

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Monday, 20<sup>th</sup> April 2015 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### PRESENT

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

Shri Jarnail Singh, Shri Sandeep Hans, Director, Higher Education U.T. Chandigarh and Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

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

1. The Vice-Chancellor said, "I feel immense pleasure in informing the honourable members of the Syndicate that –

- (1) Shri Satya Pal Jain, Fellow, Panjab University, has been appointed as Additional Solicitor General of India for a period of three years by the President of India.
- (2) Dr. Anil Kumar, Professor of Pharmacology in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has been selected for the ICMR Award for the Scientists belonging to underprivileged communities in the recognition of his research contribution for Biomedical Research work entitled 'Neuropharmacological Investigations on various Neuroprotective Mechanisms for Age and Related Problems'. This award carries a cash prize of Rs.20,000/- and Certificate of Honour.
- (3) Ms Ranjana Bhandari, ICMR-Senior Research Fellow, pursuing doctoral research work at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has been selected for a very prestigious fully funded international 'KIKEN-BSI Summer Internship Programme 2015' on the theme "Sculpting Neural Circuits and Behaviour" at Mental Biology Laboratory, RIKEN, Brain Science Institute, Japan from June 10 to August 05, 2015."

Principal Gurdip Sharma suggested that the felicitations of the Syndicate members should be recorded for three-year extension to the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. Sanjeev Arora endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Principal Gurdip Sharma.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the extension in the term of the Vice-Chancellor should also be a part of the Vice-Chancellor's Statement.

Principal Parveen Chawla suggested that it should be recorded that the Syndicate felicitated the Vice-Chancellor for getting extension for a period of another three years.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the Syndicate welcomed the extension given to the Vice-Chancellor for another three years. They all are grateful to the Chancellor who has been very kind in granting extension to the person, who has served this University actively during the previous three years.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he also wanted to join Shri Chatrath in extending his heart-felt happiness for extension of three years to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked the Syndicate and said that he would try his best.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Shri Satya Pal Jain, Fellow, Panjab University, on his having been appointed as Additional Solicitor General of India for a period of three years by the President of India;
  - (ii) Dr. Anil Kumar, Professor of Pharmacology in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on his having been selected for the ICMR Award for the Scientists belonging to underprivileged communities in the recognition of his research contribution for Biomedical Research work entitled 'Neuropharmacological Investigations on various Neuroprotective Mechanisms for Age and Related Problems'; and.
  - (iii) Ms Ranjana Bhandari, ICMR-Senior Research Fellow, pursuing doctoral research work at University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on her having been selected for a very prestigious fully funded international 'KIKEN-BSI Summer Internship Programme 2015' on the theme "Sculpting Neural Circuits and Behaviour" at Mental Biology Laboratory, RIKEN, Brain

Science Institute, Japan from June 10 to August 05, 2015.

- (2) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 25.01.2015, as per **(Appendix-I)**, be noted.

**Items C-2(i) and C-2 (ii) on the agenda were taken up for consideration together.**

**Appointment of Chief  
Vigilance Officer**

**2(i).** Considered minutes dated 30.03.2015 **(Appendix-II)** of the Selection Committee for appointment of Chief Vigilance Officer (Advt. No.3/2014) in Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**Appointment of Chief  
of University Security**

**2(ii).** Considered minutes dated 07.04.2015 **(Appendix-III)** of the Selection Committee for appointment of Chief of University Security in Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Initiating discussion, Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that he just wanted to know the functions and duties of the Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO). As such, they must be very clear that what are the functions and duties of the CVO and they should analyze the cost for the paraphernalia structure for the office of the CVO. He further wanted to know how far it would be beneficial for the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that if they re-call that the interview for the post of CVO had been fixed in August 2014 just three days after the Syndicate meeting held in August 2014. In that meeting, it was discussed in detail and divergent view has been emerged whether they need full time CVO. At that time as an unanimous decision, it was resolved that interview be postponed and a Committee consisting members of the Syndicate was constituted under the Chairmanship of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath and both the Directors of Higher Education, Punjab and Chandigarh, Professor A.K. Bhandari, Dean of University Instruction and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) were the members of that Committee. He wished that he was wrong, but to his knowledge, no meeting of such Committee had taken place and if the same had taken place, may be, he was not able to attend that meeting, but probably, he had not received any notice for such a meeting. At that time, full Syndicate was of the considered view that it needed to be re-looked into whether they need a full time CVO or not. According to him, if the meeting of that Committee could not take place and they approve the appointment of the CVO in this manner, it would be disrespect to the decision of the Syndicate taken in August 2014. If the meeting of the Committee took place, he would be happy if minutes of the meeting be supplied to him. Secondly, he wanted to point out that the interviews for the posts of CVO and CUS were conducted by the University. As far as his memory goes, for all non-teaching posts including for the post of Registrar, the interviews were not conducted as per the Syndicate decision taken in 1998-99. As per that decision, one member of the Syndicate has to be included in the Selection Committee/s. Earlier, two members of the Syndicate and Senate used to be there for the Selection of teachers only. After the U.G.C. notified the constitution of Selection Committees, it was ceased for the Selection Committees for the interviews of teachers, but there is no such case as far as appointment/s of non-teaching employees is concerned. He found that in both the Selection Committees, there is no member of the Syndicate on the Selection Committees. He did not

know when this decision was taken. If such decision was not taken then wherefrom the idea had come to revise the decision of 1998-99 and no member of the Syndicate was put on the Selection Committee/s of non-teaching employees. If that decision of 1998-99 was not revised, then it is not proper that the Syndicate/Senate members are being ignored from the Selection Committees for the non-teaching employees. He would be happy if the Vice-Chancellor could guide him on these issues. One man applied for the post of Chief Security Officer, who alleged that he did not get the call letter in time. While the claim of the office is that they had sent the same to him well in time. According to him, the office must be right, but it is their duty to satisfy themselves and also to satisfy the aggrieved person. Now, he (the person applied for the post of CSO) said that the letter which was sent to him through Speed Post has not reached to his society or home. He met the Hon'ble Registrar and produced some documents as evidence, he might be correct or not, but one thing which he claimed, if he is right, raised a serious doubt for the purpose of calling him for Medical Examination for which the University has sent him SMS and e-mail, but as far as the interview call letter is concerned, the same has not been intimated to him through SMS or e-mail. According to him, this also needed to be verified. But whatever mode, the University had adopted for medical examination; the same should also be adopted for interview. Because on the surface of it, it seemed that the man who had applied for the post, if he has received the invitation, there could not be any possibility that he could not appear for the interview. So these three aspects should be noted. There is nothing wrong in the recommendation of the Selection Committee as far as the CUS post is concerned. But they have to see/ensure that they did not go wrong as far as procedural parts are concerned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that as far as the post of CVO is concerned, it is very much required, during the last few days, there were attacks on the office of the Dean of Student Welfare, Wardens and Vice-Chancellor without any specific complaint about it. If this kind of office is there and if somebody is doing his duty faithfully and still accused, at least that person/s is/are saved and there is clear-cut position and everything could be easily verified from the record. As far as Chief of University Security is concerned, because he is a person who says that he is aggrieved and giving representation to the University that he had not received the interview letter well in time. He (Prof. Goyal) clearly saw that the interview letter was dispatched to him on 13.3.2015 and the interview scheduled for 25.3.2015. If there was any delay on the part of the Postal Service, the University could not be blamed.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it should be clarified whether invitation for interview was sent to him through e-mail as well as through SMS as was done in sending the information to the candidates through e-mail and SMS for medical examinations.

It was clarified that in both the cases the intimation was sent through e-mail also and he (the applicant) admitted that he couldn't find time to open his e-mail for fifteen days and was not able to see the same.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what about the SMS to him.

The Vice-Chancellor added that the candidate has also stated that he could not access his e-mail, presumably as he was probably away and he could not use even his phone for SMS for a fortnight. There was nothing wrong as far as office is concerned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it meant that he was satisfied.

It was clarified that when the representation was submitted by him, it was assured that the same would be examined and feedback would be given to him. Thereafter he did not turn back. On examining, the facts/position did not change.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it meant, the University had sent him interview letter through Speed Post as well as through e-mail and SMS.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the office produced the record and by virtue of that record, a letter was sent to him on 27<sup>th</sup> and the postal department attempted to deliver the same at his house on 28<sup>th</sup> for the first time and it was attempted by them to deliver at his house a few days later thereafter. On both the occasions he was not at his residence, he was away where he could not access his e-mail as well as phone. By the time, the date of interview was over. There is no attempt as far as the office is concerned to prevent him from appearing for the interview.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whatever University could do, University did. University could not be held responsible if letter did not reach him. If University had sent SMS to him and the same was not accessed by him, University could not be held responsible. If University had sent an e-mail and the same was not opened by him, University could also not be blamed. Similarly, delay on the part of the postal service is concerned, University could not be blamed. What he was saying that only from the University point of view, they must ensure that whatever was needed to be done at that time by the University, the University had done. The file containing all documents including e-mail from the candidate was made available to the Syndicate members during the meeting.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that earlier the Courts used to take notice of the postal delay. Thereafter, the Courts found that some manipulation is possible to take place. Now the courts are of the clear view that they are not responsible for the postal delay if somebody could not get any letter due to postal delay and no benefit is given in such cases. This is the latest position.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it had to be explained by the office as he had never seen any such situation where any letter, which has been sent through registered post or speed post, returned undelivered. He enquired whether envelope of such a (returned) letter is to be opened. If something had returned undelivered, they have to keep that envelope in a file in sealed manner and they could not open it. For what purpose the envelope was opened and the letter was taken out. To give evidence, University could produce the envelope in question, now the envelope was opened and what was the guarantee that what was contained in it. That is why if anything comes undelivered, the envelope was kept as it is as evidence that this is what the University has sent. So if somebody challenged it tomorrow in the Court, the same could be opened there and shown that this is

the letter they have sent. But here in the file, the envelope is annexed separately and the call letter for interview is annexed separately and nothing is contained in the envelope. When the Postman went to his residence to deliver the letter on 28<sup>th</sup>, he had written nothing on it. But on 30<sup>th</sup>, the Postman had noted that the house was locked. It is on 6<sup>th</sup> April that it had been probably received undelivered by the University or the post office. The University officials might correct him if he was wrong. The University seemed to have received it on 9<sup>th</sup> April whereas the envelope says 6<sup>th</sup> April. He did not know whose signatures are these on the envelope received in the office unclaimed. From where it has established that it was received in the University on 9<sup>th</sup> April whereas the interview was conducted on 7<sup>th</sup> April. That was why, he was saying that these are very sensitive days as the letter has taken back undelivered by the Post Office on 6<sup>th</sup> April and why it was not received by the University office on 6<sup>th</sup> itself, 7<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> April. He had already said that he is not against the selection. He was of the view that the University should be very strong as far as procedural part is concerned. Since the man has raised objection, whatever had been done by the postal service, the University could not be held responsible. But whatever the duty of the University, they should vouch for it. The University should also put on record so that if tomorrow something is legally examined and they could be able to say why the envelope was opened, which was received undelivered in the University office.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that if there were stamps of the postal authority on the envelope, then there is no harm in opening the envelope.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as far as University is concerned, interview letters were sent to all the candidates through Registered Post/Speed Post and e-mail. The candidate who has made representation admitted himself that he had not opened his e-mail. This is the sufficient evidence as far as evidence is concerned. He did not want to pursue the matter, as they are discussing here only the recommendation of the Selection Committee and they should discuss only that. As far as opening of undelivered letters are concerned, in future it would be taken care of.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they must be satisfied that they the University had dispatched interview letters to the concerned persons in time. It is not the responsibility of the University whether somebody received it or not, returned or not returned, opened or not opened. If the University dispatched him the call letter in time, it is sufficient.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that interview letter was sent to him through e-mail.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the University sent him interview letter through e-mail and SMS also, then they are practically on the strong footing. But, in future, it must be ensured that no undelivered letter could be opened.

A din prevailed.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the only concern of the University with the person is that the person, applied and the University had called him/her for interview. There is no other relation

of the University with him. If the University had sent call letter to him/her, whether it is received or not, envelope opened or not, it is sufficient on the part of the University as per law.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired, why the undelivered envelope was opened?

Professor Karamjeet Singh observed that the Chief Vigilance Officer should not be appointed merely to counter the allegations, as the allegations would be there as a part of the system. His main concern is that whether full time CVO is there or not as none of the University around them has appointed CVO. The University is going to appoint CVO in the Pay Band of Rs.37400-67000 + GP Rs.8900/- plus allowance admissible under the University rules. He is being appointed in the Pay Band of Professor and only AGP is less than Professor. He was of the view that there would be an expenditure of approximately Rs.70 lac to 1 crore annually for the establishment of CVO's Office. There was no sanctioned post of CVO and that was why one post has to be transferred from one Department. He was of the view that, first of all, the University should examine the duties of CVO and also made cost benefit analysis before issuance of appointment letter to him.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to see the Advertisement for the post of CVO.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the position of CVO was passed by the BOF, placed before Syndicate and Senate and thereafter the post of CVO was advertised. The file was examined as the members had forgotten when the post was sanctioned and cleared by the Syndicate and Senate. The file had been made available to Shri Chatrath ji and the same did not come back to him and now one year's validity of the advertisement was going to expire. Since everything had been done by following the due procedures of the University, it was passed by the Board of Finance and thereafter it was placed before the Syndicate and Senate. This was also examined by the Committee. The Selection Committee also wanted to see whether the University had a sanctioned position of CVO in the Budget or not. All these things were examined thoroughly.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it meant all the things were cleared at different stages.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that, first of all, the post of CVO was passed by the Board of Finance. Thereafter the same was adopted by the Syndicate and Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that one of the members of the Senate, Professor Anil Monga was member of the Selection Committee and he could vouch for it. One of the members of the Selection Committee asked for the file to see whether it has been a sanctioned post in the given period.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he has not been disputing this.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the post of the CVO has been cleared at all the stages. The only concern of Professor Karamjeet Singh is whether it is worth or not as none of the Universities in the

region have the post of CVO. At one point of time, Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Karamjeet Singh were the members of the Committee constituted to implement double entry system in the University. There are so many lacunas/discrepancies in the double entry system.

Similarly, at one point of time, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue of CVO was discussed at length and discrepancies were pointed out. These discrepancies were removed while the post had been cleared by the B.O.F., Syndicate and Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that the interview for the post of CVO had already been taken place. Now, there should not be any question of money involved in it, whether it is 70 lac or 1 crore. He was of the view that they should approve CVO's appointment.

Endorsing the viewpoints expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Yograj Angrish stated that the post of CSO is very much necessary as the University had been giving the charge of this post to someone in the University as an additional charge. The post of the CVO had already been cleared in B.O.F. Two members of the Senate, namely Prof. Anil Monga and Shri I.S. Chadha were the members of the Selection Committees in the two cases. In this way, the internal mechanism has also been followed in the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Panjab University is very unique institution in the Indian Universities. This University is an Inter-State Body Corporate and Panjab University is the only University in the country outside the Central Universities for which the Central Government has said that they would meet the entire deficit of the University. This kind of special status does not exist for any University in the country. When these things were stipulated, Panjab University's deficit was to the tune of Rs.100 crores for first year, which has progressively increased. Last year, the Central Government had given a grant of Rs.176 crore and still Rs.18 crores deficit is still pending with the Central Government and the Central Government had committed to meet this deficit. The deficit of the University is to the tune of Rs.176 crore plus Rs.18 crore, which rounds off to Rs.194 crore. Next year, it would enhance beyond Rs.200 crore. The Panjab University is a special institution within the Indian system and if the Central Government has some stipulation that the Institutions should have the post of CVO, the CVO preferably having an officer on deputation. They would have to work as per the guidelines of the Central Government. As per these guidelines, the Central Universities would have to appoint CVOs, though the Panjab University is not the Central University, but it is Centrally funded University and they would have to appoint CVO as per their guidelines. There is a major Central Government share in the Budget of the University, which is progressively increasing year after year. In that sense, the post of CVO had already been passed in the Board of Finance, where the representatives of the Central Government were present. The Central Government is critically examining the deficit of the University and they demand justification why the deficit is enhancing higher than the rate of inflation.

