

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on Sunday, 22nd November 2015 at 10.30 a.m., in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT

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

Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, and Director, Higher Education, Punjab, could not attend the meeting.

Condolence Resolution

The Vice-Chancellor said, "with a deep sense of sorrow, I would like to inform the House about the sad demise of one of our colleagues Professor Shishu Kaur, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on 12th November, 2015".

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

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

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

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

- (1) Professor R.C. Sobti, former Vice-Chancellor, P.U., Chandigarh, presently Vice-Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University), Lucknow has been elected as fellow of 'The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS), popularly known as TWAS, for the advancement of science in developing countries'. It is indeed a rare honour on the Fellows who are typically members of Science Academy. Only a small fraction of them is honoured with this award. We are happy that Professor Sobti has been elected as a Fellow of TWAS.

- (2) Professor Gurmeet Kaur Bakshi, Department of Mathematics has been elected as fellow of the National Academy of Sciences, India.
- (3) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Chairman, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences has been bestowed upon with the prestigious 'Jaswant Singh Rai Memorial Lectureship Award-2015' by Guru Nanak Dev University on 18th November 2015 at Amritsar, for his contributions in Pharmaceutical and Life Sciences. The award includes engraved plaque and honorarium of Rs.25,000/- who gave an oration at Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar just two days ago.
- (4) Professor Ronki Ram, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Science, has been nominated as member of the Indian Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO (INCCU) by the Ministry of Human Resource & Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India, for a period of four years. He is a member of Syndicate presently.
- (5) Dr. Parmod Kumar, Fellow, Panjab University and Director, Institute for Development and Communication (IDC), Chandigarh, has been nominated as member of the Indian National Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO (INCCU) by the Ministry of Human Resource & Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India for four years.
- To have two of our Fellows in the Commission is, indeed, a matter of pride for us.
- (6) International Brain Research Organization (IBRO) USA, has sanctioned 7000 USD to Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor of Pharmacology and Programme Coordinator, DST Inspire Internship Programme, U.I.P.S., Panjab University, to organize First IBRO/APRC Chandigarh Neuroscience Symposium at Panjab University on February 05, 2016 to foster research and training in the field of Neuroscience in the Asia-Pacific Region. I am happy that Chandigarh region is recognized to promote the agenda of neuroscience.
- (7) Dr. Bhupinder Singh 'Pali' University School of Open Learning, has been honoured with 'Shiromani Punjabi Natakhar/Theatre' Puraskar for the year 2014 by the Language Department, Patiala, Punjab.
- (8) Professor Rajat Sandhir, Coordinator, Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology has been nominated as 'Member Secretary' for Forensic Document Examiner Regulatory Authority Chandigarh by the Chairman, Forensic Document Examiner Regulatory Authority for Chandigarh, Home Department, Chandigarh Administration.

- (9) Ms. Shilpa Mahajan, of NSS Department Panjab University and student at Postgraduate Government College for Girls, Sector-11, has been awarded the Indira Gandhi National Service Scheme Award for the year 2014-15. Hon'ble President of India presented her this Award on 19th November 2015 at Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi. It is also an honour.
- (10) Ms. Rajneet Kaur, a UGC Meritorious Research Fellow under the supervision of Professor B.S. Bhoop and Professor O.P. Katare, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has been awarded with the Promising Young Scientist Award-2015 by the Select Bioscience India) Pvt. Ltd.

Principal Gurdip Sharma congratulated the Vice-Chancellor for being awarded the honorary rank of Colonel Commandant by the NCC.

All the other members joined him in congratulating the Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar congratulated all of them who have got awards. As far as Dr. Anurag Kuhad, an Assistant Professor in University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences is concerned, he has noticed that Dr. Kuhad has got 3-4 such awards. As requested earlier during the last 7-8 meetings of Syndicate, he is again requesting to constitute a Committee to recommend appropriate rewards in the form of 1-2 increments to those Assistant Professors who bring laurels to the University. This is a little bit that the University could do. It is just a suggestion, if the Vice-Chancellor thinks it appropriate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment, in the University, to the best of his knowledge, there were no way to do this. But in the 7th Pay Commission recommendations, the Government is coming up with performance related incentive. They could think about it if the Government recommends this. Government of India recognizes the value of this thing. In the Pay Commission recommendations, it has to be. Though he has not seen the report in detail, but has come to know about it from the newspapers. This kind of incentive was practiced in three departments of Government of India, namely, Department of Defence, Department of Space and Department of Atomic Energy, on an experimental basis for the last five years. The Pay Commission may have recommended incentive like this for the entire government set up. It is for the members to appoint a small Committee which could make recommendations and it could be brought as an agenda item. The point is that if somebody is doing very well, could they give some additional increments. Right now, they do not have a mechanism of appraisal of annual reports of individuals. They could not do pick and choose. Some algorithm has to be put in place. Panjab University is having a faculty of 1000. It is not a very easy task. Even if they defer it now, they may have to consider it in view of the recommendations of the Pay Commission. There is no harm in starting this work at this stage. He thanked Dr. Dinesh Kumar for the suggestion. He requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to look into this and start the process.

RESOLVED: That –

1. felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
 - (i) Professor R.C. Sobti, former Vice-Chancellor, P.U., Chandigarh, presently Vice-Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (A Central University), Lucknow for having been elected as Fellow of 'The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS), for the advancement of science in developing countries'.
 - (ii) Professor Gurmeet Kaur Bakshi, Department of Mathematics who has been elected as Fellow of the National Academy of Sciences, India.
 - (iii) Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop, Chairman, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences who has been bestowed upon with the prestigious 'Jaswant Singh Rai Memorial Lectureship Award-2015' by Guru Nanak Dev University on 18th November 2015 at Amritsar, for his contributions in Pharmaceutical and Life Sciences.
 - (iv) Professor Ronki Ram, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Professor of Political Science who has been nominated as member of the Indian Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO (INCCU) by the Ministry of Human Resource & Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India.
 - (v) Dr. Parmod Kumar, Fellow, Panjab University and Director, Institute for Development and Communication (IDC), Chandigarh, who has been nominated as member of the Indian National Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO (INCCU) by the Ministry of Human Resource & Development, Department of Higher Education, Government of India.
 - (vi) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor of Pharmacology and Programme Coordinator, DST Inspire Internship Programme, U.I.P.S., Panjab University, who has been sanctioned 7000 USD to organize First IBRO/APRC Chandigarh Neuroscience Symposium at Panjab University on February 05, 2016.
 - (vii) Dr. Bhupinder Singh 'Pali' University School of Open Learning, who has been honoured with 'Shiromani Punjabi Natakhar/Theatre' Purskar for the year 2014 by the Language Department, Patiala, Punjab.

(viii) Professor Rajat Sandhir, Coordinator, Institute of Forensic Science & Criminology who has been nominated as 'Member Secretary' for Forensic Document Examiner Regulatory Authority Chandigarh by the Chairman, Forensic Document Examiner Regulatory Authority for Chandigarh, Home Department, Chandigarh Administration.

(2) the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. 9 and 10, be noted and approved; and

(3) the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 20.09.2015, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Appointment of Associate Professors in the Dept. of Biochemistry

2(i). Considered minutes dated 14.11.2015 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professors-2 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Associate Professors-2 (General) in the Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Sudesh Kumar
2. Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Agnihotri.

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

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

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

- 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 wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professor in the Dept. of Anthropology

2(ii). Considered minutes dated 14.11.2015 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor-1 (General) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Kewal Krishan be appointed Associate Professor (General), in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

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

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

- 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 candidate enclosed. It had been certified that the selected candidate fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion as Professor, under the CAS, in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC

2(iii). Considered minutes dated 19.11.2015 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Hindi) Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5 under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Neeraj Jain be promoted from Associate Professor (Hindi) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (Hindi) (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **30.04.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

Appointment of Associate Professor (SC) in the Department of Hindi

2(iv). Considered minutes dated 19.11.2015 (**Appendix-V**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professor-1 (SC) (Advt. No. 4/2014) in the Department of Hindi, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Ashok Kumar be appointed Associate Professor (SC), in the Department of Hindi, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University.

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

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That Dr. Rajender Singh (SC), be placed on the Waiting List.

- 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 wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the post.
 3. It had also been certified that the appointment has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion as Professor, under the CAS, in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC

2(v). Considered minutes dated 19.11.2015 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Punjabi) (Stage-4) to Professor (Punjabi) (Stage-5) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Gurpreet Kaur be promoted from Associate Professor (Punjabi) (**Stage-4**) to Professor (Punjabi) (**Stage-5**), in the Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **01.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.

3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Sanskrit) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under CAS, at V.V.B.I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur

2(vi). Considered minutes dated 19.11.2015 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Sanskrit) (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Sanskrit) (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at V.V.B. I.S. & I.S., Hoshiarpur.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Sudhanshu Kumar Sarangi be promoted from Assistant Professor (Sanskrit) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Sanskrit) (**Stage-3**), at Viveshvarananda Vishvabandhu Institute of Sanskrit and Indological Studies (VVBIS&IS), Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **27.12.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under CAS, in the Department of Chemistry

2(vii). Considered minutes dated 19.11.2015 (**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) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Neetu Goel be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**), Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **23.12.2014**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under CAS, in the Department of Chemistry

2(viii). Considered minutes dated 19.11.2015 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2) under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the posts would be personal to the incumbents and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|-------------|
| 1. Dr. Shweta Rana | : | 26.08.2015 |
| 2. Dr. Varinder Kaur | : | 26.08.2015. |

- NOTE:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidates would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidates meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selections have been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage 3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under the CAS, at USOL

2(ix). Considered minutes dated 19.11.2015 (**Appendix-X**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Education) (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Jatinder Grover be promoted from Assistant Professor (Education) (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (Education) (**Stage-4**), at University School of Open Learning, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), w.e.f. **19.07.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.9,000/-, 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:**
1. The complete bio-data of the candidate would form a part of the proceedings.
 2. It had been certified that the API score obtained by the candidate meets the UGC requirement.
 3. It had also been certified that the selection has been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

Appointment of Associate Professors in the Department of Education

2(x). Considered minutes dated 13.10.2015 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Selection Committee for appointment of Associate Professors-2 (General) (Advt. No.4/2014), in the Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

- NOTE:** 1. The minutes of the Selection Committee dated 13.10.2015 for the above said posts were placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 18.10.2015 vide Item No. 2(xv) (Appendix-) and the same was deferred as the following statement made by the Vice-Chancellor:-

“the minutes of the Selection Committees are before the members for consideration except Item No. 2(xv) in which the court has directed not to declare the result”

2. A copy of the order dated 29.10.2015 of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana in CWP No. 21753 of 2015 enclosed **(Appendix-XI)**.

RESOLVED: That the following persons be appointed Associate Professors (General) in the Department of Education, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on one year's probation, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP of Rs.9,000/-, on a pay to be fixed according to rules of Panjab University:

1. Dr. Jatinder Grover (In view of his outstanding performance during the interview and of experience, the Selection Committee has recommended two additional increments over the minimum due to him at Associate Professor level).
2. Dr. (Ms.) Satvinderpal Kaur (In view of her very good performance during the interview and experience, the Selection Committee has recommended one increment on the minimum due to her at Associate Professor level).

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

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

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

1. Dr. (Ms.) Kuldeep Kaur (SC)
2. Dr. (Ms.) Manju Gera.

- 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 wait-listed candidates fulfilled the qualifications laid down for the posts.

3. It had also been certified that the appointments have been made in compliance to second amendment of UGC Regulations, 2010.

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

At this stage, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if they remember, he had made a suggestion in the September 2015 meeting of the Senate, that they should put the list of the candidates, including the selected and waitlisted candidates.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is being done. It is under process as the office has already commenced it. All this has to start when the interview letters are to be issued. He has a lot of backlog to clear, but right now Shri Rajan has already started to prepare it at the time of screening when he gets it. As such, the process has been started and they would try to implement it in the next round. They are carefully examining the data provided by the candidates and matching the same with the documents supplied. So on the basis of that suggestion, the process is already on, and it is being practiced with quite rigour. They would get it next time with full details. Even if it is not put in place, it would be circulated to all the members so that they know each & everything.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to make one more suggestion that the applicants, who are working within the University, they somehow come to know that their applications have not been shortlisted because of certain deficiencies, and they get the opportunity to represent and get the correction/s done. But those who are not from this University, if they are not shortlisted, neither do they know the reason/s as to why they have not been shortlisted nor they get any opportunity to represent and get the correction/s made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why, they have inserted a column and have decided that before they start the process of issuing the interview letters, they would examine the whole thing. Now, he is sending back the applications to Professor A.K. Bhandari to recheck so that no outsider is left out by default.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that suppose somebody has not annexed the proof in support of his claim and they did not shortlist him/her, just because somebody has represented, they called him/her for the interview, but the one who did not know that he has not been shortlisted because of non-annexing of proof in support of his claim, he would not get the opportunity.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that, that is why, they are examining each and every column of the application, before starting the process.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal said that his only submission is that there should be some mechanism in place so that all the candidates should know as to why their applications have been rejected. They could upload it on the University Website that these are applications received, these candidates have been shortlisted and these candidates have not been shortlisted due to the reason/s mentioned against each, so that nobody could say that they have favoured the insiders.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no harm in doing in at all as this transparency would help the image of the University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that Delhi University is already doing this before evening going for the interviews. They place on the internet that these were the candidates and out of them, these have been shortlisted and these not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are happy to adopt all good practices, and it would also enhance the standing of the University. They could not compete with the premier Universities of the country, if they did not follow their good practices.

Conferment of designation of Honorary Professor upon Professor C.R. Mukundan and Professor Ashum Gupta

3. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on the following eminent retired Professors, in the Department of Psychology, P.U. and they also be invited to give 4 to 5 lecture per semester in the course of next 3 years:

1. Professor C.R. Mukundan, Retired Professor, NIMHANS, Bangalore
2. Professor Ashum Gupta, Retired Professor, Delhi University, Delhi

NOTE: 1. Minutes of Joint meeting of Academic/ Administrative Committee held on 04.08.2015 enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

2. Section 18 of P.U. Act appearing at page 8 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reproduced below:

“Honorary Professor: In addition to the whole-time paid teachers appointed by the University, the Chancellor may, on recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and of the Syndicate confer on any distinguished teacher who has rendered eminent services to the cause of education, the designation of Honorary Professor of the Panjab University who in such capacity will be expected to deliver a few lectures every year to the post-graduate classes”.

3. Brief CV’s of Professor Mukundan and Professor Ashum Gupta enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

Professor Rajesh Gill said that six names of Professors have been given at page 11 by the Department. She wanted to know for the sake of her knowledge as to on the basis of what criteria, these names (Professor C.R. Mukundan and Professor Ashum Gupta) have been picked up.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since he could not pick all the six persons, he just picked Professor Ashum Gupta (Sr. No. 6), who is Chancellors, nominee at this University for many-many years. She is a very eminent academician from Delhi and she has been coming to Panjab University very regularly.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that, that meant, they could confer the designation of Honorary Professor on the Chancellor's nominee also.

The Vice-Chancellor replied in affirmative and said that there is no harm in it. He added that he had asked her (Professor Ashum Gupta) whether she could come and spent time at Panjab University, to which she had agreed. Since she visits Panjab University frequently and she is not far away from Chandigarh, he felt appropriate to recommend conferment of designation of Honorary Professor on her.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that, last time also, he had suggested that they should avoid attaching of lengthy Bio-data of the persons, and instead they should attach the briefs. In the present agenda also, more than 272 pages belong to Bio-data of different candidates. Even in the case of item under consideration 12-74 pages are related to the Bio-data.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the question is – who would make the briefs.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that on the one hand they are saying that even the candidates, who have not been called for the interview, their Bio-data should also be placed before the Syndicate, and on the other hand, they are saying that the detailed Bio-data of the candidates should not be attached.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, next time, they could ask the Department concerned to make the brief.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that he is not saying this for the sake the argument alone. So far as the case as consideration is concerned, the person has published two books and has attached the contents of the same.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in future, when he gets the documents from the department and if the same is found to be too long, he would ask the Department concerned to make the brief of the same not exceeding 10 pages.

After some further discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on the following eminent Professors, in the Department of Psychology, P.U. and:

1. Professor C.R. Mukundan, Retired Professor, NIMHANS, Bangalore
2. Professor Ashum Gupta, Retired Professor, Delhi University, Delhi

**Resolution proposed by
Dr. Gurdip Sharma and Dr.
Sanjeev K. Arora, Fellows**

4. Considered consider the following Resolution proposed by Dr. Gurdip Sharma, Fellow and Dr. Sanjeev K. Arora, Fellow:

“the difficulties faced by the unaided Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh on appointing the regular Principals on account of non-availability of the eligible and suitable candidates”.

- NOTE:**
1. A copy of resolution dated 2.11.2015 proposed by Dr. Gurdip Sharma, Fellow and Dr. Sanjeev K. Arora, Fellow enclosed **(Appendix-XIII)**.
 2. The decision of the Syndicate dated 18.5.2014 along with annexure enclosed **(Appendix-XIII)**.
 3. The minutes of the Syndicate dated 18.10.2015 (Para 21) along with the recommendation of the Committee dated 6.10.2015 is enclosed **(Appendix-XIII)**.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item under consideration is proposed by two of the members of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether there is any difference between teacher for an aided College and unaided College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in aided Colleges, a given Principal could continue in the same College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are saying that first they took a decision for Constituent Colleges that retired people could be appointed as Principals. Though now it has been pointed out that the same was against the UGC Regulations. Now, they are saying that they should include the aided and the un-aided Colleges also. His simple query is that they have taken a decision which is in accordance with the UGC that the Principals could continue up to the age of 65 years. That decision has been taken on account of non availability of Principals if the managements of the Colleges are ready to meet the expenses on their own. Then the Principals could be appointed for one or two years and continue up to the age of 65 years which is allowed by the UGC. As far as fresh appointment from one College to another College is concerned, can they do it in violation of the UGC Regulations. As per his knowledge, the decision which was taken in respect of Constituent Colleges, was due to the difficulty being faced by the Constituent Colleges being new Colleges and the experienced faculty was not available and their experience of having appointed the senior-most amongst the persons as Principal probably did not succeed. So, they have come up with the idea that the approved Principals who are retired may be appointed. But, subsequently the kind of problems that the University is facing, vis-à-vis UGC and MHRD that if they do violation instead of earlier 2014 decision, the proposal is coming that another category of unaided Colleges be added that probably will be sheer violation of the UGC Regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Professor A.K. Bhandari that they had taken this decision that if nobody is available, then they can have a retired Principal. A decision was taken to appoint on contract basis. In the same way, the Director at Regional Centre was also appointed.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they had taken the decision, but so far they had not appointed any one.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are going to advertise the position. When they are doing it for the Constituent Colleges, if they do not succeed and if they allow the retired Principals to be inducted on contract basis in the Constituent Colleges, would it be violative of the UGC Regulations?

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they should not distinguish it for that purpose that it should be at one place and not at the other place. Either it should be in both the places.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is well taken. It should be the same for Constituent, aided and unaided Colleges. There should be no difference.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor had asked a pertinent question to Professor A.K. Bhandari, who having a sharp mind being a Mathematician instead of replying to the question, said that they should not distinguish. He did not reply to the question put by the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as the Governing Body of the University, they have accepted something. He said that Professor Bhandari has said that either it should be adopted for all or none, no pick and choose policy could be adopted. They have taken a decision on behalf of the Governing Body of the University and that Governing Body decision appears to be a pick and choose. It should not be so.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that his query is as said by Shri Ashok Goyal that the re-employment in the Colleges would be very less. The advertisement should not be done for re-employment up to 65 years. If the re-employment for 1-2 years is being given, that is also a violation of the Regulations. In the self-financing Colleges, no teacher having 15 years experience and 400 API score is available. During the next 4-5 years, such teachers would not be available. The teachers working in the affiliated Colleges working for more than 15 years are under the grant-in-aid posts. No teacher serving on a grant-in-aid post would prefer to go to self-financing College even if he/she is offered more salary. So, the teachers who are eligible would not go to these Colleges as Principals. These Colleges would not find persons for the post of Principals. If they think it to be proper, re-employment could be allowed for 2-3 years due to the non-availability of eligible persons. If there seems to be any violation, that could be checked. If the advertisement is being made then hundreds of eligible persons would be available in Punjab. In these Colleges, in spite of being eligible, it is being said that eligible persons are not available. He is a representative of the teachers. It should be allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever decision they have taken as Governing Body and appears to be in violation of the UGC Regulations, all those decisions were taken justifying the practical considerations. If the UGC says why the University took the decision, they could say to the UGC that they had the practical difficulties and ask the UGC did they have any solution to the practical difficulties being faced. If the UGC did not have a solution to the practical difficulties being faced by the University, then, it should be allowed. There could be no pick and choose.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that in the Constituent Colleges, it was not allowed. The Vice-Chancellor had said that the advertisement would be given, but so far the same had not been given. If an advertisement is given, so many eligible candidates could be found.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the resolution says retired Principals of Panjab University Affiliated Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it has to be all retired Principals.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are two categories under the retired Principals also. From amongst the retired Principals, how they would be finding somebody eligible as per the latest UGC guidelines, and appoint ineligible candidates, ignoring the claim of those, who have retired but are eligible. If they cannot, then they would have to advertise afresh that now retired Principals can apply otherwise it will be pick and choose. He agreed with Dr. I.S. Sandhu that if that decision in the form of solution which has been found, for one year or two years or maximum up to 65 years. If that is in violation of the UGC, this is also in violation of the UGC. He is not against it. But at the same, they are not in a position to face the wrath of the UGC. He is trying to say why not to take preemptive steps to say that this is what they have decided after thorough discussion that they have not been able to find the solution except this. The decision should be same for aided, unaided and Constituent Colleges so that if any complaint is made to the UGC, they would not have to face that.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he proposed a compromise. The decision they have taken, they are not taking a call of reversal of that. Those decisions stand as it is. Could they have the suggestions from this Syndicate itself and not leave for the next Syndicate. Some members of this Syndicate, under the chairmanship of Professor A.K. Bhandari, give him inputs so that they are not seen doing pick and choose. They are not saying that the earlier decisions are being put on hold or withheld. They stand by what they have decided in view of the practical difficulties. If the ambit of that is to be extended and they are not seen doing pick and choose. Everybody has to be in it and they could sit together and have a considered opinion.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be done uniform for all.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that this is a genuine problem. Even new Colleges are coming up, the Dean College Development Council also knows it, where ad hoc staff has been appointed. There is nobody to take charge of the College in more than 20 Colleges, they are not having Principals for the last 10-15 years. If they are able to find Principals in the form of retired ones, they should do it. There is no need of another Committee. They have already done that that should do it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he understood that.

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora said that there two important issues. The resolution proposed by them is clear cut that on account of non-availability of the candidates. If the advertisement is given and the eligible candidates are not available and senior-most teacher is also not eligible, what is the option available with the Colleges? How could the Colleges function without the Principals? It is only if suitable candidates are not available. Moreover, if fresh eligible candidates are available, then the managements would not appoint the retired

Principals but prefer the new candidates. He did not agree to it that it is a violation of the UGC Regulations. Once a candidate is approved as Principal and has been working as Principal, has gone as a nominee of the Vice-Chancellor in Selection Committees for more about 10-15 years, how he/she could become ineligible now. The appointments are re-employment. Till date, the UGC has never said that such appointments are violation of the UGC Regulations. He cited the example of a College at Dinanagar affiliated to Guru Nanak Dev University where a suitable candidate for the post of Principal could not be found for the last 10 years. Guru Nanak Dev University has been allowing this for the last more than 10 years and the UGC has never objected to it. Why are they afraid without any reason?

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him interject and help the members to move forward. He said, that they are trying to give an *ad hoc* solution to a situation that the advertisement was given and no candidate was available. Now, in the case of so-called aided Colleges, the retiring Principal is preferred. If the management does not do that, the Government would not provide the funds. The University had said that the managements would appoint the retired Principals. First, they had approved the re-employment for two years, later it was reduced to one year. Anyway, let him not go back. They said that it should be one year plus one year. But, there is a natural candidate, who could continue. Now, they come to the unaided Colleges. There could be two persons, one retiring and the other a new one. If in unaided Colleges, the managements wanted to re-employ the retiring Principal for two years, it should be allowed. In aided Colleges, the Government pays the salary. In aided College, the natural candidate, which is actually in aided also, if they did not find a candidate, if they want to keep open competition, they should do such that in addition to their own Principal, they should make it open to retired Principals within their system to compete which means the retiring Principals would also compete with the retired Principals. When it comes unaided Colleges, the Government otherwise also does not provide them the funds. Those Colleges could appoint continuously for a period of two years or could make the competition open. Then, there is an unaided new College where the advertisement was given, but nobody could come. Now there is no favoured or natural choice. Now the field is open, the Colleges could appoint for two years and take somebody. Is it a correct description of this and in the background of this, they should not be seen to be doing any pick and choose.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he wanted to draw the attention of the Vice-Chancellor that as the Colleges had not filled up the posts, there was no retiring person available.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they are doing the violation for the last 10 years by stopping that.

The Vice-Chancellor asked about the experience of Professor A.K. Bhandari given that there are three kinds of situations: (i) Government aided Colleges where a College advertises the post of Principal and does not get the existing Principal, can continue for some years; (ii) In unaided Colleges, the retiring Principal, the Government does not pay the salary, he/she could continue; and (iii) Newly opened unaided Colleges advertise the posts, no one is available, and the competition is open where the retiring Principal from their system could apply. Let the management take the decision. There should be no pick and choose.

The members said it is passed.

