officials are sitting here and it takes them a lot of time to write down the minutes. It is not his job to write the minutes. If they wanted to write the minutes in an expeditious manner, as there are many bodies in the country where the minutes are written in an expeditious manner, one of the norms which is often followed, is that one of the members/participants takes the responsibility of expediting the writing of minutes. There are fifteen members in all and there are 12 meetings of Syndicate. One by one, one of them could assume the responsibility so that minutes are written in an expeditious manner because the way the office has functioned over the last so many decades, they have not been able to do this job more efficiently than what they have been doing right now. If they wanted to appoint a Fact-Finding Committee, the Fact-Finding Committee, on behalf of the

Syndicate, could be formed, which would go and inspect all the records of the people of the General Branch, who write the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate meetings and look at that when a certain portion of the meeting lasted in 10 hours, how much time they take to prepare the draft minutes because all this is not done in one step as the proceedings are prepared in sub-parts. The paras which are important are given preference and their proceedings are written first. This could be ascertained from Professor A.K. Bhandari, who has been the Registrar of this University for a very long time. He (Professor Bhandari) knows how difficult and how tiresome this process is. It is not that the meeting happened and everything is written within 3-5 days. Please do fact finding or appoint a Fact-Finding Committee or Sub-Committee of the Syndicate to find out how much time it takes to write all these things. It is very easy to say that it should be done expeditiously, but it is not easy to do these things expeditiously where minutes are being written in a manner where most of them wanted that whatever is being said by them should be recorded. It is not an absolutely verbatim record, rather here everyone say differently. To capture the spirit, in order to write the minutes, is not an easy task. As such, it is a specialized job and could not be done by everyone. Everyone of them (Syndicate members) might also find it a difficult though couple of them might be able to do it in an expeditious manner, but most of them would find it hard to comprehend and write it in an efficient manner. So they should have a taste of this pudding by seeing how this pudding is prepared at various stages. Hence, it is a non-trivial task. So to respond to their anguish and to the fact that they wanted it to happen expeditiously and also that the DVDs be supplied at the earliest, he could not say that it would be done by tomorrow, but could only say that it would be done as early as it could be. He is not the person, who has to come and do this particular job. It is to be done by the office and the office has also certain degree of efficiency and competency. Instead of one person, he could depute four persons to do this job, but if they wanted that this job should be outsourced to an outside agency, Syndicate should tell him. He would outsource it to an outside agency. Then they would see whether it is got done in an expeditious manner. The University Officers and technical staff have certain way of doing it and they could not do it in less time than required. The entire office of the University and technical staff could not be empowered to do it in the next two days. If they wanted it to be done in the next few days, he could only try and see as to how many people they could engage for the purpose. This is the reason that he could not answer up to when it could be done. However, the Server would be created and in future, they could come and see and if they wish, they could make a specific request, which would be acceded to. It is for prospective as nothing could be retrospective. As regards DVDs of today's meeting are concerned, they would not wait for the writing of minutes. Within a week's time each one of them would get copies of DVDs containing video recording of today's meeting. One of the members should volunteer to see that the minutes are written expeditiously. Concurrently, the Syndicate should form a Sub-Committee to see the records and experience what and how it is being done. On a query made by Shri Ashok Goyal, the Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee should see as to how much tedious a job it is to write the minutes because if the Senate meeting lasts after 10-12 hours, though it is written in the Calendar that the Registrar shall, within one month after the meeting, send to each member of the Senate, a copy of the minutes of the proceedings as approved by the Chairman, but the office is not able to cope up that much of work.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari, who has been Registrar for quite a number of years, to clarify.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that it takes time to write the minutes.

Shri Ashok Goyal, giving the background as to why the video recording of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate was started, stated that it is true that it takes time to write the minutes. Earlier, it never used to take time and that is why a month's time has been given. Now, with the passage of time, the number of Departments, courses, teachers, affiliated Colleges, etc. have increased, but they have not increased the frequency of meetings of the Senate. The meetings of the Senate, which used to take only 4-5 hours because at that time there were used to be about 30 items or so, where now there are always 100 or more items on the agenda, and resultantly it takes more time. Meaning thereby, that with the increase work, they have not increased the number of meetings. In the year 2009, it was expressed by the members that by the time the minutes in writing come, since everybody forgets what was deliberated in the meeting and felt that the Registrar or the Vice-Chancellor tampered with the minutes, they decided to introduce video recording of the proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and also as and when some of them, even before the writing of minutes, ask for the video recording, the same should be supplied. It was only in that spirit. They also understand that they are human being. How could they do something in a week's time, which could not be done in month's time? So far as the remarks of the Vice-Chancellor that the members of the Syndicate could have the taste of pudding is concerned, they already understand that it is a difficult job, but what is not difficult is not being done and what is difficult is expected to be done. To supply the copies of the DVDs containing video recording of the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate meeting is not a herculean task. They should do that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has already offered to do that.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that they should resolve that the DVDs demanded by Professor Rajesh Gill be supplied to her as quickly as possible, and in future, the DVDs containing recording of proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate be supplied to all the members within one week.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the DVDs containing video recording of the proceedings of meetings of the Syndicate and Senate demanded by Professor Rajesh Gill, be supplied to her as quickly as possible; and
- (2) in future, the DVDs containing recording of proceedings of the meetings of the Syndicate, be supplied to all the members within one week's time.

Re-fixation of pay of Dr. Deepak Kapur, University Business School, Panjab University.

8. Considered re-fixation of pay of Dr. Deepak Kapur, University Business School, Panjab University, at Rs.43,000/- with Grade Pay of Rs.10,000/- in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000, on revision of pay scales of Teachers of Colleges/Universities as conveyed by the Ministry of HRD vide letter No.1-32/2006-U.II/U.1(I) dated 31.12.2008 which is a part of the Notification on UGC Regulations 2010 at page 7922-7937, which provides that the pay of a directly recruited Professor shall be fixed at the stage not less than Rs.43,000/- in the pay scale of Rs.37400-67000 + Rs.10,000/- AGP with five non-compoundable advance increments w.e.f. 01.04.2009, the date he joined, as recommended by the Selection Committee and incorporated in his appointment letter duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate and also as recommended by the committees in its meetings dated 22.04.2015 and 07.05.2015 (**Appendices-IX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider/examine his representation/s. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-IX**) was also taken into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he did not know how it has escaped the attention of the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar. This probably should have not come to the Syndicate as while ordering the Vice-Chancellor has underlined that this item should be taken to the Board of Finance. Secondly, the recommendation of the Committee, headed by Professor Ronki Ram, is also the same. He read out the recommendations of the Committee dated 24.04.2015 as also the orders of the Vice-Chancellor on page 50. He stated that to this, the Finance & Development Officer has written that "In order to address the queries as above, may kindly convene the meeting of the same Committee for making necessary recommendation pl.". The Committee met on 7th May 2015 and replied to both the observations mentioned at page 48-49 and has also quoted the relevant Regulations. Finally, the Committee has recommended (page 50) that "In view of the Regulation 4.1 and Regulation 2(iii) (a & b) and the observation of Audit as explained, it is recommended that the minutes of the Committee may be submitted before the Board of Finance for consideration and for making recommendation to the Syndicate/Senate for approval". This recommendation of the Committee has been approved by the Vice-Chancellor. Therefore, probably through an oversight, the item has been placed before the Syndicate instead of Board of Finance. He did not want the Syndicate to take the decision first and thereafter, the item to be placed before the Board of Finance, which is a lower body. The Committee here has rightly recommended that as per Regulation wherever the amount involved is either Rs.5,000/- or more, the item has to come to the Syndicate through the Board of Finance. Therefore, they have recommended that this be placed before the Board of Finance for consideration and making recommendation to the Syndicate/Senate. He, therefore, suggested that this item should be brought to the Syndicate through the Board of Finance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that when they met in the Committee, at that time when they talked about Regulation 2.1 (a & b), his understanding was wherever the expenditure is Rs.10,000/- or more, they have to take that to the Board of Finance, but later on they had a lot of discussion, including about the UGC Standing Committee. Ultimately, they realized that new expenditure meant some other new head/s of expenditure, whereas it related to salary. So far as salary is concerned, Regulation 4.1 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I,

2007, applied to it and not Regulation 2.1. As such, it has to go to the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that he has not looked into this matter until he received the recommendations of the Committee. On receiving the recommendations of the Committee, he asked for the file as he wanted to look into file. After going through the records, he noted that Professor Deepak Kapur was working in a Government Institution in the year 2006 and that Government Institution was following norms/pay-scales of Pay Commission, which the other Universities were following. So this person changed over from a Government Institution to a well known private Institution and that Institution not only protected his pay, but also gave him a higher pay as it was following the pay-scales of IITs, which are slightly superior to the University pay-scales. The minimum salary of Professors in IITs system is slightly different. In their (University) system, the minimum pay of Professor is fixed at Rs.43,000/-, whereas in IITs, it is fixed at Rs.48,000/-. He felt that this gentleman, who was working in a Government Institution and was in a Professor's scale at certain stage and as and when the pay-scales were revised and implemented in that system, his salary in that Government Institution would have been Rs.43,000/- plus three increments. However, he left the Government Institution. He has looked into all the post facto facts. Even when he was appointed here (in Panjab University), the recommendations of the 6th Pay Commission had come. He had the benefit of looking into the whole case on hindsight and long after the event. Therefore, he felt that he would have got at least Rs.43,000/- plus three increments in the Government Institution. On a query made by Shri Ashok Goyal that Professor Deepak Kapur was working in the Government Institution and the same should be confirmed from the file, the Vice-Chancellor said that he was working in the University of Petroleum and Energy Studies.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, in fact, that University is a private University. He added that the whole case has been based on that he (Professor Kapur) was in a Government Institution, but to his knowledge, it was a private University.

Some of the members said that since it has been examined and recommended by the Committee, it should be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the Committee report came to him looking at all the things, including the way the UGC pay-scales have been implemented in the Universities in India. The Committee has justified it quoting that Professor Deepak Kapur is entitled to five increments at Rs.43,000/-, to which he is convinced. However, it was his concern as to why this gentleman has to wait for so long to get his initial salary fixation to which he was entitled. In that curiosity, when he looked into the file, to him it appeared as if he was in a University where the minimum basic salary after 01.01.2006 would have been Rs.43,000/-. As such, he was entitled minimum of 3 increments on Rs.43,000/-. And the Institution to where he went, the scale was that in IIT, where the minimum salary point after mapping from V to VI Pay Commission was Rs.48,000/-. Therefore, he felt that he was entitled to 9% or 10% more on Rs.43,000/-, i.e., about Rs.43,00/- . The second institution had put him in the old scale of IITs, but at the top of the scale. At the top of the old grade, he was entitled to three increments on Rs.48,000/- as per mapping table. If he had been given three increments on Rs.48,000/-, the basic pay would have

become about Rs.52,000/-. Therefore, he felt that Professor Kapur should be given at least five increments on Rs.43,000/-, which comes to about Rs.50,000/-. As such, the recommendation of the Selection Committee that he should be given five increments is still valid from the point of view of the candidate that he is aggrieved and this has been justified by this Committee. In view of this, he felt that Professor Deepak Kapur has a case. The recommendations of the Committee are independent of the facts as understood by him. The Committee has not given any cognizance to the history of the case, but when he looked at the entire record, he came to know about these things. As such, he personally feels that this person deserves five increments in the new scale of Professor in VI Pay Commission.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are certain cases of the persons directly appointed as Professors, but they have also not been given the initial pay of Rs.43,000/-.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she has been representing her case since 2009 and the matter had also been discussed with the Vice-Chancellor. Six years have already passed, but her pay has not been fixed at minimum of Rs.43,000/- and the reason is being advanced that a clarification has been sought from the UGC on the issue, but no reply has been received. A number of other Professors might also be facing similar situation. She, therefore, suggested that an item should be reframed by including all such cases and the same should be placed before the Syndicate for consideration and approval.

Some of the members suggested that the item under consideration should be approved and the other similar cases should be considered accordingly.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that he also wanted that the pay of all the Professors appointed through direct recruitment should be fixed at the minimum of Rs.43,000/-. He said that they should have got this case done after getting the approval of the Board of Finance. It has been mentioned at page 51 of the Appendix that "The initial pay of Dr. Deepak Kapur was fixed at Rs.40,320/- + Rs.10,000/- as per fitment table 5 in the revised pay-scale of Rs.37400-67400/-, but the audit did not admit the said fixation of pay and observed that the higher start of Rs.43000/- was admissible only where the appointment was made under the revised regulations". Professor Navdeep Goyal knew that before this case, there were four similar cases of different Departments. It has also been mentioned at page 51 of the Appendix (Para 3), accordingly, the Under Secretary, Finance, Government of Punjab, was requested to clarify the position, vide letter 1465/A dated 22.01. 2014, but no reply has been received in spite of reminders. As per 2010 guidelines, for becoming a Professor, one must possess 400 points. Therefore, an anomaly occurred in the case of the persons, who became Professors, between 01.01.2008 to 2009. Since they are already entered into so many complications, they should not enter into any more complication by approving this case. If this case is approved by the Board of Finance and thereafter, by the Syndicate and Senate, the Audit could not raise any objection. Secondly, this has also been recommended by the Committee. He pleaded that keeping in view the background of the case and also the recommendation of the Committee, firstly it be placed before the Board of Finance.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor Karamjeet Singh, Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that all such cases should be placed before the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all such cases are to be resolved before 01.01.2016, i.e., implementation of recommendations of 7th Pay Commission.

The members suggested that all such cases (pending for fixation at the minimum of Rs.43,000/-), including the case of Professor Rajesh Gill, be placed before the Board of Finance for consideration.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that a circular should be issued requesting that all the cases of directly recruited persons, which are pending for fixation at the minimum of Rs.43,000/-, be send to the Finance & Development Officer for making a consolidated item for consideration by the Board of Finance. Secondly, all the financial matters should be routed through the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when they went to the UGC this time, the Secretary, MHRD, told them very clear that only those cases of more than Rs.5,000/- amount are to be routed through the Board of Finance, which related to new expenditure and the things, which are within the existing system, are not required to be routed through the Board of Finance.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that though they had sought clarification from Punjab Government on 22.01.2014, the same has not come as they are not following it. Therefore, they must depute their Officer/s that in case they are seeking any clarification either from UGC or from Punjab Government, they should personally visit their respective offices so that the clarification reaches the University office within a stipulated time.

Professor Ronki Ram stated the Committee has examined the case threadbare, but at that time they did not get all the relevant files. They were of the opinion that when Professor Deepak Kapur joined the Panjab University service, the recommendations of 6th Pay Commission had already been implemented. As such, they thought that whatever has been recommended to him, i.e., higher start, it was neither any favour nor advantage to him, but to compensate him as to what he was drawing at his previous Institution. Therefore, they thought that there is no problem in giving him a minimum start of Rs.43,000/- + AGP Rs.10,000/- plus five increments, which is almost equal to what he was drawing at his previous Institution. The Vice-Chancellor has also raised two queries, i.e., "(1) Please confirm explicitly that the fixation of Rs.50,340 + GP of Rs.10,000/- is comparable to the last pay drawn by the new appointee; and (2) Do I have the authorization as Vice-Chancellor to approve and implement the above proposal?" Their view was that whosoever is appointed Professor through direct recruitment is entitled to minimum basic pay of Rs.43,000/- and their cases are not required to be placed before the Board of Finance. During the last couple of years several Professors have been appointed through direct recruitment, including Professor Gurmail Singh, he himself, and their cases have not been placed before the Board of Finance. As such, they should not complicate the issue. If this House thought merit in this case, Professor Deepak Kapur should be given five additional increments to compensate him

so that he could get whatever he was drawing at his previous Institution. The cases of the persons, who are similarly placed, should also be dealt with accordingly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct that they should wait for representations from the people, who are similarly placed, to resolve their cases.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not opposed to this item, rather he is only agreeing with the recommendations of the Committee that the recommendations of the Committee be placed before the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor, summarizing the discussion, said that nobody is saying that people appointed as Professor through direct recruitment during the 6th Pay Commission (01.01.2006 onwards) did not deserve fixation at the minimum of Rs.43,000/-. That meant, everybody appointed through direct recruitment as Professor needed to be given minimum of Rs.43,000/-.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the persons promoted as Professors, under the Career Advancement Scheme, are required to be fixed at minimum of Rs.40,800/- and the persons appointed through direct recruitment as Professor at minimum of Rs.43,000/-. He added that as per the Central Pay Commission recommendation regarding revision of pay-scales which was adopted by the Punjab Government in 2009, the pay of the persons appointed as Professors through direct recruitment has to be fixed at minimum of Rs.43,000/-.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the minimum pay of Rs.43,000/- for the Professors is not for those, who have been promoted under the CAS.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would present the data of the all the people, who have been appointed as Professors through direct recruitment and have been given the minimum basic pay of Rs.43,000/- and also of those who have been left out, to the Board of Finance, and there they would argue that there could not be any discrimination. He added that all the anomalies have been figured out and settled before 01.01.2016, for which a Committee, under the Chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction, would be constituted.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out that certain persons appointed as Professor, who are junior to her, have been granted minimum pay of Rs.43,000/-, but she has not been given. She, therefore, pleaded that unless all such cases, including her, are included and the item is reframed, the item under consideration should not be approved. She added that there is a settled law that the junior could not get/draw more salary than his/her seniors.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that a Committee to look into the anomaly cases should also be constituted. He further said that the service of the persons, who have come from outside and were Assistant Professors (Selection Grade) and getting AGP of Rs.9,000/- or Rs.10,000/-, should be protected and they should be covered in the equivalent grade.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Dinesh Kumar to give the same in writing and work with Professor A.K. Bhandari, so that the same could be examined and resolved.

RESOLVED: That the case of Professor Deepak Kapur as well as all other similar cases, be placed before the Board of Finance along with the information/list of persons (Professors appointed through direct recruitment), who have been given initial start of Rs.43,000/- or above and also who have not been given the same.

Change in nomenclature of the posts of Deputy Director/Reader and Assistant Director to that of Associate Professor and Assistant Professor

9. Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 12.12.2014 (**Appendix-X**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding change in the nomenclature of the posts of Deputy Director/Reader and Assistant Director to that of Associate Professor and Assistant Professor respectively in the Population Research Centre (a scheme funded by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare) in terms of the notification dated 29.4.2011 of the said Ministry regarding grant of revised pay-scales and designations for these posts.

- NOTE:**
1. There is a provision of one post of Deputy Director/Reader and one post of Assistant Director in the Population Research Centre funded by the above said Ministry which carry the UGC pay scales as in the case of Reader and Lecturer. Thus, pay-scale of both these positions have been revised by the Ministry as per the pay revision notification of the UGC as notified by the Punjab Government from time to time.
 2. The Ministry vide its notification dated 19.7.2010 (**Appendix-X**) conveyed its approval for grant of pay scale of Rs. 37400-67000 +AGP 9000 to the post of Deputy Director/Reader and Rs.15600-39100+ AGP Rs. 6000 to the post of Assistant Director effective from 01.01.2006 in terms of Punjab Civil Services revised pay rules 2009 contained in the Punjab Government notification No. 10/3/3/2009-3ETU.1/3321 dated 02.09.2009 for the teachers and equivalent staff (**Appendix-X**).
 3. Subsequently, the Ministry vide its notification dated 29.4.2011 in supersession of its earlier notification dated 19.07.2010 and corrigendum dated 15.09.2010 and in terms of the said notification of the Punjab Government dated 02.09.2009 has revised the existing designation of the Deputy Director with three years service to that of Associate Professor and that of Assistant Director to Assistant Professor along with the revision of pay band and grade pay as indicated in the said notification (**Appendix-X**).