Shri G.K. Chatrath expressed his opinion that in the first instance, the appointment of CVO should be on one year's probation and if it seems useful, his term would be extended. Secondly, for any type of doubts in the minds of the teachers regarding the appointment of CVO in the University, safeguards could be formed by constituting a Committee by the Vice-Chancellor to look what type of matters have

to be referred to the CVO so that tomorrow it would not become a source of propaganda that third force is put on them. If they appoint the CVO on one year's probation and his services did not prove useful to the University, the University could say him good bye.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that it would not be possible.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that, as per law, the post of CVO is independent. The University could not give directions to the CVO, if the University is able to give him directions, then what is the purpose of appointing CVO in the University.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath clarified that nowhere the post of CVO is independent in any organization. The matter has to be referred to him by the Vice-Chancellor. To stop any type of propaganda, it should be communicated to the teaching community.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not link two different things. There is no linkage between the recommendation of the Selection Committee placed before the House and the concern/discussion. The item is before them for approving the appointment of CVO, so they should restrict to it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that his queries are not still answered by the Vice-Chancellor. His first query is regarding the constitution of the Selection Committee for non-teaching employees. There should be two members of the Syndicate and Senate on such Selection Committee as per the decision of the Syndicate. His second query is regarding the appointment of CVO. The Vice-Chancellor has already clarified that the file of CVO had been given to Shri Chatrath and the post of the CVO had duly been sanctioned by the Board of Finance, Syndicate and Senate and they agreed. In this way, Shri Chatrath could not say that he did not know about it. Could they curtail the rights of the Syndicate and Senate? The Syndicate in its wisdom in August 2014 decided to review the situation for the appointment of CVO in the University. That was why, it had been decided to postpone the interview for the post of CVO at that time. He pointed out that now if Shri Chatrath was satisfied after seeing the file; the other members of the Committee should also be taken into confidence. Secondly, it was also pointed out that there is a procedure for appointing the CVO. For example, he (Shri Goyal) could not appoint CVO for himself. As the Vice-Chancellor has said that the CVO has to report to the CVC, then CVO should be appointed by the CVC. If he has been appointing someone as CVO and how could he expect that he would keep surveillance on him? So, it is not that if the University has to recruit the CVO, the interview and recruitment process would also be done by the University. As the Vice-Chancellor said that the CVO would report to the CVC. That is how, he would report to the CVC. He was not going into those things. This at least amounts to disregard to the decision of the Syndicate taken in 2014. Might be in 2015, he revises his opinion that they need CVO. Might be the same Syndicate on the report of the Committee also revised the need of CVO in the University. He remembered that when Shri Gurdev Singh Ghuman was the Director, Higher Education, Punjab and Shri Sandeep Hans was the Director, Higher Education, Chandigarh, they both were included in that Committee and at that time, Shri Ghuman in his statement said that CVO is must for the University. But at the same time, it was not recorded in the minutes; Shri Ghuman said that the charge of CVO is given in every

department of the Government as an additional charge to the existing officer. Now, they are going to appoint a full time CVO and in that meeting, it was decided that the additional charge of CVO's post could be given to someone from the existing officers of the University. That was why, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatarth proposed in August 2014, understanding the burden of the University, which has already been financially over-burdened, the charge of the CVO could be given to the senior officer, maybe the D.U.I. After that it was unanimously decided to constitute a Committee of the Syndicate on this issue. To say that indirectly meant that in 2014, the Syndicate has no power to take any decision, where the Senate had already taken the decision. If the Committee meeting report is still away, what had prompted the Vice-Chancellor to accept that one year's tenure of the Advertisement was expiring? He was of the view that the term of the advertisement might be extended by the Syndicate as was being done in respect of other Advertisements. So, is it not going over and above that to hell with the decision of the Syndicate and to hell with the recommendations of the Committee, he (Vice-Chancellor) would go ahead with the interview? He has under apprehension and he is right that nobody wanted to put useless and baseless allegations, but just to avoid those allegations, could they afford to take the liability of 50 lac to 1 crore? But it should be ensured that there would be overall transparency in CVO functioning, then there is no question whether it is 50 lac or 1 crore. Keeping in view the financial constraint and financial position of the University if something could be done without spending Rs. 50 lac that should be explored. This is what he wanted to clarify and he is not against the recommendation of the Selection Committee. Agreeing with Shri Chatrath, he suggested that initially the post of the CVO should be filled on trial basis for one year as he is coming here on deputation and if the experiment is successful, then it might be extended to two years or three years.

Professor Ronki Ram said that Shri Ashok Goyal had raised two points, one is of procedural matter and the other is financial matter. As far as procedural matter is concerned, it is very much clear that one member of the Senate is there on the Selection Committee. As far as the appointment of CVO is concerned, it should be initially for one year on trial basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person is being appointed initially for three years on deputation and it is not right to curtail his period of appointment now. The period of one year might be too short for anyone to come, settle and to work. If the person did something harmful to the University, he could be asked to go back even after one year and if he performed his duties well, then his term could be extended up to 2-3 years. The person is not being appointed here on permanent basis and his appointment is for a limited period and if somebody is not performing his duties well, he could be asked to go back. At the moment, if he (Vice-Chancellor) got extension for three years, it is his primary responsibility that the interests of the University should be protected. If somebody is working/doing, which amounts not to serve the University and unnecessarily causing problems to his colleagues, he would be the first one to ask him to go back.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know what are the functions of the CVO?

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the functions of the CVO are well defined. The matters which are vigilance related could be referred

to the CVO. The matters of serious nature and cases of any kind of wrong doings in the University not necessary related to finance, could be referred to the CVO. If he had done anything wrong or anyone else had done anything wrong against the Regulations/Law of the University and law of the land, the matter in such cases could also be referred to the CVO. He could not send anything directly and he needed the help of the Syndicate in doing all such things. In this way, the system of the University is very good in some sense. The Vice-Chancellor has to meet the Governing Body once in a month. Every action of the Vice-Chancellor in terms of making certain references to CVO, there are number of checks and balances and this right is there as per the Calendar. They should not have any apprehension. The post of the CVO is advertised for three years and let them approve it for three years. Similarly, his term is for three years and if CVO is not performing well, he would not allow CVO to continue and not to burden the University. He further said that one of the members of the CVO Selection Committee was a former Vigilance Commissioner. The Central Vigilance Commission comprises three members and one of those members recently retired was a member of the Selection Committee of CVO.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the CVO would be on deputation for a period of three years. There should be mentioned that initially he is being appointed for a period of one year, which would be extendable from year to year basis.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would not be proper to change the terms of his appointment at this stage.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had seen one former Central Vigilance Commissioner was in the selection panel but he wanted to say that what was discussed in the Syndicate meeting of August, 2014 unless and until they know what are the functions of the CVC in the context of the functioning of the University, how could they approve it.

The Vice-Chancellor read out the terms of advertisement for CVO post which clearly defined the purpose and duties of CVO. The Chief Vigilance Officer is to advise the Vice-Chancellor on Vigilance Complaints concerning University Officers, staff & teachers and to ensure probity and integrity in Public Administration with the objects, i.e., to get expedited the disposal of cases under investigation with the CBI/Courts; to activate the vigilance machinery in the University for investigating complaints; to sensitize the University Community against corruption and corrupt practices; to strengthen preventive vigilance by streamlining procedures; and to prevent the possibilities of corruption and encourage a culture of honesty and integrity. He clarified that at this stage, changes in the terms of the advertisement for CVO would send a wrong signal/message.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that let they not change the terms of the advertisement. When the appointment letter would be issued, in that they could say that University is at liberty to curtail the deputation period by giving three months notice or the appointee can also leave it by giving three months notice. It will not amount to any type of tempering.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let the matter be examined. This is okay with him. His primary responsibility is to serve people so that they could feel a sense of security and not have any apprehension.

After some more discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That -

- (1) Shri Sanjay Sood, be appointed as Chief Vigilance Officer, on deputation basis, for a period of three years which is extendable up to a further period of 2 years (total 5 years) in Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the Grade of Rs.37400-67000 +GP Rs.890/- plus allowances admissible under the University rules, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University; and
- (2) it be mentioned in the appointment letter that the University is at liberty to curtail the deputation period by giving three months notice or the appointee could leave the University service by giving three months' notice.

**NOTE:** A summary bio-data of the selected candidate enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidate fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That -

- (1) Shri Dhiraj Goswami, be appointed Chief of University Security, Panjab University, Chandigarh, in the Grade of Rs.15600-39100 + GP Rs.6600/- plus conveyance allowance @ Rs.750/- p.m., on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
- (2) Shri Kuldip Singh, be placed on the Waiting list.

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

**NOTE:** A summary bio-data of the selected candidate and wait-listed candidates are enclosed. It had been certified that the selected and wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

**Re-Advertisement of the 2(iii). Post** Considered minutes dated 15.04.2015 of the Selection Committee for appointment of Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon Professor of Law (Advt. No.4/2014) in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he just wished to share a concern with the members of the Syndicate as the Chairman of the Selection Committee for this specific post. There are some Professorships in our University which carry the names of very eminent people, such as, Mulk Raj Anand Chair, K.L. Sehgal Chair, etc., the Selection Committee members for such chaired positions become conscious that they have to select someone who is a very special Professor, having such a tag. One of the members of the Selection Committee suggested that whenever they advertise such positions, the existing Professors in the University should also be permitted to apply for these posts. He thought that the said person had a merit in his argument. Though it is not a matter for consideration today, but he would get back to the Syndicate at some stage, to device a policy to advertise Professors with a special tag. There should be some difference in the two advertisements. The posts of Professors and Professors with such tags should have different kind of demands/requirements, and if anyone out of the existing Professors selected against such tagged posts, there should be a provision of some incentive for him/her and such a tag should be provided to him/her for a period of five years.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that being a researcher, the Vice-Chancellor could appreciate this fact and what are the differences between the post of special Professor and normal Professor. But, in fact, what has happened in this University, unfortunately, to add honour to the post of a particular Professor, some name has been given without any specialization or without any specific requirement from the incumbent. Similar is the position of Professor Gurdial Singh Dhillon Chair as nothing specific is required from the person to be appointed against this Chair. Similar is the position of Guru Nanak Chair, Kabir Chair, etc. and some other sponsored Chairs in the University as they specifically say that they want so and so Professor and with no specific requirement/specialization. Since there is no specific requirement/specialization for appointment of Professors against such tagged posts, one of the members of the Selection Committee is very much right that there should be some difference between a Chaired Professor and a normal Professor. The same Selection Committee had found nobody suitable from amongst the three candidates for the chaired Professor's post. It is just because name has been given. It could be Professor of Law or Professor of Economics. He could have understood that here the Professor of Economics could not be eligible. However, they are considering the candidates for the post of Professor of Law. But here in both the cases, Professor of Law is required for Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon Professor of Law and for appointment of Professors in Law. The interviews for both the posts were held on the same day and the Selection Committee in the case of Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon Professor of Law after interviewing all the three candidates recommended that none found suitable for this post, because a renowned name is attached to it. The same three candidates were found eligible for the other three vacancies of Professors by the same Selection Committee on the same day. He wanted to know how to be differentiate, share with them, why they were not eligible for the post

of Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon Professor of Law, unless and until they have something to say that they did not have something, which was required to be appointed as Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon Professor of Law. Neither anything has been mentioned in the files nor in the advertisement, except, declaring one of the positions as Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon Professor of Law.

**RESOLVED:** That since none was found suitable for appointment as Dr. Gurdial Singh Dhillon Professor of Law, the post be re-advertised.

**Appointment of Professors in Laws**

**2(iv).** Considered minutes dated 15.04.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Professors-2 (General) (Advt. No.4/2014) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That –

(1) the following persons be appointed as Professors of Law-2 (General) in the University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP 10,000, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Rattan Singh
2. Dr. (Ms.) Rajinder Kaur

(2) That Dr. Harmeet Singh Sandhu be placed on the Waiting List.

(3) These appointments 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.

**NOTE:** 1. The score chart of all the candidates, who appeared in the interview, would form a part of the proceedings.

**2.** A summary bio-data of the selected and wait-listed candidates enclosed. It had been certified that the selected and waitlisted candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.

**Appointment of Professor in Law at P.U. Regional Centre Ludhiana**

**2(v).** Considered minutes dated 15.04.2015 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Professor of Law-1 (General) (for 5 years B.A. LL.B. Integrated Course) (Advt. No.4 /2014) at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is only one post of Professor of Law at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana and only one person appeared in the interview for this post. If he was not wrong, as per the decision of the Syndicate, that wherever only one applicant/candidate appeared for the interview, the post would be re-advertised and interview could not be conducted. There was only one candidate for the post of Professor of Law for P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana who was also wait-listed for another position but appointed as Professor of Law for P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana. But the Vice-Chancellor might remind that during his tenure, it was discussed in the Syndicate that the rural Colleges are being facing practical difficulties on this count. If they conduct interviews in this manner, it would create practical difficulties. Similar difficulty was in the cases of appointment of teachers in the Colleges of Education and the Syndicate relaxed the requirement in respect of Colleges of Education. As far as appointments in the University are concerned, this decision has never been taken and it was over-looked by the office. He was of the view that the appointment of Professor of Law for P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana should not be approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this time there is a clause in the advertisement that the number of posts could increase or decrease. This guy appeared in the interview and the Selection Committee found potential in him. They had the option either to increase the number of posts at University Institute of Legal Studies or appoint him and post him at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana or select him at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana against the advertised post. According to him, the second option was better and thought that he would share the circumstances under which the appointment has been made with the Syndicate, the Governing Body of the University. He had recommended it to the Selection Committee that he is the only candidate for this post. The University had conducted separate interviews for posts of advertised for various Departments/Institutes. Dr. Harmeet Singh Sandhu was not specifically called for this particular interview. He was called for all the three posts. It was in his mind that posts could be increased from two to three and that was why he has been selected.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then there is no sanctity of rule which stipulate that if there is only one candidate for the interview, the interview would not be conducted and the post would be re-advertised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has done this only in that background which has already been explained to them by him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is no such provision that the person could be posted anywhere. The University advertised separate posts for separate Departments at Chandigarh and for Regional Centres of the University. There is only a provision that 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., but they could not be transferred from one Department to other or post them in other Departments.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that the University had started during the tenure of Dr. R.C. Sobti that the competent authority could post them in any of the Departments of the University, maybe Regional Centres, as the Regional Centres have been declared a part of the University. They should track all the conditions. The University is allowing migration to the students without charging any fee from Ludhiana to Chandigarh if they are qualified in all the papers. In the case of P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, a specific decision was taken in this Syndicate that P.U. Regional Centre Ludhiana would be treated as part of this University. So far as appointments of Professors are concerned, the Bar Council of India during the inspection of P.U. Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur put a condition that if they did not appoint the requisite number of Professors, they would not allow the University to make admissions for the session 2015-16. That was why he had been raising it. In this case, they had interviewed all the three persons and it was decided that merit should be prepared and according to the merit, posts were offered to them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the existing rules of the University, the interview was conducted wrongly. He understood the practical difficulty, but they also put such conditions on the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that to start LL.M. in P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, Shri Naresh Gaur also raised the same point. The LL.M. could not be started there in the absence of sufficient faculty members. Only one Associate Professor of Law is there and if one Professor is appointed there, it would be much easier to start LL.M. As far as technical point is concerned as raised by Shri Ashok Goyal, in some special circumstances, they have to take decision/s, which are beyond the written parameters, they should approve it. For example in 2016, more new guidelines/qualifications for the posts of Professors would be there and they would not be able to appoint Professor there. How long they would continue it?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should approve this appointment as a special case.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Professor Navdeep Goyal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would not make it as a precedent. In future, if there is a real necessity to proceed with an interview for a single candidate, the matter would be first brought to the Syndicate, get it passed and circumstances explained, only then it would be processed.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that this interview had been conducted wrongly and the Syndicate has approved it.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they should relax the condition only in this case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there was no such agenda of relaxing the condition.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in future, if such cases occur, the Syndicate permission would be sought. During the next three years of his tenure, he would follow it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would not want to name a particular Professor, Shri Chatrath also knew it, being an international scholar, the University should have had pride in appointing him, but being a single applicant, the University was not be able to conduct an interview for him. In this way, the University had lost good talent, but when the post was re-advertised, he/she had not applied.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that if they did not appoint teachers as per the requirement of Central Regulatory Body, the Department/Institute would be de-recognized.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Harmeet Singh Sandhu, be appointed Professor in Law (for 5 years B.A. LL.B. (Hons.) Integrated Course) in the Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 +AGP Rs. 10,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

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.