The Vice-Chancellor that the description of the item is there, it was a description.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that in respect of the Constituent Colleges, he could understand the difficulty being faced. The problem is genuine. But what Professor A.K. Bhandari said that they could not discriminate. In Constituent Colleges, a candidate might not be available. The first issue is that they took a decision in the Syndicate. After that decision, if that does not follow the UGC guidelines, there is no need to reviewing that also. There should be same rules for Constituent Colleges and unaided Colleges as Dr. I.S. Sandhu has said. When a Principal is appointed, it is a fresh appointment and in fresh appointments, persons from other Colleges could come. If they say that because of non-availability of persons, they were facing difficulty and no Principal is appointed. As Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora said that once approved is always approved. He did not want to comment on it. They all know what is the real position right now on this issue. If they want to change the earlier rules that should be checked whether that earlier decision is right or not. If that rule is not right, that rule could be changed and reviewed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the proposal at the moment is not to review the earlier decision. They are not reviewing the old decisions. If they wanted to get those decisions, he asked to give him a fresh proposal. At the moment, he is not taking a *suo moto* call. There are so many Principals working as per earlier decisions.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that what he is saying that they are to open new window. He is not talking about the past.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there were three issues which the Vice-Chancellor had very rightly articulated. How this new rule, the UGC proposal has come. They are not, first of all, doing any pick and choose at all. At one point of time, there was an urgency about making the appointment of Principals in Constituent Colleges. This August House has deliberated that domain of urgency in detail. After having a thorough discussion and various several rounds of discussions, it was decided just to wriggle out of the crisis which comes under the new guidelines which are appropriate as what to do at this moment. They are not going to dilute at all. They want to rather implement in toto. While implementing the guidelines in toto, UGC wanted to enhance the academic standards of different academic institutions. So Constituent Colleges are one of them. But if they are implementing all those guidelines, they are not getting any person and the Colleges would remain without a Principal. The real purpose of the UGC guidelines would be defeated if there is no one to guide in the Constituent Colleges because these Colleges are Central Government Colleges. In that case, they say that till the date they do not find a candidate with appropriate qualifications and API score with capping, then they could have this ad hoc arrangement. So, today the similar situation is developing in unaided Colleges also. This body is going to take into consideration that. This is not a pick and choose. They did not pick the Constituent Colleges then. Today, they are not doing pick and choose in any unaided College. They are going to have some understanding from the earlier decisions where they had decided upon this. As Professor Karamjeet Singh has rightly said that keeping that in mind, they are doing the same thing, that it is the requirement. If this requirement arises tomorrow, somebody would come and say why not for unaided Colleges. This crisis would come. This body is not doing any pick and choose. This body has taken a decision for Constituent Colleges and the same decision applies to

these Colleges also. Since they are not getting candidates in accordance with the UGC guidelines, and to tide over the situation, they are making appointment of retired Principals. But in all the Colleges, they are not going to appoint a Principal which is according to the UGC guidelines. But in case, at the time of advertisement, they find some good candidates with better qualifications, then a person who earlier was performing the Principal's job, though he might have selected 10 Principals and might have also gone to UGC to represent the Panjab University, but whereas under the today's conditions, he/she is not eligible. In today's situation, if somebody would come then they could say that this Principal would not continue. But opportunity would be there. Hence a decision is taken that if they advertise the posts, somebody with 400 API score and more qualifications comes, how could they say that they would appoint a person with lesser qualifications. The only thing is that in order to save the situation, they are doing this as per UGC guidelines. This is neither pick and choose nor violation of the UGC guidelines.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the only thing that it is pick and choose to the extent and within the Panjab University system as they are getting only approved Principals be considered for appointment in the absence of not finding a suitable candidate. Otherwise, there is no pick and choose and no violation of the UGC guidelines.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that he would like to share some information that even in best of the Colleges, Dev Samaj College with CGPA of 3.83 could not find a single candidate and RSD College, Ferozepur could get only one eligible candidate. DAV College, Chandigarh could get only one candidate with two plagiarized papers. MCM DAV College got only 3 eligible candidates. There is a shortage of eligible candidates. The Narangwal College could not get even a single person. There is a shortage of eligible candidates. This is a short term arrangement.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he simply wanted to distinguish probably the Vice-Chancellor had expressed that they are trying to fix the issue that the Principal who has been continuing for the last 5-10 years like at Dinanagar College. There are two categories, one is to continue in the same College and he agreed with the Vice-Chancellor that at par with aided Colleges, if no Principal is available, then the existing Principal or retiring Principal could continue because in both the cases, the salary is being paid by the managements. If that is passed, he could understand. Then it would be the same format for that. Now the question is over fresh appointment in different Colleges. There are two categories out of retiring Principals. As per his knowledge, they could not advertise the post that the retiring Principals are eligible to apply. Unless and until, they advertise how would they come to know that selection is to be made and who are the retiring Principals. That would mean pick and choose. Out of the retiring Principals, there might be somebody who is eligible though he has attained the age of 60 years, not eligible to be appointed, but because of the new qualifications, he/she is eligible. How could they ignore his/her claim and will this not be pick and choose and why not because it is that within the system of Panjab University, they are eligible and somebody eligible retired Principal but not from Panjab University, he/she is not eligible. How would they be able to defend? Still he is not opposing this proposal. If they are so much convinced that it does not violate the UGC Regulations at all, then where is the problem of taking the consent of the UGC in view of all this. Are they doing something at the back of the UGC? Do they apprehend that the UGC is not going to endorse their submissions?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the UGC would not give any reply. He has been told that the Regulations which have been sent to the UGC, no reply to that has been received.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as far as Regulations are concerned, Panjab University has nothing to do with the UGC. It is only MHRD and MHRD has sent those Regulations where, that is not the concern of Panjab University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not want to get into the arguments. He is not in favour of sending this to the UGC. The UGC is not sending the reply to the earlier decisions.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is okay.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is alright.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even the decision for Constituent College and Hoshiarpur, they did not ask for the consent of the UGC. He did not want to support this thing otherwise they are compromising on their autonomy on their own.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the advertisement for Constituent Colleges should be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what the Dean, College Development Council has said is that the post is advertised and the panel is given and nobody is found suitable. Thereafter, for appointment of any retired Principal, advertisement has to be given again. That meant that a retired Principal would also be appointed by a panel. But if that is to be done, then the next advertisement is to be given exclusively for retired Principals.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the advertisement, the applications are also invited from the retired Principals. He said that a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate could be formed to prepare the text of a model advertisement.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it should be the same as for Constituent Colleges.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that as pointed out by the Dean, College Development Council that in the aided Colleges, they could not find suitable candidates. What the managements are doing that the old Principal is reappointed and sends the case for approval which is approved. There is a different system. There could a solution that when the advertisement is given for 2-3 times, either the management appoints on their own level and sends for approval or advertisement should be given so that candidates could appear again.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these things have a simple algorithm. Firstly, the advertisement is given for fresh candidates. They failed to get fresh candidate. The second advertisement will invite applications from the fresh and retired Principals. He said that he would form a Sub-Committee of the Syndicate. The Dean, College Development Council would take the responsibility to prepare the model advertisement and this would be done by this Syndicate itself because it is the matter of the present Syndicate and is to be resolved by the present Syndicate. There is no need to take it to the next Syndicate. The authorization be given to him (Vice-Chancellor) to take

decision on the recommendations of the Sub-Committee including Professor A.K. Bhandari, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Karamjeet Singh, Professor Ronki Ram, Principal Gurdip Sharma, Dr. Sanjeev Arora, Dean, College Development Council (Convener) on behalf of the Syndicate. He would consult Professor A.K. Bhandari and the matter will be informed to the Syndicate. On enquiry from Shri Ashok Goyal, the Vice-Chancellor said that the item is approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the item is approved, it should not be limited only to Panjab University but should include the approved Principals of any other University also.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that Guru Nanak Dev University considers only the Principals of Colleges affiliated to it.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that only approved Principals of Panjab University should be considered because other Universities also do not consider the approved Principals of Panjab University.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that if it is made open, it could lead to litigation on the plea of discrimination.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the report of the Committee should be made time bound.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would approve the minutes prepared by the members.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that even if the proposal of the Vice-Chancellor is accepted, the real issue lies in the way it is done, for instance, in unaided Colleges, the advertisement given not only for the Principal but also for the faculty.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have already taken care of that. The advertisement for the post of the Principal has to be on the web page of Dean, Dean College Development Council (DCDC) at Panjab University website. A circular would be issued to all the Colleges to give the advertisement in two newspapers and send a copy of the advertisement to the DCDC for uploading on the Panjab University website.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the proposed Committee should look in the matter related with self-financed Colleges only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that do not confuse the things. They are facing only a small situation. The self-financed new Colleges have failed to fill up the posts even after giving the advertisement. After failing in the advertisement, they are opening the chapter again to fresh and retired Principals.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when they are inviting approved Principals, automatically no other person would come. It is very clear.

RESOLVED: That the following Sub-Committee of the Syndics be constituted to prepare the model of advertisement:

1. Professor A.K. Bhandari (Chairperson)
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Professor Karamjeet Singh
4. Professor Ronki Ram
5. Principal Gurdip Sharma
6. Principal S.K. Arora
7. Dean, College Development Council (Convener)

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

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a copy of the advertisement given in the newspapers be sought from the College and uploaded on the DCDC page of Panjab University website.

MoU between Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Govt. of India and Panjab University, Chandigarh

5. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 5.10.2015 (**Appendix-XIV**) (Item-1) that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XIV**) between Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India and Panjab University, Chandigarh, for implementation of Scheme “National Initiative for Setting up of Design Innovation Centres (DIC), Open Design School & National Design Innovation Network”, be executed and the Director, University Institute of Engineering and Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh, would be the contact person. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XIV**) was also taken into consideration.

RESOLVED: That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India and Panjab University, Chandigarh, as per **Appendix**, be executed for implementation of Scheme “National Initiative for Setting up of Design Innovation Centres (DIC), Open Design School & National Design Innovation Network”. The Director, University Institute of Engineering and Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh, would be the contact person for the purpose.

Recommendation of the Committee dated 09.11.2015.

6. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 09.11.2015 (**Appendix-XV**) to give recommendation on the ‘generic issue’ of dealing with any complaint made against any highly placed officer of the University, on the line of recommendation made by the Johl Committee.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that though she was a member of the Committee, could not attend the meeting. Both Professor Ronki Ram and Professor Navdeep Goyal talked to her on phone and she had given her consent to the recommendations made by the Committee. She suggested that her endorsement to the decision of the Committee should be recorded on the minutes.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that they had also talked to him on phone and made the recommendation/s with his consultation. He, therefore, pleaded that the recommendation/s of the Committee should be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that his first question is – are they not playing with the system? The proceedings starts with the first sentence that “Though the quorum of the Committee was not complete, due to importance of the issue, the members present discussed and considered the issue that arises when a senior member of the University fraternity has a grievance against or levies charges against a high functionary of the University including Vice-Chancellor, Dean of University Instruction or Registrar”. If the quorum was not complete, the meeting could not have started. Unfortunately, they have not only started the meeting, but also recorded the minutes even though the quorum of the Committee was not complete. He can understand, where the issue is important, their all efforts should be that no illegality is committed. However, here three members of the Committee sit and say that the quorum of the Committee is not

complete, but due to importance of the issue, the members present discussed. Meaning thereby, the three members of the Committee preferred to commit the illegality. Now to say that they have given the consent telephonically is not right. According to him, they should have recorded in the proceedings of the Committee that such and such member/s has/have given their consent because if they had spoken to these to persons on telephone for taking their consent, why did they not talk to him (Shri Ashok Goyal) as he was also a member of the Committee. Now to say that they had talked to two members, is nothing but a afterthought that whatever is recommended by the three members, is probably against the propriety. To maintain the dignity of the structure, even if the same recommendation/s is/are to come, let the Committee meet again with full quorum. Otherwise, he wonders why the office has brought this item to the Syndicate, especially when the first line of the proceedings says that though the quorum of the Committee was not complete, due to importance of the issue, the members present discussed and considered the issue. If this is how they have started functioning that the Committees are appointed by the Syndicate and the Syndicate has to consider the recommendations of the Committees without quorum and the office without even bothering the fact that it is clearly mentioned that the quorum was not completed, the item has still been placed before the Syndicate. He does not know but it is to be seen by the Vice-Chancellor whether this kind of functioning is to be allowed or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what is the definition of the quorum for the Committees constituted by the Senate or the Syndicate or the Vice-Chancellor. He requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to enlighten him whether it is mentioned anywhere the fraction of quorum required for the meetings of the Committees. He said that he had come across a number of Committee meetings in which the number of members who had come to attend the meeting was less than 50%. So he does not understand that the quorum was not complete. A statement could only be made that the quorum was not complete, if some fraction of quorum is given.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that usually for all the Committees no written norms but for statutory bodies like Faculties, Academic Council, Syndicate and Senate, the quorum is defined in the Calendar. Otherwise, they usually hold a number of meetings where they take the quorum as 51% or more. If 51% or more members have come to attend the meeting, they conduct the meeting and otherwise they usually say that the quorum is not complete. But in writing the quorum has not been defined anywhere. They could now define the quorum for the Committee meetings for the future.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that first of all instead of deciding as to what is the definition of the quorum, they should take a decision in principle that if there is no quorum, even if wrongly written in the proceedings under consideration, then this kind of meeting could not be accepted. What is the definition of the quorum, they could decide that after words. If the quorum was not complete, the item should not have been placed before the Syndicate. In this very University, the meeting of the Pension Committee had to be adjourned numerous times just because the quorum was not completed. So much so the meeting took place for three hours in the Committee Room of the Vice-Chancellor's Office, one of the members had said that they should go ahead with the meeting as he is coming shortly. The quorum was short of only one member. The Committee went ahead with the meeting and also recorded the proceedings, but at the last

moment the member refused to sign the proceedings and because of lack of quorum those proceedings have not seen the light of the day. Professor R.K. Kohli was the Dean of University Instruction at that time and had chaired the meeting. Let us agree with this that the quorum was not complete in the meeting of the Committee under consideration, and then the meeting should not be validated. Only thereafter, he expects this from Ms. Anu Chatrath, who knows very well what is the definition of quorum where it is not specifically provided. He knows that Dr. Dinesh Kumar, who is Assistant Professor in Laws, also knows that it is a settled law that wherever no quorum has been defined for any particular Committee meeting, it is always majority which forms the quorum, i.e., 51% or more, which has also been elaborated by Professor A.K. Bhandari, and this is what they have been following not from today, but from when he has been member of the Syndicate and Senate. That is why, it has been mentioned that the quorum was not complete.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that one practical solution is – these are the minutes and if the six members wanted to meet again, and if endorse these recommendations, he (the Vice-Chancellor) has the authorization to take decision on the same, on behalf of the Syndicate. However, if they do not endorse these recommendations, then the matter would come back to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they are endorsing the recommendation/s of the Committee right now.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she has said in the beginning that the recommendations have been made by the Committee in consultation with her and she endorses the same.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the meeting of the Committee was held on 9th November 2015, i.e., just two days before the Diwali. Though the members were unavailable due to the festival, Professor A.K. Bhandari requested them to come as the matter was important. Secondly, they were told that the Committee is not going to decide the issue for any individual or individuals, but it is about the 'generic issue' because Johl Committee has made recommendations about the 'generic issue'. As such, they have to meet. After contacting Professor Navdeep Goyal and him (Professor Ronki Ram), Professor A.K. Bhandari contacted Shri Ashok Goyal, who told that he (Shri Goyal) is out of station. Thereafter, they were told that Ms. Anu Chatrath has shown her willingness to come, but somehow one day before the meeting, she conveyed her non-availability. When they observed that the quorum is not complete, they opined that since it is not the issue for individual/s, it is a 'generic issue', they should continue with the meeting and make recommendations. During the meeting, they talked both Ms. Anu Chatrath and Dr. I.S. Sandhu, who conveyed their consent.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that after going through the minutes of the Committee, she has given her consent and is endorsing the decision of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had sent these minutes to the members, who could not attend the meeting. He enquired if they had received the minutes, and a couple of members replied in affirmative. He had also requested the members who could not attend to give their responses in writing, so that he could place the same before the Syndicate, but he did not receive anything from those members in

writing. He had specifically said that these minutes be sent to the members, who could not attend the meeting. He asked the office to confirm, whether these have been sent to the members or not. He again enquired whether they had received the same, and Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Yes Sir". He (Vice-Chancellor) said that if they had received the minutes, he had specifically asked them to give their input in writing as he wished to place the minutes before the Syndicate before acting on MHRD directives. This is a very important responsibility entrusted to the Governing Body (Syndicate) of the University, and they should be seen not to be failing in doing their duties.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the final decision is to be taken by the Syndicate, and if they all agree, they should approve the recommendations of the Committee.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor checked the record and said that the minutes of the Committee having two pages were sent to the members on 11th of November 2015, and the members were requested to give their views in writing so that the same along with the minutes be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting. In fact, he had written on the minutes itself "Forwarded to the Syndicate Meeting of November 22, 2015. Let these minutes be sent to the members, who could not attend the Meeting, for their views/inputs process to the Syndicate Meeting".

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that since it is not a Statutory Committee, quorum is not required, only in Statutory Committees quorum is required. Shri Ashok Goyal has pointed out that they normally take quorum as 51%, but in the beginning, she as well as Dr. I.S. Sandhu have said that the decision has been taken in consultation with them and they endorse the decision. Secondly, they were to come to attend the meeting, but due to certain exigencies they could not come. That was why, they were consulted while arriving at the decision, and in the beginning they endorsed the decision. As such, according to her, there is no harm in approving the recommendations of the Committee.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that perhaps this is the only Committee, which he has seen during the last three years, where there is no Chairperson.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee was formed by the Syndicate and he has requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to Chair the meeting. When Dr. Dinesh Kumar tried to intervene, the Vice-Chancellor said that now he should not point out any technicality. The entire matter is before them and they could take a call on it. However, he is not answering in response of any technicalities and the responsibility for the same is with the Governing Body of the University, i.e., Syndicate.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that while going through the minutes of the Committee, he is tempted to request the members, including the Chairperson of the Committee, to separate the operative part/s of the decision/s, because it is very difficult for him to separate the operative part. No doubt, the members have discussed the issue, but the discussion starts – in the last few sentences on the very first page in the fifth line after the colon, it has been written that "in the month of March of every alternate year, the Syndicate will constitute". Is this the operative part? On the next page, they have made few recommendations. There is a method/procedure, which should be followed, i.e., this is the discussion and this is the resolved part.

Therefore, there is nothing in reframing the recommendations of the Committee. He is not opposing the recommendations of the Committee, but what they have recommended should be crystal clear. Secondly, they are giving the reference of Johl Committee again and again. The recommendations of Johl Committee were approved on 31st May. He enquired whether the same have been implemented or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to the best of his knowledge, they are operative.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that after 31st May, whether in all the meetings of the Standing Committee, the representative/s of the complainant as well as the accused were invited. So far as he knew, neither the accused nor the complainant have been requested to send their representative/s.

Professor Ronki Ram said that a Committee should be constituted to enquire and if the accused and the complainant were requested to send their representatives, if it is found that they were requested to send their representatives, punishment should be awarded for leveling the false allegation. It is not good to say anything anywhere. Since they are responsible persons and sitting in the meeting of the Governing Body of this University, they should not utter whatever comes in their minds. They should maintain decorum in the meeting and also the dignity of the house, and one should have control over the language. He reiterated that letters are being issued to suggest three representatives out of whom one is selected. He remarked that sometimes it is being said that all this is being done by the members sitting on the other side, just to please the Vice-Chancellor and sometimes it is being said that this is illegal. Is it the way to do the things? Sometimes it is remarked that the persons sitting on the other side have the majority and it also had been alleged that they are 'gundey'.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to ask Professor Ronki Ram to tell the name of the person who has said 'gundey'?

At this stage, pandemonium prevailed during which only it was heard "record from the videography of the proceedings should be seen just now to verify whether 'gundey' word has been uttered by the member or not".

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that Professor Ronki Ram has just a couple of minutes before has made the statement that the Committee has asked the complainant as well as the respondent to give three names. He enquired where it has been approved that three names should be invited both from the complainant as well as the respondent because the Johl Committee has recommended that one name each should be sought from the complainant as well as the respondent. He urged the members, including Professor Ronki Ram, to go through the last line of the papers.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the members to go back and read the Johl Committee Report, wherein it is clearly written that the person would suggest three names and one out of those three names would be approved. So there is no dispute. At the moment, the matter under consideration is Item 6 and they should not digress here and there. One of the important things under Item 6 is recommendation (b), i.e., "Notwithstanding anything above, in case the complaint/grievance of any nature is against the Vice-Chancellor or a member of the Senate, then it will be processed by appropriate

University/Statutory Committee(s) duly constituted, and the findings/outcome of the findings of the Committee(s) will be directly conveyed to the Chancellor by the Chairman of the Committee". This is the most important –part, on which the Governing Body of the University (Syndicate) has to take a call because they have been asked to take a call by none other than the Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD), Government of India. They are an Institution, enacted by an Act of Parliament, and if there is a directive to them from the MHRD and the MHRD has not given the directive at its own because there are certain issues pertaining to their University (Panjab University), which stand forwarded to MHRD and the MHRD has to spend time and efforts to resolve those issues, which they are not able to resolve within the House. As such, there is a directive from the MHRD that when the matter pertains to Senior Officers of the University where some doubts are there – whether there is impartiality. In order to address that concern, the MHRD has said that in those cases, the matter should be referred to the Chancellor. But that is only a suggestion from the MHRD, which needs endorsement from the Governing Body of the University. The other things could take time, but they have to take a call so far as recommendation (b) is concerned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that both (a) and (b) are the resolved part that should be considered and approved.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the Vice-Chancellor has rightly clarified, but the Syndicate is free to take a call on it, discuss the issue and make suggestions/corrections, and that is why the matter is placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even if the Syndicate wishes to take time to discuss it and they wanted another round, it is his plea once again as the Vice-Chancellor and as an Executive Head of the University that please take a call on (a) and (b) first.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that first of all, the letter to which the Vice-Chancellor has referred to, which has been received from the MHRD, probably has not been sent to any of the members of the Committee that it is the directive of the MHRD to take a call on it. The decision which was taken, if his memory is correct, it was only on the generic issue of dealing with any complaint made against any highly placed Officer. Are the members of the Senate Officers of the University? The members of the Senate have also been incorporated. Not only that, if they read (a), that is completely a different subject matter, which is not within the purview of this Committee. Since it is purely a different act/law, it has to be dealt with differently, and the Committee is to be constituted as per that Act, and who is to constitute that Committee, is also mentioned in the Act. Probably, there must be some guidelines and rules also for that. This Committee says that if any complaint of sexual harassment is made, it would be forwarded to be handled by the PUCASH, constituted by the Syndicate/Senate, as if any complaint against anybody, after having dealt with by the PUCASH, will be sent to the Chancellor. Even if there is a complaint of sexual harassment against Class-IV employee, the PUCASH would conduct the enquiry and send the report to the Chancellor. He read out the following portion of the recommendation:

“All complaints pertaining to sexual harassment of the women employees at workplace will be forwarded to be handled by the PUCASH, constituted by the Syndicate/Senate, and the

findings/outcome of the findings of the Committee(s) will be directly conveyed to the Chancellor by the Chairman of the Committee.”

The Vice-Chancellor said that there could be problem in interpreting the recommendation and he urged the members to allow Professor A.K. Bhandari to clarify the things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that is why, he has suggested that let the Committee meet again and make recommendation/s, which should be placed before the Syndicate. He is talking of the dignity of the national body (MHRD), which has constituted the Committee, and in spite of that the recommendations were not brought before the larger body.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that keeping in view the opinion of the two members, who could not attend the meeting of the Committee, that they endorse the decision of the Committee, the matter should be considered and decision taken. Even if they meet again, the same recommendations would come, then why to delay the matter. He, therefore, suggested that the recommendations of the Committee should be approved.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that the presumption is that the same recommendations would come.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor A.K. Bhandari to tell the spirit in which (a) and (b) have been recommended.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that first of all, Johl Committee recommendations are there to deal with the complaint and grievance/s of the employees. They (Committee) have endorsed the same as first part (recommendation (a)). So suitable amendments in the relevant Rules existing in P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 should be made, as even the Rule/s are not clear. Secondly, they have been given to understand that the complaint of sexual harassment nature could not be taken up by the Standing Committee, and that has to be taken up by a properly constituted Committee constituted for handling the sexual harassment cases, and that is why, (a) is there that “all complaints pertaining to sexual harassment of the women employees at workplace will be forwarded to be handled by the PUCASH, constituted by the Syndicate/Senate”, as per the rules/regulations of PUCASH.

The Vice-Chancellor said that for that they needed the validation of Syndicate and Senate. The Vice-Chancellor further said that what he understood is that the spirit of (a) is that the constitution of PUCASH Committee has to have an endorsement from the Government of the University.