4. Accordingly, in terms of Ministry's notification dated 29.04.2011, the Honorary Director, Population Research Centre vide its letter dated 23.04.2014 has requested that the existing designation of Dr. Reena Singh, Deputy Director and Dr. Swarn Singh, Assistant Director be changed to that of Associate Professor and Assistant Professor respectively **(Appendix-X)**.
5. The Vice-Chancellor constituted a Committee to look into the issue of change in nomenclature of the posts of Deputy Director/Reader and Assistant Director to that of Associate Professor and Assistant Professor respectively in the Population Research Centre in terms of the notification of Health and Family Welfare dated 29.04.2011 as referred above.
6. The Committee made its recommendation in its meeting dated 12.12.2014. The F.D.O./D.U.I. have opined as under:-

“It has been observed that in view of the approval of the concerned Ministry, the recommendations of the Committee are in order. However, it also needs to be decided whether such employees would be covered under CAS. The D.U.I. has also observed that it needs to be ascertained if CAS is there, what should be the criteria-academic/ non-Academic/teaching-based/ project-based/any other assessment. The UGC may be consulted.”

7. In view of the recommendations of the Committee and above opinion of the FDO/DUI, the Vice-Chancellor has observed that:-

“It is my assessment that so long as the concerned persons have performed teaching and research duties on behalf of the University, whichever may be the source of their salary, they should be given benefits equivalent to their peers/ counterparts in the University. No need to refer the matter to UGC, it could delay things indefinitely. Let a decision be taken by the Senior Academia of Panjab University and be processed through Syndicate/ Senate.”

8. Copies of Syndicate paragraph No. 19 dated 07.08.2004 and No. 2 (i) dated 30.01.2010 with regard to approval of appointments of Deputy Director/ Reader, temporary (likely to continue) and Assistant Director, temporary (likely to continue) as per the recommendations of the Selection Committee are placed as per **(Appendix-X)**.
9. As per report of the G&P Section, the incumbents have already been given the revised pay scale and designation w.e.f. 01.01.2006 in term of the notification dated 19.07.2010 of Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi.

Professor Ronki Ram said that since similar persons at different places in all over India are getting it, the persons working in the Panjab University should also been given this benefit.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the recommendations of the Committee are right, but at the same time they have to record that these persons are not covered under the Career Advancement Scheme of the University Grants Commission and, therefore, they would not be considered for promotion/s under the CAS.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation/s of the Committee, be approved, as per **Appendix**, with the stipulation that, in future, these persons would not be covered for promotion, under the Career Advancement Scheme of the UGC.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 20.05.2015 regarding appointments on compassionate grounds

10. Considered the minutes dated 20.05.2015 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 20.05.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 09.04.2015 regarding eligibility conditions for the appointment of Assistant Professor in University or Colleges

11. Re-considered the minutes dated 09.04.2015 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to consider the Supreme Court Ruling regarding eligibility conditions for the appointment of Assistant Professor in University or Colleges.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.04.2015 (Para 13) (**Appendix-XII**) after discussion has resolved that the consideration of Item C-13 on the agenda, be deferred.

Initiating discussion, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that a lot of applications for the posts of Assistant Professor are pending in the Establishment Branch and in view of the recommendations of the Committee, a corrigendum be issued so that the candidates could apply again or update their CVs, if they so desired.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to ensure that appropriate action is taken by the office so that the candidates could apply again or update their CVs, if they so desired.

Principal Parveen Chawla, referring to filling up of 1925 posts of Assistant Professors in the affiliated Colleges, said that they are facing a problem for appointing Assistant Professors in the subject of Fashion Designing. She suggested that the Dean, College Development Council should be authorized to take decision in the matter so that the affiliated Colleges could appoint Assistant Professors in the subject of Fashion Designing.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu observed that in the case of the posts which are advertised recently, there is no need of issuance of any corrigendum.

It was clarified that the UGC did not conduct NET in the subject of Fashion Designing. Earlier, they were considering the candidates eligible, who had qualified NET in the subject of Clothing and Textile, which is one of the subjects in M.Sc. (Home Science), but Fashion Designing is a full-fledged subject.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since persons with Fashion Designing were not available, persons having qualified UGC NET in the subject of Clothing and Textile were also being considered eligible for the post of Assistant Professors in the subject of Fashion Designing as the UGC did not conduct NET in the subject of Fashion Designing. Now, what she (Parveen Chawla) wanted is that the persons, who have done M.Sc. in Home Science, should be made eligible for the post of Assistant Professors in the subject of Fashion Designing as the UGC did not conduct NET in the subject of Fashion Designing. However, he suggested that the candidates without NET in Fashion Designing and with NET in Clothing & Textile should be considered eligible for the post of Assistant Professors in the subject of Fashion Designing.

To this, Principal Parveen Chawla remarked that Director, Higher Education (DHE) is not agreeing to what Shri Ashok Goyal has proposed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that therefore they should resolve that the candidates without NET in Fashion Designing and with NET in Clothing & Textile should be considered eligible for the post of Assistant Professors in the subject of Fashion Designing.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that for vocational posts, the Fashion Designing is a vocational course, but M.Sc. (Home Science) is not a vocational subject. Even if they agreed to the proposal made by Shri Goyal, she did not know whether the DHE would agree to it or not. She, therefore, suggested that the Selection Committee comprising DHE or his nominee, Dean, College Development Council, subject experts should take such a decision and recommend appointments so that the same are approved by the University as well as the DHE.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Colleges are facing one more problem while making promotion from Assistant Professors to Associate Professors. So far as Government Colleges and Government aided Colleges are concerned, promotions from Assistant Professors to

Associate Professors are being made by conducting the interviews in which the Government send its nominee/s in the Selection Committees, but question is how to make promotions in the unaided Colleges. The promotions in the unaided Colleges could only be made if the University issued a circular to all the affiliated Colleges that the promotions from Assistant Professors to Associate Professors be made in the unaided Colleges as is being done in the case of Government Colleges and Government aided Colleges. He, therefore, suggested that a circular should be issued that promotions from Assistant Professors to Associate Professors in all the affiliated Colleges situated in the State of Punjab (Government, Government aided, unaided Colleges) be made as per the procedure followed by the Punjab Government for Government Colleges and Government aided Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Dean, College Development Council to resolve this issue to the satisfaction of affiliated Colleges.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 09.04.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the candidates without NET in Fashion Designing and with NET in Clothing & Textile should be considered eligible for the post of Assistant Professors in the subject of Fashion Designing.

Recommendation of DUI dated 26.06.2015 regarding appointment of independent Honorary Director of IQAC from amongst the Professors

12. Considered the recommendation dated 26.06.2015 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Dean of University Instruction, that to strengthen Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) of the University an independent Honorary Director from amongst the Professors of the Panjab University, be appointed as the In-charge of IQAC and MIS Cell for a period of three years and should be paid the honorarium equal to that of Dean Research.

- NOTE:**
1. As per recommendation of the NAAC review team, the Panjab University has to strengthen its Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) as it has to become a part of Panjab University system and has to work towards realization of the goals of quality enhancement and sustenance. The prime task of Internal Quality Assurance Cell is to develop a system for conscious, consistent and catalytic improvement in the overall performance of the University.
 2. The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has issued a draft circular to the senior faculty members of Panjab University to invite proposals for being appointed as Honorary Director of Internal Quality Assurance Cell.
 3. At present, the Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) works under the office of the Dean Research.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that since the assessment period is five years, the appointment Honorary Director of the Internal

Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) should also be made for a period of five years instead of three years.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That, to strengthen Internal Quality Assurance Cell (IQAC) of the University, an independent Honorary Director from amongst the Professors of the Panjab University, be appointed as the In-charge of IQAC and MIS Cell for a period of three years.

Pre-ponement of date of promotion of certain Assistant Professors

13. Considered the pre-ponement of the dates of promotion of the Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) as mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the teacher	Department/ Institute	Date of promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) i.e. original date of their eligibility
1.	Dr. Kalpana Dahiya	UIET	03.02.2009 instead of 17.12.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e.16.12.2010 vide office order no. 235-261/Estt.-I, dated 05.01.2012
2.	Dr. Damanjit Kaur	UIET	30.08.2010 instead of 16.03.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Orientation Course, i.e. 15.03.2011 vide office order no. 9092-9121/Estt.-I, dated 02.09.2011.
3.	Shri Mukesh Kumar	UIET	07.10.2010 instead of 19.03.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e. 18.03.2011 vide office order no. 9092-9121/Estt.-I, dated 02.09.2011.
4.	Dr. Jaspreet Kaur	UIET	23.12.2009 instead of 19.03.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e. 18.03.2011 vide office order no. 9092-9121/Estt.-I, dated 02.09.2011.
5.	Shri Sumit Budhiraja	UIET	23.09.2010 instead of 01.10.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011.
6.	Shri Naresh Kumar	UIET	22.02.2010 instead of 01.10.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011.
7.	Shri Vishal Sharma	UIET	13.09.2010 instead of 01.12.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 1756-1787/Estt.-I, dated 04.03.2014.
8.	Shri Arvind Kumar	UIET	26.09.2008 instead of 01.10.2010 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011.
9.	Dr. Gayathiri Pathmanathan	Anthropology	27.12.2009 instead of 23.03.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011.
10.	Dr. Samarjit Sihotra	Physics	02.07.2011 instead of 27.04.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e. 26.04.2011 vide office order no. 6532-50/Estt.-I, dated 03.08.2013.

NOTE: 1. The recommendation of the Syndicate dated 27.1.2013 (Para 3) regarding adoption of letter No.1-2/2009 (EC/PS) Pt. VIII dated 7.12.2012 received from Under Secretary, UGC with regard to extension in date for participation in Orientation/ Refresher Course up to 31.12.2013 in respect of eligible Teachers/ Assistant Registrar/Assistant Director of Physical Education/College Director of Physical Education for placement under Career Advancement Scheme were approved by the Senate at its meeting held on 24.3.2013 (Para V).

2. The observation of the RAO, in the cases of the above faculty members enlisted at Sr. No. 1 to 10 is as under:

“Approval of the Syndicate/ Senate for pre-ponement of the date of promotion be added, as the original promotion has been sanctioned by the Syndicate and Senate.”

3. An office note along with letter No.1-2/2009 (EC/PS) Pt.-VIII dated 7.12.2012 enclosed (**Appendix-XIV**).

RESOLVED: That, it be recommended to the Senate, the dates of promotion of the following Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), be preponed as mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the teacher	Department/ Institute	Date of promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) i.e. original date of their eligibility
1.	Dr. Kalpana Dahiya	UIET	03.02.2009 instead of 17.12.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e.16.12.2010 vide office order no. 235-261/Estt.-I, dated 05.01.2012
2.	Dr. Damanjit Kaur	UIET	30.08.2010 instead of 16.03.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Orientation Course, i.e. 15.03.2011 vide office order no. 9092-9121/Estt.-I, dated 02.09.2011.
3.	Shri Mukesh Kumar	UIET	07.10.2010 instead of 19.03.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e., 18.03.2011 vide office order no. 9092-9121/Estt.-I, dated 02.09.2011.
4.	Dr. Jaspreet Kaur	UIET	23.12.2009 instead of 19.03.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e. 18.03.2011 vide office order no. 9092-9121/Estt.-I, dated 02.09.2011.
5.	Shri Sumit Budhiraja	UIET	23.09.2010 instead of 01.10.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011.

6.	Shri Naresh Kumar	UIET	22.02.2010 instead of 01.10.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011.
7.	Shri Vishal Sharma	UIET	13.09.2010 instead of 01.12.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 1756-1787/Estt.-I, dated 04.03.2014.
8.	Shri Arvind Kumar	UIET	26.09.2008 instead of 01.10.2010 i.e. the date one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011.
9.	Dr. Gayathiri Pathmanathan	Anthropology	27.12.2009 instead of 23.03.2010 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course vide office order no. 4126-4183/Estt.-I, dated 09.06.2011.
10.	Dr. Samarjit Sihotra	Physics	02.07.2011 instead of 27.04.2011 i.e. one day after completion of Refresher Course, i.e. 26.04.2011 vide office order no. 6532-50/Estt.-I, dated 03.08.2013.

Extension in the term of appointment of Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Nandita Singh as Dean of Student Welfare (Men & Women), respectively

14. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the term of appointment of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dean Student Welfare and Professor Nandita Singh, Dean Student Welfare (Women), be extended for another one year, under Regulation 1 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 1 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 is reproduced below:

“The Senate may, on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare for such period and on such terms and conditions as may be determined by them.”

2. The present term of appointment of Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Nandita Singh is up to 31.7.2015 and 11.8.2015 respectively.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the term of appointment of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dean Student Welfare and Professor Nandita Singh, Dean Student Welfare (Women), be extended for another one year, under Regulation 1 at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

Appointment of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer, beyond the age of 65 years

15. Considered if:

(i) the appointment of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, as such on contractual basis beyond the age of 65 years, on the pattern of

Dr. Sheila Arora and Dr. Harish Khanna, be approved.

- (ii) the salary of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, be regularized from March, 2015 to June, 2015 which has been released by the Audit under objection for want of approval of the Syndicate.

Information contained in office note **(Appendix-XVI)** was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The contractual term of appointment of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, was extended by the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, for one year w.e.f. 07.03.2015 to 05.03.2016 (06.03.2016 being Sunday), with one day break on 06.03.2015, on the previous terms & conditions. This was ratified by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 31.05.2015 (Para 35 R(xiii)) **(Appendix-XVI)**.

2. The audit while admitting the salary under objection of Dr. B.S. Lal for the months of March and April 2015, has made the following remarks:-

“Since the official has attained the age of 65 years on 30.04.2015. There is no condition regarding age is mentioned in the Syndicate decision dated 17.05.2012 attached with reply. In the case of Teachers of P.U. for contractual employment, the maximum age has been fixed as 65 years.

In view of above, the salary for the period from March to April, 2015 may be admitted under objection for want of approval of the Syndicate. For the period 01.05.2015 to 05.03.2016 i.e. the period beyond 65 years may also be got decided from the Syndicate as per Regulation 18 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I.”

3. The Vice-Chancellor, after looking into the matter passed orders that the salary of Dr. B.S. Lal, ACMO, for the months of May and June 2015, be released under objection and the matter with regard to extension of Dr. B.S. Lal, beyond the age of 65 years along with audit objection be placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor has further observed that "Dr. B.S. Lal is trusted by one and all for his diagnostics. So long as he is available, and enjoys good health, P.U. should take his services, following precedence's of Dr. Arora and Dr. Harish Khanna."

4. Dr. Harish Khanna had also worked as Visiting Consultant (on contract) w.e.f. 16.08.1991 after his retirement as CMO till he was alive.
5. Dr. Sheila Arora (retired as Chief Medical Officer on 31.07.1995) has been working as Visiting Consultant (on contract) since 02.08.1995 on fixed emolument as per budgetary provision in the Health Centre. Her date of birth is 31.07.1933 & she has completed the age of 65 years on 30.07.1998. Her appointment was made by the Vice-Chancellor w.e.f. 02.08.1995 till further orders.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the appointment of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, as such on contractual basis beyond the age of 65 years, on the pattern of Dr. Sheila Arora and Dr. Harish Khanna, be approved.
- (2) the salary of Dr. B.S. Lal, Additional Chief Medical Officer, Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, be regularized from March 2015 to June 2015, which has been released by the Audit under objection for want of approval of the Syndicate.

Reappointment of three Demonstrators at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital

16. Considered if the following three Demonstrators working on purely temporary/contract basis (whose present term of appointment was for academic session 2014-15 and will expire on 30.06.2015), at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, be re-appointed further for the academic session 2015-16, i.e., w.e.f. 02.07.2015 to 30.06.2016 after one day break on 01.07.2015 or till regular selection is made, whichever is earlier, at the minimum of the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions. The person possessing Medical/Dental qualifications i.e. M.B.B.S./B.D.S. are also entitled for Non-Practicing Allowance (NPA) @ 25% of the basic-pay, subject to the condition that the basic pay +NPA shall not exceed Rs.85000/- p.m. in the terms of Senate decision dated 29.9.2013 (Para LX) (Item No. 20(III)):

1. Dr. Harkirat Sethi
Department of Pharmacology
2. Dr. Anupam Vijayvergia
Department of Physiology

3. Dr. Ravi Kant Sharma
Department of Biochemistry

Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XVII**) was also taken into consideration

NOTE: The Syndicate and Senate dated 18.05.2014 and 28.09.2014 vide Para 15 and Para XXIII respectively (**Appendix-XVII**) have re-appointed the above demonstrators w.e.f. 02.07.2014 to 30.06.2015 after one day break on 01.07.2014 or till a regular selection is made, whichever is earlier, at the minimum of the scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions.

RESOLVED: That the following three Demonstrators working on purely temporary/contract basis (whose present term of appointment was for academic session 2014-15 and will expire on 30.06.2015), at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, be re-appointed further for the academic session 2015-16, i.e., w.e.f. 02.07.2015 to 30.06.2016 after one day's break on 01.07.2015 or till regular selection is made, whichever is earlier, at the minimum of the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances, on the existing terms and conditions; and the person possessing Medical/Dental qualifications, i.e., M.B.B.S./B.D.S. are also entitled for Non-Practicing Allowance (NPA) @ 25% of the basic-pay, subject to the condition that the basic pay + NPA shall not exceed Rs.85000/- p.m. in terms of Senate decision dated 29.9.2013 (Para LX) (Item No. 20(III)):

1. Dr. Harkirat Sethi
Department of Pharmacology
2. Dr. Anupam Vijayvergia
Department of Physiology
3. Dr. Ravi Kant Sharma
Department of Biochemistry

Recommendations of the Committee dated 23.06.2015 regarding appointments in Constituent Colleges

17. Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 23.06.2015 (**Appendix-XVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to suggest guidelines for making appointments for Principals and Faculty in different subjects in the four constituent Colleges of the Panjab University and to recommend whether the appointments in these Colleges be considered transferable.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that grant from the Governments to the P.U. Constituent Colleges should be ensured. Secondly, only Principals should be appointed on regular basis and so far as faculty members are concerned, they should be appointed on contract/*ad hoc* basis. He added that the Government is paying salary of Rs.15600/- p.m. only to the teachers even to those who have been working for the last more than 10 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Joint Secretary, who is overseeing the RUSA Mission, has told them if they did not appoint

faculty on regular basis, they would not be given grant by the Government.

Continuing, Professor Karamjeet Singh said that since P.U. Constituent Colleges are not a part of the University Budget, in case the Government did not release grant, who would bear the financial liability of the Constituent Colleges? Secondly, they (Government) have said that the faculty members should be appointed on full-time basis, but have not said that they should be appointed on regular basis.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that firstly, the Principals should be appointed on regular basis and thereafter, the faculty members, so that the Colleges could work smoothly. Agreeing with Professor Karamjeet Singh, Dr. Sandhu suggested that if they required 4-5 teachers for imparting instructions to the students in each subject, at least one faculty member should be appointed on regular basis and the others on contract or *ad hoc* basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that firstly, the Principals and one faculty member in each subject would be appointed on regular basis and thereafter, if need be, others.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that despite their writing to the Punjab Government from time to time that the Syndicate and the Senate have decided in case grants for the P.U. Constituent Colleges, especially P.U. Constituent College Guru Har Sahai, which is not a Constituent College as the UGC has not approved it, it would be closed down. If they appointed faculty members on regular basis and tomorrow, if the Government does not release the grant, what would they do of the faculty?