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

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

**2(vi).** Considered minutes dated 15.04.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. (Mrs.) Jyoti Rattan be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Laws, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **01.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at U.I.L.S., P.U. Chandigarh**

**2(vii).** Considered minutes dated 15.04.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Karan Jawanda be promoted from Assistant Professor (Law) (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (Law) (**Stage-2**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **01.08.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at U.I.L.S., Chandigarh**

**2(viii).** Considered minutes dated 15.04.2015 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Jasmeet Gulati be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **12.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+ AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana**

**2(ix).** Considered minutes dated 15.04.2015 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. (Mrs.) Ashish Virk be promoted from Assistant Professor (Law) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Law) (**Stage-3**) at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **01.07.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+ AGP Rs.8000/- at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the letter of appointment/promotion to the persons appointed/promoted under Item **C-2(i) to C-2(ix)** be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 25.2.2015**

**3.** Considered if, the minutes of the Committee dated 25.2.2015 (**Appendix-X**) that the recommendations of the Board of Finance dated 06.02.2014 (Item 18) that Shri Dharamvir Sharma, Senior Draftsman, Architect Office, Panjab University be promoted to that of Assistant Architect in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- w.e.f. 1.2.2010 (against the post vacated by Shri M.K. Kashyap on his retirement on 31.1.2010) in accordance with the rules regulating the recruitment and conditions of service of persons appointed to the Punjab Architecture (Class III) Technical service and Punjab Service of Engineers(Civil Wing), notified by the Punjab Govt. vide their notifications dated 4.10.2000 and 14.10.2005 duly adopted by the Panjab University BOF/Syndicate/Senate in its meetings held on 16.11.2005, 10.12.2005 & 18.12.2005 respectively and the promotion of remaining two employees, i.e., Mrs. Lalita Sharma and Mrs. Saroj Sharma (already made in the above said orders but not implemented yet) shall be allowed as per the availability of the post in terms of Punjab Government rules.

**NOTE:** The above recommendation of the Board of Finance dated 06.02.2014 (Item 18) was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.02.2014 (Para 4) (sub item 18) (**Appendix-X**) and it was resolved that the recommendation of Board of Finance dated 06.02.2014 (Item 18) regarding promotion of Shri Dharamvir Sharma, Senior Draftsman to Assistant Architect, be **not** approved.

**RESOLVED:** That Shri Dharamvir Sharma, Senior Draftsman, Architect Office, Panjab University, be promoted to that of Assistant Architect in the pay scale of Rs. 15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- w.e.f. 1.2.2010 (against the post vacated by Shri M.K. Kashyap on his retirement on 31.1.2010) in accordance with the rules regulating the recruitment and conditions of service of persons appointed to the Punjab Architecture (Class III) Technical service and Punjab Service of Engineers(Civil Wing), notified by the Punjab Govt. vide their notifications dated 4.10.2000 and 14.10.2005 duly adopted by the Panjab University BOF/Syndicate/Senate in its meetings held on 16.11.2005, 10.12.2005 & 18.12.2005 respectively and the promotion of remaining two employees, i.e., Mrs. Lalita Sharma and Mrs. Saroj Sharma (already made in the above said orders but not implemented yet) shall be allowed as per the availability of the post in terms of Punjab Government rules.

**Recommendations dated 5.3.2014 of the Academic and Administrative Committees regarding admission criteria to BDS Course at Dr. Harvash Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital from the session 2015-16**

**4.** Considered recommendation dated 05.03.2014 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Academic and Administrative Committees that the admission criteria to BDS course at Dr. Harvash Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., be made on the basis of AIMPT merit for the session 2015-16 and an entrance test be conducted by the University at its own for admission to the seats remain vacant after exhausting the merit list of AIMPT.

Initiating discussion, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two recommendations, i.e., (a) admission in the BDS for the year 2015-16 should be made on the basis of AIPMT merit and for this a joint counselling should be done along with Government Medical College and Hospital, Chandigarh; and (b) the University should hold its own entrance test either exclusively for BDS or along with other entrance tests that University conducts, e.g. for B. Pharmacy etc. for

admission to the seats remaining unfilled after exhausting the merit list of AIMPT. He suggested that they could make it a part of the UGCET being conducted by the University in the month of May 2015; otherwise, they would have to conduct entrance test exclusive for BDS if seats remained unfilled after exhausting the merit list of AIMPT.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that this year it is late and from the next academic session, it would be made a part of UGCET.

Professor Navdeep Goyal supported the viewpoint expressed by Professor A.K. Bhandari.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that if they allowed filling up the seats in various courses on the basis of the Central Body Examinations, e.g. in 5-Year Integrated Course in Law on the basis of CLAT, the ranking of the University would automatically enhance, which is at No.12 and it would reach at No.6. But he has fear in his mind that if they started filling up of seats on the basis of CLAT, the seats would remain vacant at the P.U. Regional Centres. He would submit a proposal in this regard to the University.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath to send a proposal in this regard.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That the admission criteria to BDS course at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., be made on the basis of AIMPT merit for the session 2015-16 and an entrance test be conducted by the University at its own for admission to the seats remain vacant after exhausting the merit list of AIMPT.

**Minutes of the Committee dated 25.11.2014 regarding establishment of 'Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies' in the Department of Laws, U.I.L.S. and P.U.R.C., Ludhiana**

**5.** Considered minutes of the Committee dated 25.11.2014 (**Appendix-XII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to study the conditions of UGC for establishing the 'Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies' in the Department of Laws, University Institute of Legal Studies and PURC, Ludhiana.

Initiating discussion, referring to page No.13, Recommendation 2, regarding creation of Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies, Professor Karamjeet Singh pointed out that in the last line of this recommendation, it was mentioned, "However, this is not the position in the University Institute of Legal Studies as well as PURC, Ludhiana". Similarly, the Committee recommends that a Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies be created in the Department of Laws as per the UGC requirements and guidelines and this Centre will be from the current academic session whereas the item says for establishing the 'Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies' in the Department of Laws, University Institute of Legal Studies and PURC, Ludhiana. It should be clarified.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath read out the following requirement from the Notification of U.G.C. dated 5<sup>th</sup> August 2014 regarding clarification on duration of LL.M. Degree:

"Provided that a master's degree, where entry qualification is two bachelor's degree in succession, including one in the relevant discipline or integrated

degree of five years in the relevant discipline after plus two, the duration may be one year.”

He further clarified that as per this requirement of the UGC, they would have to establish ‘Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies’ for the whole University and not for a particular Department.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that there are two recommendations of the Committee, one is regarding start of LL.M. 2 Year Course at PURC, Ludhiana and there is no need of Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies for 2 Year LL.M. at Ludhiana as Committee had already recommended. They should allow them to start 2 Year LL.M. at PURC, Ludhiana. The second issue is regarding creation of Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies and the Committee wrongly mentioned in last line that “However, this is not the position in the University Institute of Legal Studies as well as PURC, Ludhiana”. There is no need to write PURC Ludhiana here. Why the Committee has noted down this thing because the day this meeting was called there is only one Professor in U.I.L.S. After today’s meeting of the Syndicate, there would be three Professors in University Institute of Legal Studies. According to him, there should be one ‘Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies’ in the University, which would allow both the Departments, i.e., U.I.L.S. and Department of Laws to run one year LL.M. in their respective departments.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that the Committee should pass the resolution for establishment of one ‘Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies’ in the Department of Laws.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolution has to be properly worded.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the Committee passed the same thing as Professor Karamjeet Singh elaborated.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that ‘Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies’ should be of the University rather than in the Department.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the resolution/recommendation of the Committee is not clear. It should be properly worded and thereafter it should be passed.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That one ‘Centre for Post Graduate Legal Studies’ be set up in the University, to cater both the Departments, i.e., U.I.L.S. and Department of Laws for running one year LL.M. in their respective departments. However, LL.M. course at P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana would be of two years duration.

**Items C-6 and C-7 on the agenda were taken up for consideration together.**

**Adoption of D.O. No.F.1-1/2012 (SA-III) dated 13.3.2015 received from the Secretary, U.G.C., Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi**

6. Considered D.O. No. F.1-1/2012 (SA-III) (**Appendix-XIII**) dated 13.03.2015 received from Secretary, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 with regard to creation of two seats under supernumerary quota in all recognized Higher Education Institutions for students from Jammu & Kashmir, be adopted.

- NOTE:** 1. Earlier too, the Syndicate at its meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2013 vide Para 20 (**Appendix-XIII**) has resolved that the letter No. F.1-1/2012 (SA-III) dated 19.10.2012 regarding creation of two seats for students coming from the State of Jammu & Kashmir under supernumerary quota, be adopted.
2. The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate has allowed to put the above provision in the Handbook of Information

**Adoption of D.O. No.F.1-13/2010 (CPP-II) dated 23.3.2015 received from the Secretary, U.G.C., Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi**

**7.** Considered D.O. No. F.1-13/2010 (CPP-II) (**Appendix-XIV**) dated 23.03.2015 received from Secretary, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 regarding providing the following concessions for the wards of Kashmiri migrants students for admission during the academic session 2015-16, be adopted:

- (i) Relaxation in cut-off percentage up to 10% subjects to minimum eligibility requirement.
- (ii) Increase in intake capacity up to 5% course-wise.
- (iii) Reservation of at least one seat in merit quota in technical/professional institutions.
- (iv) Waiving off domicile requirements.

**NOTE:** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate has allowed to put the above provision in the Handbook of Information.

Professor Karamjeet Singh, referring to Page 17, resolved part, stated that the University had already adopted letter of U.G.C. in this regard in its meeting held in January 2013 subject to a clarification from the U.G.C. whether these two seats also fell in the same category or are exclusively for the resident of the Jammu & Kashmir (J&K). He wanted to know whether these two seats under supernumerary quota would be for anybody from Jammu & Kashmir or for migrants from Jammu & Kashmir. But what he understands from the recent letter of the U.G.C. at page 15, these are for Jammu & Kashmir only. This item had already been passed by the Syndicate.

To this, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that these two seats would be for students from Jammu & Kashmir including the Kashmiri Migrants.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is for residents of Jammu & Kashmir as well as for migrants.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it would apply to all the residents of J & K and they would follow it.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that for Kashmiri migrants there is another separate item No.7 on the agenda for today's meeting.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Dr. Dinesh Kumar.

A din prevailed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that there would be a problem for the persons who have to make admissions tomorrow. He said that as per this letter there are two seats for Jammu & Kashmir residents. Earlier, there were additional seats for Kashmiri migrants. He wanted to know that is this letter in supersession of the earlier letter. If it is then irrespective of the fact whether someone is migrant or not, two seats for the residents of Jammu & Kashmir and there is no extra seat for Kashmiri migrants. As far as Item 7 is concerned, they only have told that they have to give some weightage for the wards of Kashmiri migrants at the time of admission in the overall merit. He suggested that let them take a conscious decision that Item 7 is for weightage at the time of admission to the wards of Kashmiri migrants as per the concessions given in the item and Item 6 is with regard to creation of two seats under supernumerary quota in all recognized Higher Education Institutions for students for the residents of Jammu & Kashmir including migrants. Earlier, there was one seat and that was only for the J & K Migrants, but now these two seats are for the residents of J & K including the migrants. Why he was saying this because it might be possible that the residents of Jammu, who are not the migrants, claim benefit of admission under this category, though they are not migrants and the Kashmiri migrants might claim that these seats are for them. They have to take care of this thing. For example, if someone has migrated from Kashmir to Pune and then he would not be considered under the category of residents of Jammu & Kashmir, but he would claim the benefit under Kashmiri migrants category only.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier, there was only one seat and now it had been enhanced to two seats under supernumerary quota in all recognized Higher Educational Institutions for the residents of Jammu & Kashmir including migrants.

A din prevailed.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they should include both the residents of Jammu & Kashmir and Kashmiri migrants as far as Item 6 is concerned, but for Item 7, the Kashmiri migrants should only be considered.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it meant for J & K residents and Kashmiri migrants covered under this item, i.e., C-6 on the agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they could not discuss it jointly. As far as Item C-6 is concerned, there is benefit of two seats under supernumerary quota in all recognized Higher Educational Institutions for students from Jammu & Kashmir after showing domicile certificate and the issue is finished. As far as Item C-7 is concerned, there are some concessions for the Kashmiri migrants whether he/she is residing in Pune or Mumbai.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the benefit of these seats should be given to the residents of J & K including the Kashmiri migrants.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that it is very much clear under Item C-7 and she read out the concessions to be given to the wards of Kashmiri migrants at the time of admissions.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it is clearly mentioned that creation of two seats under supernumerary quota in all recognized Higher Educational Institutions are for the residents of J & K and as far as Item C-7 is concerned, there are concessions for the wards of Kashmiri migrants at the time of admissions.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that these two seats under supernumerary quota would not be applicable in the cases where the conditions of Regulatory Bodies, such as, Bar Council of India, Medical Council of India, etc. are applicable.

To this, Professor A.K. Bhandari said that as per Item C-7(iii), reservation of at least one seat in merit quota in technical/professional institutions would be there for Kashmiri migrants and they would have to give this benefit to Kashmiri migrants.

Continuing, Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that since these instructions have been issued by the Government of India under Article 73 and it would overwrite the conditions imposed by Regulatory Bodies. Only after that it would be applicable in technical/professional institutions.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if he is a Kashmiri Migrant and residing in Chandigarh and if they say that Items 6 and 7 are one and the same thing.

Intervening the Vice-Chancellor said that these are not one and the same thing.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he was also of the same view that as far as Item 6 is concerned, the benefit of two supernumerary seats would be given only to the residents of J & K on the basis of domicile certificate and Kashmiri migrants should not be considered under this category. On one hand, he would produce migration certificate and on the other hand, he would also claim benefit of relaxation in cut-off percentage up to 10% subject to minimum eligibility requirement under Kashmiri migrant category. In this way, one person would take benefit of both the categories. According to him, it would be a great injustice with the residents of J & K. He was of the view that the Kashmiri migrants should be given benefit only under Item 7.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that if there are six students from Jammu & Kashmir for seeking admission under these categories in a particular College/Institution, two students would be considered for benefit to J&K under two supernumerary seats category for the residents of J&K and one student would be considered for relaxation in cut-off percentage up to 10% subject to minimum eligibility requirement for Kashmiri migrant category.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that suppose one person is migrated from Kashmir to Jammu and there are six students from J & K are seeking admission against two supernumerary seats in a particular College/Institution, as he is a migrant and also a resident of J & K. As per the second letter 10% weightage would be given to the Kashmiri migrant student and they would have to prepare a merit list of all the six students and out of those six, two students would be given the benefit. As far as the criterion for giving the benefit of concessions for the wards of Kashmiri migrant students is very clearly mentioned in Item 7.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That D.O. No. F.1-1/2012 (SA-III) (**Appendix-XIV**) dated 13.03.2015 received from Secretary, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002, be adopted, with regard to creation of two seats under supernumerary quota in all recognized Higher Education Institutions for students from Jammu & Kashmir.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That D.O. No. F.1-13/2010 (CPP-II) (**Appendix-XIV**) dated 23.03.2015 received from Secretary, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002, be adopted, regarding providing the following concessions for the wards of Kashmiri migrant students for admission during the academic session 2015-16:

- (i) Relaxation in cut-off percentage up to 10% subject to minimum eligibility requirement.
- (ii) Increase in intake capacity up to 5% course-wise.
- (iii) Reservation of at least one seat in merit quota in technical/professional institutions.
- (iv) Waiving off domicile requirements.

**Condonation of delay of 3 years, 11 months and 23 days, i.e., up to 31.12.2015 for submission of Ph.D. thesis to Ms. Kirtee, Research Scholar, Department of History as a special case**

**8.** Considered if delay of 3 years, 11 months and 23 days, i.e., up to 31.12.2015, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Ms. Kirtee, Research Scholar, enrolled on 09.01.2007 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of History, be condoned as a special case, because she met with an accident in February 2011. Information contained in the Office Note (**Appendix-XV**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. Ms. Kirtee, vide her application (**Appendix-XV**) has written that she was enrolled for Ph.D. under the Faculty of Arts vide No.16587 dated 09.01.2007. She was granted first extension of one year i.e. up to 08.01.2011 and second extension of another year up to 08.01.2012 respectively for submission of her Ph.D. thesis, but she could not submit her thesis, as she met with an accident in February 2011 and got spinal injuries and had to remain in hospital for few years. She has not fully recovered and still bed ridden, having no power in both hands and legs and just got her voice back.