Professor A.K. Bhandari replied in affirmative. He said that they discussed it in the last meeting that the PUCASH, which is to be constituted by the employer, be constituted by the Syndicate/Senate. Secondly, there is already a Committee working for as to how they should make the amendments. One meeting of the Committee has already taken place. That Committee would take care of as to how to amend the rules relating to PUCASH and other things. Now, the (b) part is that if the complaint/grievance is against the Vice-Chancellor, because the employer of the Vice-Chancellor is not the Syndicate and not even the Senate. That is why, the (b) part is there. If the members of the Senate are not to be incorporated here,

that could be debated here and the same could be deleted from here. So the (b) would remain as such.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that she was just trying to get educated from the discussions which took place so far. There is a system for conducting the meeting everywhere. In the meeting, the underlying assumption is that there is a democratic system, where a dialogue takes place, and the members thrash out the issue/s by giving their opinions, and ultimately, on the basis of the discussions and rules & regulations, the decisions are arrived at. One thing which disturbed her is when she saw people conducting the meeting/s with just 1-2 member/s and others just stamping their acceptance on that. Because it really matters when they are physically present in the meeting and discussed the things. It is totally separate things when they later on say that they endorse the decision. Had Ms. Anu Chatrath been there in the meeting of the Committee, she was 100% sure that the minutes would not have come as they are now because there is contradiction. If they look at the 8th line of the second para of the minutes of the Committee, it has been mentioned that "It was pointed out that under P.U. Rules/Regulations for employees of the University, except the Vice-Chancellor, the employee/appointing/punishing authority is Syndicate/Senate. In case of Vice-Chancellor, the employer/appointing authority is the Chancellor. As was also pointed out by Shri Chatrath in the meeting of the Syndicate dated May 31, 2015, grievances/charges against Senators are to be ultimately dealt with by the Chancellor". This is what the Calendar also says that the complaint has to go to the Chancellor because the employer of the Vice-Chancellor is the Chancellor. Now, what they are resolving. The recommendation (b) says "Notwithstanding anything above, in case the complaint/grievance of any nature is against the Vice-Chancellor or a member of the Senate, then it will be processed by appropriate University/ Statutory Committee(s) duly constituted, and the findings/outcome of the findings of the Committee(s) will be directly conveyed to the Chancellor by the Chairman of the Committee". By whom the Committee is to be constituted, it is silent and only the findings of the Committee(s) will be directly conveyed to the Chancellor. This is the twist, which has been given to Calendar Rule. There is a lot of difference between the first and second part.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that they had just read out the provision and in the case of the Vice-Chancellor, the appointing authority is the Chancellor. This is just a brief regarding the charges. Even as per (b), the final authority would be the Chancellor.

Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that it is not the final authority.

Continuing, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she (Professor Rajesh Gill) is reading only the second thing. If they read both the things (recommendations) in consonance with each other, but hereinafter Professor Rajesh Gill intervened to say that she (Ms. Anu Chatrath) is absolutely right. She (Professor Rajesh Gill) is reading both the paragraphs ((a) and (b)) along with MHRD letter dated 18th September 2015, which was placed in the Syndicate meeting dated 20th September 2015. The MHRD letter says that they examined the issue and in the case of the Vice-Chancellor, the Chancellor should be approached for constituting the Committee. Now, they are writing to the MHRD opposite to what the MHRD has directed. Therefore, they should sit together and urged her (Ms. Anu Chatrath) not to go in for endorsing like that. She (Ms. Anu Chatrath) should be a part of the Committee and get hold of the papers and then give her opinion as it

is a serious matter. The members should also be more serious about the matter.

Ms. Anu Chatrath enquired whether she (Professor Rajesh Gill) is right that as per the contents of the MHRD letter, the Committee in the case of Vice-Chancellor or Registrar or Officer/s of the University has to be constituted by the Chancellor?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar, Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Rajesh Gill said that Committee in the case of Vice-Chancellor only is to be constituted by the Chancellor. Professor Rajesh Gill added that they have specially mentioned that the Vice-Chancellor's employer is the Chancellor, and it is only to avoid that such proceedings have been prepared.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would like to talk on the part of members of the Senate because the members of the Senate mean employer. Since all the members of the Senate are employer and the disciplinary authority is going to be the employer, they could not take decision for themselves. That is why in the case of Vice-Chancellor and the members of the Senate, they thought advisable to send the report to the Chancellor's Office.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that here is the difference. It is the prerogative of the employer to constitute any Committee to look into any complaint against the Vice-Chancellor or the member/s of the Senate, but they (Committee) are saying that they would conduct the enquiry and send the report, which is not possible.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that it is not correct. The enquiries are to be conducted as per the statutory provisions. There should be PUCASH, is a law of the land. Who would constitute the PUCASH in the context of the University, is the work of the Government of the University, which is Syndicate and the Senate. The endorsement of PUCASH would be done by the Syndicate and Senate. Now, the Government of the University has decided that there would be Standing Committee, but the purview of the Committee is yet to be decided. What Professor A.K. Bhandari has told them via meeting of the Committee that they needed to expand the jurisdiction of the Standing Committee as the grievances have not been mentioned, and for expanding the purview of the Committee, there is a background of Johl Committee. Johl Committee has said that in order that the people have trust and faith in the proceedings of the Committee/s so that the complainant and respondent feel that they have been listened to and have also confidence, their point of view has been taken into consideration, he/she could suggest three names each, out of which one each would be picked up by the given Chairman of the Standing Committee. The grievance could be between an individual and the Institution and between the two individuals. There would be grievance of a person against someone. Both are allowed to suggest three names. The Standing Committee, which had three members, its upper limit now could be five members plus the President, PUTA. The Committee would thrash out the whole issue so that when the matter is placed before the Governing Body, it has an informed decision so that at that time the option could be properly utilized as they could not have hours of discussion in this body, especially when there are 30 or more items on the agenda. So that they could have an informed decision, they have done all this so that they have detailed input and some summary could be made. In the background is that if the complaint is against the high Officer/s of the University, i.e., the Vice-

Chancellor or the Senate members, as the Senate members are the part of the Governing Body, the recommendations of the statutory Committee would be directly sent to the Chancellor. So this is the gist. He urged the members to take a call on it.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired as to what is the meaning of statutory Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that PUCASH duly constituted by the employer.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the Vice-Chancellor's case could not go to PUCASH.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment this is not the matter under consideration; rather the matter under consideration is Item 6. One person's opinion is that the case of the Vice-Chancellor could not go to PUCASH.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is not the opinion of one person; rather there are so many opinions, and also the directive of MHRD.

At this stage, a couple of members spoke simultaneously and nothing could be heard clearly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not the matter under consideration. The matter under consideration is, which he has clearly articulated. Now, he would like to seek opinion of the members one by one. He urged the members to give their opinion on "that there is a Standing Committee, which right now deals with certain number of things, in which the grievance part is to be added. Meaning thereby, what is there, its scope has to be expanded, and for that they have to discuss the things in the background of following:

"That both the complainant as well as the respondent be asked to give three names, out of which 1 each would be picked up by the Chairman of the Committee, and they are not debating it as it has already been approved. However, if the matter related to the Vice-Chancellor or the member/s of the Senate, the report would go to the Chancellor directly."

So far as the constitution of PUCASH is concerned, the same is already there and the same is in accordance with the Act of Government of India. Hereinafter, he sought opinion of the members one by one.

Ms. Anu Chatrath, Shri Jarnail Singh, Principal Gurdip Sharma, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Principal Parveen Chawla, Principal Sanjeev Kumar Arora, Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Yog Raj Angrish and Professor A.K. Bhandari (10 members) opined in favour of the proposal stated by the Vice-Chancellor. However, Dr. Dinesh Kumar, Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Karamjeet Singh, Professor Rajesh Gill and Shri Naresh Gaur (5 members) did not favour the proposal.

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that if the majority favoured something wrong, it does not become right.

Since majority of the members, i.e., 10 against 5 voted in favour, the stated proposal was carried.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it is nothing, but politics of numbers, which is unfortunate for the Syndicate of Panjab University.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that in democracy, they could not do unfortunate things like this, which they are going to just after few minutes.

After detailed discussion, voting and counting of heads, since it was found that the majority (10 in favour and 5 against) opined in favour of the proposal put forth before the Syndicate on the basis of recommendations of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 09.11.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved, including that –

- a) All complaints pertaining to sexual harassment of the women employees at workplace will be forwarded to be handled by the PUCASH, constituted by the Syndicate/ Senate.
- b) Notwithstanding anything above, in case the complaint/grievance of any nature is against the Vice-Chancellor or a member of the Senate, then it will be processed by appropriate University/Statutory Committee(s) duly constituted, and the findings/outcome of the findings of the Committee(s) will be directly conveyed to the Chancellor by the Chairman of the Committee.

**Recommendations of the
College Development
Council dated 18.11.2015**

7. Considered minutes dated 18.09.2015 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the College Development Council.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that the financial subsidy recommended to be paid to the Degree Colleges for holding Seminar/Symposium/Conference/ Workshop for the session 2015-16 should be increased from Rs.39,500/- to Rs.40,000/-.

It was clarified that the available amount has been distributed equally.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the amount should be increased to Rs.40,000/- and it would not make much difference.

Professor Karamjeet Singh suggested that the following recommendation 5 of the College Development Council appearing at page 106 of the Appendix should be deleted/not approved:

- “5. The teacher is allowed to travel by private Airlines provided the air fare is lesser than the Government Airlines.”

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that since Professor Tankeshwar Kumar has been appointed Vice-Chancellor of Guru Jambheshwar University of Science & Technology, Hissar, his name should be deleted from the Committee constituted for facilitating NAAC Accreditation at page 108 of the Appendix.

This was agreed to.

At the stage, Professor Ronki Ram staged walkout against the remarks made by a couple of members that the majority decision is nothing, but politics.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that it has been mentioned at page 107 of the Appendix that “Regarding the balance payment of construction office, the members also resolved that a justification from the XEN Office be called regarding the original estimate, revised estimate and reason for increased payment vis-à-vis the deficiencies in the construction of building of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan”. He suggested that the above said justification should be taken from the XEN Office because somewhere it had been mentioned that the work carried out by the XEN Office is not satisfactory.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that since now they have full-time Dean, College Development Council, the functioning of the Colleges had improved a lot. Earlier, they used to face the problem for affiliation. Two years ago, an affiliation Committee was formed and several of the problems have been solved. He further said that in the last meeting of the Syndicate, it was said that the Vice-Chancellor would constitute an Approval Committee and the recommendations of the Approval Committee would be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting, which would result into transparency and ensure that no case is pending.

It was said that the suggestion put forth by Shri Jarnail Singh is good as it would facilitate the office in expediting the approval cases, especially cases which are pending owing to certain discrepancies; otherwise, they are getting the approval cases done in a time bound manner.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he had requested the Dean, College Development Council couple of times to clear the case of Guru Nanak College, Muktsar before the meeting of the Syndicate by holding the meeting of the Committee. There might be reasons due to which the meeting of the Committee could not be held. The case of the College has been put on hold due to the template, which is the creation of their own. The selection of four candidates was made by the College in one interview, but the University has approved the appointment of only one candidate, i.e., Amarjit Kaur.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would address the issue today itself.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the College Development Council dated 18.09.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved, with the modification that the financial subsidy to be paid to the Degree Colleges for holding Seminar/Symposium/Conference/Workshop for the session 2015-16, be increased from Rs.39,500/- to Rs.40,000/-; and recommendation 5 of the College Development Council appearing at page 106 of the **Appendix**, be treated as deleted.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 04.08.2015 regarding demerger and restore of original status to Directorate of Sports and Campus Sports

8. Considered the minutes dated 04.08.2015 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to demerger and restore of the original status of two units i.e. the Directorate of Sports and Campus Sports which existed before the merger as an independent units for the welfare of the Sports culture and sports persons within P.U. Campus as well as for its affiliated Colleges.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that there were problems so far as sports activities, including inter-Colleges and Panjab University Campus are concerned. Earlier, what was happening was that the whole charge of Panjab University Campus sports was given to the Director (Sports), who is actually looking after the Inter-Colleges and Inter-Universities tournaments? Earlier, there were altogether two separate wings and that time things were definitely better. As an experiment these two wings were merged, thereafter, they found that the Campus students are not being looked after properly. Even if both the wings are separated again, it would not cause any problem as they would use the available infrastructure and the same would be taken care of by the Director of Sports, because only they have the expertise. Just to ensure that the interests of the Panjab University Campus students are taken care of, they have suggested creation of another wing headed by the Deputy Director and he could be provided some staff for the purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is okay with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that to say that earlier, the Directorate of Sports and Panjab University Campus Sports were two separate wings, is wrong. In fact, from the very beginning it was only one unit, and subsequently, it was divided as a proposal has been brought that they should go back to the position which existed before 2009. They came to that situation after they thought that the situation which they would bring as per the proposal would not deliver the goods. That's why, it was bifurcated and he thought that all the people present here know the background of the bifurcation. As Professor Navdeep Goyal has rightly explained, if they are going back to the old system, which was prevailing before the year 2009, it would have been better had it been recorded in the deliberations as to what difficulties are being faced under the existing system and why they are recommending the demerger. But nothing has been mentioned except that consequent upon demerger of both Directorate of Sports and Campus will attain their previous original status that existed before the merger dated 06.05.2009 for posting of the employees. Had the purpose of the merger been mentioned, they would have been enlightened. The decision of merger, which was taken in the year 2009, was also taken by the Syndicate. That meant, they have realized that the said decision was wrong. But it has not been pointed out where that decision proved to be wrong because at that time when they took the decision of merger, it was shown as if with the merger, the University is going to attain very high status. Now, the same is being shown with demerger. The merger was also done because they were facing a lot of practical problems and it was also said that the persons belonging to the campus did not obey the orders. They at that time suggested that they should be put under the direct control of Directorate of Sports. Now, they are saying that demerger should be done as if with the demerger they would not face the earlier quarrelsome problem because it has been mentioned that the charge of infrastructure would remain with the Directorate of Sports, who would be using the same in consultation with the Dean of Student Welfare (DSW). He did not know what was the condition earlier. He is in favour of the system which the Syndicate thinks is in the best interest of the University, but that unfortunately has not been defined as to how it is in best interest of the University and probably it was also not defined in 2009 when the decision of merger was taken. He did not see the proceedings and do not know whether the same has been recorded or not, he must have asked the reason at that time also.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that this issue was also discussed in one of the meetings of Syndicate in the year 2013. In fact, the issue was raised by Dr. Dinesh Talwar and he had given a number of reasons, but unfortunately those reasons have not been attached. So as said by Shri Ashok Goyal that part is correct that the reasons were there. The reasons were there and that was why they took that decision. Only one thing is at variance was the infrastructure, which was divided, but the same should not have been divided. In consultation with the DSW is that when there would be issue/s concerning the Campus students, the infrastructure would be used in consultation with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that his opinion is slightly different and according to him, this issue could wait for some time and they should also see those reasons as to why the decision for merger was taken so that it might not prove to be counterproductive. If it could wait up to next meeting, there is no harm in postponing the decision.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they permit, let him seek the opinion of Professor Naval Kishore, who was Dean of Student Welfare at that time.

It was told that, as said by Shri Ashok Goyal, reasons, for merger of the two wings, was infighting between the two wings. There was no clarification between the functions of the Directorate of Sports and Deputy Director. Resultantly, there were a lot of infightings between the two wings and it was suggested that these two wings should be merged and the resources could be pooled. The main objection was that the fixtures/ties were fixed by the Director of Sports in an arbitrary manner and the students of the Campus were put to disadvantage, even though the University and the affiliated Colleges is a single unit. Several complaints were received even from the Colleges that the Directorate of Sports fixes the fixtures and also decides the objections and do the same in arbitrary manner. Secondly, it is mandatory for the campus students, who have taken admission under the sports quota, to attend to the ground, but when they merged the two wings, the campus students stopped going to the ground and they were not taken care of by the Directorate of Sports even though the two wings were merged.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if all the things have been seen by the Committee and it is found that it is in the best interest of the students, he is not against it, but since the reasons have not been given, he is just saying that the reasons should be appended with the item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that somebody would make a summary of the reasons and it is the responsibility of the Dean of Student Welfare to attach the same with the item as an Appendix.

The members suggested that the item should be approved. However, it be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting as an information item.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 04.08.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved, with the stipulation that the summary of the reasons due to which the two wings were merged earlier and also the reasons as why it is being demerged, be provided to the office by the Dean of Student Welfare so that the same could be attached as an **Appendix-XVII**.

Recommendations of Executive Committee of PUSC dated 28.09.2015 of **9.** Considered minutes dated 28.09.2015 (**Appendix-XVIII**) (Item No.12, 15, 17 & 26) of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C.

Professor Karamjeet Singh pointed out that at page 118, Sr. No. 9, the prize money has been reduced to Rs.51,000/- from Rs.1,00,000/-. It is right to reduce the prize money because there may be reasons that in individual games, there might be more players. But at Sr. No.10, it has been reduced to Rs. 51,000/- from Rs.75,000/-, which could be reduced to the level of Rs.31,000/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the participation prize money could be increased from Rs.51,000/- to Rs.75,000/- He proposed that the prize money for participation in individual event be increased to Rs.75,000/-.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar pointed out that these rates are repeated on other pages also under Categories A-2 and A-3. He said that it should be increased to Rs.75,000/- because there might not be much players.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be increased to Rs.61,000/-.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that Principals and Sports persons are members of the Executive Committee. Some more persons from other fields should also be included as members in the Executive Committee.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the item is approved. The Committee is constituted after a particular duration. The rates of TA/DA should be revised by the Committee after a specified period.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let this come as a resolved part.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C. dated 28.09.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved with the modification that the proposed prize money for participation in individual event under Category A-1, A-2 and A-3 be increased from Rs.51,000/- to Rs.61,000/- and the TA/DA be revised periodically.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was wondering as to who was the person sitting on the right side of the Vice-Chancellor and Professor Karamjeet Singh told him that, he is the new Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to introduce the new Secretary because the earlier SVC was never introduced to the Syndicate and till date they did not know each other.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he sincerely regretted the lapse on his part. In fact, he should have commenced the meeting before taking up the agenda by introducing Dr. P.S. Sandhu. Dr. Sandhu has served as Registrar of three national institutes and he had served there for over six years. He is B.Tech. from Punjab Engineering College, M.Tech., M.B.A. and Ph.D. in Management from national institutes. He superannuated after serving those institutes and came to settle down in Chandigarh. The Vice-Chancellor sought his services because a SVC is needed who could aid the Vice-Chancellor for the enhanced responsibilities given to the Vice-Chancellor of Panjab University. Panjab University Vice-Chancellor has been named as Chairperson of State Higher Education Council, U.T. Chandigarh, which is a very big responsibility. All the money related

to colleges and also the Panjab University has been declared for such purposes to be in the same bracket as State Universities as an Inter-State Body Corporate but when it comes to release of grants to the colleges and the State Universities of India for RUSA through the instrument of State Higher Education Council. Fortunately for us, the Panjab University has been offered to receive that grant. Panjab University Vice-Chancellor is the Chairperson of State Higher Education Council and Director of Higher Education, UT is the Co-Chairperson and its office is to be located in Sector-42, Chandigarh. The Vice-Chancellor is expected to spend some time there. The Vice-Chancellor is also a member of the State Higher Education Council of Punjab as well. The meetings of the Council have to be conducted once every month. The whole machinery has to be set up. Luckily, Dr. Dalip Kumar, a member of the Senate is helping in these things. The proposal is that he would take leave and take the responsibility in setting up the office. Dr. Sandhu on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor is supposed sometimes to attend to those added responsibilities and also he has three Regional Centres, Rural Centre at Kauni and four Constituent Colleges. These are extended University in addition to the Regional Centres at Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana. Those people have lots of concerns that those concerns have to be addressed. The involvement of the Vice-Chancellor is there and has to attend to all such things. The Vice-Chancellor could not visit those Centres very frequently and there has to be somebody who could do all these things on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor. That is the reason that the Vice-Chancellor felt that Col. Sandhu could help the Vice-Chancellor, given his past experience of administrative and technical nature in national institutes including Indian School of Mines, which is an old institution. It was in this background that the Vice-Chancellor sought the services of Dr. Sandhu.

The members extended a hearty welcome to Dr. P.S. Sandhu.

Change in assignments of certain Fellows to the Faculties

10. Considered requests of the Fellows for change of their assignment to the Faculties, under proviso (ii) to Regulation 2.1 at page 46 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the University has the system of permitting the Fellows to change their assignment to the Faculties at the end of two years. This is a right which has been accorded to the members of the Senate. It is in that context that they have received requests from certain Fellows.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this issue has been hanging fire, at least he knew, for more than 20 years. Sometimes the Syndicate used to say that the change of Faculties in the fourth year or after a mandatory period of two years could not be allowed. The same Syndicate at some other time says that it is to be allowed, then again the same Syndicate says that it is not to be allowed, then again the same Syndicate says it is not to be allowed. So it was in the year 2012 when such requests came before the Syndicate, and probably, it was 24th March 2012. For the first time at that time, the case went to the High Court, wherein, he would not attach anything, as to what was said by Late Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath. He would also not go by what was said by Principal Gurdip Sharma and also Shri Jarnail Singh, who were the members of the Syndicate and Senate. He also does not want to touch as to what was said by Ms. Anu Chatrath in the High Court, as an Advocate representing the private respondents after filing the application. He does not want to go into that because it is of no interest. So far as this Syndicate is concerned, they are to go by what the University has said and they have to take a decision

whether the University would be able to go to the High Court and change its own stand, which the University had taken in the year 2012, and it was not only the University through the Registrar, but it was the stand taken by the Vice-Chancellor of the University also, wherein it was categorically stated in the written statement filed, on behalf of them, by the then Advocate of the University namely Shri Deepak Sibal, who is now a Judge of the High Court, wherein the University took a stand that if, at all, in the past the Syndicate has allowed any such change of Faculties after the expiry of two years, it was on account of wrong interpretation of regulation/s. This is the stand of the University in the High Court. Another stand of the University is that it is allowed only and only after the expiry of two years, i.e., half way, and the University has gone to the extent of saying that if the Senators are allowed to change their assignment to the Faculties any time after the completion of two years, the chaotic condition would prevail in the University and the purpose for which the Faculties have been formed could not be served and so on this stand has been taken by the University in the High Court. Why he is bringing it to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor because the above-said stand has been duly endorsed in the orders passed by the High Court by Justice Ranjit Singh. The item could not have been brought to the Syndicate for consideration because it is the University only, which said that beyond the expiry of two years, no such requests could be considered. Though there were two issues at that time – (i) issuing the letter for inviting requests for change in the assignment of Faculties; and (ii) whether it was right for the Syndicate of 2012 to reject the requests for change in the assignment of Faculties. In the High Court, it was also pleaded, though not by the University, by the private respondent that it was Shri Ashok Goyal, who in the year 2008 had said that the assignment of Faculties could not be changed, and it is Shri Ashok Goyal only in 2012, who has applied for change in assignment of Faculties, pleading that these could be changed. His view though right from the beginning is that assignment of Faculties could not be allowed to be changed after opportunity has been granted to all in the year 2014, and when the opportunity has been given to all and availed of by all, some have availed it by sending their requests for change in assignment of their Faculties and some by not opting for any change. As such, nobody could say that opportunity has not been given and the opportunity has not been availed. There was no such thing written in the Calendar that if one does not opt for change, he/she could keep it pending for the period, one likes, and this is the stand taken by the University in their written statement. In the year 2008, he said that they could not be allowed to change their assignment to the Faculties, but his view was not accepted by the then Syndicate and it was resolved that “Yes”, they could accept the change at this (that) stage. Keeping in view that decision of the Syndicate of 2008, when he requested for change in the assignment of Faculties in the year 2012, it was said; rather alleged, same man, who was saying in the year 2008 that they could not change, is himself asking for change in assignment of his Faculties. The only fault of mine was that notwithstanding what his personal opinion was, he preferred to follow the decision of the Syndicate, and as per the decision of the Syndicate, if he said something, the allegation was ‘see the double standard of this man’. Now, those people who filed the written statement as the private respondent saying ‘see the double standard/changing stand of this man’, who said that the assignment in Faculties could not be allowed to be changed, are fortunately for him the applicants for change in assignment of Faculties, who said very vociferously not only in the Syndicate, but also in the High Court, that change in assignment of Faculties could not be allowed, are now saying, “Yes”, change in assignment of Faculties could be allowed.