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the Committee has recommended appointment of a Committee comprising Shri G.K. Chatrath (Chairperson), Professor A.K. Bhandari, Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla, Principal S.K. Arora and Professor Naval Kishore (Convener) for framing of Regulations and Rules for the Constituent Colleges. Since Shri G.K. Chatrath is unwell and would not be able to chair the meeting, someone else should be appointed chairperson of the Committee in his place.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the next person on the Committee would chair the Committee.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pleaded that certain more persons belonging to the Colleges should be associated with the Committee.

RESOLVED: That the recommendation of the Committee dated 23.06.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved with the addition that the following persons be also made members of the Committee:

1. Principal Gurdip Sharma
2. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
3. Shri Ashok Goyal.

In case Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath is not able to attend the meeting of the Committee, Professor A.K. Bhandari would chair the meeting in his absence.

Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy

18. Considered if, final draft of the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy (**Appendix-XIX**) of Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved.

NOTE: 1. Earlier, the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy of Panjab University, was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.12.2014 vide Item No. 19 (**Appendix-XIX**). During discussion on the item for finalization of the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy, the Vice-Chancellor, said that, if, Professor B.S. Bhoop wanted to enhance the liberal ratio from 70:30 to 80:20 or more, the University could consult IIT Ropar and Bombay, respectively.

After the discussion, the Vice-Chancellor said that whatever they wanted to be included in the proposed IPR Policy, they might let him know so that the same could be incorporated in this Policy before its finalization.

This was agreed to.

2. Accordingly, the final draft has been approved vide No. CIIPP/204 dated 18.05.2015 (**Appendix-XIX**).
3. Letter No. CIIPP/223 dated 28.05.2015 of Director (Honorary), Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme, P.U., Chandigarh, enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the Intellectual Property Rights Policy, the ratio of sharing the revenue between the Inventor and the University has been given as 70:30, which is appropriate. He pointed out that Rule 9.1 appearing at page 65 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 says that the ratio of revenue sharing between the consultant and the university would be 50:50. He suggested that the aforesaid rule should be amended in such a manner that the revenue is shared in the ratio of 70:30 between the Consultant and the University.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that a Committee should be constituted to examine the issue of sharing of revenue of consultancy and make recommendations.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the ratio of sharing of revenue earned through consultancy has already been amended in the revised rules of CIIPP. However, if the members still insisted, the matter would be examined.

RESOLVED: That the Intellectual Property Right (IPR) Policy of Panjab University, Chandigarh, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Dean of University Instruction be authorized to take decision in the matter of sharing of revenue of consultancy between the Consultant and the University in

the ratio of 70:30 after getting the issue examined by a Committee or by other means.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 04.06.2015 that Ms. Payal Gupta, a candidate for Ph.D. at UBS be allowed to continue without having submitted the Migration Certificate

19. Considered the minutes dated 04.06.2015 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to consider the issue pertaining to migration certificate (**Appendix-XX**) submitted by Ms. Payal Gupta from EIILM University, Sikkim, for her enrolment in Ph.D. Programme at UBS, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the candidate has submitted a fake migration certificate and the University still allowed her to continue as a Ph.D. candidate, it would not be fair.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that verification of the certificate could not be got done as the University has close down. Secondly, when the candidate was called before the Committee, she informed that she did not know whether it is a fake certificate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar enquired whether degree of the candidate (five years old), on the basis of which she has been registered for Ph.D. in this University, has been verified.

Professor Yograj Angrish said that technically when the University issued the migration Certificate, the University concerned verified the particulars of the candidates as well as the examination/s passed by him/her. When it has been found that the migration Certificate submitted by the candidate is fake, why they are allowing her to continue as Ph.D. candidate? On the one side, they usually say that Panjab University is a premier University of the country and on the other side, they are allowing a candidate, whose degree seems to be fake, to continue.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if a candidate with a fake degree studied for 1-2 years, could they allow him/her to complete the course.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that in a case of a teacher of a College, wherein it was doubted that one of the degree/experience certificate was fake, an FIR was lodged by the University.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that if the certificate submitted by the candidate is fake, what is their compulsion to allow the candidate to continue with the Ph.D. programme?

The Vice-Chancellor said that when he saw the file, he was under the impression that the Dean of University Instruction is convinced with the MBA degree of the candidate.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he wanted to make it clear that he did not support anybody, who has submitted the fake certificate, to continue with the study. However, in the case under consideration, after the candidate got the MBA degree, the University was closed down. Secondly, the name of this University did not exist in the list of fake Universities displayed by the UGC on its website. In fact, since it was a private University, it passed a resolution itself and closed down the University. The candidates, who have passed the examinations from that University, should not be punished. He, therefore, suggested that verification should be got done and if it is

proved that the degree of the candidate is genuine, she should be allowed to continue with the Ph.D. programme. He remarked that if the candidate is wrong, she should be punished.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that some of the members have said that the University was closed down in the year 2012, but if they see the certificate carefully, they would find that the certificate, which has been submitted by the candidate, has been issued on 9th November 2014.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that even if the University was closed down, the candidate should have made a written request that the University has been closed down and it is not possible for her to obtain and submit the Migration Certificate, instead of submitting a fake Migration Certificate. Submission of fake Migration Certificate showed that the candidate had *mala fide* intention.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that earlier, a case had come to the Syndicate wherein it was alleged that a person, who was appointed Principal in College, has submitted a fake Experience Certificate and he (Principal Gurdip Sharma) had pleaded time and again that the Experience Certificate should be got verified. In fact, the Experience Certificate was manipulated by the management of the College, but they punished the Principal on the plea that he has submitted a fake Certificate. Since the case under consideration is a similar one, an FIR should be lodged against the candidate as she has submitted a fake Migration Certificate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if the candidates took admissions on the basis of fake Certificates in a prestigious Department like University Business School and got degrees of Ph.D., what would be the fate of other small Departments. He suggested that the verification should be got done and if it is found to be true that the candidate has submitted the fake Migration Certificate, an FIR should be lodged against her.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Registrar has talked at the Ministry level and the concerned Officer has told him that the University was earlier functioning, but due to some kind of scam in the College/University, it has been shut down. On a query, the Officer concerned had also told him the University had made an *ad hoc* office from where it is functioning. The candidate, when she appeared before the Committee, told that she has asked one of her friends to obtain her Migration Certificate, but she did not know from where her friend has obtained the Certificate. During the meeting, it was also transpired that she has qualified the UGC-NET. Therefore, they all (Committee) agreed that she may be allowed to continue with her Ph.D. Programme.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it has been recorded in the proceeding that "The Committee was of the view that the candidate should have stated the fact that the University has been closed rather than submitting a non-genuine looking document". As such, the Committee has not given her a clean chit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these were the concerns and that is why the case has been placed before the Syndicate. Now, if the Syndicate in its wisdom feels that it should not be done, it would not be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is not in favour of the candidate though she has explained that she has obtained the Migration Certificate through one of her friends. Let them presume that she does not seem to be at fault though the Migration Certificate seems to be fake. Probably, an affidavit has also been obtained from the candidate, which is a wrong procedure. But they had been obtaining affidavits in much more serious cases where the genuineness of the Degree and Migration Certificate was in question and on the basis of mere affidavit, they had given the relief. Probably, in that spirit, the Committee has recommended relief to her, but he is again saying that he is not in favour of allowing the candidate to continue with her study. Ultimately, the candidate has submitted the Migration Certificate, which is not a genuine one and it is inconsequential that she has obtained the same through one of her friends. As such, she does not deserve any kind of relaxation. He wondered could the case of the candidate be considered for admission to Ph.D. Programme in the absence of Migration Certificate. Their regulations are very stringent that unless and until the candidate did not submit the Migration Certificate, the admission of the candidate could not be regularized, but they had been regularizing the admissions even without the production of Migration Certificates what to talk of genuineness of the Migration Certificates and that too, without placing the matter before the Syndicate despite there being no such provision and no power with anybody/authority. He was of the opinion that whenever any kind of fakeness is found on the part of the student, teacher, Principal, Professor, they should not be given any kind of relaxation and the criteria should be same for all and no pick and choose policy should be adopted. He thought that this student did not deserve admission at least and so far as lodging of FIR is concerned, it is for the House to decide.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the House should take the decision on the basis of the merits of the case ignoring whether somebody has earlier been given the relief or not.

RESOLVED: That the enrolment/registration of Ms. Payal Gupta to Ph.D. Programme at University Business School in the Faculty of Business Management and Commerce, be cancelled.

Condonation of delay beyond 8 years in submission of Ph.D. thesis

20. Considered if –

- (i) delay of 1 year 6 months and 16 days beyond eight years, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Shri Moibungkhongbam Damudor Singh, Research Scholar, enrolled under No.16175 on 15.12.2005 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Geography, be condoned, and as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis, due to following reasons:

1. Disturbed law and order situation in Manipur state (his study area) coupled with accessibility problems to visit remotely located tribal settlements in hill districts of the state delayed his fieldwork beyond his imagination. It took him nearly two years to complete.

2. Thereafter, in 2008 he get selected as an Assistant Professor through Manipur Public Service Commission and joined Government College, Thoubal, on probation in January, 2009.
- (ii) he be allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis within 15 days from the date of communication of orders of the authority.

Information contained in office note **(Appendix-XXI)** was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. The request dated 25.05.2015 of Shri Moibungkhongbam Damudor Singh enclosed **(Appendix-XXI)**.
 2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled. **However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded.** The relevant regulations be amended accordingly”

Referring to Items 20, 21 & 22 which related to condonation of delay in the submission of Ph.D. thesis by certain candidates, Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that he has earlier also requested them and again request them to amend their regulations/Ph.D. Guidelines/rules in view of the new UGC Guidelines so that they could deregister the candidates from Ph.D. programme.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that all these cases are related to old Regulations and under the new Regulations they are not condoning the delay.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the moment they give an undertaking that the University is following the UGC norms in toto, they would be on the wrong footing as these condonations are in contravention of the UGC norms.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that these cases are covered under the old regulations as the new UGC Regulations are effective

from 2009. However, in the new UGC Regulations they are not allowing any condonation beyond the period of 8 years.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in one of the cases, he could understand that the candidate is a District & Sessions Judge and he has to do administrative work concerning the entire District in addition to his normal duties. Therefore, they should amend their regulations so that in such exigencies they could have power to condone the delay.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

1. the delay of 1 year, 6 months and 16 days beyond eight years, for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Shri Moibungkhongbam Damudor Singh, Research Scholar, enrolled under No.16175 on 15.12.2005 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of Geography, be condoned, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis, due to following reasons:
 - (i) Disturbed law and order situation in Manipur state (his study area) coupled with accessibility problems to visit remotely located tribal settlements in hill districts of the state delayed his fieldwork beyond his imagination. It took him nearly two years to complete.
 - (ii) Thereafter, in 2008 he get selected as an Assistant Professor through Manipur Public Service Commission and joined Government College, Thoubal, on probation in January, 2009.
2. he be allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis within 15 days from the date of communication of orders of the authority.

Condonation of delay beyond 8 years in submission of Ph.D. thesis

21. Considered if, delay of 8 months beyond 8 years, i.e., up to 04.02.2016, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Ms. Manpreet Grewal, Research Scholar enrolled under No.16880 w.e.f. 05.06.2007 in the Faculty of Law, Department of Law, be condoned, as she could not submit her Ph.D. thesis due to following reasons:

- (a) She is working as Assistant Professor in Law in a Private University, i.e., Desh Bhagat University, Mandi Gobindgarh.
- (b) She has a five year old daughter after a complicated delivery process.
- (c) Her Grandmother, Mrs Harbhajan Kaur Mann as well as father, Lt. Col. Gajinder Pal Singh Grewal passed away in 2011/12 and being eldest of the siblings had to look after her ailing mother and fight property litigations of her father.

- (d) She is suffering from Hypothyroidism since last two years.
- (e) Her research involved intensive as well as empirical study on Punjab, it took her more time to compile the thesis.
- (f) Despite familial/work pressures and health concerns, she compiled her thesis and is under the scrutiny of her supervisor, Professor (Dr.) D.N. Jauhar.
- (g) She requires an extension of eight months to endorse the suggestions of her esteemed supervisor, Professor (Dr.) D.N. Jauhar.

Information contained in office note **(Appendix-XXII)** was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. Request dated 04.06.2015 of Ms. Manpreet Grewal enclosed **(Appendix-XXII)**.
 2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/ Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as 8 years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled. **However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond 8 years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reason to be recorded.** The relevant regulations be amended accordingly”.

RESOLVED: That the delay of 8 months beyond 8 years, i.e., up to 04.02.2016, for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Ms. Manpreet Grewal, Research Scholar, enrolled under No.16880 w.e.f. 05.06.2007 in the Faculty of Law, Department of Law, be condoned.

Condonation of delay beyond 8 years in submission of Ph.D. thesis

22. Considered if, delay of 10 months and 5 days beyond eight years i.e. up to 20.11.2015, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Shri Tejwinder Singh, Research Scholar, enrolled under No.16643 on

16.01.2007 in the Faculty of Laws, Department of Law, be condoned, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis, being District Judge apart from doing judicial work and has to do administrative work also concerning the entire district, therefore, the research could not be completed because of official exigency. Presently he is posted as District & Session Judge at Bathinda. Information contained in office note **(Appendix-XXIII)** was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:** 1. The request dated 25.05.2015 of Shri Tejwinder Singh enclosed **(Appendix-XXIII)**.
2. The extract from the Clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled. **However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded.** The relevant regulations be amended accordingly”.

RESOLVED: That the delay of 10 months and 5 days beyond eight years, i.e., up to 20.11.2015, for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Shri Tejwinder Singh, Research Scholar, enrolled under No.16643 on 16.01.2007 in the Faculty of Laws, Department of Law, be condoned.

Sanction of Rs.12,79,200/- out of budget head “Water and Electricity Fund”, for electrical installation at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni

23. Considered if, an amount of Rs.12,79,200/- out of budget head “Water and Electricity Fund”, be approved for providing electrical installation at Panjab University Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, and be also allowed to invite the tenders. Information contained in office note **(Appendix-XXIV)** was also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:** Rough Cost Estimate for providing electrical installation at Panjab University Rural Centre Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, prepared by S.D.E. (Electrical), P.U. enclosed **(Appendix-XXIV)**.

RESOLVED: That an amount of Rs.12,79,200/-, be approved/sanctioned, out of budget head “Water and Electricity Fund”, for providing electrical installation at Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, and the Centre be also allowed to invite the tenders for the purpose.

Deferred Item

24. Considered recommendations dated 08.06.2015 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the following amendment in Sub-Clause 5, be made, in the “Revised Standard and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degree in conformity with UGC (Minimum Standard and Procedure for Award of Ph.D. Degrees) Regulation 2009”, to extend the facility of appointment of Co-Supervisor/s from International Research Centre/ Universities (DST approved Institution) for the Ph.D. candidate in all Departments/Centres of the University, on the request of the candidate and the Supervisor:

PRESENT REGULATION	PROPOSED REGULATION
<p>Joint or Co-Supervisors may be appointed, on the request of the candidate and the Supervisor, from the teaching Departments/P.U. Regional Centres/ Research Centres approved by the Panjab University and Post Graduate Regional Centres of Universities recognized by the U.G.C. and also from the National/ Autonomous Institutions, National/ Autonomous organizations and National /Autonomous laboratories to be certified by the Chairperson of the concerned Department, provided they fulfill the conditions mentioned for appointment of a Supervisor.</p>	<p>(a) Joint or Co-Supervisors may be appointed, on the request of the candidate and the Supervisor, from the teaching Departments/ P.U. Regional Centres/ Research Centres approved by the Panjab University and Post Graduate Regional Centres of Universities recognized by the U.G.C. and also from the National/ Autonomous Institutions, National/ Autonomous organizations and National / Autonomous laboratories to be certified by the Chairperson of the concerned Department, provided they fulfill the conditions mentioned for appointment of a Supervisor.</p> <p>(b) to extend the facility of appointment of Co-Supervisor/s from International Research Centre/Universities (DST approved Institution) for the Ph.D. candidate in all Departments/Centres of the University, on the request of the candidate and the Supervisor duly certified by the Chairperson of the concerned Department, provided they fulfill the conditions mentioned for appointment of Supervisor/s.</p>

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that since it is nothing more than that the appointment of Co-Supervisor/s from International Research Centre/Universities (DST approved Institution) for Ph.D. candidates has been suggested, instead of adding another regulation, this should be added in the existing regulation itself.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that the proposed regulation is, in fact, contrary to the UGC letter dated 6th July 2015, in which it has been written that it has come to the notice of the UGC that some Universities are hiring the services of the Supervisors, who are not regular teachers of the Universities or their affiliated PG Colleges/Institutes awarding M.Phil. and Ph.D. degrees. This practice is in violation of UGC Regulations, 2009. As such, whatever they are going to approve is in contravention/violation of the afore-said letter, a copy of which was handed over to the Registrar on the floor of the House.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that though the point made by Professor Navdeep Goyal is relevant, there seemed to be no problem as they had already a regulation and they were just adding a provision to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the letter of the UGC says that non-regular faculty members working in the Universities or their affiliated Colleges/Institutes could not be appointed Supervisors of Ph.D. candidates. However, probably they have also been appointing retired faculty members as Supervisors. Though he is not against the appointment of retired faculty members as Supervisors, but as per this they could not be appointed as Supervisors. Similarly, the persons working in Research Laboratories could also not be appointed as Supervisors of Ph.D. candidates as they are not regular faculty members of the Universities or their affiliated Colleges/Institutes.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that question is not about the Institute, but who could be appointed as Supervisor of Ph.D. candidates. The UGC through the above-said letter has clarified that whosoever is doing Ph.D. under the new UGC Regulations 2009, it is applicable only to them. The UGC, in fact, has decided the criteria for appointment of Supervisors of Ph.D. candidates and the Supervisors could only be regular teachers from the University or its affiliated PG Colleges. Earlier, his Department used to appoint Judges of District Courts and High Courts as Supervisors of Ph.D. candidates. As soon as new UGC Regulations 2009 came, they had been barred. A practice is still going on in certain Departments, which appoint Supervisors, who are not working as teachers on regular basis and the UGC in this letter has written that this would be considered violation. Therefore, ultimately the loss would be of the students, who would get the Ph.D. degree. He, therefore, suggested that the matter should be taken up with the UGC.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are permitting teachers of the undergraduate Colleges to become Supervisors of the Ph.D. students. He had also discussed this issue in the RUSA Committee, wherein he has told that since the teachers in the Undergraduate Colleges are appointed with the same qualifications as in the Postgraduate Colleges, if they did not allow them, they would not be able to progress. Therefore, they should take up the matter with the UGC.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that till a clarification is not sought and received from the UGC, the insertion of the proposed provision should not be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that somebody has to go to the UGC and requested Dr. Dinesh Kumar to visit UGC and articulate our viewpoint and convince them and get the clarification.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he would definitely go to the UGC for the purpose. However, the General Branch should be asked not to reject the cases of appointment of teachers, which are not according to the afore-said letter, as Supervisors and keep them pending, until a final decision is taken on the issue.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that neither in the existing nor proposed regulation, it has been mentioned that the teacher, who is

seeking appointment as Supervisor/Co-Supervisor, should be from PG affiliated College or UG affiliated College.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that a clarification on the issue is a must as the Government of India itself has floated a scheme under which the people belonging to Industry are appointed Supervisors of Ph.D. candidates.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the above-said item, be deferred.