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 delay of 3 years, 11 months and 23 days, i.e., up to 31.12.2015, be condoned as a special case, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Ms. Kirtee, Research Scholar, enrolled on 09.01.2007 in the Faculty of Arts, Department of History, because she met with an accident in February 2011.

**Condonation of delay of 3 years, 03 months and 28 days, i.e., within 15 days from the communication of the decision to Mr. Dinesh Chandra, Research Scholar, Department of Hindi**

**9.** Considered if, delay of 3 years, 3 months and 28 days, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Mr. Dinesh Chandra, Research Scholar, enrolled on 16.11.2006 in the Faculty of Languages, Department of Hindi, be condoned and he be allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision. Information contained in the Office Note (**Appendix-XVI**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. Mr. Dinesh Chandra vide his request (**Appendix-XVI**) duly recommended by supervisor and Chairperson, Department of Hindi, has written that he was enrolled for Ph.D. under the Faculty of Languages vide No.16548 dated 16.11.2006. He was granted first extension of one year i.e. up to 15.11.2010 and second extension of another year up to 15.11.2011 respectively for submission of her Ph.D. thesis, but he could not submit his thesis because of long illness of his daughter.

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 delay of 3 years, 3 months and 28 days, be condoned, for submission of Ph.D. thesis of Mr. Dinesh Chandra, Research Scholar, enrolled on 16.11.2006 in the Faculty of Languages, Department of Hindi and he be allowed to submit his Ph.D. thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision.

**Request of Ms. Stuti Narain (Kacker), Secretary (Retd.), Department of Disability Affairs, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi for revival of her Ph.D. Registration or be exempted from appearing in Ph.D. Entrance Test**

**10.** Considered request dated 15.12.2014 (**Appendix-XVII**) of Ms. Stuti Narain (Kacker), Secretary (Retd.), Department of Disability Affairs, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi that her Ph.D. registration, be revived or she be exempted from appearing in the Ph.D. entrance test. Information contained in the Office Note (**Appendix-XVII**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. Ms. Stuti Narain (Kacker) was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts with the Panjab University in the year 2007 under No.16570/Ph.D. vide letter dated 15.02.2007. She was also advised to submit the application for registration within one year. But due to non-completion of formalities her enrolment was cancelled under Regulation 3.5 (b) at page 189 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007 vide diary No.5861/DRG dated 14.12.2010 & 13431/Regn. dated 14.12.2010.

Regulation 3.5 (b) at page 189 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, is reproduced below:

“In case a candidate does not submit the registration form, tentative title of the thesis and synopsis to the Chairperson of the Department within a period of two years, his/her enrolment be treated as cancelled automatically. No separate intimation would be sent to the candidate.”

2. As per UGC Ph.D. Guidelines there is no exemption available to the Civil Servants, from appearing in the Ph.D. Entrance Test.

3. The DUI has observed that:

**“The grant of exemption to individuals on case to case basis may not be considered, as it may be against the U.G.C. guidelines.”**

4. Dr. Nandita, Department of Education has opined that:

**“The candidate Ms. Stuti Narain (Kacker) was enrolled for Ph.D. with Panjab University in the year 2007 and as stated in her letter she could not pursue it because of her various responsibilities. She has also stated that she has been working in an official capacity in the area in which she had written her dissertation. With her vast experience in the field her request to contribute to the field does not seem to be inappropriate. At the same time University is bound the U.G.C. Regulation for Ph.D., therefore, this case may be referred to the University governing body i.e. the Syndicate/Senate to take appropriate decision.”**

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that he had gone through the item and also read the recommendation of the D.U.I. in which he mentioned that “the grant of exemption to individuals on case to case basis may not be considered, as it may be against the U.G.C. guidelines”. Keeping in view this, he suggested that they should not open such chapter, which would create problem later on. He was of the view that this item should be rejected.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that it is a request of unusual kind from a very special category person, where the autonomy and flexibility of the University comes to a test and the Governing Body wisdom also come to a test. If they look at it in a default manner, then this item is rejected. He agrees with it, but this is a request from a Civil Servant who is at the verge of retirement. For whatever reason, the civil servant was not able to complete her research. Now, the civil servant wishes to complete her research. This civil servant had not able to complete her research because of certain requirements/formalities. They could say that the civil servant can publish her research work anywhere. Her dissertation is going to be on “Entrepreneurship Development of Persons with Disabilities”, and i.e. likely to be a high quality work. From Panjab University’s point of view, he thought that if they allow this civil servant to revive her enrollment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, then as and when her work would be published, University’s name would get associated

with it. That was why he had placed her request before the Syndicate, the Government of the University.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Shri Naresh Gaur said that it should not be allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could also consider it on the same pattern as Golden Chance that had been given to the students of various examinations of the University at undergraduate and postgraduate level.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it could have/would have probably, but keeping in view the latest decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, sooner or later, the candidates who had done their Ph.D. under 2009 Regulations of the U.G.C., they would have to issue a certificate by the University that he/she had done his/her Ph.D. under U.G.C. Guidelines/Regulations-2009; otherwise, he/she would not get job anywhere.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed that how long they would consider such requests from the bureaucrats, there ought to be no end to such requests.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they should not allow her; otherwise, it would open Pandora's Box.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that there are two courses in Law, one is through correspondence and the other is through regular mode. The students, who had done their LL.B. through distance mode, are not eligible to do practice in any Court.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that the course which is done through distance mode, it is called BL and here they say LL.B.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that this case should be referred to the U.G.C. to seek guidance on this issue with the remarks that the Governing Body hands are tight, so that positive message could go as far as Governing Body of the University is concerned.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that copy of the latest judgement of the Supreme Court should also be appended with it when the case is referred to the U.G.C.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this item along with the discussion would also be sent to the U.G.C.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that from the last 3-4 meetings of the Syndicate, he had observed that number of cases relating to submission of synopsis or thesis was being placed before the Syndicate for condonation of delay. He suggested that there is a provision in Central Universities, like J.N.U that the students after Registration/Enrolment for Ph.D. could de-enrol and when their research work is completed, they again enrol and submit their thesis. He further suggested that this possibility could be explored by constituting a small Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Dr. Dinesh Kumar to give him a proposal in this regard.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that it would be beneficial for the students who enrolled/registered for Ph.D. in the University and assume that their research work would not be completed in a stipulated period. If such a provision is there, such students could de-enroll/de-register themselves and again enroll/register when their research work is completed and submit the thesis.

After some further discussion, it was –

**RESOLVED:** That request dated 15.12.2014 (**Appendix-XVII**) of Ms. Stuti Narain (Kacker), Secretary (Retd.), Department of Disability Affairs, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi that her Ph.D. registration be revived or she be exempted from appearing in the Ph.D. entrance test, be forwarded to the U.G.C. along with a discussion for seeking clarification.

**Institution  
Endowment**

**of an**

**11.** Considered if, an Endowment of Rs.6,00,000/- made by Mr. Yogendra Anand and Mr. Ram Anand, 15 Green way, Chelmsford, MA, USA, be accepted for institution of an Endowment of 'Professor B.M. Anand Memorial Fund' in the memory of their revered father Late Prof. B.M. Anand in the Department of Physics, P.U. The investment of Rs.6,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in State Bank of India and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the S.E.T. Fund A/c No.10444978140 for holding an Annual Memorial lecture series and the first lecture be happened this year only. Information contained in the Office Note (**Appendix-XVIII**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:**1. Mr. Santosh Sawhney, #112, Asian Games Village, New Delhi-110040 along with proposal letter (**Appendix-XVIII**) for donation of fund to the Panjab University by the children of Professor B.M. Anand Family has handed over a donation of Rs.6,00,000/- vide cheque No.016448 dated 01.02.2015 to the Chairperson, Department of Physics, P.U., in favour of Registrar, Panjab University, for instituting Memorial lecture series in the Department of Physics and accordingly the same was deposited through Banking Cell in the S.E.T. Fund A/c No.10444978140 on 09.02.2015 in the State Bank of India, Sector-14. The annual proceeds would come up to Rs.52,000/- p.a. (approx.) which can be utilized to hold aforementioned lecture every year.

2. The family of Professor B.M. Anand proposed to establish "Prof. B.M. Anand Memorial Endowment Fund" in his honour to the Panjab University for the following purposes:-

- a) Initiate a lecture series called "Prof. B.M. Anand Memorial Lectures" an annual event of lectures by eminent scientist and

educators to honour the life's work and memory of their father.

- b) Devise a suitable "Memorabilia" to honour Prof. B.M. Anand.

The Vice-Chancellor informed that the University had already received a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- for institution of an Endowment and Rs.60,000/- for organizing Professor B.M. Anand Annual Memorial Lecture.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that in the item, it should be mentioned that with an additional sum of Rs.60,000/- received from them, "the first lecture had already been organized this year".

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that so many people donate money to the University for Institution of Endowments and Lectures. He suggested that it should be monitored and streamlined. Professor Rupinder Tewari talked to him yesterday and he told that he had given a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- for the Institution of Annual Lecture in the memory of his revered father Major Jiwan Tewari. If they did not streamline the system, it would be an insult to them. One of his relative had also donated a sum of Rs.1,25,000/- for Institution of Prize to the student who topped in M.A. Hindi. A Committee had been constituted for this purpose and he had not heard anything in this regard during the last seven years. He suggested that it needed to be monitored.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would do it as a part of revamp and expansion of the activities. The University would have seen in managing the endowments in a proper manner. He would talk to the Dean University Instruction to revamp all such information before the commencement of the next academic session.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that organizing such lectures is also part of the merit of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all such information would be prepared for dissemination as how many lectures had been organized, what is the abstract of these lectures and if necessary video-recording or written transcripts of the lectures would be there as it is necessary for the grading of the University by NAAC. The Aligarh Muslim University is doing this properly. They have to learn from them.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that University website should be updated and designed properly. The present website of the University is very dull. There are so many Departments in the University where various types of Funds/Endowments are available. According to him, a chart/table of all such Endowments/Funds should be prepared and properly disseminated on the website of the University so that more and more people could be encouraged for such Endowments towards the University.

**RESOLVED:** That an Endowment of Rs.6,00,000/- made by Mr. Yogendra Anand and Mr. Ram Anand, 15 Green way, Chelmsford, MA, USA, be accepted for institution of an Endowment of 'Professor B.M. Anand Memorial Fund' in the memory of their revered father Late Prof. B.M. Anand in the Department of Physics, Panjab

University. The investment of Rs.6,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR in State Bank of India and the interest so accrued be credited annually in the S.E.T. Fund A/c No.10444978140 for holding an Annual Memorial lecture series and the first lecture with an additional sum of Rs.60,000/- be organized successfully this year.

**Recommendation of the Board of Studies (Post-Graduate/Undergraduate) dated 27.01.2015 regarding Regulations/Rules for B.Sc. Nursing (Four-Year) effective from the session 2014-15**

**12.** Considered the recommendations dated 27.01.2015 (**Appendix-XIX**) of Board of Studies (Post-Graduate/Under-Graduate) in Nursing that the Regulations/Rules (**Appendix-XIX**) for B.Sc. Nursing (Four Year) (duly approved by the Dean, Faculty of Medical Sciences) at Govt. Medical Hospital & College, Sector-32, Chandigarh, as per authorization given by the Faculty of Medical Sciences in its meeting dated 23.3.2014 (**Appendix-XIX**), effective from the session 2014-15, be approved. Information contained in the Office Note (**Appendix-XIX**) was also taken into consideration.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations dated 27.01.2015 (**Appendix-XIX**) of Board of Studies (Post-Graduate/Under-Graduate) in Nursing that the Regulations/Rules (**Appendix-XIX**) for B.Sc. Nursing (Four Year), effective from the session 2014-15 at Govt. Medical Hospital & College, Sector-32, Chandigarh, be approved.

**Deferred Item**

**13.** Considered minutes dated 09.04.2015 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.

Initiating discussion, Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that the University is doing action on it very quickly. Earlier also, the University has implemented the decision of the Government regarding appointment of Principals in the Colleges without its proper adoption by the University. The University constituted a Committee to consider the Supreme Court Ruling regarding eligibility conditions for the appointment of Assistant Professor in the University or Colleges and placed the recommendations of the Committee before the Syndicate for implementation. He was of the view that where there is a loss to the teaching community, the University tries to take action quickly and where there is a benefit, the University does not take action so quickly. He pointed out that there are so many decisions of the U.G.C. which were not implemented so quickly. For example, they were not given the benefit of refresher courses, in spite of letter being issued every year by the U.G.C. in this regard. According to him, the candidates with Ph.D. under old regulations are eligible for the post of Assistant Professors and have been working on a salary of Rs.12000/-, Rs.15000/- in Self-financed Colleges. The case of 1925 posts is still pending in the Court and the Supreme Court of India had given ruling regarding eligibility conditions for the appointment of Assistant Professors. He suggested that the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India should not be implemented hastily. What would they do if tomorrow the decision is reversed after the review petition? He further suggested that this item should be deferred up to June 2015 and they had to wait up to 90 days or up to the decision of the Review Petition, if any. The Inspection Committees which went to various Colleges for inspection and put the condition for appointment of teacher/s up to June 15, 2015. If the decision is not reversed by the Supreme Court of India, then they would have no alternative, but to implement the same. He as a member of the Inspection Committee went to Gurusar Sadhar College and put the condition of appointment

of Punjabi teacher up to 15<sup>th</sup> June 2015. Most of the Inspection Committees put the condition for fulfilling the requirement up to 15<sup>th</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup> June 2015. It meant, firstly, the College/s had to fill up the post/s against Self-financing posts and thereafter if stay is vacated, then against 1925 posts of grant-in-aid. He suggested that they have to extend the date of compliance by the Colleges up to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2015.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that Dr. I.S. Sandhu had raised a technical issue that there should be a Revision Petition in the Supreme Court and that might be understood; otherwise, they would have to follow the ruling of the Supreme Court of India.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. I.S. Sandhu is very much right. The orders of the Supreme Court could not be ignored as on today, but tomorrow it could be revised. If the decision is revised after two months, then they would not be able to take the decision to re-advertise the posts again, but at the same time they could not go ahead also with the existing regulations. So let them wait for filling up of these posts up to 90 days. He suggested that this item should be deferred till that date.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that he agreed with the decision of the Supreme Court of India. The decision of the Supreme Court is that the Government of India under Section 20 had not given relaxation to Ph.D. under old Regulations. According to him, Government of India might give such relaxation and change these regulations even without the direction of the Court, then again they would become eligible for the post of Assistant Professor. He suggested that till further orders, the item should be deferred.

It was clarified that as far as the filling up of posts of Assistant Professors in the University, they would not advertise the posts, but for the Colleges where the University had already given panel, what they would do.

The members in one voice said that they had to wait up to 90 days and Colleges should be given period up to 31<sup>st</sup> July or whatever date they deem fit for filling up of the posts as per the conditions laid down by Inspection Committees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that where the panels had already been given, they should continue and no fresh panels would be given.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that how they could give new Panels as there is stay on 1925 posts by the Punjab Government.

It was clarified that there is no stay as far as Punjab Government is concerned. The Punjab Government had given fresh template after incorporating the instruction as per the ruling of the Supreme Court of India for filling up of 1925 posts in the affiliated Colleges.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that Punjab Government had sent the template before the judgement of the Supreme Court of India.

It was clarified that new template had come from the Punjab Government for filling up of these 1925 posts in the affiliated Colleges.

The members in one voice said that new template had already been received in the University office as well as in the affiliated Colleges from the Punjab Government for filling up of these posts.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if the selections were made as per the panels given by the University, the University would not be able to approve those appointments till the final outcome of the Court in this regard.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the issue is too important and they would have to try to save themselves. According to him, they should not advertise the posts as per the ruling of the Supreme Court of India in the Universities as well as its affiliated Colleges keeping in view that a review petition could be filed in the Court. Similarly, they could not continue to fill up these posts as per the existing rules. So they would have to wait for the final outcome of the Court in this regard.

Principal Parveen Chawla enquired that if there is any direction from the Punjab Government to fill up 1925 posts, then what they would do?

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that there is no such decision from the Punjab Government in this direction and if any decision came, then it would be discussed and decided accordingly.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that in some of the Colleges panels had already been given by the University. He suggested that if there is any decision from the Government that they should go ahead, then they have to fill up these posts whether they follow that condition of NET or not. Secondly, this item is related to the affiliated Colleges and there is no person put on the Committee from the affiliated Colleges. He said that, in future, this thing should also be kept in mind.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point put forth by Principal Gurdip Sharma is well taken.