But he was sure that whatever he is saying is neither in the knowledge of the (present) Vice-Chancellor, on whose behalf the written statement had been made, nor in that of the Registrar, though it was the duty of the University office to bring it to the knowledge of all that this is what the University has decided and this is the observation/s of the Court on the stand taken by the University. He would not like to read the whole thing and he does not know whether he (Vice-Chancellor) has got the copy of the written statement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not seen the same.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they could easily perceive as to what is the stand of the University. The only thing is to be decided, irrespective of what the Government of the University, i.e., the Syndicate says, whether that could they go back from the stand, which they had taken in the year 2012. Would it not be contemptuous, if they say that what they had said in 2012, they have become wiser and changed their stand. It says that as per provision 2 above, i.e., the Regulation that "A Fellow may, however, ask for a change on the expiry of 2 years of the assignment, and his request will be considered by the Syndicate". As per the above proviso, it is clear that within the terms of 4 years and half the way stage, a Fellow can opt for change qua Faculties and the same could be allowed subject to that his request is considered favourably by the Syndicate. As per Regulation so and so, every Faculty shall consider the recommendations of the Board of Studies/Board of Control These are functions of the Faculties and it is on page 2 of the written statement on behalf of then Registrar, Panjab University. It has also been mentioned at page 5 that it is clear from the above that the purpose and object of Fellows assigned to Faculties is qua their contribution/s regarding the above, the functions. The above object and functions of the Faculties is statutory right and extremely important for the academic development of the University. It is for this reason that during the tenure of 4 years of the members of the Faculties, Regulation 2.1 provides the members of the Senate can be assigned to different Faculties and have the option to change the Faculties only on the expiry of two years. Meaning thereby, that the Faculty members are required to be a part of the Faculties for two years each (if they opt for change; otherwise, continue in the same Faculties for four years). This is the stand of the University. This is so, so that they can contribute as members of the Faculties for academic development for those particular Faculties. If change of Faculties after 2 years is allowed at any time, then no purpose would be served as the Faculty members would at random seek change of Faculties at will, after a period of two years, and that too, within short interval. The contribution/s of the Faculty members can be gauged only if they spent at least two years in a particular Faculty. So far as the present situation is concerned, thereafter, he says that so far as the petitioners are concerned they have at the beginning of their term opted for the Faculties. Thereafter, on the expiry of two years, i.e., in 2010, options were sought but the petitioners failed to exercise such options and chose to continue in the Faculties opted by them in the year 2008, so the request is illegal and arbitrary. It is submitted because they had taken the plea that earlier it was allowed, why the rule has changed now. The petitioner relies on the decision by the Syndicate the meeting has changed at the fag end of the year. It is submitted that the earlier decision taken by the Syndicate for allowing change in assignment of Faculties cannot come to the help of the petitioner. Even otherwise, the request is arbitrary, this and that. The present writ petition is an abuse of process of law. The petitioner is apparently using this Hon'ble Court for political reasons which

should not be permitted. It is on page 8, which is very interesting, it is written that in replied to paragraph so and so, it is not proper for a Senator to ask for a change in assignment of Faculties anytime after a period of two years reading of Regulation 2.1 proviso (ii) read with other Regulations quoted above would show that the change in assignment of Faculties could be allowed on the expiry of two years and not thereafter anytime. If this interpretation that Faculties could be changed anytime after the expiry of two years is allowed, then the same would lead to chaotic results and further would not serve the objects and reasons for which the Faculties have been formed. It is further submitted that submissions made in the preliminary submissions, which he was reading earlier, be also kindly be read as replied to these paragraphs as well. The Syndicate considers the provision of Regulation 2.1 proviso (ii) of Chapter 2-A and after interpreting the same, decided not to permit the Fellows assigned to different Faculties to change their opted Faculties at the fag end. So far as the earlier decisions cited by the petitioners are concerned, the same were taken by using the incorrect interpretation of Regulation 2.1 (ii) of Chapter 2-A read with objects and reasons for assignment of Faculties cannot come to the help of the petitioners. Then they say the Syndicate after considering the item, under these Regulations, has finally decided not to permit change in assignment of Faculties. This is the stand of the University. He would read only four lines because his friends are of the opinion that the Court has left it to the Syndicate. The Syndicate in 2012 considered and rejected the requests of the Fellows for change in assignment of Faculties as if the Syndicate is empowered to change its own decision/s as and when they thought fit as if it is within the powers of the Syndicate to interpret the same Regulation today in different direction and tomorrow in different direction, as if there is no law of the land, which is prevailing in this University, as if it does not bother about its stand taken in the High Court. The judgment starts, of course, he is not happy the way it has been written, but they have to accept what the Judge has said, "In an education field a politics is at play. Those elected/selected to contribute in the field of education, are seen fighting on petty and in significant issue without any care". Counsel for the petitioners would contend that the Fellows would have a right to claim change of Faculties throughout the tenure of 4 years as is being consider today, but the counsel for the respondent (Panjab University) and private respondents (Ms. Anu Chatrath) would contend otherwise to say that such a request could not be sought only on expiry of two years and not that the same request can be made at any time during the entire tenure of 4 years. And in the end, he (Judge) says that he wonders if this change would do any good in the field of education. It may serve some personal goal. This is the opinion of the Judge and in the end he says that "I see the justification in the stand of the University". So he has denied relief to the petitioners, on whose side he (Shri Goyal) was at that time.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to what the judgement says.

Shri Ashok Goyal read out the judgement "I see justification in the stand of the University. Otherwise also there is no allegation of *mala fides* made against anyone for which the Syndicate would not consider the request, if otherwise, legally permissible. The issue of change of faculty having been considered, would not require this Court to go into the same again. Whether this issue would be justiciable or not or that such a request if made is to be allowed or only consideration is to be done or whether the person has right to seek such a change, etc. need not be gone into as the request has been considered and rejected. No legal infirmity is noticed in the

impugned order, which would call for any interference in the exercise of writ jurisdiction. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed". At that time, the relief from the Court was that they have wrongly been denied the opportunity of not accepting their requests of change of Faculties, and the University gave the logic and private respondent also gave the logic for the same. There were two issues at that time – (i) that the Syndicate observed that the Registrar has issued the letter without any authority from the Syndicate or anybody else, but no such letter has been issued this time. Now, those people, who believe in what strictly was said by the High Court and what was strictly decided by the Syndicate, and who in spite of the fact, may have wanted to change the Faculties, have not changed it believing in the system, what is their fault, because no letter has been issued as there was no need for issuance of such letter. In view of the stand taken by the University and in view of the orders, which is very in the custody of the University. Shri Ashok Goyal further added that if any request for change in assignment of Faculties was received by the Registrar or the Vice-Chancellor, it should have been straightaway replied to by saying that it could not be allowed at this stage. If there is any way out of going back of that stand, he wondered, the friends could guide that "Yes", they could change their stand. If yes, only then the requests could be considered. He said that he has told that neither legally nor technically, it could be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that, first of all, when they talked Regulations and what they say, otherwise also it is written that a Fellow may, however, ask for a change on the expiry of 2 years of the assignment, and his request will be considered by the Syndicate. Thus, the regulation clearly says that a Fellow may ask for change. In fact, that is what he discussed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as per Regulation, a Fellow may asked for change of Faculties on the expiry of 2 years of the assignment, and two years of the assignment does not mean two years of the start of the Senate.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that because it says that a Fellow may ask for a change, and that means, no letter is required from the University. If somebody has applied now, his/her request has to be considered by the Syndicate, and if anybody applies later on, his/her request could also be considered by the Syndicate. So far as operative part is concerned, as Shri Ashok Goyal has read out, it says that earlier their requests were considered and rejected. So he thought the basic reason why the Court had rejected was, as per the Act and the Regulation/s, it is the authority of the Syndicate to decide the change of Faculties. He (Shri Goyal) has said that the issue has been hanging fire for the last 20 years as sometimes the requests for change in assignment of Faculties have been accepted and sometimes not. Now, they have applied for change in assignment of Faculty, the Syndicate might accept their requests or might not.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that Shri Ashok Goyal has talked about the issue, which happened in the year 2012. He thought that both of them are here for the last about 23 years. This issue of change of Faculties has happened in March 2012, and after March 2012, elections for the next Senate (from 1st November 2012 to 31st October 2016) was to be held in the month of September 2012. Basically, the Syndicate comprised representatives of various Faculties, which helps the Vice-Chancellor and the University academically and administratively. Since at that time elections of the Syndicate were already held, the members were of the view that it

would not serve the purpose because thereafter no election of the Syndicate from that Senate was to be held. This was basically the spirit behind that decision that it would not serve any purpose. There have been people, who have been changing the assignment of Faculties at the expiry of two years and some others before three years.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal pointed out that it has also been mentioned that from the date of assignment and it is for full term.

Continuing, Shri Jarnail Singh said that there have been instances where they have been changing the Faculties in a particular term of the Senate before the last elections to the Syndicate are held. Last time it became controversial only because the elections of the last Syndicate were already held. Since it has come before the elections to the last Syndicate, members are their right to change their Faculties.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that whatever Court Judgement, University stand, opinion of the worthy members of the Syndicate are there, and what was said by the advocate of the other party because it is a proper way in which the legal issues are discussed and decided. Each and every Senate member is allowed to opt for Four Faculties (two major Faculties and two minor Faculties). In fact, he belonged to one Faculty of his specialization and he is given chance to work in three Faculties of which he has knowledge informally, but not formally. Meaning thereby, they have been given four Faculties. Not only that, a given members has also right to add member/s to the Faculties because he/she was expected to help the University to contribute to the society, which is the original mandate, because maybe that was not the age of specialization, but the age of combining the things. One could not be a good dentist, but he/she could be a good advocate, and he could be in the Faculty of Medical Sciences and also in Faculty of Law. After working for two-three years in a Faculty, if one thinks that he is unable to contribute in that Faculty, he requests for change of Faculty, which should be allowed as provided in the Calendar. Calendar gave opportunity to the members to change Faculties after a period of two years. Why the member/s has/have remarked that it is nothing but politics, he did not know.

Shri Ashok Goyal remarked that Professor Ronki Ram has staged a walkout some minutes ago on the word 'Politics' and now he himself is using the same word.

Continuing, Professor Ronki Ram stated that the politics is good thing and not bad thing all the times.

At this stage, din prevailed.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that these Faculties are made not only to contribute to the academic domain of the University, Faculties are made to constitute the Cabinet of the University (Syndicate). Therefore, these are highly important bodies because if the right Faculties are there, the Cabinet of the University is empowered to take appropriate decisions, and everybody tries to do this. So then the matter was really hanging fire for the last many years. Thereby they have said what for these bodies are. These bodies might need changes. But now the question is that the change in assignment of Faculties is allowed by the Calendar. Why the change has been allowed by the Calendar because four Faculties are large domain. Therefore, people might change their Faculties. If one is a member of

the Faculty of Languages, he could also be a Dean of Faculty of Medical Sciences. If one could not contribute to a given Faculty, he/she could change that. His opinion on this is that if one wants to take such things very seriously, the whole issue is to be resolved. But so far as the demand of the Senate members to change their Faculties is concerned, it is well in order and is their democratic right as per the Calendar. Since there is possibility, they have applied for the change.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that his submission is that those friends, who have applied for change in assignment of Faculties, have applied as per the provisions of the Calendar. Whichever background Shri Ashok Goyal and the clarification given by Shri Jarnail Singh, from that it is clear that the opportunity has been given by the Calendar. The light in which the High Court has given the decision, they needed to look into because at that time elections to the next Senate were to be held in the month of September and it has also to be seen as to what is the purpose of seeking change in assignment of Faculties, and the High Court had given the decision in that light. As said by Professor Ronki Ram, the elections of Deans of various Faculties and Syndicate for the term 1st January 2016 to 31st December 2016 are scheduled for 6th December 2015, if the Fellows are allowed to change the assignment of Faculties, they would exercise their right properly. If the Fellows have been allowed to exercise their right to change the assignment to the Faculties after two years, they should also allowed to change the assignment to the Faculties in the 3rd year so that they could exercise their right for the betterment of the University academics. Therefore, the changes in assignment of Faculties have been sought by the Senators in accordance with the Regulations and there is nothing illegal in it, they should be allowed. Though the changes in assignment of Faculties have been rejected by the Syndicate by majority, as the same has to be considered by the Syndicate, which is the Governing Body of the University. Then the persons approached the Court, and the Court dismissed their petition. Now, the situation is same. He pleaded that the requests of the Fellows for change in assignment of their Faculties should be accepted as these are as per the provision/s of the Calendar and they are the custodians of the Calendar.

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that she would like to have information only on three points. What is the decision of the Syndicate to which Shri Ashok Goyal has just referred in the writ petition of 2012 because as has been pointed out by the member that she (Ms. Anu Chatrath) was the Counsel for the private respondent/s. In the year 2012, when the matter came up for consideration, the Syndicate was of the opinion that, in future, before the completion of term, no meetings of the Faculties are to be held and no fruitful purpose would be served by changing the Faculties. In view of that, the Syndicate rejected the requests for change in assignment of Faculties because the term of that Senate was to be completed on 31st October 2012, and the elections for the next Senate were to be held in September 2012.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that let him correct her. In fact, that was not the position. The meetings of the Faculties were to take place in March 2012 and December 2012 also because the terms of the Faculties expire on 31st January next year.

Continuing, Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that the matter which was discussed by the Syndicate was that with the change of Faculties, the members were not to cast their votes because as told by Shri Jarnail Singh, the elections to the Syndicate were already over, and

they were to cast their votes for the next Senate elections only. So the matter was discussed by the Syndicate in detail and found that the only purpose for changing the Faculties was to contest the election to the Senate for the next four years' term. That was why, it was not allowed thinking that it would be a misuse of Calendar provision. It was also thought at that time, that with the change the Faculties only for a few months, no fruitful purpose would be served. As said by one of his friends, that one wanted to contribute to the academics through his/her qualifications and experience, but if the term remains only for 3-4 months and no meetings of the Faculties are to be held, no fruitful purpose would be served, and that was why, the Syndicate rejected the requests at that time. As pointed out by Professor Yog Raj Angrish, it was not a decision of the Court. The decision of the Court based that the Syndicate, which is the competent body as per the provision/s of the Calendar, has rejected the change in assignment of Faculties and on the basis of that now allowing them to change their Faculties for electing the members of the Senate for the next four years' term, is a misuse. So it is not a decision on merit.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that, as per the provision of the Calendar, it is the prerogative of the Syndicate to allow or not to allow the requests for change of Faculties. Therefore, they could take a call on it and decide. Since this is within the framework of this four-year term, they could allow it. The earlier, decision was after the expiry of that period and was to be misused in the next elections to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that let him share a little bit of his comprehension of four Faculties per Senator. Whatever he has read, this algorithm that the Senate members could choose to be a member of four Faculties, all this at a time and at an era when the University had very few Professors, who were appointed, on behalf of the University. Even when this Campus commenced, the number of Professors at the Campus was less than 20. So nobody amongst the rest of the academia was a member of the Faculties by default. So it was in that background that the academic Administration had to be done on behalf of all the subjects and so on and so forth. They could not say that the Professor of every College could become a member of the Faculty. At the that time, even the Career Advancement Schemes of the University were also not there. As such, the assignment of a Senate member to four Faculties was in that spirit. The 90 odd members of the Senate were expected to look after the academic interests of the University and they were asked to work in different Faculties. Since all the 90 members could not be assigned a single unit of four Faculties, they were asked to choose four different Faculties from the list of given Faculties. In this background, all this had been provided. But the University has evolved and has now about 230-240 Professors and Heads of the Departments. Earlier, even the Heads were also not appointed on rotation and the senior-most teacher was the Head of the Department. This option that larger cross-section of academia could participate by virtue of teacher/s of this University, was not there. Nowadays, a large number of Professors and Heads of various Departments are members of the Faculties by default. As such, the representation of teachers is there, and the representation of the teachers is also there, as some of them are a part of the Senate as representatives of the Lecturers, Readers, Professors and some are representing the staff of affiliated Colleges. This is how, the whole background is there. He did not know why the High Court has used these words "this is all politics". They (High Courts) used these words because in addition to academic things, in newspapers people used such or related words on the eve of elections.

That is why, sometimes they say some unpleasant things about them. That is why, the NAAC also was a little bit surprised that the Deans of the Faculties and members of the Syndicate of Panjab University are elected every year. In this scenario, such members, including the Dean, might not be a specialist of the opted Faculty/Faculties. NAAC members found these things strange because these things are not typically there in most of the Universities in the country. They found their system a little bit different from what they experienced in other Universities and wanted it to be changed. But as of matter before them today, they have to go by what the Calendar says. If there are issues which somebody feels that they are violative of the law of the land or they are doing something, which the Court has decided against, they have to see that the same takes its own course. He felt that they have to go by the Calendar, which says that a Fellow may, however ask for a change on the expiry of two years of the assignment. They have also President, PUTA, whose term is of one year, but the same person could be got elected for continuously for 3-4 terms. Earlier, Dean of Student Welfare was also not a member of the Senate, who at one point of time had remained Dean of Student Welfare for five years.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired what about those cases, who complete, two years in third year.

Professor A.K. Bhandari stated that they should see the proceedings. In the year 2012, their own Late Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath had interpreted 'on' in so many words and it was interpreted that on means exactly 'on' the expiry of two years term. The Vice-Chancellor is right that two years means two years after the assignment. In the case of those, who have been assigned the Faculties late, they may be allowed change of Faculties; otherwise, this 'on' is to be interpreted as exactly 'on'. Why he did so because they have to read this in addition to (a) with the provision of Added Member. If they see the provision of Added Members are for two years term and are elected every alternative year. If the Senators are allowed to change their Faculties very frequently, it would create imbalance on the number of added members, which could be half of the number of Fellows in that Faculty. Once one is made an Added Member of the Faculty, they could not remove him/her. Therefore, this was to be interpreted in that light, was the spirit of the affidavit given by the University, which he had signed as Registrar at that time. So in his opinion, this 'on' is after the assignment. This is the interpretation, they took in the High Court and also took this stand. Before that whatever decisions were taken, were not taken to the High Court. Since the matter was in the High Court, they debated it and decided the interpretation of 'on'. Now, the matter is before the Syndicate and if it wants to change the stand taken by the University at that time, he does not know.

Shri Ashok Goyal, supplementing Professor A.K. Bhandari, stated that not only this, the University affirmed in the High Court that the earlier decision of the University allowing the Fellows to change their Faculties, is contrary to the provision/s, was wrong on their part.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that whatever little he (Vice-Chancellor) understood about the spirit of Added Members, the Added Members are typically supposed to be the teachers or professionals for given subject(s). Imagine an era when there was no campus and the Faculties are made of the Senators, and the Senators are choosing the Faculties in a manner that looks arbitrary. One

Faculty is of their specialization and the others depend on their whims. As such, there could be extraneous considerations for choosing the Faculties. If there are no Added Members, then there could be Faculties where people are there only for extraneous consideration. In order to impart academics, provision for Added Members (in the subject concerned) must have been made. Nowadays, the Added Members and Professors of the University Campus are subject experts in the Faculty concerned, as the College Professors *per se* are not the (default) members of the Faculties. Even the Professors of Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, are not members of Faculty of Medical Sciences, which is very strange, even though the Professors of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital are members of Faculty of Medical Sciences. Actually, the Professors of Government Medical College & Hospital, Sector 32, Chandigarh, should be the members of Faculty of Medical Sciences, but they are not members of Faculty of Medical Sciences, because the Calendar does not permit. As such, there are a lot of odd things, which are needed to be looked into and changed. That is why, they are going to form a Committee, which would look into all such things. At the moment, they have to do the things, which are correct and could be defended, as per this black book (P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007). So personally, he is not worried about the imbalance in the Added Members as that would not materially affect the functioning of a given Faculty, on behalf of academics attached to that Faculty. Academics could be taken care of by the other members of the Faculties, which include Professors and the Senators, though the Senators may or may not be subject experts. The Added Members are mostly from the Colleges and if they are from the University Campus, they are of the lower rank than the Professor. Now, the whole thing's boil off has come to as to what is the meaning of asking for a change of Faculties on the expiry of two years. Whether it is 'on' or 'after', but it could not be done before two years. Now, the point is that they have sharp differences amongst themselves. They have to finally go by the majority, as they function in a democratic way.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that he agreed with Professor A.K. Bhandari so far as Added members are concerned because it is not only the question of academics, but the question is whether they are following the regulations or not, as what they are trying to do would amount to violation of regulations. If the number increases or decreases, it would definitely affect that particular body. Citing an example, he said that if the elected members are not half of the Fellows, who have opted that particular Faculty, the Vice-Chancellor is authorized to nominate Added Members on that Faculty. Meaning thereby, the Regulations are very clear so far as Added Members are concerned, that the Added Members should be half of the Fellows in that particular Faculty. If Fellows opt for other Faculty/Faculties, the number would definitely increase/decrease, it would not only create imbalance, but it would also be violation of regulation/s regarding the Added Members. Secondly, so far as judgement quoted by Shri Ashok Goyal is concerned, in case they take any stand other than the then Registrar, Vice-Chancellor and the University had earlier taken, that would amount to contempt of court. In case the petition is dismissed, that does not mean it is not a judgement/order of the Court. Ms. Anu Chatrath could easily throw light on that in case the writ petition is dismissed, that does not mean that the High Court has not taken a decision/final decision on the issue which was before the High Court. So far as voting right is concerned, they are saying that since in 2000, there was election, but his question would be, if in today's meeting a Fellow does not opt for change of Faculties, and tomorrow one more

application is received in the office of the Registrar, what would be the affect of that application. Would they allow in December 2015/January 2016, if yes, up to what extent. They could not say that in case a Fellow just wants to exercise his voting right in Senate only, he/she should not be allowed, but in case he/she wants to exercise his right in the last year of Syndicate elections, he/she should be allowed. Before the High Court the election was not the criteria. Perhaps, his office (Vice-Chancellor's Office) as well as the office of the Registrar was not aware of the judgement, which Shri Ashok Goyal has been quoting. If the office of the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar, the Registrar must have sought some legal opinion – whether they could bring this time to the Syndicate or not as there is no such thing on record. So he thinks that they should not allow change of Faculties and should honour the judgement of the High Court because it would amount to contempt of court.

On a point of information, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wants to know for his knowledge that has this decision of placing the requests for change of Faculties after looking (by Vice-Chancellor) into all the documents, including the stand of the University, and also other bodies and the orders of the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not read this judgement.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that maybe the Registrar has seen it.

It was informed even he (Registrar) has not seen it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that, if they have not, he just wants to submit because on behalf of the University or on behalf of the Vice-Chancellor, the reply which was submitted in the High Court, was signed by the then Registrar and the Registrar is the custodian of the Calendar. The Registrar is the one who is the custodian of the University also. It is he, who has to face the music that is he carried away by what the Syndicate says or he sticks to what the University has said/submitted in the High Court. If they want to change something, did they seek permission of the High Court that they want to change the stand or over and above what the High Court has passed orders and on what they have said in the High Court, they have taken the decision just because some members of the Syndicate has taken the decision by way of majority? Now, the Vice-Chancellor has said that, personally, he is not bothered about the imbalance in the Added Members. In fact, this is what was argued in the High Court by the private respondent and the argument which was given was that this change of Faculties by Shri Malwinder Singh Kang, the first petitioner and others, is nothing but keeping in view elections of the Senate. He is happy that here with the members are saying that 'Yes', they have every right to change the Faculties keeping in view the forthcoming elections of the Syndicate. Meaning thereby, what they were saying that the purpose of formation of Faculties is nowhere other than the academics and Shri Malwinder Singh and others want to change the Faculties for the purpose of elections. Now, it is being said that by that time in March 2012 the elections to the Syndicate had already taken place and it was only for the purpose of Senate. Now, he says that the petitioners at that time wanted to change the Faculties for one election, and his friends are saying that they want to change the Faculties for two elections. Let him tell them that he wondered whether Ms. Anu Chatrath could say that once the election programme is announced, could the electoral college be allowed to be changed.

Couple of members said, 'No', electoral college could not be changed after the announcement of election programme.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that on the 16th November, the Registrar, Returning Officer, has issued the notice for the elections of the Syndicate to be held on 6th December 2015 and for elections of Deans of various Faculties to be held on 7th December 2015 along with the schedule of elections. The only agenda for the meetings of the Faculties scheduled for 6th and 7th December 2015 are the elections of the members of the Syndicate and Deans of various Faculties. The voters' lists have also been issued. It is an established election law that once the election process is initiated, the voters' lists cannot be altered. But he does not want to say all these things on merit because he simply thought that can the University afford to go back of its own stand, that too, by way of affirmation under the signature of the Registrar in the High Court, because it is ultimately the embarrassment of the University. The University does not mean that they would all not be embarrassed; rather they all would be embarrassed. In fact, he was sure that had this order/averment been in the knowledge of the Vice-Chancellor or the Registrar, this item would not have been brought to the Syndicate. He wonders where the Officer says that in placing this that this is the document and, that is why, Professor A.K. Bhandari said that he did not know (though it is off the record), he (Shri Goyal) also knows how this reply was prepared (Professor Bhandari has said that he had prepared the reply) because the then Vice-Chancellor probably was not in favour of the stand taken by the University in the Court and the reason which was given by the private respondent was that since the decision is not to the liking of the then Vice-Chancellor, it may be an embarrassing position while defending case in the University. So they should be impleaded as a party to clear to lay down what the regulations say. He has not read out even a single line from what is written by the private respondent. The first line starts with, which is under the signature of Ms. Anu Chatrath, on behalf of the all the private respondent, that this process of changing the Faculties any time within four years has brought in fighting.

Professor Ronki Ram said that earlier in the years 2008 and 2008, whatever the then Registrar had said, he had said according to his own understanding.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that this is not true, and he should withdraw these words. In fact, the Registrar represented the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor Ronki Ram should withdraw his words.

The Vice-Chancellor stated that the point is that this is a very important matter as far as the country at large is concerned. So far as NAAC is concerned, all this forms the governance structure of this University which needs a relook. All choices that the Senators make, a large factor of it goes for the electoral arrangement, which elects the Syndicate. The academic considerations are some part, but a larger part dictates how the Faculties formation comes about, and the changes which come in at the end of two years are also related to that, as well as the changes which are proposed to be made via the present proposal. So he is not taking side on one way or the other. His responsibility here on behalf of a National Institution is that whatever they do, it must serve as a guidance, to the larger question for which they have already started the debate as to how the future governing

structure of this University could be. Right now, 3-yearly terms of the Syndicate have gone by, and one more yearly term of the Syndicate is remaining. The process of electing new Senate has already been commenced, and the Chancellor has also okayed the dates, and so on and so forth. So the process is on and the next Senate is going to be elected, the way they have been electing the Senate in the past. There is going to be a larger body of the Committee members, that they have to constitute, for which Professor Bhandari is helping him. Such a move was triggered by another item which was placed before the Syndicate on behalf of the PUTA. Whatever changes would happen, those would not be for the forthcoming/next Senate, but for the future. So, what they are debating is important for the Governing Body of this University. In that light, they are free to say whatever they like, and everything is being recorded.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that it was the members of the Syndicate and Senate in the year 2008 and 2012, who exercised their right to change, and the matter was taken to the Syndicate, which took the decision according to the Calendar. There was difference of opinion and the matter went to the Court, and the Court has taken its own take on that. The Court did not say what they did and what they did not do. The Court has given the decision on the basis of the understanding of the Calendar and overall situation. If the Syndicate and Senate of Panjab University do not take any decision as per the Calendar, let the matter go to the Court and decide whether this way it is right or wrong. Because when it suits him/her, he/she would change and when it does not suit him/her, one would oppose. Let the matter go to the Court again and again. Ultimately, the matter would be decided by the Courts as per the Calendar, and then the matter could go to the Parliament. They are not violating the Calendar, rather they are asking, and they should do it as per the Calendar. If the Court gave them a good verdict, very fine. If the Court thinks that the matter is not settled properly, the Court could give its own verdict. They say that their Registrar or the Vice-Chancellor or the Syndicate members did not see the balance. If the University gives him the right, he would accept it; otherwise, he would go to the Court because he is not going to the Court against the University, he is going to the Court as per the very idea of the Calendar. This is a body of which he is a member, whether he is here or not, because this University belonged to him.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that whatever agenda has been placed before the Syndicate by the Registrar or the Vice-Chancellor, are in accordance with the Calendar and no illegality has been committed therein. Secondly, they had exercised their right for change of Faculties and they could do this. Therefore, to say that the agenda are not as per the Calendar, is wrong.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to say only one line for the information of the House and draw special attention of Ms. Anu Chatrath that the petitioners as well other Fellows have availed of this right while continuing in the Faculties assigned to each of them for the whole term of four years and those who chose not to make the requests at the expiry of two years in the year 2010.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she was not aware of this development as she is a new member of the Syndicate. She is happy that he (Vice-Chancellor) has informed them about the objections raised by the NAAC regarding the governing body.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, in fact, the NAAC has not raised any objection.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill clarified that objections means concerns. In view of that it is really imperative that they improve their system, especially in that light if they look at the change of Faculty at this moment, in view the elections which are due in the next fifteen days, how would the NAAC/anybody else interpreted it. What was said in the Court order is that the change of Faculties demanded in March 2012 were eyeing on the elections of Senate. Now also, they have elections within next fifteen days. The point she would like to respond him (Vice-Chancellor) is in light of Court Judgement which is being quoted time and again, can they really ignore the Court order and only see to the Calendar. She would like to have specific answer, and sometime back both the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar said that they have not seen this document. But she is surprised that they (Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar) never tried to get hold of the document/s also. If they have not seen it, they have also not grabbed the same for seeing it even now. But there has been no attempt for the last one hour to have a look at the document/s, which means perhaps this was in their knowledge. So could they ignore that Court order?