Recommendations of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 12.06.2015

25. Considered minutes (Item Nos. 4, 7, 9 and 16) dated 12.06.2015 (**Appendix-XXV**) of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. (Items 4, 7, 9 and 16), as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Admission guidelines for Outstanding Sports persons

26. Considered the recommendation (No.10) of the Chief Admission Committee dated 30.06.2015 (**Appendix-XXVI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the proposed guidelines for Outstanding Sports persons entitled "Special Incentives" as per **Appendix-B**, be approved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the proposed guidelines for special incentives to the sportspersons, they have forgotten to mention the World University Games, which should be included in the guidelines. He suggested that the World University Games should be included in the guidelines and the Dean of University Instruction should be authorized to approve the same, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that an incentive of Rs. 1 lac has been recommended to the participants in the International/World University Games, whereas only Rs.1.25 lacs has been recommended to the medal winner. He suggested that the medal winners should at least be given an incentive of Rs.2 lacs, i.e., double the amount of a participant.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the Guidelines for Outstanding Sports persons, entitled "Special Incentives", as per **Appendix**, be approved;
- (2) the International Games including World University Games be included in the above said guidelines, and the Dean of University Instruction be authorized to approve the same, on behalf of the Syndicate; and
- (3) the amount of incentive to the medal winners in the International Games including World University Games, be raised from Rs.1.25 lacs to Rs.1.50 lacs.

**Branch Sliding Norms
for B.E. Students**

27. Considered –

- (i) the recommendation dated 22.04.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of the meeting that the Branch Sliding norms (**as per Annexure-A**), be applicable for students admitted in B.E. from the session 2015-16 onwards.
- (ii) that the branch sliding as already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (Para 26) (**Appendix-XXVII**), may be approved for the students of the session 2014-15 only instead of 2014-15 onwards.

NOTE: On the representation dated 17.6.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of Ms. Seema Kapoor and Ms. Savita Bhatnagar, students of UICET, the DSW has recommended that earlier decision of the Syndicate may be allowed to be applicable to the students of 2014-15 batch.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) Branch Sliding norms (**as per Appendix-Annexure-A**), be approved, for students admitted to B.E. from the session 2015-16 onwards; and
- (2) the Branch Sliding norms already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (Para 26) (**Appendix-XXVII**), be approved for the students of the session 2014-15 only instead of 2014-15 onwards.

**Issue regarding the
introduction of “Domestic
Violence against Women
and Children” Paper**

28. Considered the following recommendations dated 29.05.2015 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to the introduction of a paper on “Domestic Violence against Women and Children” at Graduation Level, as per authorization given by the Syndicate dated 21.12.2014 (Para 10) that:

1. the nomenclature of the paper/topic to be introduced at the undergraduate level, be “Violence against Women and Children” instead of “Domestic Violence against Women and Children”
2. the paper/topic, “Violence against Women and Children” be made as third part of paper, “Environment & Road Safety Education”, and thus, from the session 2016-17, this paper be named as “Environment, Road Safety Education and Violence against Women & Children”. The third part/section shall comprise of 30 marks having 30 multiple choice questions and duration of the same will be 30 minutes. The entire syllabus is to be covered in ten hours in total, with each lecture of one-hour duration.
3. xxx xxx xxx

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 21.12.2014 vide Para 10 **(Appendix-XXVIII)** while considering the recommendation dated 03.11.2014 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the subject “Domestic Violence against Women and Children”, be introduced as a separate compulsory qualifying paper having maximum 50 marks (one semester) at undergraduate level and resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to constitute a Committee and the recommendation/s of the Committee be placed before the Syndicate in one of its meetings.
2. The decision of the Syndicate dated 12.7.2014 (Para 22) also enclosed **(Appendix-XXVIII)**.

RESOLVED: That –

1. the nomenclature of the paper/topic to be introduced at the undergraduate level, be “Violence against Women and Children” instead of “Domestic Violence against Women and Children”; and
2. the paper/topic, “Violence against Women and Children” be made the third part of paper, “Environment & Road Safety Education”, and resultantly, from the session 2016-17, this paper be named as “Environment, Road Safety Education and Violence against Women & Children”. The third part/section shall comprise of 30 marks having 30 multiple choice questions and duration of the same will be 30 minutes. The entire syllabus is to be covered in ten hours in total, with each lecture of one-hour duration.

**Recommendations of the
House Allotment
Committee dated
18.5.2015**

29. Considered the minutes dated 18.05.2015 **(Appendix-XXIX)** of the House Allotment Committee-I and II.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the past service in other institutions/organizations could not be counted for allotment of accommodation at the campus. Therefore, the service of Sh. Bajinder Kumar, Clerk, College Branch rendered by him in Indian Air Force should not be counted for allotment of University accommodation.

Professor Ronki Ram said that service for allotment of accommodation is counted only when the person concerned joins the service of the institution where he/she intends to get accommodation.

Referring to recommendation 2 of the House Allotment Committee, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in point No. 5, it has been recommended that the allotment of residential accommodation to University employees on medical grounds be considered for taking into account the medical grounds of only the self/spouse and children. He suggested that the parents of the employees, especially if they reside with the employee concerned continuously, should also be included in the aforesaid recommendation.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that they should not include the parents for allotment of accommodation at the campus on medical grounds straightaway as the same would require verification. There might be instances when the parents would stay with the employee for about 6 months and after allotment of accommodation to the employee, they would leave.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Sh. Naresh Gaur said that parents should not be included in recommendation 5 (Item No.2) for allotment of residential accommodation at the campus to the employees on medical grounds. However, preferential accommodation should be allotted to the employees on medical grounds of the parents on case to case basis.

Referring to current Item No. 2 of the House Allotment Committee, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in it a proposal was made by President, PUTA for retention of houses by the retired University teachers, who have opted for re-employment, for 6 months instead of 2 months, to which he had recorded his dissent, but the same is missing in the minutes. He pleaded that this proposal should not be accepted, especially when they were already giving house rent allowance to the retired teachers. Secondly, most of the teachers have their own houses in the tricity. Therefore, retention of University accommodation for more than 2 months should not be allowed as in addition to the aforesaid reasons so many teachers are waiting for allotment of accommodation.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that, in fact, the reason for raising the limit for retention of accommodation from 2 months to 6 months was that the teachers, who did not opt for the re-employment, are allowed to retain the accommodation for 6 months. Why the teachers, who opted for the re-employment should be deprived of this facility and the permissible period in their case be decreased to 2 months.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that he had given representation four times that certain teachers have been occupying two houses at the Campus, but no house has been got vacated by the University authorities so far. On the one side, certain teachers are occupying two houses and on the other side, certain teachers are waiting for allotment of houses for the last so many years and have been compelled to pay hefty amount as rent to the landlords.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in Government, the retired employees are allowed to retain the Government accommodation for 2 months on normal rent and from 2 onwards to 6 months on penal rent, which is six times of the normal rent.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the services rendered by the employees at other Institutions/ Organizations, be **not** counted for allotment of accommodation at the Campus. In view of this, Sh. Bajinder Kumar, who has rendered service in Indian Air Force be **not** allotted accommodation at the University Campus;
- (2) the recommendations of the House Allotment Committee-I and II (Item 2, Item 1 & 2 of Current agenda), as per **Appendix**, be approved; with the addition that preferential accommodation be considered for allotment to the employee on medical grounds of the parents if they reside with the employee continuously, on case to case basis.
- (3) So far as the proposal of President, PUTA, is concerned, the Retired Teachers, who have opted for re-employment in the University, be allowed to retain the University accommodation for 2 months on normal rent and from 2 onwards to six months on penal rent, i.e., six times of the normal rent.

Addition in Clause (V) of Procedure for the Allotment of Residential Houses

30. Considered if the following addition in Clause (V) of Procedure for the Allotment of Residential Houses approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.01.2009 (Para 52) (**Appendix-XXX**) regarding counseling for allotment of Residential Accommodation, be made as proposed by the J.C.M. dated 04.06.2015 (**Appendix-XXX**):

Existing Provision under Clause (V)	Proposed addition (Approved by the JCM)
<p>The Counselling will be done as per the waiting-cum-seniority list. If a person is not willing to accept any vacant house even if his/her name figures in the seniority list, he/she shall not be debarred. The house will be allotted and the keys will also be given by the XEN (Mtc.) to the allottee on the spot at the time of counselling. However, if an applicant, already residing in the Campus, accepts the allotted house by signing and then refuses to take possession of the house so allotted within stipulated time, he/she will be charged the money equivalent to one month market rent of that particular category house. It will be deducted from his/her monthly salary.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>In the counselling system for the House Allotment (Open/Change) there will be continuation of waiting list of applicants for six months</p>

	(January to June & July to December every year) rather than starting the counselling from Sr. No.1 every month for 'A' to 'D' type Houses only.
--	--

Information contained in office note (Appendix-_) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That, as proposed by the J.C.M. dated 04.06.2015, addition in Clause (V) of Procedure for the Allotment of Residential Houses approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.01.2009 (Para 52) (**Appendix-XXX**) regarding counselling for allotment of Residential Accommodation, be made as under:

Existing Provision under Clause (V)	Proposed addition (Approved by the JCM)
The Counselling will be done as per the waiting-cum-seniority list. If a person is not willing to accept any vacant house even if his/her name figures in the seniority list, he/she shall not be debarred. The house will be allotted and the keys will also be given by the XEN (Mtc.) to the allottee on the spot at the time of counselling. However, if an applicant, already residing in the Campus, accepts the allotted house by signing and then refuses to take possession of the house so allotted within stipulated time, he/she will be charged the money equivalent to one month market rent of that particular category house. It will be deducted from his/her monthly salary.	No Change In the counselling system for the House Allotment (Open/Change) there will be continuation of waiting list of applicants for six months (January to June & July to December every year) rather than starting the counselling from Sr. No.1 every month for 'A' to 'D' type Houses only.

Recommendations of the Standing Committee dated 21.5.2015 regarding benefit for participation in the workshop

31. Considered the minutes dated 21.05.2015 (**Appendix-XXXI**) of the Standing Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor in terms of Rule 3 at page 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 regarding "Guidelines for Processing of Serious Charges of Allegations against the University, its Officers and Others" in pursuance of the decision taken by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 14.09.2002 (Para 38) and the Senate on 22.09.2002 (Para XL-66), to consider the case of Dr. Shashi Chaudhury for promotion from Stage-I to Stage-II under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS).

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that as such there is no problem in the case, but it has been mentioned in the recommendation that the case for promotion of Dr. Shashi Chaudhury as Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to (Stage-2), under the CAS, with effect from the due date, i.e., 03.04.2010 be considered after giving her benefit of 10 marks for participation in the Workshop and exemption in attending Orientation/Refresher Course, as per UGC letter. The quoted UGC letter says that for promotion the person must have attended Orientation/Refresher Course by 30th December 2013. Therefore, it should be ensured that Dr. Shashi Chaudhury has attended the Orientation/Refresher Course by 30.12.2013.

Professor Ronki Ram clarified that Certificate for attending the workshop was shown by the candidate to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there were two issues – (i) there was a reference that she has undergone a course in the year 2007 but she has not attached the documentary proof. Professor Ronki Ram has just now clarified that they had seen the certificate. They are referring to UGC letter under which the date for attending the Orientation/Refresher Course was extended to 30.12.2013, but it has nowhere been mentioned that she has undergone the Orientation/Refresher Course up to 30.12.2013. He enquired has she undergone the Orientation/Refresher Course by 30.12.2013?

Professor Ronki Ram said that the objection from the Establishment branch was only that she has not attached the certificate for attending the Workshop held between January 4 and 12, 2007. The second issue was not there. Had it been there, they would have verified that also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that perhaps Professor Ronki Ram has forgotten, but it has been mentioned in the minutes of the Committee itself that “she becomes eligible for promotion as Assistant Professor Stage-I to Stage-II under CAS w.e.f. 3.4.2010 after giving benefit of exemption in attending Orientation/Refresher Course”.

Professor Ronki Ram clarified that, in fact, they had called both the candidate and the official who is dealing with this case. Since after seeing the certificate produced by the candidate, the dealing official was satisfied, the Committee recommended her promotion.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that the item should be approved subject to attending of Orientation/Refresher Course by the candidate by 30.12.2013.

RESOLVED: That, after giving benefit of 10 marks for participating in the workshop held during January 4-12, 2007 to Dr. Shashi Chaudhury, she be promoted from Assistant Professor Stage-I to Stage-II at National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, under Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. the due date, i.e., 3.4.2010 in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University, subject to the condition that she has attended the Orientation/Refresher Course by 30.12.2013. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

Deferred Item

32. Considered minutes of the Standing Committee dated 21.5.2015 along with written statement of Professor B.B. Goyal, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in term of Rule 3 at page 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 regarding "Guidelines for Proceeding of Serious Charges of Allegations against the University, its Officers and Others" in pursuance of the decision taken by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 14.09.2002 (Para 38) and the Senate on 22.09.2002 (Para XL-66) to consider the complaint/s of Professor B.B. Goyal, University Business School (U.B.S.).

- NOTE:**
1. Statement showing minutes of all the previous meetings of the Syndicate and Senate pertaining to the case of Professor B.B. Goyal.
 2. Statement showing detail of Court cases filed by Professor B.B. Goyal against the University.
 3. A detailed office note containing the history of the case of Professor B.B. Goyal.
 4. **Other relevant papers were sent to the members with Supplementary Agenda).**

The members were of the view that since the relevant papers in huge number were supplied to them with the supplementary agenda, i.e., only a few days before the meeting and in view of the paucity of time, they could not go through these papers, the consideration of the item be deferred.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item, be deferred.

MOU between UIET, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Govt. Medical College & Hospital, Chandigarh

33. Considered if, the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXXII**) between University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh and Govt. Medical College & Hospital, Sector-32, Chandigarh, be executed.

- NOTE:** The Research Promotion Cell in its meeting dated 15.04.2015 (**Appendix-XXXII**) has recommended that in principle, the MoU between UIET, P.U., Chandigarh and GMCH, Sector 32, Chandigarh was approved, subject to the minor modifications as authorized by the Committee, Dean Research has modified the MoU.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that the Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology, and Director, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, should also be included in the Co-ordination Committee suggested to be constituted to monitor and review the collaborative program(s) between the two Institutions.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that the vetting of the language of the MOU should also be got done.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she has gone through the MOU as well as the minutes of the Research Promotion Cell and found that

the language needed to be corrected. For example, somewhere it has been mentioned MOU between Panjab University and Government Medical College & Hospital (GMCH) and somewhere MOU between University Institute of Engineering & Technology and GMCH. She suggested that uniformity should be maintained and it should be MOU between University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University and GMCH. Secondly, it should also be confirmed whether the MOU is to be executed between University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University and Department of Psychiatry, GMCH or GMCH alone.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), as per **Appendix**, be executed between University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh and Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, with the stipulation that Dean, Faculty of Engineering & Technology and Director, University Institute of Engineering & Technology, be included in the Co-ordination Committee suggested to be constituted for monitoring and reviewing the collaborative program(s) between the two Institutions.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That before the execution, the language of the MOU be got vetted.

MOU between PU Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre (PUSSGRC), Hoshiarpur and Divine Home Mundi Institute (Hostel Division), Hoshiarpur

34. Considered if, the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXXIII**) be executed, between Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre (PUSSGRC), Hoshiarpur and Divine Home Mundi Institute (Hostel Division), Hoshiarpur.

NOTE: The minutes of the meeting dated 13.5.2015 with regard to finalize the MoU between Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre (PUSSGRC), Hoshiarpur and Divine Home Hostel (Mundi Institute), Hoshiarpur are enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that they had taken a building from a person at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, which is being used as Hostel. The students of the hostel are facing certain problems, including the facility of Wi-Fi. He pleaded that since they had enhanced the annual charges as well as refundable security, it is their moral duty to take care of the demands of the students.

RESOLVED: That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), as per **Appendix**, be executed, between Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre (PUSSGRC), Hoshiarpur and Divine Home Mundi Institute (Hostel Division), Hoshiarpur.

Rates of remuneration to the official/s for the work of re-checking

35. Considered if, the rates of remuneration of Rs.50/- per answer-sheet to the official/s for the work of re-checking, be approved out of budget head "Conduct of Examination". Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXXIV**) was also taken into consideration.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether earlier there was no remuneration to the official/s for the work relating to re-checking of answerbooks.

It was clarified that earlier, there was no such fee. Secondly, it is not a re-evaluation; rather it is rechecking and involved 11 steps, and is in between re-evaluation and the information got through RTI Act. The students get the total checked and if found any question unmarked and marks are awarded to him/her accordingly. Hence, it is an additional benefit to the students and they had received so many applications for the purpose and they are charging Rs.440/- from a student. In this process, four to five channels are involved and that is why, they had proposed this remuneration.

RESOLVED: That the rate of remuneration of Rs.50/- per answer-sheet to the official/s for the work of re-checking, be approved, out of budget head "Conduct of Examination".

Endowment in the memory of Major Harjinder Singh World War-II

36. Considered if an Endowment of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Dr. Lakhbir Paul Saini, 7612 Tea Berry Way, Sacramento, CA 95828 (USA)/ # 380, Sector-38A, Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of an Endowment 'Major Harjinder Singh EME World War-II Memorial Gold Medal' in the memory of his beloved father Major Harjinder Singh EME World War-II. The Investment of Rs.1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment and the interest of the amount be utilized to award Gold Medal every year during the Panjab University Convocation, to the student who secures highest marks in M.Sc. (Hons. School) in Bio-Technology. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXXV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The e-mail dated 14.05.2015 of Dr. Lakhbir Paul Saini enclosed (**Appendix-XXXV**).

RESOLVED: That the endowment of Rs.1,00,000/- made by Dr. Lakhbir Paul Saini, 7612 Tea Berry Way, Sacramento, CA 95828 (USA)/# 380, Sector-38A, Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of an Endowment 'Major Harjinder Singh EME World War-II Memorial Gold Medal' in the memory of his beloved father Major Harjinder Singh EME World War-II. The Investment of Rs.1,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment and the interest of the amount be utilized to award Gold Medal every year during the Panjab University Convocation, to the student, who secures highest marks in M.Sc. (Hons. School) in Biotechnology.