Continuing, Principal Gurdip Sharma said that if they receive any direction from the Punjab Government to fill up these posts, then definitely these posts should be filled up.

Principal Parveen Chawla wanted to know that if there is any direction from the Punjab Government to fill up these posts, then the Office of the Dean, College Development Council would issue circular to the Colleges or a special meeting of the Syndicate would be convened to sort out the issue.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that such thing could be resolved by constituting a Committee of 2-3 persons.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that item should be deferred up to June 2015; otherwise, if appointment/s is/are made as per the panels given to the Colleges and placed before the Syndicate for approval and thereafter someone challenged the same, then the selected candidate would be harassed unnecessarily. To avoid unnecessary litigation, let them wait for 90 days.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he understood the importance of these posts for the Colleges. If need be, he would not hesitate in convening a special meeting of the Syndicate.

Agreeing with the viewpoints expressed by other members of the House, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the advertisements of the affiliated Colleges were slightly different from the University. The affiliated Colleges advertised posts as per the U.G.C./Punjab Government rules. The Supreme Court also said that these posts should be filled up as per the U.G.C. Guidelines. The Punjab Government had also not diluted the U.G.C. Regulations. According to him, if anything is diluted, is diluted by the Senate of the University. Due to that, there advertisement is not wrong and the selection process could be continued.

A din prevailed.

Principal Parveen Chawla said that as informed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, the Colleges had given advertisements as per U.G.C./Punjab Government rules. As and when, they receive any notification with revised template/instructions from Punjab Government for filling up these posts, an emergency meeting of the Syndicate could be convened and take decision accordingly.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he was also saying the same thing and it should be told to him who is eligible today according to the U.G.C. The Supreme Court in its ruling regarding eligibility conditions for the appointment of Assistant Professor in University or Colleges and they should wait for the outcome of the review petition or up to 90 days after the decision of the Supreme Court of India for filling up of the posts of Assistant Professors in the University as well as in the affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for advertisement of the posts of Assistant Professors in the University, they would wait for two months.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of **Item C-13** on the agenda, be deferred.

**Resolution proposed by  
Dr. S.S. Sangha and  
Shri Varinder Singh,  
Fellows**

**14.** Considered the recommendations of the Committee dated 17.3.2015 (**Appendix-XX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, in pursuance of the Syndicate decision dated 18.5.2014 (Para 12) and (Para 47 (ii)), on the following Resolution proposed by Dr. S.S. Sangha and Shri Varinder Singh, Fellows:

That two additional seats for rural area students and one additional seat for border area students, respectively be created over and above the sanctioned seats in all the Under Graduate/Post Graduate courses offered by teaching departments of Panjab University, Constituent Colleges, Regional Centres and its affiliated Colleges, subject to the condition that rural students must fulfil the following conditions:

“Only those candidates will be considered in this category, who have passed their Matriculation and +2 examination from those rural schools which do not fall in the area of a Municipal Corporation/Municipal Committee/Small Town/ Notified Area. Further, the candidate should have been studying in such school for at least five years before passing the last examination. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the D.E.O./Principal of the concerned Institute of the area certifying that the school from where the candidate has passed the Matriculation and +2 examination, falls within the aforesaid rural area.”

For Border area candidates, the following conditions are applicable:

“Only those candidates will be considered in this category, who have passed their Matriculation and +2 examination from Border area schools. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the Tehsildar of the area certifying that the school from where the candidate has passed the Matriculation and +2 examination, falls within the aforesaid Border Area.”

The reservation in the Rural area/Border area could be availed only once by the candidate during his/her entire academic career.

The above concession is not applicable to the courses falling under regulatory agencies such as BCI, MCI, DCI and NCTE.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.5.2014 (Para 12) (**Appendix-XX**) has resolved that the Item C-12, on the agenda be referred back to the Committee to be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor along with the Resolution of Shri Varinder Gill placed before the Syndicate as Information Item and thereafter the recommendations of the Committee be placed before the Syndicate.
2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.5.2014 (Para 47 (ii)) (**Appendix-XX**) has resolved that the information contained in Item 47-I-(iii) to I-(xi), on the agenda, be noted. Item 47-I-(i) be placed before the Syndicate as consideration item. As far as Item 47-I-(ii) is concerned, the same be referred to the Committee to be constituted to consider Item C-12.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the reservation policy of Panjab University is of all India level and this is also mentioned in the Calendar. They should, first of all, clarify the border area.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that they have no right to make reservation on the basis of residence. This is a constant view of

the Supreme Court of India and there is a bar in the Constitution under Article 16, Clause 3, this can be done only by the Parliament and nobody else. Under Article 35 again and he had brought a judgement of full bench of the Punjab & Haryana High Court. He had handed over a copy of the same on the floor of the House. This is the judgement where all these things were checked. The Punjab Government had granted 5 marks on the basis of residence, which was stuck down by the High Court.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they are not talking about the reservation, they are talking only one additional seat for the people of border area.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that one additional seat for border area could be there, but there is need to define the border area. They could not do it only for the people of Punjab.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath read out Article 16, Clause 3 and under this Article, they could not give any reservation on the basis of residence for employment. The University has to see such things at the time of admission to U.B.S. and MBBS.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when two additional seats were given on the basis of residence for J&K and at that time Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath remained silent.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that under Article 73 and Article 16 Clause 3, the Government of India could do reservation on area-wise.

A din prevailed.

Principal Parveen Chawla, referring to page 51, said that in the minutes of the Committee dated 17.3.2015, the word 'Kashmiri Migrant' should be read as "Kashmiri Residents".

The Vice-Chancellor said that border area for this purpose should be the jurisdiction of Panjab University and border area with other nations.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that these seats should be only for the people of border area within the territorial jurisdictions of Panjab University.

A pandemonium prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University could seek a legal opinion for this purpose.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if they consider the border of jurisdiction of Panjab University, then the students of Amritsar and Gurdaspur Districts were deprived from this benefit and only the students of Ferozepur District remained.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Punjabi University, Patiala and Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar had already been giving such benefit to the students of their respective jurisdictions. Being the character of the Panjab University as Inter-State Body Corporate, they should seek legal opinion from the Constitutional Expert, whether

similar benefit could be given to the students belonging to the region which is under the jurisdiction of Panjab University.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that there should be some existing definition of border area.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could not implement the same without taking the legal opinion.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that what about two additional seats for rural area students.

The Vice-Chancellor said that both the issues would be decided together. They had to decide about the rural area under the jurisdiction of Panjab University; otherwise, the entire country is covered under rural area. He would talk to the person from whom they would seek legal opinion and tell him what is their input?

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that whenever any State provided reservation on the basis of border area, difficult area, Beat area, Hilly Area, the reservations were upheld by the Courts. The reservations on the basis of rural area were not upheld. Under Article 35, it is only the Parliament which could give any such benefit. They could not provide reservation on the basis of residence.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the viewpoints expressed by the members of the Syndicate would be placed before the person from whom he would seek legal opinion on these issues.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they are going to provide this benefit only to those students who are residing within the jurisdiction of Panjab University. It is very much clear from the recommendation of the Committee which is reproduced below:

“Only those candidates will be considered in this category, who have passed their Matriculation and +2 examination from Border area schools. A candidate claiming such benefit will have to produce a certificate from the Tehsildar of the area certifying that the school from where the candidate has passed the Matriculation and +2 examination falls within the aforesaid Boarder area”.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that they had put two very clear clauses in the recommendations of the Committee and on the basis of these clauses everything is crystal clear.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is fine but as questioned by Professor Bhandari that Panjab University has a very unique character and keeping that in view, he did not want to commit any illegality so that they have to face any trouble at later stage.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that reservation of seats on the basis of residences had already been there in Chandigarh and Punjab. There are 85% seats reserved for the students who passed their +2 examination from the schools in Chandigarh.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that in the case of Sunil Jaitley v/s State of Haryana, the petitioner had cleared 8<sup>th</sup> and 10+2

classes from rural area schools and he wanted admission in MBBS against the seats reserved for rural area students, but the Supreme Court had quashed his case. He cautioned that they should not take any such decision which could create problem for them later on.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they are demanding additional seats for rural area students and not any reservation.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that in the recommendation of the Committee, it was mentioned that reservation in the rural area/border area could be availed only once by the candidate during his/her entire academic career. He wanted to know if the candidate had done his graduation from border area College/s and wanted to seek admission in M.A. at Panjab University, whether he/she would be eligible under this category or not. This should be clarified at the time of seeking legal opinion so that the University could be saved from any harassment later on. He is not against this, but indirectly such seats would be considered as colourful reservation in the legal language.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if a student of Fazilka and residing in Chandigarh and passed his/her education from Chandigarh, he/she automatically not eligible for seeking benefit under this category.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that the Committee constituted by the University to consider these issues, no teacher from the affiliated Colleges, (numbering 192) where these decisions are to be implemented, is included in this Committee.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that Principal R.S. Jhanji and Dr. Dalip Kumar were the members of this Committee. Somehow, Principal Jhanji could not attend the meeting.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that two-three members Committee could be constituted to resolve this issue because there are so many lacunae and he had fought more than 100 cases on such matters.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no need of Committee on these issues. He would seek legal opinion from more than one person.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that there are judgements which permit reservation for border area, but for rural area, there is no such judgement. Whether it would be a vertical or horizontal reservation? If they wanted to give reservation, the border area and rural area issues should be separated. If they want, he would provide them judgements on these issues. There is one judgement in respect of U.P. State in the case of Pradeep Tandon, there were reservation for rural area, hilly area, difficult border area. In this case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India had approved reservation for hilly area, difficult border area and reservation for rural area had been cancelled. Till to his estimation, under Article 54, they say that rural population is not treated as homogeneous population because there are very rich people and very poor people residing in rural areas and they could not treat them at par. As per law, if they could give this benefit, then it should be given. As per the existing law, what cannot be done directly cannot be done indirectly.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That a legal opinion be sought from more than one person on the issues of two additional seats for rural area students and one additional seat for border area students, over and above the sanctioned seats in all the Under-graduate and Postgraduate courses offered by teaching Departments of Panjab University, Constituent Colleges, Regional Centres and affiliated Colleges, subject to the conditions laid down by the Committee in its recommendations and thereafter the item be placed before the Syndicate for approval.

**Award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**15.** 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.).

**Referring to page A-18 of the Appendix,** Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that however the item is approved. But he wanted to draw attention in the case of Mr. Rajesh Kumar for Ph.D. thesis at page 18. Report of the two examiner's are appended in which one of the examiners in his report on the thesis of Mr. Rajesh Kumar for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology has pointed out that "Quality of publication is poor". However, the second examiner reported, "That the work done is of moderate quality". He suggested that now the case should be approved, but in future, such things should not be ignored.

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

Sr. No.	Name of the Candidate	Faculty/ Subject	Title of Thesis
1.	Mr. Jandeep Singh H.No. 2/83, Boys Hostel No.6, Panjab University Chandigarh	Science/ Chemistry	SYNTHESIS AND STRUCTURAL CHARACTERIZATION OF NEUTRAL PENTA-COORDINATE SILICON (IV) COMPLEXES
2.	Mr. Rajesh Kumar Associate Professor ECE Department NITTTR, Sector-26 Chandigarh	Engineering & Technology	FPGA IMPLEMENTATION OF OPTIMIZED DDC & DUC FOR SOFTWARE DEFINED RADIOS
3.	Mr. Har Dharam Bir Singh 5479/1, CAT-II Modern Housing Complex Manimajra Chandigarh	Business Management & Commerce	ADOPTION OF GREEN SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES BY SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES IN SELECTED INDUSTRIES IN PUNJAB
4.	Mr. Anirudh Kumar Prasad Flat No.187, Sect-09 Pkt-02, Dwarka New Delhi	Arts/ Political Science	TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF KASHMIR PROBLEM: A POLITICAL ECONOMY PERSPECTIVE
5.	Ms. Preeti H.No.112, V.P.O. Gamri Tehsil Gohana District Sonapat (Haryana) – 131301`	Arts/ Sociology	SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT OF THE AGED IN RURAL HARYANA: A CASE STUDY OF SONEPAT DISTRICT
6.	Ms. Ila Garg H.No.13148-C 1/A, Shiv Colony Bathinda	Science/ Physics	NEW MINIMAL SUPERSYMMETRIC SO (10) GUT PHENOMENOLOGY AND ITS COSMOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Candidate</b>	<b>Faculty/ Subject</b>	<b>Title of Thesis</b>
7.	Mr. Dinesh Kumar Sharma H.No.2320, Sector-23-C Chandigarh	Engineering & Technology	DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT OF POLLUTION PREVENTION TECHNIQUES IN COTTON BASED TEXTILE INDUSTRY
8.	Mr. Vishal Thakur Hostel No.1, Block No.3 Room No. 32, P.U. Chandigarh	Science/ Biotechnology	PRODUCTION, PURIFICATION, CHARACTERIZATION AND EVALUATION OF BIOCATALYTIC POTENTIAL OF AN ORGANO- TOLERANT LIPASE FROM AN EXTREMOPHILE
9.	Ms. Maryam Didehdar Ardebil H.No.1512, Sector-10 Chandigarh	Arts/ Psychology	EFFECTIVENESS OF COGNITIVE BEHAVIORAL THERAPY AND MINDFULNESS BASED STRESS REDUCTION FOR TREATMENT OF CHRONIC LOW BACK PAIN
10.	Ms. Tawinder Kaur H.No. 883, Sector 41-A Chandigarh	Arts/ Gandhian Studies	CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: A STUDY IN A GANDHIAN PERSPECTIVE

#### **Item No.16 Gap**

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor left the House by saying that he is abstaining from the meeting and requested Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath, the Senior-most Syndic, to chair the meeting of the Syndicate in his absence. The same was proposed by Dr. I.S. Sandhu and was seconded by Principal Gurdip Sharma.

#### **Appointment of Professor Neera Grover in the Department of Music**

**17.** Considered the recommendation of the Dean University Instruction that it would be appropriate if Professor Neera Grover is further appointed as Professor in the Department of Music, P.U., Chandigarh for a period which the Syndicate deems fit, under Regulation 5(b) (i) at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 8.9.2012 approved temporary appointment of Professor Neera Grover of S.N.D.T. Women's University, Mumbai in the Department of Music of Panjab University for a period of one year from the date she joins. She joined Panjab University as Professor on 17.12.2012 and served up to 13.12.2013. Thereafter, her case was again allowed for temporary appointment under Regulation 5(b)(i) at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007 in the Syndicate meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> January, 2014 up to 31.7.2015. She rejoined Panjab University w.e.f. 5.2.2014 after getting leave from S.N.D.T. Women's University, Mumbai.
  2. The Dean University Instruction has observed that Professor Neera Grover has been teaching M.A. and M.Phil. classes of

the Department of Music against the work load available. She has supervised students for the M.Phil. and is also co-supervisor of Ph.D. students. Besides that, she has been giving concert performance in classical vocal music in Chandigarh adding to the cultural for a of the Chandigarh region. The Panjab University can take benefit of services of a renowned Music Teacher and a performing artist for more time.

3. Curriculum Vitae of Professor Neera Grover enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**).

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath read out the item.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it is a recommendation from the Dean of University Instruction and they should approve it. He added that let the period of appointment be one and half years.

Many members supported the above view.