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there is a good suggestion from Professor Ronki Ram that let the Syndicate in its wisdom decide the matter one way today itself. If it goes to the Court, the matter would be finally decided for all times to come.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would like to ask a very pertinent question to Ms. Anu Chatrath ji, who is a daughter of a very eminent legal person, that a case has been made that in view of the statement made, on behalf of the University, if they do these things, would it amount to contempt of court and if they take a decision, on behalf of the Syndicate, would it be contempt of the Government Body of the University. So what is her take on it? She could think over it and in the meantime, they would break for lunch.

After the lunch, the Vice-Chancellor stated that he closed the meeting at a time, when he wanted to know from an Hon'ble member, Ms. Anu Chatrath, is there any contempt involved in taking a decision on this item.

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that first Shri Ashok Goyal has just raised an objection that once the electoral rolls have been published or election programme started, because the election dates have been notified, the electoral rolls cannot be changed. So far as his that point is concerned, it is settled law that once the election programme is notified, no writ petition can be filed, and it is not that electoral rolls can be changed or not. Nowadays, even the CAS promotions and direct recruitments as Professors are there, they could also cast their votes in the next Senate elections. Secondly, it is also a settled law that the Election Law is a Statutory Law. The provisions of Panjab University Calendar clearly say that on the expiry of two years. If that is taken on the face of that stage, two years is the minimum limit and after that it can be changed because once a member submits a request to the Registrar, he/she is duty bound to place the same before the competent authority, which as per the provision of the Calendar is Syndicate. He (Shri Goyal) has also made a reference to the affidavit filed by Professor A.K. Bhandari as Registrar as a respondent, she thinks that the Syndicate is the competent authority to review its own decision/s. It is also one of the viewpoints that let

Professor A.K. Bhandari and she herself, both abstain from today's decision by the Syndicate. Since the matter has been placed before the Syndicate, let it take a decision because the competent authority can review its own decision. Once that decision was taken in that context because the circumstances, as all the members have explained, because the requests were made for changing the Faculties at that time, when they were to elect members of the Senate for the next four years term. Now, it is not that situation. In March 2012, the only purpose was to elect members of the Senate for the term 2012-2016. However, the present scenario is totally different. She thinks the matter is before the Syndicate and Syndicate alone, as per provision. Election Law is Statutory Law and the Statutes are before the Syndicate and the Syndicate is the competent authority. At the most, Professor Bhandari and she (Anu Chatrath) could abstain and let the rest of the Syndicate take the decision. So far as contempt is concerned, as per her view as an Advocate, contempt is always when the Court order is not implemented. So far as court order read out by Shri Ashok Goyal is concerned, the Court has specifically averred that because the competent authority (Syndicate) has considered their requests and rejected. It is not a decision by the Court on merit. Shri Jarnail Singh and others while participating in the discussion, have suggested that they should take a decision as per the provisions of the Act, and if anybody is aggrieved, he/she could approach the Court and let the decision come on merit. Because that is not the decision on merit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Added Members are added by the Fellows, who choose the Faculties. Two have to put together and elect one and the number cannot exceed half. The people change the Faculties at the end of 2nd year, the mix which is there is also affected, and at that stage, the imbalance also arises.

Professor A.K. Bhandari intervened to say that it is taken care of because when the Faculties are changed, immediately thereafter, election of Added Members is held generally in the month of January. Typically, the Senate is elected in October/November and the Faculties are assigned in November/December, the two years expired in November/December, and when the change is allowed, immediately in January election of Added Members is held and the same is held to take care of the imbalance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now the question is when in the long past the Faculties were allowed to be changed. They faced the problem in the year 2012 only and prior to that it was going topsy-turvy. What were they doing then?

A couple of members, namely Shri Jarnail Singh and Professor Navdeep Goyal, said, "Nothing".

Professor Ronki Ram said that Dr. Gurdial Singh chose the Faculties just a few days before the meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that in the very long past, this issue has not become a major issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No Sir". It has become an issue in the year 2012.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that it has not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, Shri Jarnail Singh and Principal Gurdip Sharma said that before 2012, it has never become an issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are 91 Senate members in total and one choses four Faculties (two major and two minor), and the total Added Members in all Faculties would remain 182 only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since four Faculties are chosen, some imbalance is bound to be there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that minor difference could be there.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if they look at the microscopic of the given Faculty, when the people change the Faculties in the year 2008, it could have posed the problem.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that same thing would have happened at that time also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that hence, that is not an issue. Thus, this imbalance is not an issue. If somebody is aggrieved, he could approach the Court.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that how one could say that as a Fellow, he could exercise his right to change the Faculties, but could not exercise his another right to add the Added Member/s to the Faculty/Faculties.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that one member can get two opportunities to add Added Members, i.e., one in the beginning and another in the middle of the term.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, anyhow, that is not an issue at the moment. If somebody has to get it legally examined, let him do that.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that Ms. Anu Chatrath has said that the decision is not on merit. He is of the different opinion because in case the petition has been withdrawn or dismissed as withdrawn, then they can say that the decision is not on merit if the petitioner has withdrawn it. Now, both the parties had made their arguments and after going through the arguments, the Court is saying that it sees justification in one party's arguments. As a result, the petition is dismissed. That mean, the decision is on merit. Secondly, what the Court has discussed in that judgement is that the Court has interpreted in particular regulation of the Calendar only. The Court has interpreted the regulation only and only in view of the arguments advanced by the University as well as the respondent. So at this stage, they simply cannot say that the Court has not taken a call/decided the case on merit. In fact, this is on merit and technically, it would amount to contempt. He further said that he thinks that they should take this change of Faculties issue to the next Syndicate.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said "No".

The Vice-Chancellor enquired technically, what is the contempt of court. Is it a contempt of court reversing anything that the University has decided?

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that contempt is only when the Court decides a matter and gives directions to a particular authority, but the person having vested the right and corresponding duties vested in an authority, then the Court decides a matter on merit that this is your right and it has been wrongly denied to you and we are directing to give that right to you. And if it is decision by the Court, and that court decision is not implemented, then it is contempt of court.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that exactly. Now, take up the case of NRIs admission.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not related to the item.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that this is relevant.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would come back to you later. So let him first sort out this. So in this case, what is the Court's judgement? Has the Court upheld the decision of the Syndicate? Had the Syndicate right of whatever it had done?

Ms. Anu Chatrath and Professor Navdeep Goyal said, "Yes".

The Vice-Chancellor said that since it is an important matter, he does not want to get confused. The Court is not happy the way they do the things. The Court is also not happy the way the choices of Faculties are made. It is clear that the choices of Faculties are not purely for academic considerations. Since the governance is via democratic processes, and the governance is by the people doing whatever they have been doing, so it is clear that the Court is not happy with the fact that some extraneous considerations come into play other than the academics in making the choices for the Faculties. That is why, the Court has made some negative remarks, but they are not going into all that.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, as Ms. Anu Chatrath has said, that election petition is not maintained. He did not use anywhere the words 'election petition'.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she is saying that this is the law.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that let him say what he said that the rules of the game cannot be changed midway. That is only what he wanted to tell. He has never said that they are going to file an election petition.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that since he (Shri Goyal) has taken the objection that once the election programme has been circulated, no electoral rolls can be change. She says that this not the Law and the Law is that once the election programme has started, no writ petition can be filed.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired could the electoral rolls be changed?

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the competent authority could do that.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wants to say for the gain of Ms. Anu Chatrath only that on the date of declaration of election,

whatever voters list existed irrespective of the fact that on which date the election is to take place, even if a person ceased to be retired, he remains the voter. Why because the Law is that the rules of the election cannot be changed when the election process is on.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that for Syndicate election, nowhere anything like has been mentioned.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what Shri Goyal has told, it is for Senate election only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these are two different things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Yes", these are two different things.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it is written in Regulation 1.3 that elections shall be held at meetings of the Faculties concerned Names shall be proposed and seconded on the floor of the House. When after the Syndicate meeting, the voter is changed, people have changed as some procedure has been laid here. Before that they have said that they can change the Faculties. The Syndicate can allow the change of Faculties to the Fellows.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Shri Jarnail Singh) means to say that the election process has not been put into motion.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that what he wants to say is that what is the last date, and the programme has also be notified.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that only to the candidates, who want to contest the elections, and not the voters list.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is if it was being done up to the elections of 2008, so the process for doing this thing was on in this University. In the year 2012, the given Syndicate did not permit. The matter went to the Court and the University also filed the things and many other people also filed the things. What did the Court upheld?

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the Court upheld the decision of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "No", the Court upheld the stand of the University, and it is specially mentioned.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the stand of the University is, the decision of the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that 1100 cases have been filed against the University after his joining as a Vice-Chancellor. All these things have been filed by so many respondents. Whatever is filed by the Advocates, they all are the stands of the University, but none of them can keep a track of that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Vice-Chancellor Sahib, what kind of statement you are making and it is also being videographed."

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Yes".

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Can you say that what is being said on behalf of the University, he is not aware of that?"

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has not said that he is not aware. What he is saying is that he cannot go through the 1100 submissions made on behalf of the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that is why the paraphernalia has been provided to the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said "Fine".

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that she has read and she thinks that Dr. Dinesh Kumar has not read and he has pointed out that it was dismissed as withdrawn, which is factually incorrect.

Shri Ashok Goyal tried to clarify something, but he could not do so as Ms. Anu Chatrath vociferously spoke to say that the judgement says, "I see justification in the stand of the University. Otherwise also there is no allegation of *mala fides* made against anyone for which the Syndicate would not consider the request, if otherwise, legally permissible. The issue of change of faculty having been considered, would not required this Court to go into the same again. Whether this issue would be justiciable or not or that such a request if made is to be allowed or only consideration is to be done or whether the person has right to seek such a change etc. need not be gone into as the request has been considered and rejected".

A couple of members, including Principal Gurdip Sharma, said that this is very clear.

Continuing, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that so the Court is giving conclusion that, but here again the pandemonium prevailed.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that do make the confusion please. Now, what the order says that the University has said that it is after interpreting the Regulation 2.1, that the change of Faculties cannot be allowed any time after the expiry of two years. The Syndicate, after interpreting this Regulation as such, has rightly rejected and the Court says "I see the justification in the stand of the University and after having been considered and rejected, rejected on the ground where the University has taken the stand on what ground it has been rejected. So let us to say that the decision is not on merit. He says that he has heard the Counsels for both the parties. So he says that the Counsel for the petitions would contend that the Fellows would have a right to claim change of Faculties throughout the tenure of 4 years, but the Counsel for the respondent, i.e., the University and private respondents, i.e., the members of the Syndicate, would content otherwise to say that such a request could not be sought as a matter of right and could be so sought on expiry of two years and not that the same request can be made at anytime during the entire tenure of 4 years. And in the end, after taking into the pleas of both the University as well as private respondents, as to why it has been rejected, he has said, "He see justification in the stand of the University". Thereafter, he says that no allegation of *mala fide* has been levelled against the petitioner that it is only on account of some

malicious attitude on the part of somebody. So he says it has rightly been done. Nowhere, he says that it is the Syndicate, which is the final authority to keep on changing its decision/s anytime because the University has said earlier whatever it was doing, it was because of wrong interpretation of the regulation/s. For the first time, they have done the right interpretation and that stand of the University has been found correct by the Judge.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that so far as what Ms. Anu Chatrath has said is concerned, now the scenario is that the Syndicate took a decision in the year 2012 and in that decision, they interpreted this particular regulation. Now what the Court is saying that the interpretation is right and the stand of the University by way of affidavit in which the University also interpreted the same thing, as his Fellow colleagues are saying, that it was the Governing Body stand. So on that particular stand, the University also took a stand only and only on the basis of the Syndicate decision, but does it mean that the University Syndicate interpreted it in one way and as a result, the Registrar filed an affidavit that this is our interpretation and the earlier interpretations were wrong. We are admitting it, and the Court said okay. Now, since you have rightly interpreted it, so that is the reason we need not to go into the interpretation again. This is what the decision is – that there is no need to change the decision and no need to look into the decision again taken by the Syndicate as well as the University is clear enough. So that decision should prevail. It is nowhere saying that the Syndicate is the competent authority which can keep on changing its decision time and again. Regarding contempt, as he was trying/constrained to intervene, that what happened in NRIs admission cases, because there was a judgement and that judgement was applicable on all the Universities. In one particular admission, another University, which is a State University, denied admissions to some NRIs. As a result, a petition was filed and the petition was contempt of court. It was a State University which did not give admission to the NRI candidate/s, the contempt notice was issued even to Panjab University also. Resultantly, till date they suffering economic loss, which the University used to gain through NRI admissions. So in case that particular decision was applicable to our University, then how this decision is not applicable on Panjab University which is directly pointing towards the interpretation on our own Calendar, he fails to understand.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that he is again of the stand that this is the prerogative of the Government of the University to take call on whatever agenda come to it. They have been changing their stand and interpretation, and different decisions have been taken by the different Courts in the country. So if they take a call on it and decide that they allow it, it is their right. It is their right to ask for change of Faculties after 2 years, if they have not already done it. So his plea is that instead of discussing it time and again and repeating the same thing, they should go ahead with it and allow change of Faculties.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Fellows have right to apply for change of Faculties and did not have right that the Syndicate should accept their requests. That is what the Court is saying. The stand of the University is also that the Fellows could apply for change of Faculties, but it is not necessary that the Syndicate would accede to their requests. The decision has been given on this and that is what the final line says, “it has been considered and rejected”. To consider the requests for change of Faculties is necessary and for considering the circumstances/conditions at that time were different

and now the circumstances/conditions are different. At that time, the decision taken by the Syndicate in its wisdom was that and which decision the Syndicate its wisdom would take today, would be of today, because exactly the same situation is not prevailing.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that three factors are to be looked into. One is the claimer; second is the tradition/s which happened in the University; and third is – who wants to change their Faculties, and who wants to support them and who does not want to support them. The Calendar clearly says that there is provision for change of Faculties. Tradition says such things happened also. Only in the year 2012, the matter went to the Court. Because no resolution has come from outside to this body. This body is the Governing Body and those who write resolution/s and make changes are also members of this body, and those who do not want to allow this, are also members of this body. Therefore, it is a unique case. Some people who have applied for change of Faculties, are members and those who say that there should not be such provision, are also members of this body. The question is – who is right and according to him both are right. They say, they want to do it and give them the permission, while the others say, “No”, they could not do it. As such, something is at stake and they should understand this. Now, while doing this, they are making use of the Court Judgement and provisions of the Calendar, but they have to come to some decision. This body says that the Calendar is saying that such requests shall be considered by the University and the University is the Governing Body. If such a deadlock occurred in this Body as some are saying that it should be allowed and some other are saying that it should not be allowed, which meant that the Court should decide again. Since both the parties are members of this body as well as the Senate, to break the deadlock, they have to go by the Calendar, and if even then no decision is arrived at, then there is no alternative, but to approach the Court.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that since he is new in this Syndicate, he did not know what happened earlier. When he reached Chandigarh, he read a news clipping of “The Tribune Chandigarh Edition”. After going through the news, he thought that there might be some problem somewhere and let the Law take its own course. It has been written by the newspaper that all this is being done to shunt-out a particular person from the Syndicate and all are party to that. If it is true, it is unfortunate. On the one side, they are saying that they are the custodians, which the Vice-Chancellor has also said, as they are the members of this Governing Body. If they are running the University by becoming a party to all this, it is very unfortunate. According to him, it would prove to be a wrong decision of the University.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that they all are discussing the issue in the light of the provisions of the Calendar. They have in front of them the provisions of the Calendar and also a Judgement of the Court. The provisions of the Calendar allow them to change the Faculties after two years. After two years means, minimum two years. This is the demand of their Colleagues, who have requested for change of Faculties, that they should be allowed. It has now been said that it has been written that all this is being done to shunt-out a particular person from the Syndicate, he said that the newspapers wrote several things, what authenticity is there in those news, the Syndicate/Senate or the University need not to go into. In every election, some persons go out and some new enter, and the process goes on because it is not guaranteed in the election process as to who would continue for 4 or

10 or 20 years. Whosoever would come, is to be decided by the Senate through votes and it would continue. Now, it seems to Shri Gaur that it is being done to hit a particular person and he (Shri Gaur) could give logic to this, but who is doing this, could not be known because every person is aligned to one lobby or the other. According to him, there is not merit in all these things. Wherever the election process is there – whether it is Senate or the Syndicate, big political fronts are there. So in the election process such things appeared in the newspapers and the same should not be discussed. It is being apprehended that whether they are not taking a decision against the Court, in which they might not face a problem later on. The Syndics also want that they would not take any such decision. The Vice-Chancellor has also sought legal opinion from the member present here, who is legal expert. From the discussion taken place so far, it is clear, though he is not a legal expert, that after the decision read out by Shri Ashok Goyal, Ms. Anu Chatrath and Professor Ronki Ram, the meaning is that whatever decision was taken by the Syndicate, on the basis of that they have rejected the appeal. It was the case in the year 2012, but before that, in according with Regulation 2.1 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, they were allowing change of Faculties after 2 years, 2½ years, 3 years and 3½ years. So he thinks it is not a law case, but someone still approach the Court against the decision of the University, he could do so. But he thinks, it is legally right and this right is made out, and they should be allowed.

Concluding the discussion, the Vice-Chancellor stated that the Black Book says that people can apply at the end of two years and now it is on. At that incident or a little later, is a matter of some grey areas. As per University's affidavit, it looks as if it is on and it cannot, but it is a University affidavit. In the background of this, the people have asked for change in assignment of Faculties. If it is an issue of contempt of Court before the Syndicate, which is always there before the given Syndicate. Contempt of Court meant, the Court would interpret whatever they are doing. His view is that he is neutral and he has put the matter before them. Now, they should decide, for which he would ask each one of them one by one.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant, he (Vice-Chancellor) stands by his decision of having placed the matter before the Syndicate for consideration, which could not have been done as per orders of the Court.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that Shri Ashok Goyal has just said that the matter should not have been placed before the Syndicate at that time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Goyal) is saying the matter should not have placed before the Syndicate now and not at that time.

Continuing, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that even the Court has said that the matter should not have placed before the Syndicate and the reason for the Court coming to this conclusion is that a letter was earlier written by the Registrar inviting requests for change in assignment of Faculties, which was challenged. She read out the following portion from the judgment of the Court:

“Since Annexure P-13 is under challenge and it was not having ...”

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that that is right.

Professor A.K. Bhandari opined that he is in favour of the stand taken by the University at that time. When the Vice-Chancellor asked him that he (Professor Bhandari) thinks that the requests for change in assignment of Faculties should not be permitted now, Professor A.K. Bhandari replied in affirmative.

Shri Naresh Gaur also said that the requests for change in assignment of Faculties should not be permitted.

Professor Rajesh Gill also said that the requests for change in assignment of Faculties should not be permitted.

Professor Karamjeet Singh also said that the requests for change in assignment of Faculties should not be permitted.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he just wanted to say few things – that if the requests for change in assignment of Faculties allowed to be considered, it is nothing, but abuse of power by the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate and the Registrar, which is completely in violation of the orders of the Court, and nothing but a political game being played only keeping in view the lapses of the office. When few of the members said 'No', Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is giving his opinion which should be recorded that it is nothing that it has been said by the so many members that the Faculties have been requested to be changed keeping in view the elections to the Syndicate which are to be held on 6th of December.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the allegation, which Shri Goyal has levelled, against him (the Vice-Chancellor) is uncalled for.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that the requests for change in assignment of Faculties should not be allowed

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that the requests for change in assignment of Faculties should be allowed. Secondly, it is not a political game; rather it is as per Calendar.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that the requests for change in assignment of Faculties should be allowed. Why these should allowed, because after going through the arguments, they have seen that the Syndicate and Senate have allowed the Fellows to choose four Faculties, which are larger domain, where a provision has been given to them and under that provision certain freedom has been given to them to make right choices so that they could contribute for the betterment of the system. Under this provision, when they allowed change in assignment of Faculties, they are exercising their democratic rights. According to him, there is no politics in that and they have to see the way the Senate is being constituted since 1882. Since a lot of time has passed, maybe at that time, they might have faced more problems than now. Whenever the members of the Senate want to exercise their right/s, the problem might come. If possible, the Calendar should be changed. Secondly, certain members of the Governing Body wanted changes and certain not. Thereby, his position is that no politics is involved in it at all. In the end, he said that the requests for change in assignment of Faculties should be allowed.

Principal Sanjeev Kumar Arora, Principal Parveen Chawla, Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Professor Navdeep Goyal, Principal Gurdip Sharma,

Shri Jarnail Singh and Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the requests for change in assignment of Faculties should be allowed, as per Calendar and also previous practice.

After detailed discussion, voting and counting of heads, it was found that the majority (9 in favour and 6 against) was in favour of allowing the requests of the Fellows for change of their assignment to the Faculties, it was –

RESOLVED: That the requests of the Fellows for change of Faculties, as per **Appendix-XIX**, made under proviso (ii) to Regulation 2.1 at page 46 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, be acceded to.

At this stage, Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the envelopes should be opened and, as per previous practice, a copy of the list signed by the Registrar should be supplied to the members.

The Vice-Chancellor said “Okay” and lists were made available to the Syndicate members before the conclusion of the meeting.

**Confirmation of certain
Programmers working in
the Departments**

11. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following programmers working in the Departments mentioned against each, be confirmed on completion of one year of probation in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, under Rule (viii), page 128, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009:

Sr. No.	Name/ Department	Date of Joining	Date of completion of one year probation	Proposed dated of confirmation
1.	Shri Mohinder Singh Negi Programmer Department of Computer Science & Application	30.05.2014	29.05.2015	30.05.2015
2.	Shri Ankur Kukreja Programmer Computer Centre	09.07.2014	08.07.2015, L.W.P. 63 days (2 months 3 days)	12.09.2015
3.	Shri Balram Sooden Programmer Computer Centre	19.08.2014	18.08.2015	13.09.2015

Information contained in office note was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: Rule (viii) appearing at page 128, P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 is reproduced below:

“the members of the University staff will be confirmed from the date of successful completion of probationary period without prejudice to the inter-seniority recommended by a Selection Committee and approved by the competent authority”

Professor Karamjeet Singh enquired the reasons for the delay in confirmation of the person at Sr. No.3, namely Shri Balram Sooden because in the office note, no reasons have been given. The person completed the period of probation on 18.08.2015 and is being confirmed on 13.09.2015.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Professor A.K. Bhandari has rightly said that the person at Sr. No.2, namely Shri Ankur Kukreja joined on

09th July 2014 and completed the probation period on 08.07.2015. Since that person was on leave without pay for 63 days, he is being confirmed from 12.09.2015 and the next person is being confirmed after that person. The next person should not suffer because of some other and he should be confirmed from 18.08.2015 and the confirmation of Shri Ankur Kukreja could be delayed because of leave without pay.

The Vice-Chancellor thanked Shri Ashok Goyal for pointing out this discrepancy and said nobody should suffer because of the other person.

RESOLVED: That the consideration of item be deferred and the matter be re-examined, if need be, legally also.