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

Award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy

37. 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.	Ms. Kriti Gupta H.No.134, Tagore Nagar, Bathinda	Science/ Botany	ASSESSMENT OF COMBINED EFFECTS OF WATER AND HIGH TEMPERATURE STRESS DURING REPRODUCTIVE STAGE ON <i>MACROSPERMA</i> AND <i>MICROSPERMA</i> CHICKPEA (<i>CICER ARIETINUM</i> L.) GENOTYPES
2.	Ms. Anubhuti Sharma #1219, Sec-34-C Chandigarh	Arts/ Psychology	FAMILY SIZE AND BIRTH ORDER EFFECTS ON INTELLIGENCE, MENTAL HEALTH CONDITIONS, PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIP, AND CAREER CHOICE PATTERNS
3.	Ms. Nancy George H.No. 1520 3B2, Mohali	Science/ Microbiology	PRODUCTION OF ALKALINE PROTEASE FROM AN ENVIRONMENTAL ISOLATE AND ITS APPLICATION FOR MAKING INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES ECOFRIENDLY
4.	Ms. Sukhbir Kaur #1850/3 Housefed Complex Phase-10, Mohali	Law/Law	GENOCIDE AND HUMANITARIAN LAW: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY IN INTERNATIONAL LAW
5.	Mr. Balpreet Singh Centre for Public Health P.U., Chandigarh	Science/ Public Health	DETERMINANTS OF MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTHCARE UTILIZATION IN GOVERNMENT HEALTHCARE FACILITIES IN PUNJAB (INDIA)
6.	Ms. Rajinder Kaur Ward No.1, H.No.151 Old Post Office Street City Zira District Ferozepur	Languages/ Punjabi	KARAMJIT SINGH KUSSA DE NOVELAN VICH VIAKTI ATE SANSTHAWAN DE PARSANG VICH SAMAJIK NYAN DI CHINKARI
7.	Mr. Gurpreet Singh V.P.O. 3C-Chhoti District Sriganganagar Rajasthan	Science/ Biotechnology	CLONING AND CHARACTERIZATION OF LIPASE LIP V (RV3203) AND LIP L (RV 1497) FROM <i>MYCOBACTERIUM TUBERCULOSIS</i> H37RV
8.	Mr. Amrinder Pal Singh #70, T-II, Sector-25 Chandigarh	Engineering & Technology	DYNAMIC CONTROL OF THRUST FORCE AND TORQUE DURING DRILLING OF FIBER REINFORCED PLASTIC COMPOSITES
9.	Mr. Shankar Sehgal House No.E-8 Sector-14, Chandigarh	Engineering & Technology	DEVELOPMENT OF EFFICIENT FINITE ELEMENT MODEL UPDATING TECHNIQUES
10.	Ms. Seema Pehal #1066, Sector-6 Karnal, Haryana	Arts/ Ancient Indian History Culture and Archaeology	PATTERN OF URBANIZATION IN NORTH INDIA IN THE GUPTA AND POST-GUPTA PERIOD FROM AD 320 TO 750
11.	Ms Neeru Kaushal V.P.O. Dho, Tehsil Bharanj District Hamirpur H.P.	Science/ Botany	PROBING MECHANISMS GOVERNING HEAT SENSITIVITY AT REPRODUCTIVE STAGE IN CHICKPEA (<i>CICER ARIETINUM</i> L.)
12.	Mr. Gaurav Parashar 754, Milk Colony Dhanas, U.T. Chandigarh	Science/ Biotechnology	REACTIVATION OF EPIGENETICALLY REGULATED <i>FANCF</i> AND <i>PAXI</i> BY NATURAL COMPOUNDS IN CERVICAL CANCER CELL LINES

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
13.	Mr. Pawan Kumar S/o Ralla Ram V.P.O. Bardwal, Tehsil Dhuri Distt. Sangrur	Languages/ Punjabi	GURBACHAN SINGH BHULLAR DIAN KAHANIAN VICH VICHARDHARA TE BIRTANTIK JUGTAN
14.	Mr. Rajesh Kumar H.No.E-6, CCET Staff Campus, Sector-26, Chandigarh	Engineering & Technology	STUDY ON PERFORMANCE AND MIX PROPORTIONING OF SELF- COMPACTING CONCRETE
15.	Ms. Poonam Yadav V.P.O. Satroad Kalan District Hissar Haryana	Science/ Environment Science	ASSESSMENT OF TRANSFER FACTOR OF NATURAL RADIONUCLIDES AND HEAVY METALS IN THE VICINITY OF PROPOSED GORAKHPUR NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, HARYANA
16.	Ms. Kinnri Jain B-XIX 693 Malerkotla House Cemetery Road, Civil Lines Ludhiana	Science/ Nuclear Medicine	EVALUATION OF SYNERGISTIC EFFECTS OF CURCUMIN AND ZINC IN CHEMOPREVENTION AND DIAGNOSTIC EFFICACY OF ^{99m} Tc-CURCUMIN IN DMH INDUCED COLON CARCINOGENESIS IN RATS
17.	Mr. Roshan Lal House No.205, PEC Campus Sector-12, Chandigarh	Engineering & Technology	INVESTIGATIONS ON REINFORCED CONCRETE CORNER JOINTS UNDER OPENING MOMENT
18.	Ms. Harmandeep Kaur D/o Santroop Singh V&PO Handiaya Near M.C. Office District Barnala (Punjab)	Science/ Physics	GREEN SYNTHESIS OF SILVER NANOPARTICLES AND THEIR BIOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS
19.	Ms. Gurminder Kaur HL-132, Phase-2 Mohali	Languages/ Punjabi	SAMKAALI NARI-KAAV DA MANOVISHLESHNATAMAK ADHIYAN (MANJIT INDRA, MANJIT PAL KAUR, AMARJIT GHUMAN, NEERU ASEEM DE VISHESH SANDHARB VICH)
20.	Ms. Stuti Arya Gian Bhandar Lower Bazar Shimla (HP)	Science/ Biotechnology	STUDIES ON DIFFERENTIAL EXPRESSION OF HORMONE SENSITIVE LIPASES IN <i>MYCOBACTERIUM</i> <i>TUBERCULOSIS</i>
21.	Mr. Lokesh Jain B-34, 3122/A New Tagore Nagar Haibowal Kalan, Ludhiana	Engineering & Technology	AGRICULTURAL INFORMATION DISSEMINATION SYSTEM USING MOBILE NETWORKS
22.	Mr. Narendra Kumar H.No.986 Ward 15 Sukhwant Cinema Road Purani Abadi Sri Ganga Nagar Rajasthan	Science/ Statistics	SOME STATISTICAL INFERENCE PROCEDURES UNDER ORDER RESTRICTIONS
23.	Mr. Ashok Kumar H.No. 1437/B-1 Abdullapur Pinjore, District Panchkula Haryana	Arts/Public Administration	PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF HARYANA ROADWAYS
24.	Ms. Priya Saharan # A-69, HMT Colony Pinjore District Panchkula	Science/ Environment Science	PREPARATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF SOME METAL OXIDE NANOPARTICLES AND THEIR APPLICATION FOR THE REMOVAL OF WATER CONTAMINANTS

Consideration of following Item 38 on the agenda was deferred:**Deferred Item**

38. To consider the promotion of Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar, Reader (designate as Associate Professor) Department of History, P.U., as Professor under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS).

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar was appointed as Reader in 1999 in the Department of History. She applied for promotion in the year 2006 from Reader to Professor under UGC, CAS-1996 along with the list of her five publications of Articles and two books.
 2. Five research publications are required to be assessed by the experts for promotion from Reader to Professor. The research publications should pertain to the period between her appointment as Reader and the due date on which she became eligible for the promotion as Professor.
 3. In case the candidate does not have the requisite number of applications, his/her eligibility is required to be shifted to such date on which he/she becomes eligible after fulfilling all the requirements.
 4. The five publications submitted by Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar were sent to the experts for scrutinization/ evaluation and their reports were positive.
 5. In the meanwhile, complaints from Shri Prithi Pal Singh, Fellow, P.U. and Professor Indu Banga (now Retd.), Department of History, P.U., were received on 29.04.2006 and 07.06.2006 wherein it was stated that Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar cannot be considered for promotion as the publications submitted by her pertains to the period prior to her appointment as Reader.
 6. A letter was written to Professor Neeladri Bhattacharya, Centre for Historical Studies, School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, Delhi by the then Vice-Chancellor to examine the material and to intimate whether the candidate in question was eligible for promotion as Professor or it is a case of academic fraud as alleged by the complainant.
 7. Dr. Sukhmani Bal Riar appeared before the Selection Committee on 10.09.2006 and the Selection Committee recommended that she be promoted as

Professor in the Department of History, P.U., Chandigarh, under UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (subject to fulfillment of UGC conditions) in the pay-scale of Rs.16400-450-20900-500-22400 at a starting of pay to be fixed under the rules of the University.

The recommendations of the said Committee were sent to UGC for approval.

8. The Under Secretary, UGC vide letter dated 15.11.2006, informed the University "to hold the recommendations of the Selection Committee till further directions".
9. Dr. Riar filed a CWP No. 2973/7 in the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, against the University and UGC.
10. On 07.10.2013 the Vice-Chancellor constituted a Committee consisting of Professor Navtej Singh, Department of Punjab Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, Professor Madhu Sharma, Department of History, H.P. University, Shimla and Professor Aditya Mukherjee, Centre for Historical Studies, JNU, New Delhi for finalizing comments on the complainants made by Shri Prithi Pal Singh and Professor Indu Banga. However, Professor Navtej Singh refused to the assignment and the papers sent to Professor Madhu Sharma, received back with the remarks that she has been retired from the University service. Thus, Professor Raghuvendra Tanwar, K.U. (Kurukshetra) and Professor B.B. Yadav, Rohtak, were appointed for the purpose. Professor Raghuvendra Tanwar informed that he is not in a position to spare the time. Anyhow, the comments from other two members have been received and the Vice-Chancellor has observed that two favorable reports have been arrived at and let this be proceeded further as the case is already delayed.

11. A comprehensive office note enclosed.

Issue regarding placement of Dr. Manjit Paintal in the Senior-Scale of Lecturer

39. Considered if, Dr. Manjit Paintal, Lecturer (Senior Scale) (now re-employed as Professor), Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, be placed in the Senior Scale (Project Officer, later on designated as Lecturer) (of Rs.3000-5000 unrevised, revised to Rs.10000-15200 w.e.f. 01.01.1996) w.e.f. 05.07.1995 to 08.08.2002 with financial benefits, as the UGC has relaxed the condition for participating in the Refresher/ Orientation courses from time to time i.e. up to 31.12.2013 vide letter No. 1-2/2009/(EC/PS) Pt. VIII dated

07.12.2012 and adopted by the Syndicate dated 27.01.2013 and Senate dated 24.03.2013 (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

- NOTE:**
1. Dr. Manjit Paintal was allowed Senior Scale w.e.f. 5.7.1995 under UGC (CAS) with condition that she will fulfill the requirement of orientation/refresher courses as per U.G.C. guidelines.
 2. Dr. Manjit Paintal could not fulfill the requirement of attending the orientation /refresher courses till 8.8.2000. Hence, the Syndicate/ Senate vide (Para 9)/(Para VII) in its meeting dated 29.06.2010 and 10.10.2010, respectively (**Appendix-XXXVI**) has allowed the Senior Scale w.e.f. 5.7.1995 without financial benefits.
 3. However, the UGC vide letter No. F.2-16/2007(PS) dated 30.06.2010 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) has extended the date beyond 30.6.2009 for participation in Orientation/ Refresher Courses, which was adopted by the Syndicate/Senate on 19.8.2008 and 24.6.2013.
 4. Dr. Manjit Paintal vide application dated 22.12.2014 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) has requested for grant of her due benefit of Senior Scale, w.e.f. 05.07.1995 with financial benefit in accordance with the UGC letter dated 30.6.2010 wherein the UGC has notified the extension date for participation in orientation/ refresher course beyond 30.6.2009 till the date of issuance of Regulation 2010 for the purpose of Career Advancement.
 5. In pursuance of UGC letter adopted by the Senate, Dr. Manjit Paintal is eligible for placement of Senior Scale w.e.f. 5.7.1995 with all financial benefits
 6. Earlier, the issue was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.04.2015 as an Agenda Item, but the same was withdrawn.
 7. An office note along with list of certain employees who have already been promoted/placed in Senior Scale/ Selection Grade/ stage-1 to 2, 2 to 3, 3 to 4 & 4 to 5 under CAS of UGC are enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

RESOLVED: That Dr. Manjit Paintal, Lecturer (Senior Scale) (now re-employed as Professor), Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, be placed in the Senior Scale (Project Officer,

later on designated as Lecturer) (of Rs.3000-5000 unrevised, revised to Rs.10000-15200 w.e.f. 01.01.1996) w.e.f. 05.07.1995 to 08.08.2002 with financial benefit, as the UGC has relaxed the condition for participating in the Refresher/ Orientation courses from time to time, i.e., up to 31.12.2013 vide letter No. 1-2/2009/(EC/PS) Pt. VIII dated 07.12.2012 and adopted by the Syndicate dated 27.01.2013 and Senate dated 24.03.2013 (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

Issue regarding sanction of funds for development of infrastructure

40. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor dated 08.07.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) that the funds for the items as mentioned in the **Annexure-'A'** (**Appendix-XXXVII**), be sanctioned for development of infrastructure and other facilities in the Departments, from the earnings of the Examination Wing of UIAMS.

NOTE: Minutes of the meeting of all Chairpersons/ Directors/Coordinators of Humanities, Social Sciences and Languages Departments/ Centres/Institutes dated 06.04.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVII**).

RESOLVED: That the funds for the items, as mentioned in the **Annexure-'A'** (**Appendix**), be sanctioned out of the earnings of the Examination Wing of UIAMS for development of infrastructure and other facilities in the Departments.

Fee for On-line submission of re-evaluation forms

41. Considered the recommendation of the Committee dated 26.06.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that the fee for online submission of Re-evaluation Form of under-graduate and post-graduate examinations from July, 2015, be amended as below:-

Under-Graduate Courses : Rs.550/- (for a single paper)

Post-Graduate Courses : Rs.600/- (for a single paper)

RESOLVED: That fees for On-line submission of Re-evaluation Forms of under-graduate and post-graduate examinations from July 2015, be amended as below:-

Under-Graduate Courses : Rs.550/- (for a single paper).

Post-Graduate Courses : Rs.600/- (for a single paper).

Recommendations of the Committee dated 29.4.2015 regarding P.U. Constituent Colleges

42. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 29.04.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate and Senate to run P.U. Constituent Colleges on 'no profit no loss basis' along with the recommendation (**Appendix-XXXIX**) of the Coordinator, P.U. Constituent Colleges that the Fee structure for B.A., BCA, B.Com. and PGDCA at P.U. Constituent Colleges for the academic session 2015-16 will remain the same for the session 2014-15.

RESOLVED: That the Fee structure for B.A., BCA, B.Com. and PGDCA courses being offered at P.U. Constituent Colleges for the academic session 2015-16, be the same as was for the session 2014-15.

Transfer of Funds from UIAMS Examination Wing Account to budget head “Building and Infrastructure Account”

43. Considered if, fund of Rs.50 lakhs out of the funds generated by UIAMS Examination Wing, be transferred from UIAMS Examination Wing Account to budget head “Building and Infrastructure Account No.1044978026, for the purpose of dental chairs at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, Panjab University. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XL**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2013/05.03.2013 (Para 23) has resolved that the surplus generated/ balance left after meeting all the expenditures for smooth conduct of examination/ recruitment test shall be utilized on the following purposes:

- (i) Strengthening of infrastructure of UIAMS/ UIAMS Exam. Wing.
- (ii) Any other expenditure for promotion of academic activities and social/ welfare activities of staff of Panjab University as approved by the Vice-Chancellor. For rest CIIPP rules will apply.

RESOLVED: That a sum of Rs.50 lakhs, be transferred out of the funds generated by UIAMS Examination Wing Account to budget head “Building and Infrastructure Account No.1044978026, for the purchase of Dental Chairs at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences and Hospital, Panjab University.

Establishment of Centre for Industrial Relations and Management Research at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana

44. Considered the proposal dated 06.07.2015 (**Appendix-XLI**) of the Coordinator (MBA), Panjab University Regional Centre, P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana, that Centre for Industrial Relations and Management Research (CIRMR), be established at University Business School, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana and permission be granted to appoint one Assistant Professor to perform the duties of Industrial Relations and Placements Officer.

RESOLVED: That Centre for Industrial Relations and Management Research (CIRMR), be established at University Business School, Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana and permission be granted to appoint one Assistant Professor to perform the duties of Industrial Relations and Placements Officer.

Condonation of delay in submission of application for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Com. course

45. Considered the request dated 04.04.2015 (**Appendix-XLII**) of the Principal, Govind National College, Govind Nagar, Narangwal, Ludhiana, that delay for applying for temporary extension of affiliation for B.Com.I for the session 2015-16, be condoned and the College, be granted temporary extension of affiliation for B.Com. I for the session 2015-16, as per observations of the Peer Team of NAAC (**Appendix-XLII**). Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XLII**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That the delay for applying for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for B.Com.I by Govind National College, Govind Nagar, Narangwal, Ludhiana, for the session 2015-16, be condoned and, as observed by the Peer Team of NAAC, the College be

granted temporary extension of affiliation for B.Com. I for the session 2015-16.

Survey Committee for Bajaj College, Village-Gureh (Chaukimann), Ferozpur Road, Ludhiana (Punjab)

46. Considered the minutes of the Survey Committee dated 17.06.2015 (**Appendix-XLIII**) for deciding the issue of the opening of the new College namely Bajaj College, Village-Gureh (Chaukimann), Ferozpur Road, Ludhiana (Punjab) from the session 2015-16. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XLIII**) was also taken into consideration.

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that a new College is being proposed to be opened at Samadh Bhai and a Committee has been constituted to visit the College. Almost a month has passed, but the Committee has not visited the College. The College has all the documents for opening the College. If they have to send the Inspection Committee for inspecting Bajaj College, Village-Gureh (Chaukimann), Ferozpur Road, Ludhiana (Punjab), an Inspection Committee should also be sent to inspect the proposed Samadh Bhai so that the College could make admissions from the session 2015-16, if fulfilled the conditions.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that it is good that the case of Bajaj College, Village-Gureh (Chaukimann), Ferozpur Road, Ludhiana (Punjab) has been placed before the Syndicate and if it is approved, the College could make admissions. He, however, pointed out that there is a College in his area, which has not been placed before the Syndicate and the case of the College also came under the purview of the Core Committee. Satyam College is making admissions without getting affiliation from the University. Last year also, the College had made admissions without getting affiliation and the University had shifted the students to other nearby College/s. Though the case of the College for affiliation has not been placed before the Syndicate, the College is making the admissions. What would they do this year?

It was clarified that the case of Satyam College was placed before the Syndicate and since the College did not fulfill the conditions, its students were shifted to nearby Colleges. Later on, the College fulfilled the conditions and the Central Government had also issued NOC to the College. Thereafter, the Syndicate took a decision that the case of this College should be dealt with on the pattern of Jalalabad College.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that, according to him, the Syndicate never took such a decision. If the Syndicate has taken this decision, the same should be shown to him. This year, the case of Satyam College should have first come to the Syndicate and after the approval of the Syndicate, the College should have made the admissions. He enquired how the College is making admissions without getting affiliation from the University. He added that the Core Committee has been constituted for considering extension of affiliation and not for new affiliation/s.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the College was asked why the faculty members have not been appointed and other conditions had not been fulfilled, which were pointed out by the Inspection Committee last year. They told them (Inspection Committee) that since this College is at a place far away from the City, NET qualified persons did not apply for appointment. Now, certain NET qualified

persons have come. They also told that the College has been opened to serve the people of about 25 villages.

On a point of order, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that his question is could the College be opened without the approval of the Syndicate?

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor Naval Kishore to provide him the latest status and, if necessary, the College be asked to stop the admissions.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that in certain cases, the Vice-Chancellor grants approval, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate after receiving the reports of the Inspection Committees. In this case also, the Vice-Chancellor might have given the approval to the College, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate.

It was clarified that Item C-46 has been placed before the Syndicate because there is a rule that no College could be opened within the radius of 15 kms. of another College and there are already 4 Colleges in the radius of 14 kms. namely, DAV College, Jagraon, Government College, Jagraon (both within the Municipal Council limit), GTB College, Dakha and the College at Sidhwan Khurd.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that so far as the rule that no College could be opened within the radius of 15 kms. is concerned, they have already opened 5 Colleges within the radius of 15 kms. at Moga. As such, there is precedence. Secondly, this rule was framed, when the Colleges were not allowed to open, but now that they are talking about expansion of education.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the afore-said rule is very old. Now, since it is an era of expansion, they should review this rule.

It was informed that they had adopted UGC Regulations 2009 regarding affiliation, but have not amended their Calendar. Somewhere they quote the UGC Regulations and somewhere the University Regulations/Rules. In order to maintain uniformity, a Committee should be constituted to examine the whole issue and suggest amendments in the Regulations/Rules.

The Vice-Chancellor said that RUSA is also of the view that there has to be affiliation reforms. They have to decentralize the office of the Dean, College Development Council, for which the members of the Syndicate and Senate should come up with a proposal.