Shri Ashok Goyal however, enquired whether they want to help the Vice-Chancellor or create problems for him. He stated that he had pointed out this thing last time also when such an item was placed before the Syndicate in January 2014. That time also the Vice-Chancellor proposed the name of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath to chair the meeting in his absence without caring for the procedure laid-down in the University Calendar. It meant, they were creating unnecessary problems.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that a person from amongst the members of the Syndicate be elected to Chair the meeting only if the Vice-Chancellor does not come to attend the meeting. But he is abstaining for one item and being the senior-most member of the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor had asked him to chair the meeting for this particular item, which is acceptable to the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that alright, but according to him, it is not the right procedure. The quoted Regulation 5(b) related only to emergent temporary appointments on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that the Vice-Chancellor could not recommend her name as she happened to be his relative.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was not against this appointment, but wanted that proper procedure must be followed. Firstly, the Regulation which is quoted is only for emergent temporary appointments. Nowhere it is mentioned under this Regulation that Dean University Instruction could make recommendations for emergency temporary appointments. The Dean of University Instruction has also nowhere mentioned in what terms this case is of emergent nature. Further, instead of the recommendation by the Vice-Chancellor, the recommendation is from the Dean of University Instruction. It is nowhere mentioned that in the absence of the Vice-Chancellor, his number two would recommend the same. According to him, as per the settled law, it should be referred by the

higher authority and the recommendation should come from the Chancellor. The regulation under which the item has been brought for consideration is not proper and it is not covered under that regulation. As per regulation, it is the Syndicate to decide as to who would chair the meeting in the absence of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath again clarified that Vice-Chancellor asked him to chair the meeting in his absence being a senior-most member of the Syndicate, which has been accepted by the members of Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not know as to when the Vice-Chancellor has proposed his name to Chair the meeting in his absence, but Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath had already occupied the seat to Chair the meeting.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that when the item regarding the appointment of Professor Neera Grover has been placed before the Senate earlier, the Vice-Chancellor had abstained from the meeting had asked Professor R.P. Bambah to chair the meeting in his absence being a senior-most member of the Senate.

At this stage, overwhelming majority of the Syndics agreed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that to the manner in which the item has been placed before the Syndicate, his dissent should be recorded.

Shri Naresh Gour said that his dissent should also be recorded.

Principal Gurdip Sharma reiterated his earlier statement that he had proposed the name of Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath to chair the meeting be recorded and this item should be passed. The proposal of Principal Gurdeep Sharma had been supported by Dr. Iqbal Sandhu and Professor Navdeep Goyal.

After discussion, the item was approved and it was –

**RESOLVED:** That Professor Neera Grover be further appointed as Professor in the Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for a period of one and a half year, w.e.f. 01.08.2015, under Regulation 5(b) (i) at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

( G.S. Chadha )  
Registrar

Confirmed

( **Gopal Krishan Chatrath** )  
**CHAIRMAN**

**Extension of Affiliation**

**18.** Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to Govt. Home Science College, Sector-10, Chandigarh, for Post Graduate Diploma in Child Guidance and Family Counseling (15 Seats), for the session 2015.

**NOTE:** Inspection report and an office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXII**).

**RESOLVED:** That temporary extension of affiliation for Post Graduate Diploma in Child Guidance and Family Counseling (15 Seats), for the session 2015, be granted to Govt. Home Science College, Sector-10, Chandigarh.

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the following Item 19 on the agenda be treated as withdrawn:**

**Recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department of Laws made on 13.2.2015, 19.2.2015 and 25.2.2015**

**19.** Considered the recommendations of the Academic and Administrative Committees of the Department of Laws made in their joint meetings held on 13.02.2015 (Item 1), 19.02.2015 (Item 1) & 25.02.2015 (Item 9) that:-

- (i) fresh/final fee structure of LL.M. I year course be approved for the session 2015-16 **as per Annexure-**, supplied by the Chairperson of Law in pursuance of the recommendation of the Committee dated 19.2.2015.
- (ii) the revised department fee structure of LL.B. (3 year course) for the next academic session 2015-16 as per **Annexure-** supplied by the Chairperson of Law in pursuance of the recommendation of the Committee dated 25.2.2015.
- (iii) the honorarium for evaluation of term paper and dissertation from the external examiner i.e. Rs. 150/- for term paper and Rs.200/- for dissertation be allowed (Committee dated 13.2.2015).

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 22.3.2014/25.5.2014 had approved the fee structure for LL.M. one year course. However, at the time of implementation of the said fee structure, representation received from the students as in the minutes it was not clear whether the other charges as referred in the approved fee structure of LL.M. one year course were as suggested by the Committee in its meeting dated 9.5.2014 or it was as per the charges being recovered from the students of other departments at the University level. To resolve this issue, a Committee was constituted by the Vice-Chancellor which in its meeting dated 6.2.2015 recommended that fee structure may be reviewed to remove such ambiguity. The minutes of the Committee duly approved

by the Vice-Chancellor.

2. An office note enclosed.

**Request dated 28.01.2015 of Dr. Devi Sirohi nee Devi Verma, Professor (Re-employed) for extra-ordinary leave without pay for more than two years w.e.f. 07.02.2015 up to 07.02.2017**

**20.** Considered the request dated 28.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXIII**) of Dr. Devi Sirohi nee Devi Verma, Professor (Re-employed) that she be granted Extra Ordinary Leave without pay for more two years w.e.f. 07.02.2015 up to 07.02.2017, as her term as Chairperson, Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights. The information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXIII**) was also taken into consideration.

**NOTE:** 1. Dr. Devi Sirohi nee Devi Verma was re-employed on contract basis at Department of History, w.e.f. 02.01.2013 up to 31.12.2015 (i.e. attaining the age of 63 years) by the Senate in its meeting dated 24.03.2013 vide Para XXVIII (**Appendix-XXIII**).

2. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 15.3.2014 vide paragraph 34(iv) noted the following information:

“The Vice-Chancellor, in accordance with the decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013 (Para 5) has granted Extra Ordinary Leave without pay to Dr. Devi Sirohi nee Devi Verma, Professor (Re-employed), Department of History for one year w.e.f. 07.02.2014 (F.N.) to enable her to join as Chairperson of the Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights.”

3. As per notification No. SW3/SCPCR/2014/1167 (**Appendix-XXIII**) issued by Social Welfare Department, Chandigarh Administration, and attached with the application dated 28.01.2015, the term of Chairperson will be for a period of three years from the date Chairperson assumes the charge of the post.

4. Since, the re-employment of Dr. Devi Sirohi is up to 31.12.2015, her request for grant of Extra Ordinary Leave without pay can be considered up to 31.12.2015 at this time.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he had already pointed out 2-3 times that the re-employment teachers leave rules should be got amended.

The Vice-Chancellor agreed that it should be done. The University had already started process in this direction. Some of the teachers of the University got Vice-Chancellorship or other assignments during the period of their re-employment. They have to have very clear guidelines in this direction so that there should not be any need for taking clearance from case to case basis and it would also be good for the University system.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that if anybody from the University got higher responsibility and better chances, leave provision should be there for such persons during re-employment period and the same should be taken as a normal case and not as a special case. If anybody becomes Vice-Chancellor or get higher position, they should facilitate him/her. According to him, it should be a matter of policy and they should resolve it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is working here and his previous employer, i.e. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai has extended his re-employment up to 65 years. He would not hesitate in providing the same benefit to the teachers of the University.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That the request dated 28.01.2015 (**Appendix-XXIII**) of Dr. Devi Sirohi nee Devi Verma, Professor (Re-employed), be granted Extra-Ordinary Leave without pay for two years more w.e.f. 07.02.2015 up to 07.02.2017, (till as her term as Chairperson, Chandigarh Commission for Protection of Child Rights).

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 18.2.2015 regarding modified application form for appointment of/ promotions of Principals/ Professors/Associate Professors/Assistant Professors in affiliated Colleges and University**

**21.** Considered the minutes of the Committee dated 18.02.2015 (**Appendix-XXIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the modified application form which has the inclusion of API Score meant for determining the eligibility as per UGC guidelines for making the appointments and promotions of Principals/Professors/Associate Professors/Assistant Professors in Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has full regard as far as the Registrar of the University is concerned. He pointed out that the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the modified application form which has the inclusion of API Score meant for determining the eligibility as per UGC guidelines for making the appointments and promotions of Principals/Professors/Associate Professor/Assistant Professors in Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, under the Chairmanship of the Registrar. The Committee comprised of 4-5 Syndics/Fellows. Being academic matter, the Chairman of the Committee should not be the Registrar. He suggested that, in future, such things could not happen.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it was well taken.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that as per the existing principle, wherever any member of the Syndicate is a member of the Committee, he/she should be the Chairman of the Committee.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that it was noted that in some of the Selection/Inspection Committees, the Fellows were on such Committees were members whereas the non-Fellows made appointed Chairman. He suggested that wherever Fellows were on such Committee/s, the Fellow should be the Chairman of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if there were two Fellows as members of the Committee/s, the Professor Fellow should be given preference over Assistant Professor Fellow.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath stated that there is a provision in the Calendar of the University, i.e., (i) Fellow of the University is considered equivalent to a Professor of the University and (ii) Professor Emeritus on special occasions like Convocation is to be treated at par with the Fellow of the University. It meant that the Fellow is equated with the Professor and a Professor Emeritus on special occasion is treated at par with Fellow.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as stated by the Vice-Chancellor that if there is a Professor Fellow and Assistant Professor Fellow of the same Committee, then the Professor Fellow should be the Chairman of that Committee. He further elaborated that he was a member of the Syndicate and Senate and in spite of that he was a member of the Inspection Committee and other Professor was the Chairman and if they did not take any positive decision in this regard, tomorrow it would create problem.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professorship is implemented in a very selective way as Punjab Government as well as U.T. Administration has put certain conditions for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor and that was why there are so many Associate Professors who has been working for more than 10-15 years and they have to try to over-come such problems also so that they could not feel that discrimination is being meted out with them.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu stated that he was a member of one of the Inspection Committee sent to SMS Karamjot College for Women, Miani (Hoshiarpur) for Inspection and the Principal of one of the affiliated Colleges was the Chairman of the Committee. He prepared the Inspection Report. He further said that they had decided, in future, if such thing happened, then they would not go for inspection.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he understood the difficulty of the members.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar suggested that they should not make any discrimination between the Fellows whether he/she is Assistant Professor/Associate Professor and Professor, they should be treated at par.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that what Dr. Dinesh Kumar said, there is a merit in it. He wanted to point out certain things through the Vice-Chancellor to the Dean, College Development Council because the office of the Dean says and there are instances that one of the subject experts would be the Chairman of the Committee. Now, sometimes the Fellow had been included in the Inspection Committee/s and not as a

subject expert. In such cases, the non-Fellow becomes the Chairman, but if a Professor who is subject expert is already there and suppose to be the Chairman of the Committee. Sometimes to avoid Chairmanship of the Committee to that person, another man from the same field is included in the Committee which creates heart burning and also burdened the Colleges additionally. This had already been happened in one or two cases. Secondly, as far as possible, Fellow should be the Head/Chairman of the Inspection Committees irrespective of the fact whether he/she is Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor. He was not talking of his own behalf as he was not Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor and had not been included in any such Committee. Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath had also not been included in such Committees as he had already been Chairman of so many other Committees in the University. To say that where Assistant Professor is a Fellow and is junior to a Professor that probably undermining the authority of the member of the Senate. Selection Committees, then it is 'yes', but in Inspection Committees, the Fellow has much more experience as far as procedural part is concerned as Dr. I.S. Sandhu told and the Chairman of the Committee should ensure that everything has been done as per the terms of the Regulations of the University, U.G.C. or the State Government. The Professor could be of eminence in his subject, but he/she has not much knowledge as far as procedural part is concerned of such Committees.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that in the Selection Committee for the post of Principals, there are many variations in the API score. He suggested that one or two expert Principals should be there to tackle such problem.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the Committee dated 18.02.2015 (**Appendix-XXIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the modified application form which has the inclusion of API Score meant for determining the eligibility as per UGC guidelines for making the appointments and promotions of Principals/Professors/Associate Professors/Assistant Professors in Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh, be approved.

**Amended proposed policy received through E-mail on 15.4.2015 from Deputy Registrar Colleges, Punjab for the selection of Assistant Professor, be kept in abeyance**

**22.** Considered if, the amended proposed policy received through E-mail on 15.4.2015 (**Appendix-XXV**) from Deputy Director Colleges, Punjab for the selection of Assistant Professor, be kept in abeyance till the Punjab Government intimate the final decision in this regard.

- NOTE:** 1. It is evident from the E-mail that these are only the draft guidelines.
2. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 25.01.2015 (Para 49) has approved the notification of the Punjab Government along with the format of advertisement for filling of 1925 posts of Assistant Professors on contractual basis.

**RESOLVED:** That the amended proposed policy received through E-mail on 15.4.2015 (**Appendix-XXV**) from Deputy Director Colleges, Punjab for the selection of Assistant Professor, be kept in

abeyance till the Punjab Government intimate the final decision in this regard.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 07.04.2015 regarding fee structure, admission process etc. for starting MDS course at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital from the session 2015-16**

**23.** Considered minutes dated 7.4.2015 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to finalize the issues like fee structure, admission process etc. for starting MDS courses at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Sector 25, Chandigarh from the current academic session 2015-2016.

**NOTE:** Letter dated 30.3.2015 of permission to start MDS courses at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Chandigarh received from Under Secretary to the Govt. of India, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare (Dental Education Section) is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVI**).

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 07.04.2015 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Committee regarding finalization of the issues like fee structure, admission process, etc. for starting MDS courses at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, Sector 25, Chandigarh from the current academic session 2015-2016, be approved.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 18.03.2015 for incorporation in the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Amrita Shergil Girl's Hostel, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana w.e.f. the session 2015-16**

**24.** Considered the following recommendations of the Committee dated 18.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) to be incorporated in the Handbook of Hostel Rules for Amrita Shergil Girl's Hostel, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, for the session 2015-16:

1. Guest charges Rs.50/- per day instead of Rs.25/- per day.
2. Electric kettle not to be permitted because of the extra load on electricity and misuse.
3. Laptop may be permitted with a payment of Rs.800/- per annum to be realized at the beginning of the session.
4. Wi-Fi charges @ Rs.500/- per annum.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that the recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No.3 should be deleted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they wanted, it should be deleted.

Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that Wi-Fi charges @ Rs.500/- per annum should also be deleted as the University is already taking Wi-Fi charges from the students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recommendation of the Committee at Sr. No.4 should also be deleted as the University is taking a sum of Rs.30/- per month from the students as Wi-Fi charges.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations of the Committee dated 18.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) w.e.f. the session 2015-16, be approved as under and the same be allowed to incorporate in the

Handbook of Hostel Rules for Amrita Shergil Girl's Hostel, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana:

1. Guest charges Rs.50/- per day instead of Rs.25/- per day.
2. Electric kettle not to be permitted because of the extra load on electricity and misuse

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the following Item 25 on the agenda be treated as withdrawn:**

### **Withdrawn Item**

**25.** Considered if, Dr. Manjit Paintal, Lecturer (Sr. Scale) (now re-employed as Professor), Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, be placed in the Senior Scale (Project Officer) (3000-5000 unrevised 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. Information contained in the office note be also taken into consideration.

- NOTE:**
1. In terms of the Senate decision dated 23.9.1997 (Para VI), Dr. Manjit Paintal (Retd.) and Re-employed in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, P.U., was placed in the senior scale of 3000-5000 w.e.f. 5.7.1995 under CAS (revision of pay-scales for teachers, 1986) with the condition of attending two Refresher Courses or one refresher course and one orientation course etc. upto 31.12.1995 and in future, the conditions are relaxed, the same would apply to them.
  2. The Syndicate/Senate in its meeting dated 29.06.2010 (Para 9) and 10.10.2010 (Para VII) had approved that Dr. Paintal be placed in the Senior Scale of Lecturer as under:-
    1. Placement in Senior Scale w.e.f. 5.7.1995 without any financial benefit.
    2. Placement in Senior Scale w.e.f. 9.8.2002 with financial benefit.
  3. The Syndicate/Senate dated 19.08.2008 & 24.03.2013 has adopted the letter No. F.2-16/2007(PS) dated 30.06.2010 of University Grant Commission regarding extension of date beyond

30.06.2009 for participation in Orientation/Refresher Courses in respect of Teachers/ Assistant Registrar/Assistant University Librarian /College Librarian/ Deputy Librarian /Assistant Director of Physical Education /College Director of Physical Education for placement/promotion under Career Advancement Scheme.

4. Dr. Manjeet Paintal vide application dated 22.12.2014 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.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 31.03.2015 submission of Ph.D. Synopsis**

**26.** Considered minutes dated 31.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate dated 25.01.2015 (Para 22 & 34) (**Appendix-XXVIII**), to look into the issue as to what period the candidate could be allowed to submit their Ph.D. Synopsis, whether the synopsis could be accepted before doing the Pre-Ph.D. Course Work or not.

Initiating discussion, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the item should be passed as proposed, but he wanted to know about the time period of submission of the synopsis by the candidates who were enrolled for Ph.D. after doing M.Phil., as they are exempted from doing the Course Work.

It was clarified that such candidates could submit their synopsis within a stipulated period as prescribed in the item or even after 15 days or one month after their Registration of Candidacy.