Confirmation of Assistant Registrars

12. Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the following Assistant Registrars, be confirmed in their posts with effect from the date mentioned against each:

Sr. No.	Name of the Person and Branch/ Department	Date of Promotion	Date of Confirmation	Remarks
1.	Shri Bharat Bhushan Talwar, Accounts	01.08.2012	01.01.2014	Vice Mrs. Sushma Anand A.R. Retired on 31.12.2013
2.	Mrs. Sneh Lata, Community Education and Disability Studies	12.02.2009	04.01.2014	Vice Shri Manohar Lal Offg. D.R. Vol. Retired on 03.01.2014
3.	Mrs. Usha Rani, Office of the D.U.I.	01.08.2012	01.07.2014	Vice Ms. Sulakashna Sharma Offg. D.R. Retired on 30.06.2014
4.	Mrs. Poonam Chopra, A.C. Joshi Library	03.08.2012	01.08.2014	Vice Shri Balbir Khosla A.R. Retired on 31.07.2014
5.	Shri Kuldeep Kumar Sobti Estt.-I	08.10.2012	01.09.2014	Vice Mrs. E.B. Singh Offg. D.R. Retired on 31.08.2014
6.	Shri Rajinder Singh, Office of the Vice-Chancellor	04.01.2013	01.10.2014	Vice Mrs. Soma Sharma Offg. D.R. Retired on 30.09.2014
7.	Mrs. Raj Manchanda nee Raj Rani Accounts	19.08.2009	01.11.2014	Vice Mrs. Santosh Chopra A.R. Retired on 31.10.2014
8.	Shri Dharam Paul Sharma Establishment-II	01.05.2013	01.12.2014	Vice Mrs. Hasan Devi Offg. D.R. Retired on 30.11.2014
9.	Mrs. Indra Rani USOL	02.09.2013	01.04.2015	Vice Mrs. Harbans Kaur, Offg. D.R. Retired on 31.03.2015.
10.	Mrs. Kiran Sharma Examination-II	22.10.2013	02.04.2015	Vice Shri Davinder Pathania, Offg. D.R. Retired on 31.03.2015

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

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that since the confirmation of Assistant Registrar is on the basis of vacant slots, two slots became available on 01.04.2015. The person at Sr.No.10, Mrs. Kiran Sharma is being confirmed on 02.04.2015 whereas she should also be confirmed from 01.04.2015.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that two positions of Assistant Registrar became available on 01.04.2015. One person is being confirmed w.e.f. 01.04.2015 and the other on 02.04.2015 to maintain seniority between the two. He pointed that if two persons are confirmed on the same date, their seniority in the lower cadre has to be taken into consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the office should not manipulate the things and they have to set it right on behalf of the Syndicate instead of blindly doing it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, if need be, it should be written that both the Assistant Registrars stand confirmed on 01.04.2015 and to maintain the seniority, their seniority in the lower post should be taken into consideration.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would get it checked and he be authorized to take decision on behalf of the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That –

1. it be recommended to the Senate that the persons from (Sr. No. 1 to 8), be confirmed in their posts with effect from the date mentioned against each; and
2. so far as confirmation of persons at Sr. No. 9 & 10 is concerned, the matter be examined and the Vice-Chancellor be authorized to take decision on the matter, on behalf of the Syndicate.

Re-appointment (afresh) of Dr. Vishal Agrawal as Assistant Professor in the Department of Biochemistry

13. Considered if, Dr. Vishal Agrawal, Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, be re-appointed afresh purely on temporary basis, for the academic session 2015-16 or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5(b) at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he is working earlier at Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXI**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. Regulation 5 at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007 reads as under:

“5. Notwithstanding anything contained in these Regulations -

- (a) xxx xxx xxx
- (b) Syndicate shall have the authority to make emergent temporary appointment on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor
 - (i) For a period exceeding one year, or on contract basis for a limited period.

- (ii) Allow higher starting salary within the grade of the post.

An appointment made under this Regulation shall be reported to Senate.”

RESOLVED: That Dr. Vishal Agrawal, Assistant Professor, Department of Biochemistry, be re-appointed afresh purely on temporary basis, for the academic session 2015-16 or till the posts are filled up through regular selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 +AGP Rs.6000/- plus other allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5(b) at Page 111, of P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which he is working earlier at Department of Biochemistry, Panjab University.

Recommendations of the Committee dated 3.11.2015 regarding grant of benefit of past service

14. Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 03.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXII**) constituted by the Syndicate, that Dr. Naveen Gupta, be allowed benefit of past service rendered at DAV (C) Dental College, Yamuna Nagar, on the same analogy as has been allowed in the case of Dr. Latika Sharma, Department of Education and he be considered for promotion, under career Advancement Scheme, from Lecturer to Lecturer (Senior Scale) w.e.f. the due date i.e. 04.05.2006 (after excluding the period of 18 days w.e.f. 30.03.2006 to 16.04.2006 for which he was not paid salary).

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.09.2015 (Para 7) (Appendix-XII) has resolved that a Committee comprising of Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Karamjeet Singh and Professor Ronki Ram to be chaired by Professor A.K. Bhandari, be constituted to examine the case and submit its recommendations within 10 days to be placed before the next meeting of the Syndicate.

RESOLVED: That Dr. Naveen Gupta, be allowed benefit of past service rendered at DAV (C) Dental College, Yamuna Nagar, on the same analogy as has been allowed in the case of Dr. Latika Sharma, Department of Education and he be considered for promotion, under career Advancement Scheme, from Lecturer to Lecturer (Senior Scale) w.e.f. the due date i.e. 04.05.2006 (after excluding the period of 18 days w.e.f. 30.03.2006 to 16.04.2006 for which he was not paid salary).

Appointments on compassionate grounds

15. Considered minutes dated 09.09.2015 (**Appendix-XXIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

After some discussion, it was –

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Committee dated 09.09.2015, as per **Appendix**, be approved.

Writing off articles of SAIF

16. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 17.11.2006 and 30.10.2009 (**Appendix-XXIV**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the following articles of more than the value of Rs.5,00,000/- (**as per**

Annexure-A), at Sophisticated Analytical Instrumentation Facility (SAIF), P.U., be written off from the record, as they are beyond repairs or unserviceable on account of non-availability of spare parts:

Sr. No.	Item	Price	Qty	Date of Purchase
1	XRD (PW 1718) & Accessories	6,59,416.00	1 no.	07.07.1983
2.	AAS (ECIL 4139) & Accessories	6,56,556.00	1 no.	21.05.1997
3.	GC-MS (VG 70-250S) & Accessories	57,50,128.00	1 no.	31.05.1988
4.	FT-NMR Spectrometer (Bruker ACF 300) & Accessories	73,65,182.00	1 no.	25.05.1992
5.	Ultracentrifuge (L 8M) & Accessories	35,28,259.27	1 no.	19.09.1982

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 29.10.2005 Para 88 (**Appendix-XXIV**) has written off the old DST instruments of the Department of Sophisticated Analytical Instrumentation Facility (SAIF).
 2. Ministry of Science and Technology, Government of India, New Delhi, vide letter dated 25.09.2007 (**Appendix-XXIV**), has approved that the following articles may be disposed off as per the provision contained in GFR 2005 and thereafter written off from the records:
 1. GC-MS (VG 70-250S)
 2. FT-NMR Spectrometer (Bruker ACF 300)
 3. Ministry of Science and Technology, Government of India, New Delhi, vide letter dated 20.07.2015 (**Appendix-XXIV**), has approved that the following instruments may be disposed off as per the Govt. rules (Rule 196-200 of GFRs):
 1. XRD (PW 1718)
 2. AAS (ECIL 4139)
 3. Ultracentrifuge (L 8M)
 4. As per P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009 appearing at page 450-51, the competent authority to write off losses is as under:

1.	Vice-Chancellor	Up to Rs.1 lac per item
2.	Syndicate	Up to Rs.5 Lac per item
3.	Senate	Without any limit for any item

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the following articles of more than the value of Rs.5,00,000/- at Sophisticated Analytical Instrumentation Facility (SAIF), P.U., be written off from the record, as they are beyond repairs or unserviceable on account of non-availability of spare parts:

Sr. No.	Item	Price	Qty	Date of Purchase
1	XRD (PW 1718) & Accessories	6,59,416.00	1 no.	07.07.1983
2.	AAS (ECIL 4139) & Accessories	6,56,556.00	1 no.	21.05.1997
3.	GC-MS (VG 70-250S) & Accessories	57,50,128.00	1 no.	31.05.1988
4.	FT-NMR Spectrometer (Bruker ACF 300) & Accessories	73,65,182.00	1 no.	25.05.1992
5.	Ultracentrifuge (L 8M) & Accessories	35,28,259.27	1 no.	19.09.1982

Deletion of one of the conditions for award of “Late Shri Ajit Singh Memorial Scholarship”

17. Considered if, the condition enlisted at Sr. No.6 of the following existing terms and conditions, for award of “Late Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi Memorial Scholarship” be deleted as recommended by the Joint meeting of Academic and Administrative Committee dated 28.08.2015 (Item 8) (**Appendix-XXV**) of the Department of Law, P.U. and be implemented from the session 2015-16 onwards:

Existing Conditions	Proposed Conditions
1. Scholarships may be awarded to two students out of the interest money to be received from endowment fund yearly (Rs.8000/- p.a. each).	1. No Change.
2. Two students, one from second year and one from final year of LL.B would be selected on the basis of their merit of first and second year respectively.	2. No Change.
3. To calculate merit for selection of second year student, marks of both the semester i.e. First and Second semester would be considered, whereas for selecting the student of final year marks of all the semesters i.e. first to fourth semesters would be considered.	3. No Change.
4. Only regular students would be considered eligible for this scholarship.	4. No Change.
5. Student/s should not have failed or got any re-appear in any paper.	5. No Change.
6. The scholarship would be awarded on the basis of first declaration of the result, not re-evaluation result, if any.	6. Deleted.

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

NOTE: The donation given by Dr. (Ms.) A. Garkal was accepted by the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of the Syndicate and she was informed in this regard vide Endst. No.19382-83/A dated 21.11.2001 (**Appendix-XXV**).

RESOLVED: That, as recommended in the joint meeting of the Academic and Administrative Committees dated 28.08.2015 (Item 8) (**Appendix**) of the Department of Law, Panjab University, the condition enlisted at Sr. No.6 of the following existing terms and conditions, for award of "Late Shri Ajit Singh Sarhadi Memorial Scholarship" be deleted and be implemented from the session 2015-16 onwards:

Existing Conditions	Proposed Conditions
1. Scholarships may be awarded to two students out of the interest money to be received from endowment fund yearly (Rs.8000/- p.a. each).	1. No Change.
2. Two students, one from second year and one from final year of LL.B would be selected on the basis of their merit of first and second year respectively.	2. No Change.
3. To calculate merit for selection of second year student, marks of both the semester i.e. First and Second semester would be considered, whereas for selecting the student of final year marks of all the semesters i.e. first to fourth semesters would be considered.	3. No Change.
4. Only regular students would be considered eligible for this scholarship.	4. No Change.
5. Student/s should not have failed or got any re-appear in any paper.	5. No Change.
6. The scholarship would be awarded on the basis of first declaration of the result, not re-evaluation result, if any.	6. Deleted.

Withdrawn Item

18. Considered the issue regarding officiating arrangement against leave vacancy for Ministerial Cadre post and Secretarial Cadre.

NOTE: 1. The Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) in its meeting dated 04.06.2015 has recommended as follows:

- a.) Previous practice as followed for allowing officiating arrangement in leave vacancy shall be continued. The incumbent, who has been allowed such officiating arrangement in leave arrangement, is entitled for emoluments of higher post on which he is promoted in officiating capacity. Further, in case such person retires

from University service after availing promotion in officiating capacity, is entitled for retiral benefits on the basis of last pay drawn on date of retirement.

- b.) The Vice-Chancellor can make officiating arrangement upto six months in order of seniority.
 - c.) The Registrar can make officiating arrangement upto one month in order of seniority. In case the officiating arrangement is for a period less than one month, then the incumbent so promoted on officiating basis shall not be entitled for emoluments of higher post, but if he officiates for a period of more than one month he shall draw higher pay of the post he officiates.
2. Subsequent to the recommendations of the JCM the establishment branch has been following the same as above.
 3. However, in one of the case of Ms. Gurpreet Kaur, Superintendent, Examination Branch-I who was allowed to officiate as Assistant Registrar against the leave vacancy, the audit made certain observations that it involves financial loss in term of enhanced pension, gratuity, leave encashment after her retirement as she has been promoted at the verge of retirement.
 3. Legal opinion was sought by the Legal Retainer, P.U. on the issue and he has opined that pensionary benefits which was being given by the University to officiating employees is not correct. Such benefits are only to be given to the employee (retiring) holding substantive post after promotion. The legal opinion was enclosed.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath wanted to know under which provision of the Panjab University Calendar, this matter had been placed before the Syndicate because the Joint Consultative Machinery (JCM) has taken a valid decision in this regard. If there was any audit objection qua one person that the officiating was for less than one month, the same should have been placed qua that person only. Firstly, it should be seen that the officiating arrangement has been going on since very long and now the situation is that one Mrs. Gurpreet Kaur was promoted on 1st October and was to retire on 31st October, 2015 and the period of officiating was less than one month. She has been informed that the Syndicate in its meeting held on 31st August 1964 vide para 26 and 33, meeting dated 1st September, 1965 and then 30th October 1976 have been taking the decision of this officiating arrangement. In view of past practice, the JCM has taken this decision for officiating arrangement because the higher posts are very few and the persons have been serving for a long time and do not get

promotion. Career Advancement Scheme was introduced for teachers. Once a person is appointed, he/she gets regular pay scale of Professor to which the person is promoted. In view of that the Syndicate has been taking decision since 1964 and not a decision taken by the JCM just now. The audit objection is raised qua Gurpreet Kaur only and she could not understand why the total matter has been placed before the Syndicate. If late Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath would have been here, he could have explained the whole position. The JCM has taken the decision in the presence of both the parties. Why the Registrar has sought the legal opinion. JCM is a statutory body in existence for the last so many years. JCM is a body where the decisions are taken after hearing both the parties with mutual consent and she was doubtful why the Registrar who was supposed to be in the meeting of the JCM has sought the legal opinion. The Registrar was not present in the JCM meeting and the Controller of Examinations was officiating as Registrar. In that capacity, the Registrar must have sought the legal opinion. But in her opinion, the members still agree that the practice is in operation since 1964. The JCM has taken a decision. The audit objection is qua only one person. In view of the facts of that case, instead of getting that audit objection removed, the total matter of officiating capacity is placed before the Syndicate. She did not appreciate this. JCM is a properly constituted body having members of the Syndicate and Senate and the decisions are taken in the presence of representatives of the employees as well as officials of the University. Seeking legal opinion on the decision of the JCM is an insult of the JCM which is properly constituted and statutory body.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the University's financial matters are under scrutiny of the Government. Every penny, everything done on behalf of the University is being scrutinized and would get scrutinized. They have been told to be careful when it comes to financial outflow of the University. Everything is under scrutiny. If they were following some practices which may be consistent but if those practices are not being followed in the Central Government or in other State Universities, they would be questioned as to why they are doing so. They had to go through the Fact Finding Committee scrutiny for many things which they thought were right. But they have to go and explain and bring the changes. In the light of those things, they thought to put the record straight. The Government may point out that the University is doing such and such things which should not have been done.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that since the legal opinion and the audit objection is qua Gurpreet Kaur only and the practice is continuing since 1964, the JCM is competent to review the decision. Why the whole matter has been placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if somebody had pointed out that the practice is not proper. Government participation is also involved. Even though the DPIs as representatives of Punjab and U.T. are supposed to be present in the meeting, they did not come to attend the meeting. The University takes a decision and those decisions are to be ratified by the representatives of the Government. Once the University has taken a decision, that does not mean that the representatives of the Government, like DPI, Advisor and other ex-officio members would concur with that decision. Everything done on behalf of the University, the representatives of the Government are supposed to read that and their concurrence, in principle, has to be there. In spite of all this, when the University went for Fact Finding Committee last time, the University was asked many things. The University has done it as a matter of extreme precaution and caution

so that it is not said that the University has not considered. He is okay with it. Anything that the members do, it is for the members.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that re-employment for teachers is nowhere in any government nor in the Central Government. As far as this right of the non-teaching staff is concerned, either make the appointment or the employees be allowed for a short time to continue in officiating capacity.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not against anything. He has put the matter before the members in that spirit that tomorrow somebody should not say that the Vice-Chancellor did not bring the matter to the knowledge of the members.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the reasoning given is that if the employee retires, he/she shall get the retirement and pensionary benefits. After 1st January, 2004, the pension scheme is not applicable.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the pension to the persons after 1st January 2004 is not applicable but the persons appointed before that date are entitled for pension.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that what Mrs. Anu Chatrath has said is right. In every organization, there is a JCM. JCM is a consultative body between the management and the employees. This type of JCM is also in the University. The decision taken by the JCM and the management should be implemented since it is continuing since 1964. After having the legal opinion, if this officiating arrangement is being discontinued, it is a wrong step.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the legal opinion is not binding.

Continuing, Shri Naresh Gaur said that they were changing the rules and violating the UGC and MHRD regulations as the re-employment of teachers up to the age of 65 years is not there in any other University. The present officiating arrangement should be allowed to continue.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she would like to add one thing that the decision of the JCM has been approved by the Vice-Chancellor and after approval, on the basis of legal opinion and that too qua Mrs. Gurpreet Kaur, the total matter could not be reopened.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they were in such a financial situation that they have to reform the practice and save every penny.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not only saving the penny but review the practice.

Continuing, Professor Rajesh Gill said that there are so many things which could be avoided. For instance, creation of several positions in the University is going to put a burden on the University. Renovation of some offices is also going on. Then why only the non-teaching staff is being denied the opportunity of officiating.

It was informed that the University is not against this officiating arrangement. The intention was not like that. The intention was to have a practice which is going to sustain for long time. As of now, the system is not, it could have audit objection the way it had happened. The decision taken by the JCM was not at all at

any time not in practice in true letter and spirit. Thereafter, after the decision of the JCM, each month, the promotions have been given. There was no such case that the decision taken by JCM was ignored. Late Shri G.K. Chatrath had given inputs which helped to take decision. That was not ignored at all and the decision is being followed. The audit objection and simultaneously the financial condition of the University did prompt to seek the opinion of the Finance and Development Officer if any financial implication is involved and what are the repercussions. The employees could not be given certain incentive as far as he/she is working but giving for one month and for pension in the long run. The finances are not involved for one month but for lifelong. Then there is a slight mismatch. The Committee could decide and give its recommendations as to for how much period the benefit could be given and if that employee is going to contribute towards the University. There was a case when one person came against leave vacancy and then he/she also wants to proceed on leave. The third person is also to be promoted to fill up the gap. It is a chain reaction and people are shifting from one place to another just to create the leave vacancy arrangement.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that till the regular appointments are made, the past practice should be continued.

It was clarified that it is being done only for stop gap arrangement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the representative of the Central Government visits the University and finds anything like this, he/she could say that this practice is going in the whole of the University system.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that if they start modifying the decision of JCM and implementing like this within a second, the University would come to a standstill. It means that the decision of the JCM is given go by. The legal opinion was sought only qua Mrs. Gurpreet Kaur because the audit objection was that officiating arrangement was for less than one month and the legal opinion was also for that purpose and matter should have been placed for that person only whereas the agenda item before the Syndicate has been placed for total policy.

It was informed that there is no such policy for short periods.

Professor Ronki Ram said that once this matter came up, persons came to him.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the Syndicate had already taken the decision in this regard in the year 1964, 1965 and 1976.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee of the Syndicate could be constituted to look into the issue.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that instead of constituting a Committee, let the matter be reconsidered by the JCM itself because it is a decision taken by the JCM.

The Vice-Chancellor said okay.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it could be examined by a Committee of the Syndicate.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that it could be reconsidered by the JCM.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if somebody on the Board of Finance level points out, it would cause problems. Nobody of the University is absolute. A new practice has started is that when the Board of Finance agenda goes to Delhi, a representative who is supposed to be in the Board of Finance, who does not come, they just send some comments and the comments are considered in the Board of Finance and when the minutes are sent to them, they insist, is if they have veto power, that if the University did not satisfy their whims and since the money is released by them, they say that the Fact Finding Committee is on its work. The University is at their mercy. This is just a matter of caution so that the University does not get all these problems.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that she is against the discontinuation of officiating practice.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no practice has been stopped.

Continuing, Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that as per the settled law, the judge who gives the judgment, if some clarification is to be sought, that has to be sought from the same judge. In this case also, the JCM had taken the decision. Why the matter is before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Syndicate is the Governing Body and ultimately everything has to come to the Syndicate.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that JCM is a channel for sorting out the problems of the employees. Why they are giving a go by to that channel. It is a right of the employees. Since the Registrar was not present in the meeting of the JCM, how he could justify.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired what is the constitution of the JCM and how the JCM is supposed to act. He thought that the issue is very serious. The Registrar has made the statement that legal opinion has not been sought on the decision taken by the JCM. He disagreed with it. It is not the Registrar, it is the Vice-Chancellor who has endorsed the proposal of the Registrar to seek legal opinion as to whether the decision taken by the JCM is legally tenable or not. It is the decision of the JCM which has been sent for legal opinion to the Legal Retainer by the University. As per his understanding, the recommendations of the JCM, in fact, without changing full stop/comma, are supposed to be placed before the Syndicate for its approval. He wondered if the JCM has taken some decision, who took the decision because the head note of the office says that 'as desired/discussed with the Registrar, the following detailed office note on the matter of officiating arrangement against leave vacancy prepared for obtaining legal opinion so that it can be taken to the Syndicate for its consideration' and the office note (p.183) relating to recommendation of the JCM dated 4.6.2015 says 'in view of the facts stated above, legal opinion may be sought if the recommendations of the JCM are legally tenable in the matter before putting up the same before the Syndicate'. He is not commenting on the merits but his serious concern is that are they not violating the set procedures as laid down in the Panjab University Calendar that without any authority from the Syndicate, the recommendations of the JCM cannot be sent to anybody. That means that the recommendations of the JCM are filtered through a Legal Retainer. JCM is constituted by

the Syndicate and Senate where the representatives of both the Syndicate and Senate are the members. Probably, Mrs. Anu Chatrath pointed out that JCM decisions are not only put under the scanner of the Legal Retainer but it is with a view to discontinue the age old practice which has been going on in the University. Whether it is right or wrong, they would discuss it later on. What face would they show to the people who are protesting for some act on the part of the University? He wondered that the Registrar is simply not sure that legal opinion on the JCM recommendations has been sought.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he was a member of the JCM for a year. The JCM was constituted for a healthy amicable resolution of conflicts which arise between the University and the employees. It is a properly constituted body. This body is administrative body on the basis of which certain administrative decisions are to be taken. It is not the final court body. It is a body where demands of the employees are to be discussed and amicably resolved. Then the recommendations come to the Syndicate. There are some matters which are of highly contentious nature. Normally, these matters go to the court. Before approaching the court, it is better to constitute a body like JCM. Some issues which are discussed but are not resolved and remain pending for a meeting one after the other. There are some genuine demands. But there are some demands, which due to financial problems or other reasons, could not be met now but were met at that time. Keeping that in mind, there was a practice which was there for many years that the people were consulted. There are examples when a person who is short of the qualifying service for full benefit, says that he/she has six months to retire and would definitely like to get the full service benefits of 33 years. But there is a person who is short of only one month and would like to get the benefit of complete service. There are examples that persons are short of six months and ask the other persons to proceed on leave and get the salary for that period. That person has done the job. That person remained in officiating capacity. At that time, it was thought that it was good that the employees could get the benefit of full service. They are to work for the welfare of the employees. All the facilities should be given to the employees. The question is that can that person get the benefits of officiating. If there is any audit objection in the capping, could they have any answer to that. If any decision is not taken by the JCM, the matter would come to the Syndicate and if the Syndicate could not resolve the same, the matter would go to the court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he faced a situation where an Assistant Registrar also wanted this arrangement. Everybody was in favour of this arrangement. But one person said that he/she would not proceed on leave. In spite of everybody in favour for that lady, she could not get the benefit because of a person who did not take the leave. There are people who manage to get the benefit while others could not manage. The persons who could not get the benefit would start writing letters everywhere saying that people are in connivance with. Someday, they would have to face this issue. How long could they face the issue? If a finance person from Delhi asks what is happening in the University, what would be the answer to that. It is better that he placed this matter before the Governing Body. The members should know all the facts, they could reject everything. It is necessary for the members to know all the facts. It is not going to undermine the decision of JCM. If there are certain unsatisfactory happening on behalf of the University and later on the University got in that, then there is a problem. The University had to face these things before the Fact Finding Committee relating to transfer to

Panjab University account of 25% of funds related to Hostels of Panjab University, ever since Boys Hostel No. 1 was created.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the things might not be in the notice of the Vice-Chancellor. She stood with the query raised by Shri Ashok Goyal the legally valid decision taken by the JCM has been put for a legal opinion of before a single person thereby challenging the decision taken by 4 Senate members as members of the JCM. The Legal Retainer is changing the decision taken by 4 members. What are the reasons for taking the legal opinion? Although she knows, she did not want to disclose the person behind seeking the legal opinion. There are certain things related to seeking legal opinion which she would not share in the meeting. Since the year 1964, 1965 and 1976, the officiating arrangement is continuing and the then Registrar had circulated this decision of the Syndicate vide letter No. 13390-489 dated 15.12.2000 and as per the decision of the Syndicate, this practice is continuing and implemented. Now, on the basis of one legal opinion and that too qua only one person, the total matter had been placed before the Syndicate. She is not able to understand it.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the scheme of allowing officiating chance is a good one. When the NAAC Team visited the University and asked about any welfare scheme being run for the employees, on getting the information about this scheme, the Team appreciated it. This scheme should continue. If there are any lacuna, that could be taken care of by the JCM.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired about what is the final decision taken on the item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter should go back to the JCM and whatever decision the JCM takes, would be placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired why this could go back to the JCM and for what.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there are certain things that need to be looked into.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that since the objection related to Mrs. Gurpreet Kaur only, the JCM could consider only that matter.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu also endorsed the viewpoint expressed by Shri Naresh Gaur.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the JCM could advise on the matter.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that he has been a member of the JCM. This decision was taken under the chairmanship of late Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath and in the presence of Dr. R.S. Jhanji only to implement the decisions already approved by the Syndicate long time back. The audit objection in respect of Mrs. Gurpreet Kaur came up in the meeting of JCM, which could not be held due to lack of quorum. This policy should not be closed. This could be discussed in the next meeting of the JCM.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that the Vice-Chancellor was talking of financial crunch.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that he was not talking about finances but about practices. There is a lot of difference between finances and practices.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that money would not matter in these things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said he was sorry to say that probably nobody has read what the recommendations of the JCM are. But it has been pointed out that the case in question where the audit has raised the objection qua Mrs. Gurpreet Kaur only because in her case the officiating is for less than one month. As per the recommendations of the JCM, 'the Registrar can make officiating arrangement upto one month in order of seniority. In case the officiating arrangement is for a period less than one month, then the incumbent so promoted on officiating basis shall not be entitled for emoluments of higher post'. This means that the JCM decision also does not cover Mrs. Gurpreet Kaur. Could it be accounted for that benefit? As per the recommendations of the JCM, no financial benefit would be given for less than a month. The audit has rightly raised the objection that since the period is less than one month, the financial benefit could not be granted. The same had been sent for legal opinion alongwith the recommendations of the JCM. It should be seen whether the audit objection is because the period of officiating is less than one month.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would try to protect her but through a process.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not in favour of protecting the interests of any individual but in protecting the dignity and sanctity of the decision of the University bodies and if at all, there was any difficulty being faced by the office keeping in view the decision of JCM, it might be that the period might be less than one month, which could be checked. For future, he suggested that if such a situation arises, it should be brought to the Syndicate because JCM prestige is to be taken care of by the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point made by Shri Ashok Goyal is well taken.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that ultimately they have to correct the position. The office note is signed by the Sr. Law Officer who has not been able to give any opinion and he writes to the Registrar that it be sent to the Legal Retainer for legal opinion whether the JCM decision is legally tenable. The decision of JCM, which was headed by a former Advocate General of Punjab, the senior most member of the Senate and legal luminary, is being got examined by the Law Officer of the University from the Legal Retainer on an issue which has been passed by the JCM. They should see the matter in that light. As far as the practice of giving officiating is concerned, if it has been going on for the last 50 years, then probably it needs very big efforts to discontinue rather than getting a legal opinion and take a decision. The consequences of this also needed to be seen and the message that this University is meant not only for teachers, Senators or non-teaching staff, they are a family first. That is the message that they have to give.