Referring to new Colleges, Principal Gurdip Sharma said that had the Vice-Chancellor constituted a permanent Survey Committee comprising Registrar, Dean, College Development Council, and Executive Engineer. Since the Registrar is very busy, someone else should be appointed in his place on the Survey Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has been mentioned in the Regulation/Rule that the Registrar has to be on the Survey Committee.

To this, Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it has also been mentioned in the Regulation/Rule that the Vice-Chancellor shall be on so and so Committee, but since the Vice-Chancellor is very busy, he could not go himself to each and every College. He, therefore,

pleaded that Survey Committee should immediately be sent to 4-5 big Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is a responsibility for which the members of the Syndicate and Senate should come forward.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they are very fussy that the Colleges have to apply within the stipulated date, i.e., 1st October and if somebody is late in submitting the application, they could not entertain the same. However, in accordance with certain rules, which are completely illegal, they could accept the late application with a late fee of Rs.1 lac. If somebody has applied well in time, then if the University has not been able to send the Survey Committee by the 3rd week of July, how would they evaluate themselves, that too, if the letters by the Colleges have been submitted by the 1st week of June. He knew that the Dean, College Development Council or the Registrar or any other persons could be busy, but could they afford to ignore the Institution, which has spent so much money. So the Colleges where the Survey Committee has not been able to go till date, their first priority should be that the Survey Committee must go and if any member of the Survey Committee owing to one reason or the other is not able to go, the substitute/s should be appointed; and if he (Vice-Chancellor) wanted that the members of the Syndicate and Senate should come forward, he could request them for the purpose, but there should not be any delay. The opening of new Colleges and grant of affiliation is not within the purview of the Affiliation Committee, and Dr. I.S Sandhu is right that till the affiliation is not granted by the Syndicate, admissions could not be made by the College/s. Since now the Syndicate would meet in the month of August and that meant they have to wait up till August or if the positive reports come, the Vice-Chancellor would have to grant affiliation to the College/s in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate. For Colleges, whenever his services are required, he could be asked anytime. On the one hand, some Colleges, which have fulfilled the conditions, have been facing the problem of making the admissions and on the other hand, some Colleges which have been granted affiliation but are not within the purview of the Affiliation Committee, but have made the admissions. So such Colleges should also be brought within the ambit of the Affiliation Committee. There is another category of the Colleges, which by way of issuing an advertisement, have said that they have opened their extension branches at such and such places. There is only one affiliated College, which has opened extension branches in different areas and asked the students not to come to the College and asked them to go to the extension branch where rest of the things are guaranteed. There are Colleges, which have only twelve classrooms, but they have admitted about 4000 students and the number of teachers is just twelve. There is another category of the Colleges, which have appointed ineligible teachers and their returns also sent to the University office, to which no objection has been raised by the University. The Colleges take it as if the appointments/returns have been approved by the University. Whenever it is pointed out by the Inspection Committee, the Colleges say, "What is their fault as the University has never objected to it?" This is happening because due to some reason or the other, the Periodical Inspection Committees have not visited the Colleges, had they visited the Colleges, probably they would have looked into this aspect. While going for grant of affiliation for next year, they should send Periodical Inspection Committees or Surprise Committees so that they could have some

kind of check on the Colleges because it is not the Colleges which are going to get the bad name, but the University which would get the bad name. A couple of days before, there was a big news where the degree of Panjab University was being questioned, and they thought as if everything is being done in connivance with Panjab University. It is their limitation that they are not able to keep control over such things. They should take care of the Colleges by not giving them any leverage to exploit the system, but at the same time provide them all support which they required. Therefore, firstly they should send the Survey Committee and the same should be followed by an Affiliation Committee, which is to be followed by an Inspection Committee. Thereafter, the admissions are to be made, but he wondered whether the admissions are to be made this year! He emphasized that the returns of the teachers should be got checked.

The Vice-Chancellor told Professor Naval Kishore that the agenda is there for him.

It was informed that though they had done a lot in the case of Colleges of Education, the situation has not changed much and the reason is that the Periodical Inspection Committees had not visited the Colleges. For that now a Committee under the chairmanship of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath has been constituted. Secondly, since the Colleges seek affiliation subject-wise, 100% compliance is done before the University gave affiliation. The Periodical Inspections, which have not been done for the last 4-5 years, must be done. At the moment, there are five Colleges namely, Halwara College, Syon College, Samadh Bhai College, Nightingale College and Sai College, which are under the pipeline. They had already taken a few steps for these Colleges and needed to send Survey Committee and Affiliation Committees. To avoid delay, the Vice-Chancellor should be authorized to take decision regarding grant of affiliation to those five Colleges, on behalf of the Syndicate, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that Dr. I.S. Sandhu is right. The Colleges Branch gets the Inspection Committees constituted and the Inspection Committees visited the Colleges, point out the deficiencies, which are complied by the Colleges concerned. Though they are big Colleges, they did not know requirements of the University, including that the approval of the Syndicate is required before making the admissions.

On a point raised by Professor Yog Raj Angrish regarding B.Sc. (Agriculture), it was clarified that since B.Sc. (Agriculture) has practicals, it has 40 seats and in the subject where there is no practicals, 60 seats are there.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there are certain Colleges, which had only 30 seats for B.Sc. (Agriculture). He, therefore, suggested that it should be uploaded on the University website that the minimum seats for B.Sc. (Agriculture) are 40.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that all the Colleges, which are offering B.Sc. (Agriculture) course, should be uniformly given 40 seats. However, this course should be given to only those Colleges, which are offering B.Sc. courses as the faculty members belonging to arts courses could not impart instructions to the students about this course (B.Sc. Agriculture).

Principal Gurdip Sharma endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Dr. I.S. Sandhu.

It was clarified that since B.Sc. (Agriculture) course is presently in demand, it should be given to the Colleges. However, both Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, have given this course almost to all the Colleges. What they could do is that they should follow the norms strictly.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that firstly the Colleges should successfully run the B.Sc. course/s for at least 3-4 years and thereafter, they should be given B.Sc. (Agriculture) course.

It was clarified that last year, even the seats of B.Sc. courses were also not filled up in the rural Colleges. As such, they have to run the courses and not to close down the Colleges. If the willing Colleges have the requisite faculty, they should be given B.Sc. (Agriculture) course.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that though a very good point has been raised, unfortunately, they are concentrating only on B.Sc. (Agriculture). According to him, affiliation to the Colleges should be given in those subjects for which they appoint teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that most of the Colleges affiliated to Panjab University are situated far away from the University. If they looked at the map of Punjab, they would see that majority of their Colleges are either on the border of Rajasthan or Pakistan except the central area, i.e., District Ludhiana. As such, they did not have effective control on them. Whenever the members of the Inspection Committees go to those Colleges, they are always in a hurry to return. Hence, they have to find some way out to decentralize and have effective control in which they have a faith.

RESOLVED: That the proposed College namely, Bajaj College at Village Gureh (Chaukimann), Ferozepur Road, Ludhiana, be opened and further process for grant of affiliation be initiated.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, in regard to grant of provisional affiliation to five Colleges namely, Halwara College, Syon College, Samadh Bhai College, Nightingale College and Sai College, for the session 2015-16 on the basis of reports of the Affiliation/Inspection Committees.

Discontinuation of Gobindgarh College of Education, Alour, Tehsil-Khanna, Ludhiana

47. Considered request dated 03.06.2015 (**Appendix-XLIV**) of the President, Gobindgarh Educational & Social Welfare Trust, GESWT Complex, G.T. Road, Mandi Gobindgarh, that Gobindgarh College of Education, Alour, Tehsil-Khanna, Ludhiana, be discontinued w.e.f. the session 2016-17. Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XLIV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. In view of the NCTE Regulations, 2014, the Governing body of Gobindgarh College of Education, in its resolution dated 30.05.2015 (**Appendix-XLIV**) has observed and decided as under:-

- a. The sanctioned intake for B.Ed has been reduced from 100 to 50 as basic unit.
- b. Duration of course has been increased from one year to two years to be completed in three years.
- c. Stand-alone institution will move towards becoming composite institutions.
- d. If we got two units of B.Ed. i.e. 100 seats then we need 16 full time teachers. We also need to provide extra instructional and infrastructural resources.

Keeping in view the above said fact and after a long discussion it was decided to close down the Gobindgarh College of Education, Alour, Tehsil-Khanna, Ludhiana from the session 2015-16.

2. It has been mentioned in the request dated 03.06.2015 that the permission for not admitting the students from current session i.e. 2015-16 may also be granted.
3. The session mentioned by the President in his request dated 03.06.2015 is contradictory to that of as mentioned in the resolution for discontinuation.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that the President, Gobindgarh Educational & Social Welfare Trust, has requested to allow them not to admit the students to B.Ed. course in the College from the session 2015-16, whereas Regulations 13.2, 13.3 and 13.4 inter alia say that "in either of the case falling under Regulations 13.2 or 13.3, an application for required permission shall be made at least one academic year in advance with detailed reasons in support of the proposal, to the Registrar". Secondly, the University has also issued an NOC to the College to offer B.A. B.Ed. course. His submission is that the five teachers working on regular basis in this College should be adjusted in the proposed B.A. B.Ed. course and their salary should also be protected. As such, the College should be allowed to be close down only on the condition that the five regular teachers would be adjusted in the proposed B.A. B.Ed. course which is to be offered in their Degree College.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that he agreed with Dr. Dinesh Kumar. In fact, they had two Colleges and in one of the Colleges they had applied for B.A., B.Sc. and B.A. B.Ed. integrated course. Probably, they will get these courses next year. As per the Regulations, it is incumbent upon the Governing Body of the College to give a notice of one year to its employees regarding termination of their services. Meaning thereby, the College could not terminate the services of the employees before one year.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that this is not the only one College which is going to be closed down. He apprehended that since earlier they had permitted the opening of so many Colleges of Education in one go, certain small Colleges which are not getting sufficient students are bound to close down. He, therefore, suggested that a condition should be imposed on the College that if they promised not to terminate the services of the teachers as also protection of their pay, only then the College would be allowed to be closed down, that too from the session 2016-17.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that as per their information, even if the teachers are being adjusted in the sister College, they are being appointed afresh and on the minimum of the pay-scale. Either the College be asked to protect the pay of the teachers or permission might not be granted to close down.

The Vice-Chancellor asked the Dean, College Development Council to issue a general circular to all the Colleges of Education that in view of the fact that certain Colleges are seeking permission to close down, the Syndicate has decided that such and such compliance should be done; otherwise, no College would be permitted to close down.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that since they are considering the request of the College, as per University norms, the College could not be closed down unless and until it applies one year in advance. If at all, it has to be closed down, it could be closed down with effect from the session 2016-17. The title of the item as well as the letter of the College says permission to close down the Colleges with effect from the session 2016-17. In the second para, they say they seek the permission to discontinue the College from the session 2016-17 and also seek permission of not admitting the students from the current session, i.e., 2015-16 for the B.Ed. course to be completed in two years. If they do not want to make the admissions, the University has no objection, but as per the Regulations of the University, they could not allow them to close down the College with effect from the session 2015-16. In the same letter, they had written that "they have five regular Assistant Professors and one regular Librarian (all un-covered posts) and other administrative and office staff (list attached). Although their appointment is supposed to be valid up to existence of course, but they would terminate the services of employees as per University direction". Now, they could only say that they are allowed to close down the College with effect from the session 2016-17 because it is not in their (University) hands to allow the College to close down from the session 2015-16 and they could not say in the form of general resolution that they would have to accommodate. If some Institution has one degree College and another College of Education, they could accommodate, but where there is only one College and if they wanted to close down the same, what condition they would impose. Therefore, in the case under consideration, they should decide that even if they did not want to make admissions to B.Ed. during the session 2015-16, the services of none of the teachers should be terminated and let them provide the job to the teachers in their sister College/Institution and prepare for the course which they wanted to introduce. This provision of giving one year's notice, in fact, is to protect the privilege of the teachers and non-teachers working in the College; otherwise, there would be hire and fire. He did not know why they have stated that they should be allowed to close down the

College from 2016-17 and not to admit the students from the session 2015-16.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said the closure should be allowed conditionally.

It was clarified that it is true that they (Trust) have demanded closure with effect from the session 2016-17. Of course, they were supposed to apply for closure one year in advance, but they did it in June 2015, which is not right. Since the name of this College figured in the list of the Self-Financing Colleges Association which is making admissions, it meant they are making admissions during this session (2015-16) also. They had talked to the Principal (Officiating) of the College on Friday and he had told him that the name of their College figured in the list of the Self-Financing Colleges Association which is making admissions. Everything has been taken on the record and the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) has been asked to seek a clarification from the College whether it is making the admissions or not. However, within half an hour a clarification was received from the Chairman of the Trust that they are not making the admissions from the session 2015-16.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whichever College it might be, it has to complete the existing course. It is from the next year that they would not make the admissions. Therefore, the Chairman of the Trust should be told that if he really wanted to close down the College, he should not make admissions from the session 2016-17. Either he should have applied earlier, i.e., one year advance.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that in the Resolution, the Chairman of the Trust has written that "All non-teaching staff will be adjusted in sister concern, while decision for regular teaching faculty will be taken as per Panjab University guidelines. Preferably, they can also be adjusted in sister institutes as per necessity of the subject". It meant, if they do not have the necessity, they would not adjust them.

Principal Gurdip Sharma remarked that, in fact, they wanted to make appointments afresh and there is no other issue at all.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would not be permitted to do that.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the President, Gobindgarh Educational & Social Welfare Trust, GESWT Complex, G.T. Road, Mandi Gobindgarh, be allowed to close down Gobindgarh College of Education, Alour, Tehsil- Khanna, Ludhiana, w.e.f. the session 2016-17, subject to the condition that the teachers be not retrenched and, if the teachers are adjusted in the sister Institute, their salaries be protected.

Introduction of Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences

48. Considered if –

- (i) Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences, be introduced at proposed PU-Institute of Social Sciences Education and Research (PU-ISSER) w.e.f. the session 2015-16.

- (ii) the regulations/rules (**Appendix-XLV**) for the above said course, be approved.

NOTE: 1. The Course structure for Five-year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences enclosed (**Appendix-XLV**).

2. The Academic Council in its meeting dated 24.06.2015, considered and approved the recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that Five year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences be introduced from the academic session 2015-16 at proposed PU-Institute of Social Sciences Education and Research (PU-ISSER).

The Academic Council has also authorized the Vice-Chancellor to approve the outlines of tests/syllabi etc. for the said course on behalf of the Academic Council.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, referring to Regulations/Rules for Five Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences, pointed out that at page 89 (iv) bottom, it has been mentioned that the pass marks will be 40%. He said that for such a specialized Course, the pass marks should at least be 45%.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that as per new UGC guidelines/instructions, at least 50% pass marks in each paper is required. Secondly, the course content are also required to be kept strictly in accordance with the UGC, which is not in this case. As such, certain changes are required, which could be made by two-three persons/small Committee.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) Five-Year Integrated Programme (Honours School) in Social Sciences, be introduced at the proposed PU-Institute of Social Sciences Education and Research (PU-ISSER) w.e.f. the session 2015-16.
- (2) So far as Regulations/Rules and course structure are concerned, necessary changes/corrections be made in them by Professor Ronki Ram in consultation with Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University

Instruction, and the Vice-Chancellor, be authorized to take decision on the same, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Request of Principal, DAV College, Chandigarh, for exemption from OCET for admission to M.Sc. Bioinformatics

49. Considered the request dated 07.07.2015 (**Appendix-XLVI**) of Principal, DAV College, Chandigarh, that the aspirant candidates be exempted from the OCET examination as eligibility criterion for admission to M.Sc. Bioinformatics for the current session 2015-2016, so that the available seats be filled on merit basis in the Department of Bioinformatics, DAV College, Chandigarh.

NOTE: The Principal has written that in current year very less number of students have applied/qualified for OCET for admission to M.Sc. Bioinformatics (37 students). More than fifty percent of applications received for admission to M.Sc. (Bioinformatics) have not qualified the OCET.

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that the request of the Principal, DAV College, Chandigarh, should be acceded to. Further, since there are several seats of M.Sc. courses vacant, the admission to which is based on OCET, the same should also be allowed to be filled in on merit basis. If such seats are vacant in the University Departments also, the same should also be filled in on merit basis.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that there are about 350 seats in the affiliated Colleges in the subject of Biotechnology, and only about 40 candidates had appeared in the OCET. Only one candidate has sought admission in his College, who has qualified the OCET. Therefore, they should allow the filling up of vacant seats of M.Sc. courses on merit basis, the admission to which is based on OCET.

RESOLVED: That the aspirant candidates be exempted from the OCET examination as eligibility criterion for admission to M.Sc. Bioinformatics for the current session 2015-2016, so that the available seats be filled on merit basis in the Department of Bioinformatics, DAV College, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That the vacant seats of M.Sc. courses, the admission to which is based on OCET, be filled in on merit basis.

Modification in Syndicate decision dated 31.05.2015

50. Considered if, the following existing decision of the Syndicate dated 31.05.2015 (Para 19), with regard to qualifying service for the purpose of pension in respect of Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, F.D.O. (Retd.), be modified as proposed:

Existing decision of Syndicate dated 31.5.2015 (Para 19)	Proposed
That the service rendered by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, F.D.O. (Retd.) as Probationary Officer, United Commercial Bank w.e.f. 14.11.1969 to 25.07.1980, be treated as qualifying service for the pension purpose.	That the services rendered by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, F.D.O. (Retd.) as Probationary Officer in United Commercial Bank w.e.f. 14.11.1969 to 25.07.1980, fulfils the requirement of Professional experience as required under Regulation 3.9 of P.U. Pension Act.

Information contained in the office note (**Appendix-XLVII**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That the following existing decision of the Syndicate dated 31.05.2015 (Para 19), with regard to qualifying service for the purpose of pension in respect of Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, F.D.O. (Retd.), be modified as proposed:

Existing decision of Syndicate dated 31.5.2015 (Para 19)	Proposed
That the service rendered by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, F.D.O. (Retd.) as Probationary Officer, United Commercial Bank w.e.f. 14.11.1969 to 25.07.1980, be treated as qualifying service for the pension purpose.	That the services rendered by Shri Ashok Raj Bhandari, F.D.O. (Retd.) as Probationary Officer in United Commercial Bank w.e.f. 14.11.1969 to 25.07.1980, fulfils the requirement of Professional experience as required under Regulation 3.9 of P.U. Pension Regulations.

Amendment in rule (vii) of Handbook of Information 2015

51. Considered if, the amendment in Rule (vii) at page 219 of P.U. Handbook of Information 2015 (**Appendix-XLVIII**), be made as per guidelines of the UGC and Punjab Government (**Appendix-XLVIII**) for admission to the courses offered by the University Teaching Departments/Centres/ Institutes to the person/s killed/incapacitated in November 1984 riots and terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh.

NOTE: 1. Rule (vii) at page 219 of P.U. Handbook of Information 2015 is as under:

“(vii) 2% for sons/daughters/ husband/wife/brothers/sisters of persons killed/incapacitated in November, 1984 riots and of persons killed/incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh. A certificate from the District Magistrate to this effect must be submitted by the candidate. Migrant card alone is not enough.”

2. Reservation policy for persons killed in terrorist violence is as under:

“Children of families of persons killed as a result of terrorist violence/by security forces acting in aid of civil power and for the children of innocent civilian who have sustained 100% disability in terrorist violence or during operation by security forces acting in aid of civil power/children of Sikh migrants/children of army deserters killed/100% physically disabled children/grand children of freedom fighters including Martyrs of Jallianwala Bagh & Kuka Lehar/

Successors of the participants of Kama Gata Maru Lehar defined to include only sons/daughter, grandsons/granddaughters (both maternal and paternal)/wards of Punjab Policemen decorated with Gallantry Medals. Certificates from Deputy Commissioner/GA to DC/ADC shall be accepted.