After some further discussion, it was -

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 31.03.2015 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate dated 25.01.2015 (Para 22 & 34) (**Appendix-XXVIII**), be approved.

Arising out of it, Principal Gurdip Sharma said that DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh and Postgraduate Government College, Sector 42, Chandigarh applied for setting up of Research Centres in their respective Colleges. The cases of these Colleges had been pending in the University office since long. He pleaded that these Colleges should be permitted to set up Research Centres for providing Pre-Ph.D. Course Work at the earliest.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, first of all such Colleges should submit the time-table for setting up of Research Centre for running Pre-Ph.D. Course Work, as it is mandatory according to the requirement of the NAAC.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the requirement of the U.G.C., the Pre-Ph.D. Course Work should be completed at the Main Campuses of the Universities. He cautioned that before allowing setting up of such Research Centres, it may also be cleared from the U.G.C.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they did not allow the affiliated Colleges to set up Research Centres, how the Colleges could grow as the Assistant Professors working in the affiliated Colleges would have to guide Ph.D. students for their promotion under CAS.

Professor A.K. Bhandari clarified that Pre-Ph.D. Course Work at the Main Campuses of the University would only be required for the research scholars who are doing Ph.D. through distance mode.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that before setting up of such Research Centres, the University should seek clarification from the U.G.C.

Shri A.K. Bhandari said that the University could look into it.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath suggested that the University had permitted CRRID as a Centre for Research and for doing this Pre-Ph.D. Course Work. Similarly, wherever the affiliated Colleges, such as DAV College, Sector 10, Chandigarh; Postgraduate Government College, Sector 42, Chandigarh and GGSG College, Sector 26, Chandigarh have applied in the University office for setting up of Research Centres. He was of the view that on the same terms and conditions, the University should allow the above-mentioned Colleges for setting up of Research Centres. As suggested by the Vice-Chancellor, the University could ask these Colleges for providing the time-table, etc., as such documents could be required during successive NAAC reviews.

The Vice-Chancellor said that CRRID had done very wonderful job with the conduct of Pre-Ph.D. Course Work and the University would seek time-table and other related material from the CRRID.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu pointed out that some of the affiliated Colleges had applied for setting up of Research Centres for Pre-Ph.D. Course Work, but the same had not been allowed to the Colleges. He pleaded that it should be done in a time-bound manner.

It was clarified that last year the University had created 4-5 such Research Centres in the affiliated Colleges. The University is preparing guidelines for setting up of Research Centres and the Colleges, which had applied for such Research Centres be allowed.

Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath said that guidelines on the basis of which Research Centre for doing Pre-Ph.D. Course Work had been allowed to CRRID, on the same pattern such Colleges should also be allowed.

**Amendment in Rules**

**27.** Considered if, following rule 5 at page 120, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, for withdrawal of GPF/PF, be amended as per the Punjab Govt. circular No.2/3/90-6/6651 dated 27.09.2004 (**Appendix-XXIX**) and the same be incorporated in the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009:

<b>Existing Rule 5</b>	<b>Proposed Rule as per Punjab Govt. circular No.2/3/90-6/6651</b>
<p>The amount standing at the credit of a subscriber in the Fund shall become payable to him in the following circumstances:</p> <p>i) When he quits service;</p> <p>ii) In the case of leave preparatory to retirement a subscriber may, at the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor, withdraw up to 90 per cent of his assets in Provident Fund</p>	<p>The amount standing at the credit of a subscriber in the Fund shall become payable to him in the following circumstances:</p> <p>i) When he quits service;</p> <p>ii) 90 per cent of amount standing at the credit in the GPF/PF within one year before retirement without linking to any purpose.</p>

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 14.15 at page 131 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I, 2007 read as under:

“Every employee, on leaving University service or on retirement, shall claim payment of Provident Fund Standing at his credit within one year of its becoming due. Interest on the Provident Fund shall not be paid to any employee from the date of expiry of one year of his leaving University service or his retirement.”

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

**RESOLVED:** That Rule 5 at page 120, P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, for withdrawal of GPF/PF, be amended as under as per the Punjab Government circular No.2/3/90-6/6651 dated 27.09.2004 (**Appendix-XXIX**) and the same be incorporated in the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009:

<b>Existing Rule 5</b>	<b>Proposed Rule as per Punjab Govt. circular No.2/3/90-6/6651</b>
<p>The amount standing at the credit of a subscriber in the Fund shall become payable to him in the following circumstances:</p> <p>(i) When he quits service;</p> <p>(ii) In the case of leave preparatory to retirement a subscriber may, at the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor, withdraw up to 90 per cent of his assets in Provident Fund</p>	<p>The amount standing at the credit of a subscriber in the Fund shall become payable to him in the following circumstances:</p> <p>(i) When he quits service;</p> <p>(ii) 90 per cent of amount standing at the credit in the GPF/PF within one year before retirement without linking to any purpose.</p>

**Temporary extension of affiliation** **28.** Considered if, temporary extension of affiliation, be granted to DAV College for Women, Ferozepur Cantt. for M.A. I & II (Punjabi) for the session 2015-16.

**NOTE:** Inspection report and office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).

**RESOLVED:** That temporary extension of affiliation for M.A. I & II (Punjabi) for the session 2015-16, be granted to DAV College for Women, Ferozepur Cantt.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That having accepted the compendium of inspection reports w.r.t. the grant of extension of affiliation for the session 2015-2016 to the Degree and Education Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, a Committee comprising the following be constituted with authorization to decide and resolve on behalf of the Syndicate the grant/non-grant of extension of affiliation to the affiliated Colleges for the session 2015-2016 and/or by effecting such measures and steps as are mandated in view of deficiencies to ensure quality education in the affiliated Colleges in consonance with the Calendar/University Grants Commission/NCTE Regulations:

- |    |                                   |          |
|----|-----------------------------------|----------|
| 1. | Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath       | Chairman |
| 2. | Professor A.K. Bhandari           |          |
| 3. | Principal Gurdip Sharma           |          |
| 4. | Principal Parveen Chawla          |          |
| 5. | Professor Karamjeet Singh         |          |
| 6. | Dr. Sanjeev Arora                 |          |
| 7. | Dr. I.S. Sandhu                   |          |
| 8. | Dean Colleges Development Council |          |
| 9. | Deputy Registrar (Colleges)       | Convener |

**The Vice-Chancellor said that the following Item 29 on the agenda be treated as withdrawn:**

**Withdrawn Item**

**29.** Considered, if extension in Association, be granted to Shri Saraswati Sanskrit College, PO: Khanna, GT Road, Khanna (Ludhiana) for (i) Prak Shastri-I (ii) Shastri-I- 40 Seats each, for the session 2015-16.

**NOTE:** 1. Inspection report and an office note enclosed.

2. As per order issued vide No. Misc./A-5/12132-12147 dated 20.09.201 the above said College was granted Association for (i) Prak Shastri-I & II (ii) Shastri-I, II & III- 40 Seats, for the session 2014-15.

In compliance of the above orders, the Principal of the Shri Saraswati Sanskrit College vide letter No. 672 dated 20.10.2014 has written that the letter for grant of association was received in the College on 25.09.2014. Meanwhile, the last date for admission to the said course/s was lapsed.

**Routine and formal matters**

**30.** The information contained in Items **R-(i) to R-(vi) and R-(viii) to R-(xv)** on the agenda was read out and ratified:-

- (i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has protected the pay of Ms. Simran Kaur, Assistant Professor in Economics, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC at Rs.20620/- + AGP Rs.7000/- w.e.f. the date of her joining in the Panjab University i.e. 04.07.2014 in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 with next date of increment as usual, as per revised LPC (**Appendix-XXXI**) issued by her previous employer i.e. Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College for Women, Jhar Sahib, Ludhiana.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate dated 04.08.2012 (Para 6) and Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para IX) has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to approve the cases of protection of pay/fixation of pay, in future, on behalf of the Syndicate.

2. As per Regulation 4.1 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007, the Senate is the competent authority for the fixation of salary, accelerated increment, grant of allowance, etc., in the case of employees holding permanent posts:

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Radha, Assistant Professor in Economics (temporary) P.U. Constituent College Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur, w.e.f. 07.02.2015, by waiving off the condition to deposit one month salary in lieu of one month notice period before resignation, under Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009.

**NOTE:** Rule 16.2 at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, reads as under:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has ordered that Professor L.K. Bansal, Honorary Director, UIHMT, P.U., be paid honorarium of Rs.2000/- p.m. and telephone facility at his residence as per University rules w.e.f. 03.11.2014 onwards (the date on which he has taken the charge of Honorary Director, UIHMT) & the same be paid against his substantive post of Professor in the USOL as was done earlier in the case of Professor R.K. Gupta.

- NOTE:** 1. Dr. R.K. Gupta, Honorary Director, UIHMT, P.U., was also paid honorarium @Rs.2000/- p.m. & telephone facility at his residence as per University rules w.e.f. 04.07.2013 i.e. the date on which he has taken the charge vide Para 64 (R-xix) of Syndicate meeting dated 04.01.2014/ 16.01.2014 (**Appendix-XXXII**).
2. Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, UBS has now been appointed as Director, UIHMT, as additional charge. She has taken over as such on 24.03.2015 (F.N.).

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate:

- (i) has approved the appointment of the following Doctors (Full-time/Part-time) at BGJ Institute of Health, P.U. initially for the period of six months w.e.f. the date they join their duties & further extendable up to two years on their satisfactory services with the terms & conditions as notified by the CMO vide his Notice No. 1525/HC dated 29.12.2014 (**Appendix-XXXIII**):

Sr. No.	Name of Doctor	Designation	Salary per month (fixed) (in Rs.)
1.	Dr. R.V. Suri	Medical Officer (Full-time)	45000/-
2.	Dr. Satish Sambher	Medical Officer (Full-time)	45000/-
3.	Dr. Vikramjeet Singh	Part-time Radiologist	20000/-
4.	Dr. Abha Sharma	Part-time Consultant (Child Specialist)	20000/-
5.	Dr. Virpal Kaur	Part-time Gynaecologist	20000/-
6.	Dr. Madhu Tuli	Part-time Medical Specialist	20000/-
7.	Dr. Meenu Kapila	Part-time Ayurvedic Medical Officer	6000/-

- (ii) has also extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Doctors up to the date on which they join their duties as

per above fresh appointment, on the previous terms & conditions:

Sr. No	Name of Doctor	Designation	Previous term	Date of break	Further extension up to the date he/ she joins afresh
1.	Dr. R.V. Suri	Medical Officer (Full-time)	31.1.2015	2.2.2015 (1.2.2015 being Sunday)	3.2.2015
2.	Dr. Madhu Tuli	Part-time Medical Specialist	31.1.2015	-do-	-do-
3.	Dr. Meenu Kapila	Part-time Ayurvedic Medical Officer	31.1.2015	-do-	-do-
4.	Dr. Satish Sambher	Medical Officer (Full-time)	31.12.2014	1.1.2015	2.1.2015

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has allowed Dr. R.K. Jindal (whose term was up to 31.01.2015) to continue to work (with one day break on 02.02.2015 (01.02.2015 being Sunday) as Medical Officer (Full-Time) (on contract) in the Bhai Ghanaiya Ji Institute of Health, P.U. against the vacant post of Medical Officer (Full-Time), on consolidated salary of Rs.45,000/- p.m., till the post is filled in afresh (on contract), on the previous terms & conditions.

(vi) 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, Hoshiarpur for further period of three months i.e. w.e.f. 27.02.2015 to 26.05.2015 with one day break on 26.02.2015, on the previous terms & conditions.

(vii) **Read as an Information Item No. I-(xiii)**

(viii) 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 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 (against which they are appointed) are filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on the previous terms & conditions:

Name of employee /Deptt.	Term upto	Date of break	Period of further extension
Mr. Bhawan Chander, Computer Centre, P.U.	25.02.2015	26.02.2015	27.02.2015 to 26.05.2015
Mr. Deepak Kumar, Computer Centre, P.U.	11.03.2015	12.03.2015	13.03.2015 to 09.06.2015

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

Sr. No.	Name of employee	Designation	Term up to	Date of Break	Period of Further extension
1.	Ms. Cheshta Arora	Programmer	09.3.2015	10.3.2015	11.3.2015 to 4.6.2015
2.	Ms. Charleen Kaur	Programmer	26.02.2015	27.2.2015	28.2.2015 to 27.5.2015
3.	Mr. Neeraj Rohila	Programmer	12.3.2015	13.3.2015	14.3.2015 to 10.6.2015

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the term of contractual appointment of Shri Rishi Kaushal (A.R. Retd. on 31.01.2012), for another six months i.e. from 03.03.2015 (with one day break on 02.03.2015, 01.03.2015 being Sunday) as O.S.D. (Exam.) @ half of the salary last paid (excluding HRA, CCA and other special allowance) rounded off to nearest lower 100, out of the Budget Head "General Administration – Sub Head- Hiring Services/ Outsourcing Contractual / Casual or Seasonal Worker".

- (xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed that the No Objection Certificate, be issued to the following Colleges in respect of subjects/courses mentioned against each for forwarding the cases to the Education Officer (NSQF), University Grant Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi under the UGC scheme of Deen Dayal Upadhyay Centres of Knowledge Acquisition and Up-gradation of Skilled Human Abilities and Livelihood (KAUSHAL KENDRAS) during XII Plan period:

Sr. No.	Name of the College	Subject/courses
1.	S.C.D. Government College Ludhiana	Bachelors/Masters in Microbiology (Hons.) and Bachelor/Masters in Instrumentation
2.	S.G.G.S. Khalsa College, Mahilpur	(i) Diploma of Stock Market Operations (ii) Bachelor of Entrepreneurship
3.	Govind National College, Narangwal (Ludhiana)	Degree Programme (i) Auto Electrical and Electronics (ii) Green House Technology (iii) Retail Management (Banking and Insurance)
4.	Goswami Ganesh Dutta Sanatan Dharma College, Sector 32-C, Chandigarh	(i) Agri-Business and Agrarian Entrepreneurship (ii) Fashion Technology and Apparel Design (iii) Hardware and Networking
5.	J.C.D.A.V. College, Dasuya Hoshiarpur	(i) Medical Laboratory Technology (Diploma/Advance Diploma/ Degree)

		(ii) Cosmetology (Diploma/Advance Diploma/Degree) (iii) Travel and Tourism (Diploma/Advance Diploma/Degree) (iv) Organic Farming (Degree, PG Diploma 1 <sup>st</sup> year, PG Degree 2 <sup>nd</sup> year)
6.	Lajpat Rai D.A.V. College, Jagroan, Ludhiana	B.Voc. Programme in Event Management
7.	D.A.V. College, Hoshiarpur	(i) B.Voc. (Tourism and Service Industry) (ii) B.Voc. (Retail Management) (iii) B.Voc. (Fashion Technology)
8.	Dev Samaj College for Women, Ferozepur City	B.Voc. Courses (i) Hospitality and Tourism Management (ii) Hospital Administration & Management (iii) Software Development

**NOTE:** Earlier too, the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has allowed that the No Objection Certificate, be issued to A.S. College, Khanna(Ludhiana) for forwarding the cases to the Education Officer (NSQF), University Grant Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi under the UGC scheme of Deen Dayal Upadhyay Centres of Knowledge Acquisition and Up-gradation of Skilled Human Abilities and Livelihood (KAUSHAL KENDRAS) in the certain subjects during XII Plan period and also ratified by the Syndicate dated 08.03.2015 (Para 47 (ix)) **(Appendix-XXXIV)**.

**(xii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following recommendation of the Faculty of Engineering & Technology dated 16.12.2014 (Item 4) that:

- (i) M.E. (Bio-technology) course at University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh, be started with intake of 20 students, which will run with academic efforts and contributions of faculty from Biotechnology Engineering from the coming session i.e. 2015-16.
- (ii) the admission to M.E. (Biotechnology) be made as per criteria given below:

Course	Seats	Duration	Eligibility
M.E. (Biotechnology)	20+2 NRI	2 Years	B.E.(Biotechnology) with at least 60% marks in aggregate from Panjab University or any other University recognized by Panjab University as equivalent thereto.
Admission will be made on the basis of GATE Score.			

**NOTE:** A copy of orders issued vide No.4319-4342 dated 09.04.2015 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXV**).

**(xiii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has released the salary of Dr. Poonam Sood, Assistant Professor in Preventive and Community Dentistry (appointed purely on temporary basis) at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U. for the period from 09.01.2015 to 22.02.2015 as she has been declared medically fit after her medical investigations by medical board to join her duty w.e.f. 08.01.2015.