Professor Ronki Ram said that nobody should be put in any trouble.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired what is the final decision on the issue?

The Vice-Chancellor said that we have to protect the past practice which is to continue.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that this item be withdrawn.

The Vice-Chancellor said that okay, the item is withdrawn but they would need to follow it up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that but it should not be at the cost of embarrassment to the University.

RESOLVED: That the item be treated as withdrawn.

Permission for admission to M.A. (History) as a special case

19. Considered request (**Appendix-XXVI**) of Shri Umesh Kumar Yadav that he be given admission to M.A. History in the Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, as a special case.

NOTE: 1. The recommendations of Chairperson, DES-MDRC, P.U. are as under:

“The candidate is an International Sports person has participated in Commonwealth Games 2010, New Delhi and his admission at DES-MDRC is going ensure bright prospects and consequential contribution to the glory of Sports in general and Panjab University in particular. The promising Sports person on admission is going to prove a great asset to the University.”

2. The last date of admission was 31.08.2015.

RESOLVED: That request (**Appendix**) of Shri Umesh Kumar Yadav that he be given admission to M.A. History in the Department of Evening Studies, Panjab University, as a special case, be acceded to.

Issue regarding grant of sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal

20. Considered request dated 29.10.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) of Shri Sukhwinder Singh, Inspector, Investigating Officer, Economic Offence Wing, Sector-17, Chandigarh, with regard to the prosecution sanction of Shri Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent, Pension Cell (now UIPS).

NOTE: Shri Sukhwinder Singh, Inspector, Investigating Officer, Economic Offence Wing, UT Police, was informed vide No.2663/R/DS dated 12.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXVII**) that competent authority to accord sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal (Superintendent) being Class A Officer is the Senate.

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the sanction for prosecution of Shri Naresh Sabharwal, Superintendent, Pension Cell (now UIPS), be granted.

Conferment of *Honoris Causa* Degrees on certain persons

21. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 16.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that *Honoris Causa* Degree be conferred on the following as mentioned against each in the convocation to be held in 2016:

1. Dr. Nuruddin Farah D.Litt. (*Honoris Causa*)
Department of English
207 Lind Hall
207 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, MN55455
2. Professor Harkishan Singh D.Sc. (*Honoris Causa*)
Professor Emeritus
University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences
Panjab University
Chandigarh
3. Shri Shiv Nadar D.Sc. (*Honoris Causa*)
Founder & Chairman HCL
8 & 9, GB Palya
Off Hosur Road
Bangalore-560068 (Karnataka)

NOTE: The Section 23 of the P.U. Act at page 9, P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“Where the Vice-Chancellor and not less than two-thirds of the other members of the Syndicate recommend that an honorary degree be conferred on any person on the ground that he is, in their opinion, by reason of eminent position and attainments, a fit and proper person to receive such a degree and where their recommendation is supported by not less than two-thirds of the Fellows present at a meeting of the Senate and is confirmed by the Chancellor, the Senate may confer on such person the honorary degree so recommended without requiring him to undergo any examination.”

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Section 23 at page 9 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, it be recommended to the Senate and the Chancellor that –

- (1) honorary degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Dr. Nuruddin Farah, Department of English, 207, Lind Hall, 207, Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN55455, on the ground that he, in the opinion of the Syndicate, by reasons of his eminent position and attainments, is a fit and proper person to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*honoris causa*);
- (2) honorary degree of Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Professor Harkishan Singh, Professor Emeritus, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Panjab University, Chandigarh, on the ground that he, in the opinion of

the Syndicate, by reasons of his eminent position and attainments, is a fit and proper person to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Science (*honoris causa*);

- (3) honorary degree of Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Shri Shiv Nadar, Founder & Chairman HCL, 8 & 9, GB Palya, Off Hosur Road, Bangalore-560068 (Karnataka), on the ground that he, in the opinion of the Syndicate, by reasons of his eminent position and attainments, is a fit and proper person to receive the honorary degree of Doctor of Science (*honoris causa*);

NOTE: Bio-Data of Dr. Nuruddin Farah, Professor Harkishan Singh and Shri Shiv Nadar enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

Conferment of title of Professor Emeritus on certain persons

22. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 16.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXIX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the title of Professor Emeritus, be conferred on the following faculty members:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 1. Professor Raj K. Gupta
Department of Physics
Panjab University
Chandigarh | PHYSICS |
| 2. Professor K.K. Bhasin
Department of Chemistry
Panjab University
Chandigarh | CHEMISTRY |
| 3. Dr. G.S. Gupta
Ex-Professor
Department of Biophysics
Panjab University
Chandigarh | BIOPHYSICS |
| 4. Professor S.P. Khullar
H.No. 1633, Sector-7-C
Chandigarh | BOTANY |
| 5. Professor Pam Rajput
Dept-cum-Centre for Women
Studies & Development
Panjab University
Chandigarh | WOMEN STUDIES |
| 6. Dr. Neelam Man Singh Chowdhary
H.No. 9, Sector-4
Chandigarh | INDIAN THEATRE |

NOTE: The Regulation 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“The Senate, may, on the recommendation of the Syndicate, confer the title of ‘Professor Emeritus’ on any distinguished teacher of the University on, or after his retirement, in recognition

of his scholarship and conspicuous service to the University, provided that no such title shall be conferred unless the connection of the teacher with the University shall have extended over a period of not less than ten years. A Professor Emeritus shall for all the purpose of courtesy and on ceremonial occasions be upon the same footing as a Fellow of the University but he shall not as such be entitled to membership of any University body or authority.”

RESOLVED: That it be recommended to the Senate that the title of Professor Emeritus, be conferred on the following faculty members:

- | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------|
| 1. | Professor Raj K. Gupta
Department of Physics
Panjab University
Chandigarh | PHYSICS |
| 2. | Professor K.K. Bhasin
Department of Chemistry
Panjab University
Chandigarh | CHEMISTRY |
| 3. | Dr. G.S. Gupta
Ex-Professor
Department of Biophysics
Panjab University
Chandigarh | BIOPHYSICS |
| 4. | Professor S.P. Khullar
H.No. 1633, Sector-7-C
Chandigarh | BOTANY |
| 5. | Professor Pam Rajput
Dept-cum-Centre for Women
Studies & Development
Panjab University
Chandigarh | WOMEN STUDIES |
| 6. | Dr. Neelam Man Singh
Chowdhary
H.No. 9, Sector-4
Chandigarh | INDIAN THEATRE |

NOTE: Bio-Data of the above persons enclosed (**Appendix-XXIX**).

Conferment of award of Udyog Rattan and Gian Rattan on certain persons

23. Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 16.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXX**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the awards of Udyog Rattan and Gian Rattan be conferred on the following persons in the Convocation to be held in 2016:

- | | | |
|----|---|------------------------|
| 1. | Shri Y.C. Daveshwar
Chairman, ITC
37, Jawaharlal Nehru Road
Kolkata-700071 | Udyog Rattan (2015-16) |
|----|---|------------------------|

2. Professor J.S. Grewal Gian Rattan (2015-16)
(Former Vice-Chancellor
G.N.D.U., Amritsar)
H.No. 29, Sector-11
Chandigarh.

RESOLVED: That the awards of Udyog Rattan and Gian Rattan be conferred upon the following persons in the Convocation to be held in 2016:

1. Shri Y.C. Daveshwar Udyog Rattan (2015-16)
Chairman, ITC
37, Jawaharlal Nehru Road
Kolkata-700071
2. Professor J.S. Grewal Gian Rattan (2015-16)
(Former Vice-Chancellor
G.N.D.U., Amritsar)
H.No. 29, Sector-11
Chandigarh.

NOTE: Bio-data of Shri Y.C. Daveshwar and Professor J.S. Grewal enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**).

Institution of “Panjab University Khel Ratna” and “Panjab University Kala Ratna” awards

24. Considered if, two new awards namely “Panjab University Khel Ratna” and “Panjab University Kala Ratna”, be instituted and be given alternate years to recognize outstanding contribution in the field of Sports and Performing and Visual Arts as suggested by Professor S.S. Johl, Fellow, P.U., during the deliberation in the meeting of the Committee dated 16.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXXI**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that the year 2016 is the centenary year of Balwant Gargi. He (Vice-Chancellor) has constituted a Committee in consultation with Professor A.K. Bhandari. A campaign will be organized showcasing the performing arts not only of Panjab University but also of other universities of Punjab. This is the agenda that they were taking on behalf of the Universities of Punjab. The campaign would start in the year 2016 and come to an end in June, 2017.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the family members of Balwant Gargi should also be invited.

The Vice-Chancellor said that till now they were conferring the awards of Vigyan Rattan, Udyog Rattan, Sahitya Rattan and Gian Rattan. Panjab University is a premier University having eminent persons in the field of sports and performing arts. For performing arts, the award is Kala Rattan and for sports it is Khel Rattan. These awards will be conferred alternate year. This year, Khel Rattan is being conferred. Next year, Kala Rattan would be conferred. Earlier, they were having three awards. Now they would have six awards.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the decision taken to institute new awards is a good one.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the amount of awards has not been mentioned.

The Vice-Chancellor said that these awards will carry an amount of Rs.1 lac each.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Committee needs to be complimented and congratulated for recommending the name of Shri Balbir Singh, (Sr.). Panjab University should have taken such steps earlier to honour such persons. He said that it should be mentioned that the awards will contain Citation and an amount of Rs.1 lac each.

RESOLVED: That, as suggested by Professor S.S. Johl, Fellow, P.U., during the deliberation in the meeting of the Committee dated 16.11.2015 (**Appendix**), two new awards namely “Panjab University Khel Ratna” and “Panjab University Kala Ratna”, containing a Citation and an amount of Rs.1 lac each be instituted and be given in alternate years to recognize outstanding contribution in the field of Sports and Performing & Visual Arts.

Award of First Panjab University Khel Ratna to Hockey Legend Shri Balbir Singh

25. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 16.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXXII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the award of first Panjab University Khel Ratna honour to Hockey Legend Shri Balbir Singh (# 1067, Sector-36-C, Chandigarh (Currently in Canada)).

RESOLVED: That the honour of first Panjab University Khel Ratna Award, be bestowed on Hockey Legend Shri Balbir Singh (# 1067, Sector-36-C, Chandigarh.

NOTE: Bio-Data of Shri Balbir Singh (Senior) enclosed (**Appendix-XXXII**).

Separate Bank Account for financial accounting of project

26. Considered if, a separate Bank Account for financial accounting of the project “National Initiative for design Innovation”, be opened in the name of Director, UIET at State Bank of India, UIET Campus, Sector-25, as per criteria followed in the case of “TEQIP” project. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXXIII**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: 1. The Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi, has released an amount of Rs.2.56 crore under research project entitled “National Initiative for design Innovation” during financial year 2015-2016 to Panjab University. The detail of sanction orders dated 30.09.2015 of the MHRD for release of funds along with the terms & conditions for financial and administrative management of this project enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

2. The decision of the Syndicate meeting dated 27.07.2013 (Para 41) regarding TEQIP project enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

3. As per clause 6 of the Guidelines for National Initiative for setting up of Design Innovation Centres, Open Design School &

National Design Innovation Network (**Appendix-XXXIII**), the accounting procedures shall be as under:

6. Accounting Procedures

- (i) Separate accounts are to be maintained by each DIC in regard to the grants released by the Central Government.
- (ii) The Accounts of the grantee organization shall be open to audit at any time by the Comptroller and Audited General of India or his nominee at his discretion.
- (iii) The grantee organization shall submit to the Government of India, a Statement of Accounts audited by a Chartered Accountant, stating out the expenditure incurred on the approved project and indication the utilization of the Government grant in the preceding years. If the utilization certificate is not submitted within the prescribed period, the grantee shall arrange to refund immediately the whole amount of the grant received together with interest thereon at the prevailing borrowing rate of the Government of India unless specially exempted by the Government.
- (iv) The grantee organization will be open to a review by the Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development by appointing a Committee or in any other manner decided by the Government as and when deemed necessary by the Government.
- (v) It will be subjected to such other conditions as may be imposed by the Government from time to time.

RESOLVED: That, as per criteria followed in the case of “TEQIP” project, a separate Bank Account, be opened in the name of Director, UIET at State Bank of India, UIET Campus, Sector-25, Chandigarh, for financial accounting of the project, “National Initiative for design Innovation”.

Execution of MoUs

27. Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 17.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXXIV**) of Research Promotion Cell that Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-XXXIV**), between (i) University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, and Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA), (ii) University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh and ISDC Services India Pvt. Ltd., be executed and Professor Karamjeet Singh would be the contact person for both the MoUs.

Professor Karamjeet Singh pointed out that the word 'UNO' has inadvertently been mentioned at page 191 of the agenda. He suggested that the same should be treated as deleted from the minutes of Research Promotion Cell dated 17.11.2015.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix**), between (i) University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, and Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA), and (ii) University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh and ISDC Services India Pvt. Ltd., be executed. Professor Karamjeet Singh would be the contact person for both the MoUs.

Dispute between the teachers and the Governing Body of GMT College of Education, Ludhiana

28. Considered the issue/dispute between the teachers and the Governing Body of G.M.T. College of Education, Ludhiana, for their termination from the College without prior notice. Information contained in office note (**Appendix-XXXV**) was also taken into consideration.

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.09.2015 (Para 30) (**Appendix-XXXV**) has resolved that –

- (i) the report of the Fact-Finding Committee dated 8.8.2015, as per **Appendix-XXXV**, be accepted; and
- (ii) the College should be written to that the Syndicate has taken a serious view of the matter; hence, it should comply with the recommendations of the Fact-Finding Committee within a week's time and respond, failing which the University would be compelled/forced to take action against it as per the provisions of the University Calendar.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item being an important one, it is the acid test of the Governing Body. He asked Shri Jarnail Singh, who had visited the College along with other members, to give his opinion.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it was for the Syndicate to take a decision.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that the affiliation of the College should be withdrawn.

It was informed that some time was given to the College to comply with the recommendations of the Fact-Finding Committee

failing which the University would initiate proceedings against the College as per Regulation 11.1. The College did not reply. In the meantime, the College sent a letter to the NCTE. The letter of the NCTE says that the regulations of the affiliating body will prevail. Show cause notice, under Regulation 11.1, has been issued to the College, but the reply has not been received from the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whether the examination of the students who had been admitted by the College, should be conducted or not.

Principal Parveen Kaur Chawla said that the interests of the students should be protected.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the fees collected from the students be shifted to the University and the centre of examination should be created at any other College.

Professor Rajesh Gill enquired what would be the fate of the teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that to protect the interest of the students, they should be shifted to some other College. The Dean, College Development Council was asked for his opinion. It was ascertained that the College could be derecognized as per Regulation 11.1.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if the College agrees, the students could continue; otherwise, the students be shifted to some other College.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that, if possible, a last opportunity could be given to the College to comply with the directions of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said what about the teachers' future.

It was informed that if the College does not agree to allow the teachers to continue, the students should be shifted to any other College and disaffiliation process should be initiated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the management of the College be written that the teachers be reinstated and without the reinstatement, there would be no negotiation. If the management does not agree, then the students be shifted to any other College and the College be disaffiliated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they had already asked the management to reinstate the teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the management did not reinstate the teachers. They had delayed the matter. The College could have been disaffiliated at that time itself.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that notice under Regulation 11.1 has been given and the period for submitting the reply by the management is also over. If the notice had already been issued, it should have been mentioned what is the action to be taken? The items should be prepared properly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had asked the Dean, College Development Council, to prepare the detailed note.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested that such items be not brought to the Syndicate which becomes a joke. The management says that they would not adhere to, let the University do whatever it wants. Then it is said to negotiate and ask the management that the teachers be reinstated and the management would not adhere to that. Now there is a proposal that the students be shifted to some other College and the interests of the students should not be compromised. At that time, it was said that till the management did not reinstate the teachers, the admission should not be allowed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that who allowed the admission.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why should the University regularize the admissions.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that what Shri Goyal said is right.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that the returns of the students must have been submitted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the College has no affiliation, why the returns of the students have been accepted, and who had accepted the same? It is a lapse on their part.

Professor A.K. Bhandari said that it should be checked whether the returns of the students have been accepted or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have to have some enquiry, if the returns were accepted.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that during the stay of the Vice-Chancellor of more than three years and in the last so many years, could he be told if any of the Colleges has been disaffiliated by the University in spite of the fact that the Colleges have been doing much more than what this College has done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a decision has to be taken. The Syndicate has been seeing the matter for the last six months. The College has taken so much time. At the first instance, it was said that the College would not be given any relief. A Committee of the Syndicate also visited the College.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since the University is not taking action for disaffiliating the College, the managements do not have any fear of the University.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that similar situation prevailed at Alour College.

It was informed that the notice under Regulation 11.1 has been issued to the College and the action to be taken is to be decided by the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the process of disaffiliation be initiated.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that for the last many years, he has been pointing out that the managements of the Colleges are not paying full

salary to the teachers. He cited the example of Alamgir College where the management instead of giving full salary is paying Rs.18,000/- to the Principals and Rs.7,000/- to the teachers, but no action has been taken by the University in this regard till date. He had requested 2-3 times that a letter should be written to the College but he did not know whether any letter had been issued to the College or not and whether the College had sent any reply.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Committee would visit the College including Dr. I.S. Sandhu and Secretary to Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as said by Dr. Sandhu there are so many Colleges and it is not that the University has to intimate that the Colleges already stand inspected. The visit of the Periodical Inspection Committees to these Colleges is due and there are so many Colleges wherein the evidence in the form of documentary proof is with the University and still no action is being taken for obvious reasons.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that the periodical inspection of the Colleges, which is pending for some time now, should be started.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that earlier discussion had taken place how the unaided Colleges could be left without the Principals. Could they make the statement that there is no affiliated College where no Principal is there for the last 1/2/3 years. It is even for the last seven years that in a College, the Principal has not been appointed and the College is functioning. He said that they are saying that the Colleges are facing difficulty without Principals, but the Colleges are functioning in the absence of Principals.

RESOLVED: That steps for disaffiliation of G.M.T. College of Education, Ludhiana, be initiated as per Regulation 11.1. However, in order to safeguard the interest of students, if need be, they be shifted to a nearby College.

RESOLVED FURTHER: That a Committee, including Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Shri Jarnail Singh and Secretary to Vice-Chancellor, be constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to visit Bhai Nagahai Singh Memorial College, Alamgir, Ludhiana.

**Recommendations of the
Committee dated
19.11.2015 regarding
Tagore Chair Professor of
Indian Literature**

29. Considered minutes of the Committee dated 19.11.2015 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor with regard to filling-up of Tagore Chair Professor of Indian Literature.

Professor Ronki Ram said that when some eminent personality is invited to deliver lectures no conditions should be imposed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Yog Raj Angrish also said that this should be allowed without any conditions.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor R.P. Bambah had said that there are so many Chairs including Mahatma Gandhi Chair, Tagore Chair. He had said that eminent persons should be invited and they may be given TA/DA and car should be provided and let them come and spend time in the University for a duration which he/she feels comfortable and interact with the students and the faculty. Shri Ajit Singh used to come twice-thrice in a year for Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair. Persons would come to the University and accept the Chair in the University and the University could advertise

that they are having so and so Chairs. He had talked to Shri Gulzar Ji and asked him to come to the University as Shri Ajit Singh used to do.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is written by the Committee that Shri Gulzar Ji would be expected to deliver at least one lecture per week. Until and unless those persons interact with the faculty and the students, what for they were coming.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had talked with Shri Gulzar Ji and he agreed to consider to come.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the recommendations of the Committee, it is written that Shri Gulzar Ji be invited on this Chair to spend time between three weeks to six months, in a phased manner. It means that he may take up to five years to make three weeks stay. He could come for two days and interact with the students and the faculty.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the eminent persons come and interact with the students and faculty.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that it should be simply mentioned that Shri Gulzar Ji would come for academic interaction and paid honorarium of Rs.5,000/- per day.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it should be written that Shri Gulzar would visit Panjab University from time to time for interaction.

RESOLVED: That Shri Gulzar be invited to the Tagore Chair for academic interaction. He would be provided honorarium @ Rs.5,000/- per day during his visits and provided other benefits and facilities as approved by the Committee during the meeting dated 19.11.2015. He could choose time and duration of his visit and mode of interactions with the students and faculty.

At this stage, the Vice-Chancellor said that he apologized that he forgot to mention in the Vice-Chancellor statement that out of the eight Panjab University affiliated Colleges which had been inspected by the NAAC for accreditation, five have been granted 'A' grade.

The members congratulated those Colleges with thumping of desks and clapping.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the appreciation by the Syndicate be sent to these Colleges and the Syndicate would like to encourage that more Colleges should go in for accreditation. He thought that on behalf of the Dean, College Development Council, the Colleges getting 'A' grade should be appreciated in some form, as it is a good beginning.

This was agreed to.

The Vice-Chancellor further said that they must put at least half a dozen of the Colleges for autonomous status especially Dev Samaj College.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the kind of awards that Mrs. Madhu Prashar, the Principal of Dev Samaj College, Ferozepur City has been awarded, that has never been mentioned in the Syndicate or Senate and the awards she has won, none of the Principals has got. She is the only teacher from the College who has

got the State award. She has recently been awarded Baba Farid Award along with Professor Raj Bahadur.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he really appreciated that commitment.

Routine and formal matters

30. The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xvii)** on the agenda was read out, viz. –

(i) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies as Dean of International Students w.e.f. 12.11.2015, till further orders, under Regulation 1 at page 109 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Harish Kumar of U.I.E.T. as Honorary Director, Centre for Skill Development and Entrepreneurship, Panjab University, w.e.f. 12.11.2015 till further orders, in place of Professor Suresh Kumar Chadha of University Business School.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam, Associate Professor, UIHTM, as Honorary Director of the University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, Panjab University, with immediate effect, till further orders.

NOTE: The Vice-Chancellor has relinquished Professor Meenakshi Malhotra from the charge of the Honorary Director, University Institute of Hotel and Tourism Management, as she has been allowed to work as Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University, with immediate effect.

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Professor Ashutosh Kumar, Department of Political Science, Panjab University, as Honorary Director of Coaching Centre for IAS & other competitive Examination for SC/ST & other categories, P.U., as additional charge for a period of two years w.e.f. 30.10.2015.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has:

(i) re-appointed (afresh) the following Assistant Professors at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 06.07.2015 for the academic session 2015-16 or till the regular posts are filled in through regular selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2014-15:-

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member & Subject
1.	Ms. Inderjot Kaur Assistant Professor in Law
2.	Shri Hardip Singh Assistant Professor in Punjabi

- (ii) Dr. Rajnish Kumar Mutneja has appointed as Assistant Professor at P.U. Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib on part-time basis w.e.f. 08.07.2015 for the academic session 2015-16, or till the regular post is filled in through regular selection, whichever is earlier, on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) (for teaching 12 hours a week).

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed afresh the following as Assistant Professor at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University of Chemical Engineering & Technology purely on temporary basis w.e.f. the date of start/started of the classes for the academic session 2015-16, or till the regular posts are filled in through regular selection whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier for the session 2014-15:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation
1.	Ms. Twinkle Bedi	Assistant Professor in Computer Engineering
2.	Ms. Harpreet Kaur	Assistant Professor in Mathematics

- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the appointment of Dr. Deepak Kaushik as Medical Officer (Full-Time) purely on contract basis against the vacant post in B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. on fixed emoluments of 45000/- p.m., initially for the period of six months w.e.f. the date he joins his duty & further extendable upto two years by giving one day break after every six months upon satisfactory performance, with the following stipulation:

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

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes of the meeting of Committee dated 07.11.2015, for appointment of following persons as Director, Associate Director and members of the Research Promotion Cell (RPC), for the period of two years, with immediate effect:

1. Dr. O.P. Katare, UIPS : Director, RPC

2. Dr. Ramanjit Kaur Johal, : Associate Director,
Department of Public Administration RPC
1. Dr. Rajat Sandhir,
Department of Biochemistry
2. Dr. C.N. Kumar,
Department of Physics
3. Dr. Ashutosh Kumar,
Department of Political Science
4. Dr. Anju Suri,
Department of History
- } As members
of the RPC

(ix) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Hardeep Singh, Assistant Professor (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur, w.e.f. 22.09.2015 after considering one month notice period from 22.08.2015 to 21.09.2015, required under Rule 16.2 given at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

NOTE: Rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar Volume III, 2009 is reproduced below:

“The service of a temporary employee may be terminated with due notice or on payment of pay and allowance 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.”