The University also provides facility of (tuition) free education to children of persons killed in November, 1984 riots and terrorist violence in Punjab State.”

3. A copy of letter NO. 1/3/2012-3/D.M.-3/19709-30 dated 17.12.2012 issued by Under Secretary (Revenue (U), Govt. of Punjab, Revenue, Rehabilitation & Disaster Management Department (D.M. Branch) enclosed (**Appendix-XLVIII**).

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that as per the provision of Handbook of Information, there is concession for sons, daughters, wife, etc. of the riots victims, but not for grand children. However, he urged the members to carefully read and see whether the grand children of freedom fighters, including Martyrs of Jallianwala Bagh & Kuka Lehar/Successors of the participants of Kama Gata Maru Lehar, are covered in it or not.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that as per Punjab Government, the grand children of freedom fighters, including Martyrs of Jallianwala Bagh & Kuka Lehar/Successors of the participants of Kama Gata Maru Lehar, are entitled for this benefit. But the question is whether they had adopted the said letter/circular of Punjab Government.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that till recently, Kuka Lehar and Kama Gata Maru have not been included in the freedom fighters category and till 2008 they were not covered under this category. UGC says that the grand children are not entitled for this benefit. Referring to Punjab Government notification, he said that Punjab Government nowhere said that reservation should be given to grand children. In fact, the Punjab Government had only said that the names of grand children of riot victims, should be entered in the Red and Yellow Cards, whereas the grand children of freedom fighters are included for this benefit from day one. As such, the grand children of riot victims are never covered for this benefit. This University faced not only one, but numerous cases of grand children of riot victims and even the Court has also not favoured them (the grand children of riot victims) and the Court has said that the reservation is limited only to the children of riot victims and not to the grand children. He, therefore, suggested that the consideration of the item should be deferred because they are amending the provision from today, but what about those grand children of riot victims, who have not applied.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the consideration of the item be deferred. In the meanwhile, a Committee be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the whole case and make recommendation/s.

At this stage, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that additional seats be granted to the affiliated Colleges and the same be allowed to be filled with the late fee with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor.

Principal Gudip Sharma said that the additional seats should only be granted cautiously and, that too, after conducting the survey so that the seats of all the Colleges are filled in; otherwise, the Colleges situated in the rural areas would suffer.

Principal Parveen Chawla remarked that no College would suffer by granting the additional seats as the normal seats are filled in before the start of admission with the late fee with the permission of the Vice-Chancellor.

Reiterating his earlier views, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the additional seats should be granted on the same pattern, which was adopted in the earlier years.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the seats for the courses should be as prescribed by the UGC and as per UGC, one Unit for B.Com. course consists of 60 students, but the Colleges are admitting even more than 70 students per unit to B.Com. course. According to him, if additional seats are to be given, it should be unit-wise.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, according to him, additional seats should be given case to case on merit basis, instead of with one stroke that five additional seats per course be given. If a College applied for additional seats, but according to them with the grant of additional seats to it, the seats of nearby College would not be filled up, which has applied, should not be granted additional seats.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Centre has given a directive stating that certain teacher and taught ratio has to be maintained. As such, they could not go beyond that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that grant of additional seats at the Postgraduate level courses, should be considered, and that too, as per requirement.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu remarked that the majority of the affiliated Colleges are giving full salary (as per UGC norms) to the teachers and if they are not given additional seats, from where they would meet their expenses.

Principal Gurdip Sharma pointed out that one of the Government Colleges has received 300 applications for the subject of History, but the College did not have even a single teacher in the subject concerned and the College is also offering postgraduation in the subject.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would have it legally checked up.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That Professor A.K. Bhandari, Syndic & Fellow and Dean of University Instruction, be authorized to take decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, on the issue of grant of additional seats to the affiliated Colleges for the session 2015-16.

Routine and formal matters

52. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xviii)** on the agenda was read out and ratified:-

- (i)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has granted Sabbatical Leave to Dr. Harpreet Pruthi, Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies, for period of six months from the date she is relieved from the department. It is subject to the approval of proposed amendment in Regulation for grant of Sabbatical leave by the Government of India.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (Para 4) (**Appendix-XLIX**) has resolved that Professor A.K. Bhandari and Professor Karamjeet Singh be requested to re-look into the proposed regulations for grant of Sabbatical Leave to the Professors and make recommendations. The Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the recommendations of Professor A.K. Bhandari and Professor Karamjeet Singh, on behalf of the Syndicate.

- (ii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of Dr. Shruti Sahdev, Medical Officer (Homeopathic), SSGPURC, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, on fixed emoluments of Rs.25,200/- p.m. for six months more, i.e., w.e.f. 28.05.2015 to 24.08.2015 (89 days) with one day break on 27.05.2015 & further w.e.f. 26.08.2015 to 19.11.2015 (86 days) with one day break on 25.08.2015, on the previous terms & conditions.

- (iii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Programmers for further period of six months, i.e., w.e.f. the date as noted against each after giving them one day's break, or till the posts of System Manager/Programmer at Computer Centre (against which they are appointed) are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions:

Name of employee/ Deptt.	Term up to	Date of break	Period of further extension
Mr. Bhawan Chander, Computer Centre, P.U.	26.05.2015	27.05.2015 & 25.08.2015	28.05.2015 to 24.08.2015 (89 days) & 26.08.2015 to 19.11.2015 (86 days)
Mr. Deepak Kumar, Computer Centre, P.U.	09.06.2015	10.06.2015 & 08.09.2015	11.06.2015 to 07.09.2015 (89 days) & 09.09.2015 to 03.12.2015 (86 days)

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Shri Rajinder Singh, Assistant Registrar/Special Officer to the Vice-Chancellor as Special Officer to the Vice-Chancellor after his retirement on 30.06.2015, w.e.f. 02.07.2015 (with one day break on 01.07.2015), till further orders @ half of the pay last drawn plus D.A. (including CCA and other special allowance) rounded off to nearest lower 100, to be calculated on the basis of current rates. His salary be paid/charged against the post of Special Officer to the Vice-Chancellor. He is allowed to continue to occupy the University accommodation (in lieu of H.R.A.) in which he is presently residing, as a special case, keeping in view of the strenuous nature of duties and concurrent requirement of his services with the Vice-Chancellor. He is entitled for reimbursement of telephone and internet facility at home.
- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Shri Raghbir Singh, Junior Technician (Grade-III) (Retired on 30.04.2015), Department of Psychology, on contractual basis on fixed remuneration of Rs. 20,000/- p.m., for a period of two months w.e.f. the date he reports for duty after issue of Office Order No. 10825-27 dated 04.05.2015 (**Appendix-L**), as a special case. His salary be charged/paid from the post of Jr. Tech. (G-III) vacated by him on his retirement.
- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the Committee dated 05.06.2015 (**Appendix-LI**) with regard to Instructions for Admission to various Courses in the affiliated Colleges/Teaching Departments for the session 2015-2016.
- NOTE:** A copy of circular issued by R&S Branch vide No.6825-7074 dated 30.06.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-LI**).
- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the guidelines issued by the Director, Department of Education (Colleges), Punjab, Chandigarh vide Memo No. 11/15-13 Grant-1(4) dated 19.05.2015 (**Appendix-LII**) for filling up the posts of Assistant Professors in Private Aided Colleges.
- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the amendment as made by the Sub-Committee dated 29.05.2015 (**Appendix-LIII**) and the Main Committee dated 04.05.2015 (**Appendix-LIII**) in respect of Registration Return Submission Process (under On-line PUPIN System) in the Admission Guidelines for the session 2015-16.
- NOTE:** Copy of orders issued vide No. 6469-74/R&S dated 18.06.2015 issued by R&S Branch enclosed (**Appendix-LIII**).
- (ix) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved that the expenses for purchase of Skylift (11 mtrs.) Boom type with Tata/Swaraj/Eicher Mazda

Vehicle, be met out of budget head "Expenditure towards replacement/maintenance of electric writing equipment/goods/plumbing/accessories in the department buildings and laboratories, offices and staff residences." already approved by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.09.2012 and 06.10.2012 (Para 35) instead of budget head 'Electricity and Water Fund Account'.

NOTE: 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 12.07.2014 (Para 12) (**Appendix-LIV**) has resolved that to provide effective services for repair of street lights at the University Campus, an amount of Rs.16.80 lacs, be sanctioned for purchase of Skylift (11 mtrs.) Boom type with Tata/ Swaraj/Eicher Mazda Vehicle, out of budget head 'Electricity and Water Fund Account'.

2. The audit while admitting the bill has pointed that the expenditure already sanctioned by the Syndicate vide Para 12 dated 12.07.2014 for the said purpose out of the 'Electricity & Water Fund Account' is not precisely covered under the existing guidelines approved by the Syndicate vide Para 35 dated 08.09.2015 and 06.10.2012 (**Appendix-LIV**).

(x) The Vice Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following panel of Legal Retainers/ Advocates for University court cases for the period of three years w.e.f. 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2017 and approved the fee for filing of caveat in the High Court, District Courts and Legal fee for sending legal notice on behalf of Panjab University i.e. Rs. 6200/-, 3100/-, 1100/- and 2200/- respectively and full fee in bunch matter in the first case and 1/3rd fee for the rest of the cases:-

Legal Retainers

(Rs. 11,000/- P.M.)

1.	Sh. Anupam Gupta	# 68, Sector 8, Chandigarh	2543045 98140-12768
2.	Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu	# 221, Sector 21 Chandigarh	99143-00002
3.	Sh. S.C. Sibal	#674, Sector 11-B Chandigarh	2744833, 2747671, 4647671

Panel of High Court

(Rs. 12,500+ 10% Clerkage + Misc. Charges)

1.	Sh. Anupam Gupta	# 68, Sector 8, Chandigarh	2543045, 98140-12768
2.	Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu	# 221, Sector 21 Chandigarh	99143-00002
3.	Sh. Dharam Vir Sharma	# 2220, Sector 15 Chandigarh	2549923, 2549105, 9814014409
4.	Manish Bansal	# 64, Sector 28 Chandigarh	2657565, 98149-00030

5.	B.L. Gupta	# 90, Sector 12 Panchkula	2657268, 94171-41415
6.	Ms. Alka Chatrath	# 2055, Sector 15 Chandigarh	2772635, 98153-93333 94171-43794
7.	Sh. Subhash Ahuja	# 72, Sector 16 Chandigarh	2278218, 98881-35550, 98882-79278
8.	Sh. Amar Vivek	#551, Sector 8-B Chandigarh	0172-2711174, 98140-27754
9.	Sh. Arun K. Bakshi	#2916/2, Sector 42-C Chandigarh	98880-42916
10	Sh. Paramjit Singh Goraya	#396, Phase-6 Mohali-160055	2227011 95308-02189
11	Sh. Kulwant Singh Boparai	#1139, Sector-71 Mohali	4643513, 2263977, 98141-20718
12	Sh. Ashish Rawal	#2099, Sector 40-C Chandigarh	94175-67484
13	Ms. Nidhi Garg	# 400, Sector 38-A Chandigarh	2691337, 94171-87174
14	Mr. Vikrant Sharma	#28, Sector 11-A Chandigarh	2746215, 98141-05515
15	Sh. Sanyam Malhotra	#425, Sector 37-A Chandigarh	99150-00267
16	Sh. Ravi Chadha	#221, Sector 21-A Chandigarh	98785-94464
17	Ms. Balpreet Sidhu	# 2212, Sector 15-C Chandigarh	99882-89880
18	Sh. Vansh Malhotra	Chamber No. 96, Punjab & Haryana High Court	98120-05654, 95306-34564
19	Sh. Vivek Arora	# 29, Sector 16-A Chandigarh	96460-70978
20	Ms. Hema Kakkar	#502, Sector 15-A Chandigarh	98146-98952
21	Sh. Abhilaksh Grover	# 569, Sector 18-B Chandigarh	89685-75860
22	Sh. Akshay Kumar Goel	# 93, Pb. Judges & Officers Enclave, Sector-77, Mohali.	98150-32198
23	Sh. Indresh Goel	#142, Sector 16-A Chandigarh	98159-54150
24	Sh. Naveen Chopra	#895, Sector 2 Panchkula	94172-09093
25	Sh. Dilpreet Singh Gandhi	# 312, Sector 46-A Chandigarh	98727-86402
26	Sh. Navinderjit Singh Dandiwal	# 1253, Sector 15-B Chandigarh	94170-42716
27	Sh. Suvir Sidhu	#221, Sector 21-A Chandigarh	98786-97595
28	Ms. Sonika Kapadia	# 1397, Sector 50-B Chandigarh	98728-50011, 95017-99633
29	Sh. Vishal Deep Goyal	#1103, Universal Society, Sector 48-B, Chandigarh	98141-98674, 99141-54400
30	Sh. Pratham Sethi	# 2538, Sector 27-C Chandigarh	98886-91269, 97815-09594
31	Sh. Gagan Jammu	# 546, Sector 36-B, Chd.	98781-10055
32	Sh. Atul Kaushik	HIG-226, Sector 48-C, Chd.	98724-95226
33	Sh. Harinder Kumar	# 84, Sector 14 (West) Milk Colony, Dhanas Chandigarh	98157-75898
34	Sh. Rattan Brar	SCF-7, 1 st floor, Sector 8-B Chandigarh	98723-25678
35	Ms. Jyoti Choudhary	#2058/3, Sector 45-C Chandigarh.	90410-75460
36	Sh. Hitender Kansal	#75, Sector 15-A Chandigarh	2549404, 98761-28686
37	Sh. Ram Lakshman Mittal	#16, Sector 22-A Chandigarh	2541022, 88724-41999

**Panel for conducting matters of Service Tax/ Income Tax/Excise/Vat etc.
(Rs. 12,500+ 10% Clerkage + Misc. Charges)**

1.	Sh. Pawan K. Pahwa	# 908, Sector 12-A, Panchkula	88727-99908, 2577908
----	--------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------

Panel of District Court (Rs. 10,000/- + 10 % Clerkage + Misc. Charges)

1.	Sh. Paras Money Goyal	# 719, Sector 40-A Chandigarh	98724-77223, 98760-77223
2.	Sh. G.K. Verma	# 3341, Sector 23 Chandigarh	2705137
3.	Sh. Ajay Sood	# 50/A-51/A, Sector 30-B Chandigarh	2657293, 98148-10293
4.	Shri P.C. Rana	Chamber No. 181, District Court Complex, Sector 43 Chandigarh	94652-16208, 76962-87386
5.	Sh. Ravinder Sharma	#619/20-A Chandigarh	97796-11748

**Panel of Consumer and Labour Court
(Rs. 2500/- + Local Conveyance and Telephone Charges)**

1.	Dr. Devinder Singh Associate Professor	Department of Laws Panjab University Chandigarh	94171-14459
----	---	---	-------------

- (xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has granted temporary extension of affiliation to Post Graduate Govt. College, Sector-11, Chandigarh, for M.Phil. (Physical Education) – 10 seats for the session 2015-16 instead of 2014-15, subject to the condition that the College will follow, in letter & spirit, the mandate/regulation/guidelines of the UGC/Panjab University/Chandigarh Administration norms.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting held on 08.03.2015 (Para 31) has resolved that the request dated 5.11.2014 of the Principal of Post Graduate Government College, Sector 11, Chandigarh, for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for M.Phil. in Physical Education (ten seats) for the session 2014-2015, be acceded to. But the course could not be started due to late intimation of the decision of the Syndicate.

- (xii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has re-appropriated an additional amount of Rs.25.00 crores from the Plan Account(s) temporarily in order to meet the liabilities of salaries and other expenditure, pending the release of grant by UGC with condition that the amount so re-appropriated shall be replenished back immediately on receipt of grant from the Government. The amount shall be drawn in phases as per the actual need and pace of Non-Plan expenditure.

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

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the proposal dated 18.06.2015 **(Appendix-LVI)** of Director, University Institute of Legal Studies duly approved by the Dean, Faculty of Law, to start LL.M 2 years (4 Semesters) Degree course in the evening shift at University Institute of Legal Studies (Self financed) from the forthcoming Academic Session, i.e., 2015-16.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of the following Laboratory Instructors purely on temporary basis at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (whose present term of contractual appointment expired on 30.04.2015) up to 30.06.2015 or till the vacancies are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules. Their salary may be allowed to be charged/paid against the vacant posts of Assistant Professors/Technical Officers in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, as before:

Sr. No.	Name	Post against which salary will be charged/paid
1.	Mr. Nand Kishore, (I.T.)	Technical Officer
2.	Mr. Sandeep Trehan, (M.E.)	Assistant Professor
3.	Ms. Seema, (Biotechnology)	Assistant Professor
4.	Mr. Lokesh, (C.S.E.)	Assistant Professor
5.	Ms. Sunaina Gulati, (C.S.E.)	Assistant Professor

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed the following as Laboratory Instructors purely on temporary basis at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (whose present term of contractual appointment expired on 30.06.2015) in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP Rs.5000/- plus allowances as admissible under the University rules, for the next Academic Session 2015-16 w.e.f. 02.07.2015 onwards, (after one day break on 01.07.2015) or till the vacancies are filled in on regular basis, whichever is earlier. Their Salary be charged/paid against the vacant posts as mentioned against each in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology:

Sr. No.	Name	Post against which salary will be charged/paid
1.	Mr. Nand Kishore, (I.T.)	Technical Officer
2.	Mr. Sandeep Trehan, (M.E.)	Technical Officer
3.	Ms. Seema, (Biotechnology)	Workshop Instructor
4.	Mr. Lokesh, (C.S.E.)	Senior Workshop Superintendent
5.	Ms. Sunaina Gulati, (C.S.E.)	Deputy Librarian

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Dr. Kajal Chawla as Part-Time Pediatrician (on contract basis) in the B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. for two hours per day from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. from Monday to Friday or as per requirement of the Institute of Health, on fixed emoluments of Rs.20,000/- p.m. (consolidated), initially for the

period of six months (i.e. w.e.f. the date she joins duty) and further extendable up to two years after giving one day break after every six months upon satisfactory performance as notified by the CMO vide No.246-249/HC dated 26.05.2015, with the following stipulation:

“That the above appointment is being made purely on contract basis and for the period as mentioned above. It is understood that the incumbent will have no claim whatsoever for regular appointment after expiry of term of contractual appointment and her appointment shall be terminated without any notice. Her contract appointment shall come to an end automatically on completion of term contract of appointment as stated above.”

(xvii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following qualifications for the post of ‘Operation Theatre Assistant’ in the pay-scale of 5910-20200+GP 2000, at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., as prescribed by the Punjab Govt. (Department of Health & Family Welfare) vide Notification dated 11.06.2007 **(Appendix-LVII)**:

- (i) Should have passed the Senior Secondary Part-II Examination with Science from a recognized University or Institution; and
- (ii) Should possess a Diploma in Operation Theatre Technique from a recognized University or Institution.

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has approved the rate for Checking Assistant/Decoding without OMR answer book in the Re-evaluation Branch from Rs.1/- to Rs.1.25/- per answer-book. Information contained in office note (Appendix-_) was taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to enhance the revised rates of Checking/Decoding of (OMR) answer book from Rs.1.75/- to Rs.2/- per answer book from the current session i.e. April, 2014 vide Para 45(vii) of Syndicate meeting dated 18.05.2014.

2. The observation of the audit is as under:

“Admit under objection for want of approval of BOF/Syndicate and Senate in view of urgency”

3. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-LVIII)**.