**NOTE:** 1. A copy of order issued by D.R.(Estt) vide No. Est/15/2944-45/Estt.I dated 7.4.2015 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

2. Dr. Poonam Sood was appointed as Assistant Professor in Preventive and Community Dentistry on temporary basis w.e.f. 09.01.2015 at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U. for the Academic session 2014-2015 in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+ GP of Rs.6000/- under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar Vol.-I, 2007 and she was requested to produce medical fitness certificate from the Chief Medical Officer, Panjab University Health Centre at the time of Joining. The appointment of the incumbent was noted by the Syndicate dated 08.03.2015 vide Para 48-I (ii).

3. Rule 7.1 appearing at page 79 of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2009, reproduced as under:

“Appointment of persons by direct recruitment for a period of more than 12 months shall be subject to their being found medically fit by the Chief Medical Officer of the University or any medical officer authorized by the Vice-Chancellor for the purpose.”

**(xiv)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has extended the tenure of appointment of Professor S.K. Soni, Honorary Director, Centre for Industry Institute Partnership Programme (CIIPP), P.U. w.e.f. 25.3.2015 to 23.3.2016, on the previous terms and conditions.

**(xv)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has accepted the resignation of Mr. Gautam Kalotra, Assistant Professor, Department of

Philosophy, P.U., w.e.f. 20.02.2015 or w.e.f. the date he is relieved from the department by waiving off the condition of giving one month notice, under Rule 16.2 at pages 83 of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2009.

**NOTE:** 1. Rule 16.2 at pages 83 of P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2009, is reproduced as under:-

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowances in lieu of such notice by either side. The period of notice shall be one month in case of all temporary employees which may be waived at the discretion of appropriate authority.”

2. Mr. Gautam Kalotra was appointed as Assistant Professor in the Department of Philosophy on one year probation w.e.f. 28.05.2014 i.e. the date of his joining as such.

3. As per letter dated 26.02.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) of the Chairperson, Department of Philosophy, Mr. Gautam Kalotra has been relieved from his duties on 26.02.2015 (F.N.).

## **Routine and formal matters**

**31.** The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(xx)** on the agenda was read out and noted:-

**(i)** In terms of Syndicate decision dated 21.01.2011 (Para 7), the Vice-Chancellor has re-designated Dr. Luxmi, Reader, University Business School, as Associate Professor w.e.f. 29.06.2013 (notionally) i.e. the date of her completion of three years of notional service as Reader in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000/- with AGP of Rs.9000/- as per UGC Regulation 2010. However, being the period of her re-designation from 29.06.2013 to 30.11.2014 as notional, she will be paid salary on account of re-designation as Associate Professor w.e.f. 01.12.2014.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2011 (Para 7) has resolved that, as per U.G.C. Regulations:

- (1) All Lecturers in-service on or before 1.1.2006 designated as Assistant Professor; and
- (2) Incumbent Readers and Lecturer (Selection Grade) who have completed three years in the current pay-scale of ₹12,000-₹18,300 on 1 January 2006 shall be placed in Pay

Band of ₹37,400-₹67,000 with AGP Pay of ₹9,000 and shall be re-designated as Associate Professor.

- (3) Incumbent Readers and Lecturer (Selection Grade) who had not completed three years in the pay-scale of ₹12,000-₹18,300 on January, 2006 shall be placed at the appropriate stage in the Pay Band of ₹15,600-₹39,100 with AGP of ₹8,000 till they complete three years of service in the grade of Lecturer (Selection Grade)/Reader, and thereafter shall be placed in the higher Pay Band of ₹37,400-₹67,000 and accordingly re-designated as Associate Professor.
- (4) Readers/Lecturers (Selection Grade) in service at present shall continue to be designated as Lecturer (Selection Grade) or Readers, as the case may be, until they are placed in the Pay Band of ₹37,400-₹67,000 and re-designated as Associate Professor as described in (3) above.

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in accordance with the decision of the Senate, dated 22.12.2012 (XXI), has approved the re-employment of Dr. Madhukar Arya, Associate Professor, Department of Urdu, P.U., on contract basis up to 10.03.2020 i.e. the date of his attaining age of 65 years, as per regulation/rules of P.U. and Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.09.2012, on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension of CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:** 1. Senate decision dated 28.09.2014 (Item C-22) (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) circulated vide endst. No.11622-11792/Estt. I dated 12.12.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.
2. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year of re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All

other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

3. Rule 4.1 at page 130 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 reads as under:

“As per rule 4.1 the re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (XXI), has extended the re-employment of Dr. V.T. Sebastian, Professor (Retd.), Department of Philosophy, P.U., on contract basis, up to 01.06.2017 i.e. the date of his attaining the age of 65 years, as per regulations/rules of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teachers opting for pension of CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:**
1. Senate decision dated 28.09.2014 (Item C-22) (**Appendix-XXXIX**) circulated vide endst. No.11622-11792/Estt.I dated 12.12.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.
  2. Academically active report should be submitted after completion of every year of re-employment by the concerned faculty member through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 130 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2009 will be applicable.

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, University Business School, P.U. as Director, University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management (UIHMT), additional charge, until further orders.

- NOTE:** Professor Meenakshi Malhotra has taken over the additional charge of Director, University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management (UIHMT) on 24.3.2015 (F.N.).

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor, has chosen Professor Pushpinder Sayal, Department of English & Cultural Studies, P.U. to continue as A.S.V.C. until further orders.

**NOTE:** Dr. Madhu Raka, Professor (Re-employed) vide her application dated 09.03.2015 has written that she be relieved from additional charge of ASVC (**Appendix-XL**).

- (vi) In continuation to office orders No.1260-80/Estt.-I dated 13.02.2015 (**Appendix-XLI**), the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that increment(s) and Dearness allowance + HRA be paid to the following teachers, as a matter of course as they are continuing in service in view of interim orders in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs Panjab University and others) and subsequent orders passed in other CWP's tagged along with above petition, subject to the final decision of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court:

1. Dr. B.S. Ghuman, Professor, Department of Public Administration.
2. Dr. Amar Nath Gill, Professor, Department of Statistics.
3. Dr. Sanjay Wadwalkar, Professor, School of Communication Studies.
4. Dr. L.K. Bansal, Professor, University School of Open Learning.
5. Professor Lovelina Singh, Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies.
6. Dr. Manju Malhotra, Professor, University School of Open Learning.
7. Dr. Bimal Rai, Assistant Professor, Department of Physics.
8. Dr. A.S. Ahluwalia, Professor, Department of Botany.
9. Dr. Sukhdev Singh, Professor, School of Punjabi Studies

**NOTE:** The Resident Audit Officer, Panjab University vide Endst. No./RAO/2015/263 dated 11.3.2015 (**Appendix-XLI**) has pointed out that the salary, increments and dearness allowance to the above faculty members has been admitted under objection for want of approval of the Syndicate/Senate (after having the Legal opinion of the University Council defending the University in

the CWP under reference) to avoid the contempt of Court.

- (vii) In continuation to this office order Nos.1260-80/Estt.-I dated 13.02.2015, 1338-46/Estt.-I and 1347-55/Estt.-I dated 18.02.2015 respectively, the Vice-Chancellor has allowed the following faculty members to continue in service 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 CWP's tagged with it. The same will be informed to the Syndicate/Senate in due course:

Sr. No.	Name of Faculty member	Department/Centre/Institute
1.	Professor B.S. Ghuman	Department of Public Administration
2.	Professor Amar Nath Gill	Department of Statistics
3.	Professor Sanjay Wadwalkar	School of Communication Studies
4.	Professor L.K. Bansal	University School of Open Learning
5.	Professor Lovelina Singh	Department of English & Cultural Studies
6.	Professor Manju Malhotra	University School of Open Learning
7.	Dr. Bimal Rai	Department of Physics
8.	Professor (Dr.) A.S. Ahluwalia	Department of Botany
9.	Professor (Dr.) Sukhdev Singh	School of Punjabi Studies

**NOTE:** Earlier too, the above faculty members were allowed to continue in their service subject to the decision of the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana in CWP referred above, as the court case was adjourned to 03.03.2015 (Syndicate meeting dated (Para 48(viii))).

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor has extended the tenure of Dr. Surinder Kumar Sharma (Retd.), Department of Chemistry, P.U., as Advisor Cultural Activities up to 31<sup>st</sup> July, 2015, as a special case, on the previous terms and conditions.

- (ix) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that the request dated 16.2.2015 (**Appendix-XLII**) of the Chairman, Satyam Cultural Social Educational Society, Village-Sayad Wala, Tehsil-Abohar, Distt. Fazilka (Punjab) for grant of temporary affiliation to newly proposed College namely Satyam College for Girls, Tehsil- Abohar, District-Fazilka be treated as annulled as the documents which are mandatory for opening of a newly proposed College, as per UGC/PU rules and needs to be submitted along with the application form in the first instance are not yet supplied by the College under reference in spite of the ample time granted by the University. However, the Chairman of Satyam Cultural Social Educational Society, Village-Sayad Wala, Tehsil-Abohar, Distt. Fazilka (Punjab) are free to apply afresh for the next academic session within the prescribed time period alongwith all the mandatory documents/ credentials as per P.U./U.G.C. norms.

- (x) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
Dr. Madhukar Arya Associate Professor Department of Urdu	10.04.1985	31.03.2015	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007 (ii) Furlough as admissible under Regulation 12.1 (B) at page 121 of Cal. Vol-I, 2007 (iii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of 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.

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

(xi) 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 Devinder Singh Pathania Deputy Registrar Secrecy Branch	15.01.1972	31.03.2015	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Harbans Kaur Deputy Registrar USOL	22.08.1972	31.03.2015	
3.	Ms. Indra Rani Assistant Registrar USOL	26.03.1977	30.04.2015	
4.	Ms. Anita Budhiraja nee Anita Malhotra Assistant Registrar	20.07.1976	31.03.2015	
5.	Shri Satish Chander Deputy Librarian PUSGGRC	02.01.1975	30.04.2015	
6.	Shri Arvind Kumar Kapoor Superintendent RTI Cell	27.12.1977	31.03.2015	
7.	Shri Karam Chand Superintendent (P.R.) General Branch	22.02.1977	31.05.2015	
8.	Ms. Veena Adya Stenographer P.U. Extension Library	22.11.1976	31.03.2015	
9.	Shri Naresh Kumar Goel Lesson Keeper University School of Open Learning	24.06.1978	31.05.2015	
10.	Shri Jawahar Lal Garg Superintendent Conduct Branch	15.02.1982	31.03.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
11.	Shri Ram Kumar Tanwar Superintendent Establishment-I (Synopsis Section)	18.02.1982	31.03.2015	
12.	Shri V. Maruthai Superintendent Examination-I	28.01.1976	31.03.2015	
13.	Shri Raghbir Singh Syal Junior Technician (G-III) Department of Psychology	05.02.1986	30.04.2015	

14.	Shri Ram Karan Work Inspector (Tech. G-III) P.U. Construction	01.10.1986	30.04.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations
15.	Shri Rattan Chand Senior Assistant USOL	04.12.1976	31.03.2015	
16.	Shri Pritam Singh Senior Assistant Examination Branch-IV	28.09.1981	30.04.2015	
17.	Shri Rajkumar Library Restorer A.C. Joshi Library	12.04.1980	31.03.2015	
18.	Shri Om Parkash Jr. Technician G-III Department of Zoology	05.02.1992	28.02.2015	
19.	Shri Balbir Singh Painter (Technician G-III) Construction Office	02.04.1993	31.03.2015	
20.	Ms. Shankeri Devi Cleaner Girls Hostel No. 2	13.07.1993	31.03.2015	

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

**(xii)** 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 Smt. Sita Rani Attendant Girls Hostel No.1	22.02.1995	22.11.2014	Shri Rajinder Kumar (Son)	Gratuity and Ex-gratia grant as admissible under the University Regulations and Rules
2.	Late Shri Nirmal Mali P.U. Construction Office	08.05.1991	16.12.2014	Smt. Kalawati (Wife)	

- (xiii) The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Rupinder Tiwari is to take over the charge as Director, Central Instrumentation Laboratory, from Professor Indu Pal Kaur at his earliest convenience and until further orders on the earlier existing terms and conditions.
- (xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, has approved the minutes dated 20.03.2015 (**Appendix-XLIII**) of the Travel Subsidy Committee for the grant of Travel subsidy for attending International Conferences outside India by the faculty member out of the UGC 12<sup>th</sup> Plan grant under General Development Assistance Scheme under the budget head Travel Grant, as per authorization given by the Syndicate dated 26.04.2014 (Para 31) (**Appendix-XLIII**).
- (xv) The Vice-Chancellor, has executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XLIV**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and The University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.
- (xvi) To note that the nomenclature of UGC-Academic Staff College has been changed to UGC- Human Resource Development Centre (UGC-HRDC) vide letter No.ASC/4298 dated 09.04.2015 (**Appendix-XLV**) in pursuance of letter No. F.23-09/2014 (ASC) dated March 2, 2015 (**Appendix-XLV**) of Deputy Secretary, University Grants Commission, New Delhi.
- (xvii) The Vice-Chancellor has clarified that the Basic Pay of Rs.44700/- in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.10000/-+NPA as admissible is to paid to Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor in Orthodontics (Contract Basis) at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital from date of his initial joining i.e. on 14.03.2013.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 26.10.2014 vide Para 20 (**Appendix-XLVI**) has resolved that the salary of Dr. Deepak Kumar Gupta, Professor in Orthodontics (Contract Basis) at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, be paid, at par with the salary of Dr. Shally Gupta, Professor in Oral Pathology (Contract Basis) who draws salary in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+ GP Rs.10000 plus NPA as admissible and other allowances with initial start of Rs.54700/- (Rs.44700+10000) + NPA, at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, under Regulation 18 at page 134 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
2. A copy of the order issued vide No. Estt./15/1595-99 dated 25.2.2015 is enclosed (**Appendix-XLVI**).

- (xviii)** The Vice-Chancellor, has approved an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week), w.e.f. the date they start/started work to the following persons as Part-Time Assistant Professor in Law for the Academic Session 2014-15.

Part-Time Assistant Professor in Law

1. Gurpreet Singh
2. Neetu Gupta
3. Lakhwinder Singh

Waiting List

1. Priyanka Bedi
2. Seema Gupta
3. Harpreet Kaur

**NOTE:** The Syndicate at its meeting dated 25.01.2015 vide Para 53 (ii) (**Appendix-XLVII**) has approved the appointment of the above Assistant Professors, Department of Laws, P.U. for the academic session 2014-2015, but there was no mention about the honorarium.

- (xix)** The Vice-Chancellor, as a special case, has accepted the score awarded to Ms Pooja, student of M.Phil. in subject of Economics who attempted the answers in Hindi Medium in the answer book of M.Phil. Semester-I, Paper I Economic Theory-I held in February, 2015.

**NOTE:** The Rule 3.2 appearing at page 323 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 reads as under:

“The medium of examination in M.Phil. in all subjects other than languages shall be English.”

- (xx)** To note the contents of the letter dated 15.4.2015 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) received from Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow and member of Syndicate.

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

- (1) Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that the Colleges of Education, which were given affiliation under NCTE Clause 7.16, should be given panel without waiting for anything, subject to fulfillment of conditions, as it is a long process.

It was clarified that the recognition letter has been given by the NCTE to such Colleges subject to fulfillment of conditions of Survey Committee and Affiliation Committee appointed by the affiliating University.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that panels should be given subject to fulfillment of conditions.

(2) Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, according to him, 109 cases of Ph.D. are pending, the same should be cleared expeditiously.

(3) Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that payment to the teachers who come for spot evaluation should be made in cash instead of through bank as payments were not cleared by the bank for more than six months.

Principal Gurdip Sharma supported the viewpoint expressed by Dr. I.S. Sandhu.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu and two-three members in one voice asked the Controller of Examination that it should be treated as approved.

(4) Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the case of setting up of Research Centre in the subject of Punjabi at GGSD College, Haryana (Hoshiarpur) has been pending in the University office for the last one and a half year. As the College fulfils all the necessary conditions, the College should be recognized as a Research Centre in the subject of Punjabi at an early date.

G.S. Chadha  
Registrar

Confirmed

**Arun Kumar Grover**  
**VICE-CHANCELLOR**