(x) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has allowed to treat the nomenclature of the post of Assistant Professor for P.G. Diploma in Advertising and Public Relations, School of Communication studies to that of Assistant Professor, School of Communication Studies.

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

(xi) In continuation of office letter No. Misc. A/6/72565-72665 dated 24.09.2015a, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the revised Academic Calendar for M.Ed. (General) course **(Appendix-XXXVIII)** for its affiliated Colleges of P.U. running M.Ed. Course for the session 2015-16.

(xii) As per the directions of the Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.16004 of 2015 & the Bar Council of India issued vide No.BCI/ D/4628/2015 (Writ) dated 29.09.2015 **(Appendix-XXXIX)**, the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has allowed to create an additional seat on medical grounds, as a special case, at University Institute of Legal Studies, for admission of Mr. Tushan Rawal in 3rd semester of B.A. LLB (Hons.).

NOTE: 1. The minutes of Board of Control dated 05.10.2015 is enclosed **(Appendix-XXXIX).**

2. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XXXIX).**

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has appointed Dr. Col. P.S. Sandhu, (Retd.) and Ex-Registrar, National Institute of Technology, Durgapur, as Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor, with effect from the date he offers to join on or after, November 16, 2015, till further orders, in the office of the Vice-Chancellor, on the last pay drawn minus pension, with facilities as provided to Shri R.L. Kapoor, Ex-Advisor & Secretary to the Vice-Chancellor as per rules/regulations of the University (except accommodation on the Panjab University Campus). His salary will be paid against the vacant post of Secretary to Vice-Chancellor.

(xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Yogesh Mishra, Assistant Professor, Department of Botany, w.e.f. 26.11.2015 (A.N.), under rule 16.2 appearing at page 83 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, due to his selection as Assistant Professor in the Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

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.”

(xv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Mr. Kapil Dev, Assistant Professor in English (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Ferozepur, w.e.f. 22.10.2015, as he has given one month notice from 22.09.2015 to 21.10.2015, under rule 16.2 appearing 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.”

- (xvi)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Shri Shaminder Singh, Assistant Professor in Physical Education (Temporary), P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Moga, w.e.f. 19.08.2015 (A.N.), as he has given one month salary of Rs.47412/-, under rule 16.2 appearing 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.”

- (xvii)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Mr. Pardeep Kumar Arora from Senior Technical Assistant (G-II) to Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) in the Department of Microbiology, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP 5400 with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant post in the said department.

Referring to **Sub-Item R-(v)**, Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that since now so many eligible candidates with NET and Ph.D. are available, these appointments should be approved only for the academic session 2015-16 and not till the regular posts are filled in through regular selection. He suggested that next year the appointments should be made after conducting the interviews.

This was agreed to.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) the information contained in **Sub-Items R-(i) to R-(iv) R-(vi) to R-(xvii)** on the agenda, be ratified; and
- (2) the information contained in **Sub-Item R-(v)**, be ratified with the modification that the appointments be made only for the academic session 2015-16.

Routine and formal matters

31. The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(xiii)** on the agenda was read out and noted, i.e. –

(i) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Professor Meenakshi Malhotra, University Business School as Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University, Chandigarh, w.e.f. the date she accept responsibility, from 12.11.2015 till further orders, as the University needs an Officer to perform the responsibility as CVO at the present juncture.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor has granted extension in joining period to Dr. Kapil Sharma upto 15.01.2016 as Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, P.U.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in terms of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) has approved the re-employment of Dr. Daya Nand Garg, Professor (Retd.), Department of Law, on contract basis up to 14.09.2017 i.e. the date of attaining the age of 65 years, as per rules/ regulations 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 teacher opting for pension or CPF.

- NOTE:**
1. Senate decision dated 28.09.2014 (agenda itemC-22) 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 in re-employment 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, in terms of Senate decision dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI) has approved the re-employment of Dr. Sukhwant Bajwa, Professor (Retd.), Department of Education, P.U. on contract basis up to 13.10.2017 i.e. the date of attaining the age of 65 years, as per rules/ regulations 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 teacher opting for pension or CPF.

- NOTE:**
1. Senate decision dated 28.09.2014 (agenda item C-22) 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 in re-employment 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, Volume III, 2009 will be applicable.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned an honorarium of Rs.3500/- p.m. to Professor R.K. Singla, Department of Computer Science & Applications, for performing additional duties of Director, Computer Centre w.e.f. 25.07.2014 till further orders during the leave period of Dr. Tankeshwar Kumar, under the Rule 35 clause (iii) of Calendar Vol.-III at pages 92-93. The amount of the honorarium be paid against the post of Director, Computer Centre.

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, has sanctioned gratuity to Dr. G.C. Bansal, Professor (Retd.), Department of Library & Information Science, for the period counted for pension w.e.f. 19.11.1968 to 14.04.1976 (Panjab University, Chandigarh) and 15.04.1976 to 02.07.1984 (Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra) under Regulation 15.2 (ii) at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.

NOTE: Dr. G. C. Bansal, Professor (Retd.) was sanctioned retiral benefits including Gratuity vide office Endst. No.10844-848/Estt.-I dated 22.11.2000 on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on 30.11.1998.

(vii) Since the interim orders dated 08.10.2015, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (18228 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 26.11.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Dr. Rehana Parveen, Professor of Urdu, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

(viii) Since the interim orders dated 24.08.2015, passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and another) and subsequent orders passed in other CWPs tagged along with the above petition continue to be in force as the CWP No. (17435 of 2015) have now been adjourned to 28.10.2015, the Vice-Chancellor has ordered that Professor Raj Kumari Gupta, Department of Education and Professor Anuradha Bhandari, Department of Psychology, be allowed to continue in service beyond the age of 60 years till the stay orders granted by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court remains in force in CWP No.11988 of 2014 (Dr. Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. Panjab University and others) and other CWPs tagged with it.

NOTE: The next date of hearing has been fixed for 26.11.2015.

(ix) As authorized by the Syndicate in its meeting held on 30.08.2015 (Para No. 28), the C.O.E. has approved the award of degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) to the following candidates:

Sr. No.	Roll No.	Name of the candidates	Father's Name	Faculty/ Subject	Title
1.	3198	Sonam Mahajan	D/o Pawan Kumar	Science/ Physics	A STUDY OF PARTICLE PRODUCTION IN PROTON INDUCED COLLISIONS USING THE MIPP DETECTOR AT FERMILAB
2.	3199	Bhanu Sharma	D/o Hari Krishan Sharma	Science/ Physics	DYNAMICAL NET-CHARGE FLUCTUATIONS IN HEAVY ION COLLISIONS AT RHIC ENERGIES
3.	3200	Renuka Ganger	D/o Malkiat Ram Ganger	Science/ Biophysics	ZINC-METALLOTHIONEIN FRACTIONATION, ITS MODULATORY ROLE IN ARSENIC SUPPLEMENTED MALE RATS AND POSSIBLE APPLICATION AS BIOSENSOR
4.	3201	Sukhwinder Kaur	D/o Gursewak Singh Mast	Science/ Biophysics	MECHANISTIC STUDIES ON TRIMETHYLTIN INDUCED NEURONAL DAMAGE IN RAT BRAIN: NEUROMODULATORY POTENTIALS OF GINKGO BILOBA AND GABAPENTIN
5.	3202	Promila	D/o Ved Parkash	Science/ Chemistry	INVESTIGATIONS IN THE FIELD OF ORGANOSILANES AND THEIR HIGHER COORDINATED ORGANOSILICON COMPLEXES: PREPARATION, CHARACTERIZATION AND REACTIVITY STUDIES
6.	3203	Mandeep Kaur	D/o Dharam Pal Singh	Science/ Zoology	TOXIC EFFECTS OF SUB-LETHAL CONCENTRATIONS OF CHLORPYRIFOS ON DIFFERENT ORGANS OF CTENOPHARYNGODON IDELLUS (CUVIER AND VALENCIENNES)
7.	3204	Kanchna Devi	D/o Satya Pal	Science/ Botany	BIOCHEMICAL STUDIES IN SOME NORTH WEST HIMALAYAN LIVERWORTS
8.	3205	Harsha Agarwal	D/o R. A. Agarwal	Arts/ Psychology	ROLE OF PSYCHOSOCIAL FACTORS IN GAMBLING TENDENCIES AMONG ADOLESCENTS
9.	3206	Pawan Kumar	S/o Ramesh Chander	Arts/ Political Science	POLITICS OF OTHER BACKWARD CLASSES RESERVATION IN PUNJAB
10.	3207	Jadhav Devidas Govind	S/o Govind Eknath Jadhav	Engg. & Tech.	DEVELOPMENT OF A MEMETIC ALGORITHM AND ITS APPLICATION IN BIOMEDICAL SIGNAL PROCESSING

11.	3208	Dnyaneshwar Sadanand Karanjkar	S/o Sadanand Karanjkar	Engg. & Tech.	DEVELOPMENT OF OPTIMAL CONTROLLER FOR MAXIMUM POWER POINT TRACKING IN SOLAR PHOTO-VOLTAIC SYSTEM
12.	3209	Pankaj Prasad	S/o Har Prasad	Engg. & Tech.	STUDY OF SUBJECTIVE ROAD TRAFFIC NOISE ANNOYANCE IN URBAN AREAS
13.	3210	Daisy Kaur	D/o Balraj Singh	Education/ Education	EFFECT OF COMPUTER BASED INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS ON ACHIEVEMENT IN PHYSICS PROBLEM SOLVING ABILITY AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS PHYSICS OF SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH DIFFERENT LEVELS OF INTELLIGENCE
14.	3211	Km. Reeta	D/o Brajpal Singh	Education/ Physical Education	A CROSS SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF OBESITY AND CARDIO-RESPIRATORY FITNESS AMONG SCHOOL STUDENTS
15.	3212	Pushpa Devi	D/o Om Parkash	Education/ Education	BURNOUT AMONG COLLEGE TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THEIR JOB SATISFACTION AND TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS
16.	3213	Kamlesh Kumar	S/o Jagdish Chand Sharma	Languages/ Sanskrit	CARAKASAMHITA MEM VARNITA SAMKHYA EVAM YOGA DARŚANA: EKA VIMARŚA
17.	3214	Anjna Kumari	D/o Lekh Ram	Languages/ Sanskrit	KĀLIDĀSA TATHĀ BHAVABHŪTI KE NĀTYA-SĀHITYA KĀ TULANĀTMAKA ADHYAYANA: SAMSKRĪTA RAṄGAMAṄCA KE VIŚEṢA SANDARBHA MEM
18.	3215	Ranju Bala	D/o Ram Saroop	Languages/ Punjabi	AAD GRANTH VICH DARJ BHAGAT BANI DA ARTH VIGIYANIK ADHIYAN (BHAGAT NAMDEV, RAVIDAS ATE KABIR DE VISHESH SANDARBH VICH)
19.	3216	Aanchal Batra	D/o Gulshan Kumar Batra	Science/ Chemistry	SYNTHETIC ELABORATION AT C-H CENTRES OF HETEROATOM COMPOUNDS BY CROSS DEHYDROGENATIVE COUPLING AND OTHER METHODOLOGIES
20.	3217	Susheel Singh Rana	S/o Devi Singh Rana	Science/ Microbiology	CO-PRODUCTION OF MULTIPLE FUNGAL CARBOHYDRASES FOR IMPROVED ETHANOL PRODUCTIVITY BY SIMULTANEOUSLY TARGETING STARCHY AND NON-STARCHY POLYSACCHARIDES OF CEREALS
21.	3218	Mohd. Shafique	S/o Mohd. Ibrahim	Science/ Biophysics	IN SILICO STUDIES ON CONFORMATIONAL AND AGGREGATION BEHAVIOR OF POLYALANINE STRETCH OF PABPNI IN RELATION TO OCULOPHARYNGEAL MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY (OPMD)

22.	3219	Jagdish Kaur	D/o Manjeet Singh	Science/ Physics	TRANSPORT STUDIES OF METAL DOPED SEMICONDUCTOR NANOMATERIALS
23.	3220	Sandeep Kaur	D/o Trilochan Singh	Science / Microbiology	PHAGE AND ANTIBIOTIC COMBINED TREATMENT TO ERADICATE ORTHOPAEDIC DEVICE RELATED INFECTIONS CAUSED BY METHICILLIN RESISTANT <i>STAPHYLOCOCCUS AUREUS</i> (MRSA)
24.	3221	Himangana Gupta	D/o Raj Kumar Gupta	Science/ Env. Science	GAPS AND LINKAGES BETWEEN CLIMATE CHANGE AND BIODIVERSITY CONVENTIONS: SCIENCE, POLITICS AND POLICY
25.	3222	Radha Chauhan	D/o Shish Pal Chauhan	Science/ Botany	PHYSIOLOGICAL STUDIES ON SOME WOOD INHABITING FUNGI
26.	3223	Sandeep Kaur	D/o Gursharan Jit Singh	Science / Anthropology	A FORENSIC STUDY OF MORPHOLOGICAL VARIATIONS OF TEETH AND PALATAL RUGAE IN AD-DHARMI POPULATION OF DOABA REGION OF PUNJAB
27.	3224	Ankita Thakur	D/o Rajinder Singh Thakur	Science/ Zoology	EVALUATION OF THE PROTECTIVE EFFICACY AND IMMUNOGENICITY OF THREE KILLED <i>LEISHMANIA</i> VACCINE FORMULATIONS IN COMBINATION WITH DIFFERENT ADJUVANTS AGAINST MURINE VISCERAL LEISHMANIASIS
28.	3225	Preeti Kalia nee Preeti Kaushal	D/o Suresh Chander Kaushal	Science/ Zoology	STUDIES ON THE ANTIBACTERIAL PROPERTIES OF HONEY BEE PROPOLIS USING <i>SALMONELLA TYPHIMURIUM</i>
29.	3226	Reena	D/o Kamal Kant	Design & Fine Arts/ Music	NARAD-KRIT SANGEET-MAKRAND KA SANGEETIK ADHYAYAN AVEM VARTMAN PRIPEKSHYA MEIN ISKI PRASANGIKTA
30.	3227	Poonam Suryal	D/o Raghuvir Singh	Design & Fine Arts/ Music	PADAMBHUSHAN USTAD HAFIZ ALI KHAN SAHEB KA SAROD VADAN KE KSHETRA MEIN YOGDAAN
31.	3228	D. Padma Kumar Pillay	S/o Aud Pillay	Arts/ Defence & Strategic Studies	EVALUATION OF MODELS OF HUMAN SECURITY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO INDIA
32.	3229	Esha Khanna	D/o Sanjeev Khanna	Arts/ Economics	TRADE, GROWTH AND PRODUCTIVITY: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF MANUFACTURING SECTOR IN THE POST-REFORM PERIOD (1991-2011)
33.	3230	Parminder Kaur	D/o Jasbir Singh	Law/Law	DNA PROFILE IN FORENSIC INVESTIGATIONS

34.	3231	Raina Kapoor	D/o Ashwani Kapoor	Law/Law	WOMEN'S RIGHT OF MAINTENANCE IN INDIA: AN ANALYTICAL STUDY
35.	3232	Rajesh Kumar	S/o Zile Singh	Law/Law	HUMAN RIGHTS OF MIGRANT LABOUR IN AN UNORGANIZED SECTOR: A SOCIO-LEGAL STUDY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE STATE OF HARYANA
36.	3233	Ghassem Mayah	S/o Mohammad	Law/Law	LAW RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN DANGEROUS GOODS UNDER INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS: A STUDY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO OPEC COUNTRIES
37.	3234	Shruti Chadha	D/o Deepak Chadha	Buss. Mgt. Comm.	CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: EVIDENCE FROM INDIA
38.	3235	Md. Afaq Alam	S/o Md. Soofi Alam	Engg. & Tech.	EVALUATION OF HYDRAULIC CONDUCTIVITY OF POROUS MEDIA-A SEMI THEORETICAL APPROACH
39.	3236	Amit Sobti	S/o Satish Kumar Sobti	Engg. & Tech.	FLOW OF VISCOELASTIC FLUID THROUGH PACKED BED: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY
40.	3237	Raminder Kaur	D/o Sukhbans Singh	Languages/ Punjabi	PICHLI TIN DAHAKEIAN DI PUNJABI KAHANI WICH PRASTUT AVAID RISHTIAN DA ADHIYAN
41.	3238	Jeetu	D/o Charnjeet Singh	Languages/ Hindi	IKKISVIN SADI KI MAHILA UPNASKARON KE PARMUKH HINDI UPNYASON MEIN MANVIYA SAMBANDH (SAN 2000 SE AAJ TAK)
42.	3239	Gurpreet Singh	S/o Bhajan Lal	Science/ Physics	VIBRATIONAL SPECTROSCOPIC STUDY OF SOME ANTIOXIDANTS

NOTE: The Syndicate in its meeting dated 30.8.2015 (Para 28) has resolved that, in order to avoid delay, the power to approve the award of Ph.D. degrees, be delegated to the Controller of Examinations, and if need be, the information be given to the Syndicate.

(x) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits in respect of Late Shri G. Bala Gangadhar, Junior Technician (G-IV), Department-cum-National Centre for Human Genome Studies & Research, who expired on 13.02.2015 while in service, to the dependants of the deceased employee on the basis of family member certificate dated 18.04.2015 issued by the Mandal Tehsildar & Mandal Executive Magistrate, Tehsildar, Kulkacheria Mandal- (i) Mrs. Saritha (Widow of Late Shri G. Bala Gangadhar)= 50% share (including share of Mrs. Gudala Shekaramma w/o Late Chandrappa, mother of Late Shri G. Bala Gangadhar, as per affidavit dated 10.08.2015, executed by her), (ii) Ms. G.

Tejasvi-(Minor daughter) = 25% Share (through her natural guardian i.e. her mother Mrs. Saritha W/o Late Shri G. Bala Gangadhar), (iii) Ms. G. Yashasvi – (Minor daughter) = 25% Share (through her natural guardian i.e. her mother Mrs. Saritha W/o Late Shri G. Bala Gangadhar):

- (i) **Gratuity** (in the event of death while in service) as admissible under Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007.
- (ii) **Encashment of Earned Leave** up to the prescribed limit, under Rule 17.4 at page 96 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III, 2009.

- (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 Satish Kumar Assistant Registrar Re-evaluation	20.05.1978	30.11.2015	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Ms. Usha Sehgal Assistant Registrar Examination Branch	14.09.1977	30.11.2015	
3.	Shri Rajinder Singh Negi Superintendent General Branch	12.02.1982	30.11.2015	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
4.	Ms. Saroj Bala Senior Assistant Accounts Branch	25.05.1989	30.11.2015	
6.	Shri Gobind Singh Daftri Registrar's Office	28.06.1973	31.10.2015	
7.	Shri Mewa Lal Cleaner-cum-Mali Department of Sports	05.11.1982	30.11.2015	

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 employee who passed away while in service:

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
Late Shri Jang Bahadur, Security Guard Department of Gandhian and Peace Studies	01.01.2001	17.05.2015	Smt. Samjeeta (Wife)	Gratuity and Ex-gratia grant as admissible under the University Regulations and Rules

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

(xiii) The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. (Pali) Bhupinder Singh as Associate Professor in the Department of Indian Theatre P.U. against the post lying vacant there, purely on temporary basis, for one year in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000+GP Rs.9000/- plus allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 (a) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and he has been permitted to retain the lien for a period of one year, against his substantive post of Assistant Professor in USOL, P.U.

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

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

1. Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he wants to draw the attention of the Registrar through the Vice-Chancellor that there are certain discrepancies in issuing of list of Principals or maybe in other Faculties also. In fact, the names of certain Principals have been omitted from the list in spite of the fact that they are continuing under the orders of the High Court, especially Principal of Dev Samaj College for Women, Sector 45, Chandigarh. Obviously, it might have been done through an oversight. He urged that the matter should be looked into and the name/names (if more) should be incorporated in the list/s. He also urged that the office should be instructed to see and prepare the lists keeping in view that in case someone is continuing under the orders of the Court, his/her/their names should be included in the relevant list/s.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he had raised the issue of Alour College in the previous meeting of the Syndicate. He enquired as to what action the University has taken on the matter.

A couple of members jointly said that the issue of Alour College should be clinched.

It was clarified that the Alour College has sent in writing to the University that it has not made any admission this year.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that, in fact, they have not taken any decision on Alour College.

It was clarified that at that time also and now also he is saying that it is a two year course. The College has sent in writing that they are closing the College from the session 2015-16 onward. But since the Syndicate has taken the

decision, now they have only one alternative that the salaries to the teachers should be paid from the Endowment Fund of the College, which is with the University. Otherwise, they have closed down the College.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that salary should be paid to the teachers from the Endowment Fund.

The Vice-Chancellor said "Okay".

2. Ms. Anu Chatrath said that one, Ms. Jasvir Kaur D/o Shri Iqwal Singh, Khalsa College, Ludhiana, is presently working on *ad hoc* basis. She has represented to the Vice-Chancellor as well as the Dean, College Development Council stating that she has qualified Joint Preliminary Test (JPT) which is equivalent to SLET, as per the letter issued by the Controller of Examinations, but Khalsa College, Ludhiana, which is affiliated to Panjab University, is not considering her eligible for the post of the Assistant Professor.

It was clarified that the Joint Preliminary Test (JPT) was conducted by Punjabi University, Guru Nanak Dev University and Panjab University jointly. That is why, it has been equated with the SLET. However, he has received the related documents only the previous day.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the problem is – if the matter is not clinched before the last date of submission of applications, she would be deprived of the chance.

3. Dr. I.S. Sandhu suggested that the date for the meeting of the Committee for considering the approval cases should be decided/fixed.

It was informed that though it is a good idea for appointing the Approval Committee, the affiliated Colleges are habitual of not enclosing all the relevant documents.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he is not opposing this, slowly in the evolutionary process in the last 20 years, unfortunately all the functions of the office are being taken over by the Committees constituted by the Syndicate and Senate. The duties which are to be performed by the Superintendent, Assistant Registrar, Deputy Registrar, Registrar or Dean College Development Council, instead of streamlining the procedure, it is said that a Committee be constituted. Now the office has also become habitual that the matters would be decided by the Committee. As one time exception, if they wanted to constitute a Committee to take care of chronic pending issues. But let them try to find out where the problem lies and what is the practical difficulty the office is facing and why the delay is there. Why such lapses are also occurring with the returns of not only the students but also of the teachers which are received and never checked. After some time, the teachers start saying that the returns had been sent and there was no objection, they are approved teachers. He had raised this earlier also. What could the Committees constituted by the Syndicate and Senate do in such matters?

4. Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that the approvals of the teachers are pending for the last about three years, which he had been pointing out in the Syndicate for the last six months. The template was also submitted. The College is paying only Rs.21,600/- to the teacher. If that approval is granted, his salary would be about Rs.48,000/-. Those teachers have been appointed through proper channel. The approval in case of one candidate was given without the template.

It was clarified that the appointment letter issued by the SGPC was not in consonance with the appointment letter of Panjab University. Due to these deficiencies, the management could exploit the teachers. Thereafter a number of meetings have been held with the Director, SGPC who was convinced that they should prepare the appointment letter in accordance with the appointment letter being issued by Panjab University, which has now been prepared. The delay, if any, has occurred only due to these reasons. Regarding the approval of the case without template, an enquiry could be conducted. If any appointment is made without the template, there are so many RTI applications. That is why that as one time exception, the Committee could examine and consider all such cases. In the absence of template, how could the appointments be approved. Regarding the salary, it was also pointed out in the Senate that the Colleges do not pay the full salary to the teachers. It was suggested that without the submission of Form-16, the approvals would not be granted. Inspection Committees going to the Colleges also recommend that the admission be granted. How the University could deny the admissions? Even the Principals say that the University has nothing to do with the salary.

Dr. I.S. Sandhu said that he had a meeting with the SGPC officials. If there were any discrepancies, that should have been pointed out earlier. When the format of appointment letter has been changed, the University has pointed out the discrepancy.

It was informed that the discrepancies had earlier been pointed out.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Dr. Sandhu had asked that the chronic cases pending for long time could be examined by the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would have a meeting with Dr. I.S. Sandhu, Shri Ashok Goyal and Secretary to Vice-Chancellor. They have to resolve the matter and send a message that this body is unable to resolve the matters. The purpose of the University is to have compliance from the Colleges. Where there are unreasonable people so designed that they want to challenge the University that challenge has to be met. Where the University could persuade for compliance, looking at the interest of the students, they should do so.

5. Professor Ronki Ram said that in the University, the security staff has been put in 'C' class. According to their cadre, they belong to 'B' class. Earlier also, they were in 'B' class. But after the revision of pay by the Pay Commission, they have been put in 'C' class. Since those who are not

regular employees, they are getting less pay. But since they belong to 'B' class, at least that pay could be given to them. It is a long pending demand.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal Gurdip Sharma to look into the issue at the JCM level.

6. Shri Jarnail Singh said that the topper students of UIAMS are not being given the scholarship while all other students are getting the same.

7. Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that so many non-teaching employees are working in the University on contract/daily wage basis for the last more than 10 years. She pleaded that a Committee should be constituted to look into the issue of their regularization.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, earlier, the regularization of the services of daily wage/contract basis employees was done on the basis of Uma Devi case and the same was a one-time exception. As such, now no Committee could be constituted.

8. Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether there would be another meeting of the Syndicate or this is the last one of the present Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment it is not so. A meeting of the Senate is scheduled to be held in December 2015.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to have this information because it has happened so in the past somehow the Syndicate members were not able to bid farewell to the Vice-Chancellors and also the members did not whether they would be elected to the Syndicate for the coming year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would hold a dinner meeting with the Syndicate members on a date convenient to the members.

G.S. Chadha
Registrar

Confirmed

Arun Kumar Grover
VICE-CHANCELLOR