Routine and formal matters

53. The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(xxi)** on the agenda was read out, viz. -

(i) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor Harmeet Singh Sandhu of P.U.R.C., Ludhiana, as Honorary Director of P.U.R.C., Ludhiana, for a period of three years, with immediate effect.

NOTE: Dr. Harmeet Singh Sandhu has joined as Honorary Director, PURC, Ludhiana on 10 June 2015. Letter No.RCL/MBA/ADE-7/688 dated 10.06.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-LIX**).

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, as per authorization given by the Syndicate dated 26.04.2014 (Para 31), has approved the minutes dated 15.05.2015 (as per **Appendix-LX**) of the Travel Subsidy Committee as well as the case of Dr. R.K. Gupta, USOL and Dr. Parshant Kumar, UIHTM approved by circulation from all the members who attended the meeting on 15.05.2015 except from Dr. I.S. Chadha as he is out of country for two months (as per **Appendix-LX**), for the grant of Travel Subsidy for attending International Conferences outside India by the faculty member out of the UGC 12th Plan grant under General Development Assistance Scheme under the budget head Travel Grant.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.04.2014 vide Para 31 has resolved that:

- (i) the recommendations of the Travel Subsidy Committee dated 03.03.2014, as per Appendix be approved.
- (ii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to sanction Travel Subsidy to the teachers, on behalf of the Syndicate. Thereafter, item be brought to the Syndicate for information.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor has allowed the extension in term of appointment of the following Assistant Professors (already working on temporary basis) at P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur up to 30.05.2015:

Sr. No.	Name	Branch/Subject
1.	Shri Kanwalpreet Singh	CSE
2.	Ms. Sukhpreet Kaur	CSE
3.	Ms. Shama Pathania	CSE
4.	Ms. Monika	ECE
5.	Shri Anish Sharma	ECE
6.	Ms. Harman Preet Kaur	ECE
7.	Shri Gurbinder Singh	I.T.
8.	Ms. Divya Sharma	I.T.

9.	Ms. Ritika Arora	I.T.
10.	Ms. Tanvi Sharma	I.T.
11.	Shri Ajay Kumar Saini	Mech.
12.	Shri Gurwinder Singh	Mech.
13.	Shri Ramandeep Singh	Mech.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, has extended the term of appointment of Dr. Vishal Agrawal as Assistant Professor on temporary basis, Department of Biochemistry, to work as such up to 31.05.2015, with one day break as usual in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, has extended the term of appointment of the following persons as Assistant Professors (already working on temporary basis), Department of Biotechnology, to work as such up to 30.06.2015, with one day break as usual in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

1. Dr. Monika Sharma
2. Dr. Baljinder Singh Gill

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed the following as Assistant Professors at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Panjab University, Chandigarh, purely on temporary basis for the Academic Session 2014-15 or till the regular posts are filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the Grade of Rs.15600-39100+GP of Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible under the University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007:

Sr. No.	Name/Designation
1.	Dr. Sunint Singh Assistant Professor in Prosthodontics
2.	Dr. Neha Bansal Assistant Professor in Oral Medicine & Radiology

NOTE: 1. The competent authority could assign teaching duties to him/her in the same subject in other teaching departments of the University in order to utilize his/her subject expertise/specialization and to meet the needs of the allied departments at a given point of time, within the limits of the workload as prescribed in the U.G.C. norms.

2. The copy of appointment letters were issued vide No.552 and 547 dated 20.01.2015, respectively and letter No.2557-58/Estt. dated 26.03.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-LXI**).

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, has approved the appointment of the following as Assistant Professors, on Contract basis, as a special case as per decision of the Syndicate dated 09.08.2010 (Para 5), against the vacant posts till the end of ongoing academic session/semester i.e. start of summer vacations of 2015 or till the posts are filled in, whichever is earlier, at a fixed salary of Rs.30400/-:

No.	Name of the Candidate	Subject	College
1.	Ms. Simranjeet Kaur D/o Sh. Jagtar Singh	Computer Science	PUCC, Nihal Singhwala, Moga
2.	Ms. Shaffy Girdhar D/o Sh. Satish Kumar	Computer Science	PUCC, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib
3.	Sh. Varun Maini S/o Sh. Bhagwan Dass Maini	Computer Science	PUCC, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur
4.	Sh. Pawan Kumar S/o Sh. Om Parkash	Computer Science	PUCC, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur

- NOTE:**
1. Syndicate in its meeting dated 09.08.2010 (Para 5) (**Appendix-LXII**) has resolved that the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to make contractual appointments of Assistant Professors on a consolidated salary of Rs.25800/- (fixed) per mensem against sanctioned posts in the subjects where regular appointment is not immediately possible due to non-availability of NET qualified persons, till the posts are filled up on regular basis.
 2. Syndicate in its meeting dated 29.08.2011 (Para 11) (**Appendix-LXII**) has resolved that as per letter No.28/54-IH(7)-2011/5226 dated 22.03.2011 received from Chandigarh Administration, Department of Personnel, Chandigarh, the salary of contractual faculty be enhanced from Rs.25,800/- to Rs.30,400.

(viii) The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed Dr. Abha Sethi, Ms Shafali and Shri Harvinder Singh as Assistant Professors (Temporary) at University Institute of Legal Studies (UILS) P.U., for the next academic session 2015-16 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 allowances w.e.f. the date they join as such on the same terms and conditions after summer vacation of 2015, when the department re-opens, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Cal., Vol.-I, 2005.

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor has re-appointed Dr. Richa Rastogi Thakur and Dr. Sunil Kumar Arora as Assistant Professor (Temporary) Centre for Nano Science & Nano Technology, w.e.f. the date they start to work but not before 06.07.2015 (as summer vacation will end on 05.07.2015) purely on temporary basis, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, for the next academic session 2015-16, or till the regular posts are filled in through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at pages 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(x) The Vice-Chancellor has acceded to the requests dated 01.12.2014 (**Appendix-LXIII**) of Ms. Sunaina and Ms. Ritu Salaria, Assistant Professors (Part-Time), Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, that their resignations be accepted w.e.f. 01.12.2014 (A.N.).

NOTE: A copy of office order No.180/ Estt.-I dated 06.01.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-LXIII**).

(xi) To note D.O. No.2-2/2015-U.II dated 11.06.2015 (**Appendix-LXIV**) of Joint Secretary (HE), Ministry of Human Resources Development, Department of Higher Education, Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi-110115 with regard to overpayment of interest of Rs.4.49 crore to the GPF/CPF subscribers of the Panjab University, Chandigarh.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.05.2015 (Para 14) (**Appendix-LXIV**) has resolved that a reply be given to the Government of India that after due consideration, the Syndicate reiterated the submissions already made by the University in the above referred letter dated 26.3.2015 and resolved that the following request be submitted to the Government:

1. that the Syndicate had approved the rate of Interest to the subscribers of the University Provident Fund, on the basis of the interest earned on the investments of Provident Fund itself, in pursuance of Regulation 14.9 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 and it involves no loss to the Government exchequer.
2. that the Government may ratify the rate of Interest already allowed in the past as one-time exception. However, in future, i.e., from 2015-16 onwards, the University shall adhere to

the rate of interest to be notified by the Government from time to time.

(xii) To note letter No.16-1/2008 dated 29.05.2015 (**Appendix-LXV**) of the Under Secretary, University Grant Commission, New Delhi, with regard to introduction of Hindi in all the undergraduate classes as a major subject.

(xiii) Since, the interim orders dated 28.05.2015 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and Another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP Nos.(9107 of 2015, 9830 of 2015 and 9152 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 10.07.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the following faculty members, be allowed to continue till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it:

Sr. No.	Name of faculty member	Department/s
1.	Dr. Ranbir Kaur, Professor	Law
2.	Dr. R.K. Gupta Professor of Commerce	University School of Open Learning
3.	Dr. Ashwani Sharma Associate Professor	Community Education and Disability Studies
4.	Dr. Ravi Kant Mahajan Professor of Statistics	University School of Open Learning

(xiv) Since, the interim orders dated 30.06.2014 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and Another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP (6395 of 2015) was adjourned to 11.05.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the following faculty members, be allowed to continue till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it. The retiral benefits already sanctioned to them has been kept pending for the time being till the Court case/s is/are finalized:

Sr. No.	Name	Department
1.	Professor Raghbir Singh	VVBIS & IS, P.U. Hoshiarpur
2.	Professor Uma Shanker Shivhare	Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar Institute of Chemical Engineering, P.U.
3.	Professor D.K. Dhawan	Department of Biophysics

(xv) Since, the interim orders dated 30.06.2014 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and Another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP Nos.(6395 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 11.05.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. (Mrs.) Vijay Lakshmi Sharma, Professor, Department of Zoology, P.U., be allowed to continue till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it. The retiral benefits already sanctioned to the above faculty member has been kept pending for the time being till the Court case/s is/are finalized.

(xvi) The Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned the following terminal benefits (along with other benefits as mentioned in the Succession Certificate) in respect of Late Dr. Balkar Singh, Associate Professor in Punjabi, P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, who expired on 18.09.2012, while in service, to his nominees (mentioned in the Succession Certificate) in equal shares i.e. (1) Dr. Gurbans Kaur, Widow of Late Dr. Balkar Singh, and (2) (Ms.) Amitoj, (Minor), Daughter of Late Dr. Balkar Singh through her natural Guardian mother Dr. Gurbans Kaur, R/o House No.38, Green Avenue, Bathinda, Tehsil and District Bathinda:

1. Gratuity (in the event of death while in service): Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
2. Ex-gratia grant: Rule 1.1 at 133 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2005.
3. Earned Leave encashment: In terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013, the payment of leave encashment will be made only for the number of days, Earned leave as due to him but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

(xvii) 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.	Shri Rajinder Singh Assistant Registrar/ S.O to V.C. Vice-Chancellor's Office	25.10.1976	30.06.2015	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Sushma Kumari Superintendent Re-evaluation Branch	09.12.1975	30.06.2015	
3.	Shri Jagan Nath Dhiman Senior Scientific Officer (Cartographer), USOL	28.07.1977	31.07.2015	
4.	Ms. Sneha Lata Assistant Registrar Department of Community Education & Disability Studies	30.10.1982	31.07.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
5.	Ms. Raj Rani Superintendent Accounts Branch (Fee-Checking)	17.03.1986	30.06.2015	
6.	Shri Raj Kumar Gupta Assistant Camera Operator P.U. Press	20.05.1981	31.08.2015	
7.	Shri Mangat Ram Attendant DSW office	01.06.1972	31.08.2015	
8.	Shri Birju Parshad Painter (Technician G-I) P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	30.06.2015	
9.	Shri Jaswant Singh Security Guard Girls Hostel No.3, P.U.	12.06.1991	31.07.2015	
10.	Shri Mahajan Helper P.U. Construction Office	02.02.1972	31.07.2015	
11.	Shri Bijay Paul Mali P.U. Extension Library Ludhiana	01.09.1971	30.06.2015	
12.	Shri Ram Lakhan Mali P.U. Construction Office	08.05.1991	31.08.2015	
13.	Ms. Veena Rani Clerk R&S Branch	05.01.2015	31.05.2015	

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(xviii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned terminal benefits to the members of the family 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 Shobh Nath Mali P.U. Construction Office	08.05.1991	11.12.2014	Smt. Tara (Daughter)	Gratuity and Ex-gratia grant as admissible under the University Regulations and Rules.
2.	Late Shri Balwinder Kumar Cleaner P.U. Construction Office	05.08.1986	09.12.2014	Smt. Neeru Devi (Wife)	
3.	Late Shri Udai Raj Yadav Frash U.S.O.L., P.U.	09.09.1977	21.04.2013	Shri Vijay Kumar Yadav (Son)	

NOTE: The above is being reported to the Syndicate in terms of its decision dated 16.3.1991 (Para 16).

(xix) To note the clarification issued vide D.O.No.F.10-6/2011(PS) Misc. dated 06.07.2015 (**Appendix-LXVI**) by the Secretary, University Grant Commission (UGC), New Delhi, with regard to hiring the services of the Supervisors for awarding the M.Phil./Ph.D. degree.

(xx) The Vice-Chancellor has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-LXVII**) between Centre for Nanoscience and Nanotechnology, Panjab University, Chandigarh and Institute of Nano Science and Technology (INST), Mohali.

(xxi) As per authorization given by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.01.2015 (Para 9) (**Appendix-LXVIII**), the Vice-Chancellor has approved the honorarium, including transportation charges to be paid to the following as mentioned against each:

1. DUI : Rs.5000/- p.m.
2. Dean Research : Rs.4000/- p.m.
3. DSW (Men & Women) : Rs.3500/- p.m.
4. Dean International Students: Rs.3000/- p.m.
5. Dean Alumni Relations : Rs.3000/- p.m.
6. Wardens : Rs.2500/- p.m.
7. Advisor & Secretary to Vice-Chancellor : Rs.3000/- p.m.
8. NSS Programme Coordinator : Rs.2500/- p.m.
9. Chief of University Security : Rs.2500/- p.m.

NOTE: A copy of office order No.3287-99 dated 17.04.2015 and No.11583 dated 02.06.2015, respectively, issued by A.R. (Estt.) enclosed (**Appendix-LXVIII**).

The Vice-Chancellor stated that there is a circular from the UGC, which arrived a few days ago and was put to him. In the circular, it has been suggested that wherever the English is being taught, the students should also be given the choice of opting for the Hindi.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that it is not choice based, but mandatory for providing facilities for opting the subject of Hindi by the students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the above said letter has been included in Item-I (xii). Anyhow, it should not have been included in the items for information, but it has gone to the information.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been mentioned in the letter of the UGC itself that as per the orders of the UGC teaching of English at the Undergraduate level is mandatory. However, the choices of subjects are being given such a manner that the study of both Hindi and English is not permissible. Hindi should also be taught in the courses at the Undergraduate level.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it meant that if certain students opted for the subject of Hindi, they have to provide teachers for them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the existing subject combination, one could not opt for both English and Hindi, but the UGC says that choice should be given to the students to opt for both these subjects. Meaning thereby, they have to modify/amend their subject combinations in such a manner that the students could opt for both English and Hindi.

Professor A.K. Bhandari suggested that this issue should be referred to the Faculties for consideration and appropriate decision.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the information contained in **Item-I(i) to I(xxi)** on the agenda, be noted.

After decisions on the agenda items were taken, the members started general discussion.

- (1) Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that from the representation given by the non-teaching employees, it has come to their notice that the posts of Deputy Registrars were advertised in the year 2011 and a corrigendum was given in 2013. Now, interview for filling up those posts is being conducted. The process has been continued for the last four years and he did not know up to when their validity has been extended. So far as his legal knowledge goes, he did not think the Syndicate and Senate could have given four year extension for filling up these posts. He pleaded that since the advertised

qualifications were changed/amended and later on a corrigendum given, the interview should be cancelled. Secondly, the qualifications which were recommended/approved by the Committee, have been amended later, for the time being the interview should not be conducted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, according to him, additional seats should be given case to case on merit basis, instead of with one stroke that five additional seats per course be given. If a College applied for additional seats, but according to them with the grant of additional seats to it, the seats of nearby College would not be filled up, which has applied, should not be granted additional seats.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would have it legally checked up.

Referring to interviews for Deputy Registrar, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that the Syndicate is also taking it from legal point of view. So don't think that everything is being done illegally. The posts of Deputy Registrars were advertised in 2013 and thereafter, though the item did not come to the Syndicate, issue was raised by him in the Syndicate meeting dated 27th January 2013 and it was stated that the qualifications advertised in the recently given advertisement for the post of Deputy Registrar are vague, so these should be modified with a view to clarify, and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to give a corrigendum. Probably, just after two three days, a corrigendum was issued not clearing the vagueness, but changing the qualifications, which did not come to the Syndicate till date. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to verify it instead of getting the same legally examined. He (Vice-Chancellor) would know that these qualifications have not been approved by the Syndicate, and these had been done by the then Registrar and the same might have been got approved from the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would have the facts checked up, but at the moment, they should permit him to check the facts and he would not do anything illegal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if whatever he has told proved to be right, what would he (Vice-Chancellor) do?

The Vice-Chancellor said that he does not want to respond to this at the moment. All he could say is that he would not do anything illegal.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the same argument was given when the qualifications for the post of Chief Vigilance Officer were discussed in the Syndicate, and the same were not approved by the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at that time the Vice-Chancellor had said that he would ensure that, in future, firstly the qualifications would be got approved from the Syndicate and thereafter, the posts concerned would be advertised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, he would not respond, but could only ensure that he would not do anything illegal.

Shri Ashok Goyal proposed that in case the advertised qualifications for the posts of Deputy Registrars have not been approved by the Syndicate, the given advertisement should not be acted upon and no interview on the basis of that should be conducted.

Few members seconded the proposal made by Shri Ashok Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not permitting them to move a resolution on this issue at the stage, until he has all the facts with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has come to their notice and they have been given a memorandum. He (Vice-Chancellor) might or might not permit, but they have every right to introduce a subject.

The Vice-Chancellor reiterated that he is not permitting them to move a resolution on this issue at this stage, until he has all the facts with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then he (Vice-Chancellor) should check it up.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that until all the facts are with him (Vice-Chancellor), he should not proceed with the selections and till then *status quo* be maintained. All the facts relating to these selections should be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if the matter is already delayed for so many years, there is no harm to wait for some more time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has to get the appointments approved from this very Syndicate, how could he do things, which are illegal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not want to stretch that far. He wanted that an enquiry should be ordered as to how an advertisement has been issued without getting the qualifications for the posts of the Deputy Registrar approved from the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could pass a resolution, if wished, but at the moment since he did not have all the facts, he could not respond.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not asking him (Vice-Chancellor) for any response.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they are the Government of the University, they could pass any resolution,

but it is not a good practice to do such things just as a matter of surprise.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not a matter of surprise as a copy of the memorandum has also been given to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that though a copy of the memorandum has been given to him, but he did not have time to go through the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, in fact, the memorandum has been delivered in the office of the Vice-Chancellor on 16th July 2015.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the memorandum might have been delivered in his office earlier, but he has got the same only today when he arrived for the Syndicate meeting. He has not got the facts checked up and they should permit him to get the facts checked, and he would respond to them after checking the facts. All he could say as a Vice-Chancellor of this University is that he would not do anything illegal. However, if they wanted to pass a resolution of instituting an enquiry or anything else, they could go ahead, but this is no way of forcing a decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that on the one side, he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying that they are the Government of the University and could do anything and on the other side, he is saying that they are forcing a decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could then do it as they wished.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then the members are saying that it is passed, so it is passed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that okay, it is fine, but before that happens let him ask the members their viewpoints one by one. He then first asked Shri Jarnail Singh, some members tried to intervene but Shri Jarnail Singh desired to continue with his articulation, and the Vice-Chancellor asked the members to let Shri Jarnail Singh speak.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there is no harm if they could wait for one month more as the matter has already been delayed for more than two and a half years. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to check the facts and place the matter before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor responded by stating he would have the facts checked and he would get back to them with those facts before the interviews.

This was agreed to by all the members.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to indulge in an argument with them as he is one and they are sixteen and it is difficult for one to argue with sixteen.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 19th July 2015

Professor Karamjeet Singh pointed out that in the April meeting of the Syndicate a decision was taken in the case of Mrs. Arun Prabha, Deputy Librarian, and when he raised the issue in the Syndicate meeting dated 31st May 2015, the Vice-Chancellor has asked him to remind him. He reminded the Vice-Chancellor and he (Vice-Chancellor) passed the orders on 7th June, but the file is still pending in the office of the Registrar. He urged the Vice-Chancellor to get the same expedited.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR