

PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of meeting of the **SENATE** held on Saturday, 3rd September 2016 at 10.00 a.m. in the Senate Hall, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

PRESENT:

1. Professor Arun Kumar Grover ... (in the chair)
Vice Chancellor
2. Shri Ashok Goyal
3. Ms. Anu Chatrath
4. Dr. Akhtar Mahmood
5. Dr. Ajay Ranga
6. Dr. (Mrs.) Aruna Goel
7. Professor Anil Monga
8. Ambassador I.S. Chadha
9. Dr. B.C. Josan
10. Dr. Charanjeet Kaur Sohi
11. Dr. Dalip Kumar
12. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
13. Dr. Dinesh Kumar
14. Professor Dinesh K. Gupta
15. Dr. D.V.S. Jain
16. Dr. Dinesh Talwar
17. Dr. Emanuel Nahar
18. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma
19. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
20. Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal
21. Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky
22. Dr. I.S. Sandhu
23. Dr. Jaspal Kaur Kaang
24. Shri Jarnail Singh
25. Shri Jagpal Singh alias Jaswant Singh
26. Dr. Karamjeet Singh
27. Dr. Keshav Malhotra
28. Shri Lilu Ram
29. Dr. Malkiat Chand Sidhu
30. Dr. Mukesh K. Arora
31. Shri Munish Pal Singh alias Munish Verma
32. Shri Naresh Gaur
33. Dr. Nandita Singh
34. Professor Navdeep Goyal
35. Dr. N.R. Sharma
36. Professor Preeti Mahajan
37. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal
38. Professor Promila Pathak
39. Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh
40. Professor Ronki Ram
41. Professor Rupinder Tewari
42. Dr. R.P.S. Josh
43. Dr. R.S. Jhanji
44. Shri Rashpal Malhotra
45. Dr.(Mrs.) Rajesh Gill
46. Professor R.P. Bambha
47. Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha
48. Dr. S. S. Sangha
49. Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa alias Surjit Singh
50. Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora
51. Professor Shelly Walia
52. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang

Senate Proceedings dated 3rd September 2016

53. Shri V.K. Sibal
 54. Dr. Yog Raj Angrish
 55. Col. G.S. Chadha ... (Secretary)
 Registrar

The following members could not attend the meeting:

1. Dr. Bhupinder Singh Bhoop
2. Dr. Dalbir Singh Dhillon
3. Ms. Gurpreet Kaur
4. Shri Jitender Yadav, D.H.E., U.T., Chandigarh
5. Dr. Jagwant Singh
6. Dr. Kailash Nath Kaul alias Kailash Nath
7. Dr. Krishan Gauba
8. Shri Krishna Goyal
9. Dr. K.K. Talwar
10. Sardar Kuljit Singh Nagra
11. Shri Maheshinder Singh
12. Professor Naval Kishore
13. Shri Naresh Gujral
14. Dr. Parmod Kumar
15. Shri Parimal Rai
16. Shri Punam Suri
17. S. Parkash Singh Badal
18. Smt. Preneet Kaur
19. Shri Raghbir Dyal
20. Justice Shiavax Jal Vazifdar
21. Shri Sandeep Kumar
22. Shri Surjit Singh Rakhra
23. Shri S.S. Johl
24. Dr. S.K. Sharma
25. Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma
26. Shri Satya Pal Jain
27. Shri Varinder Singh
28. Dr. Tarlochan Singh
29. Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab

I. The Vice Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I would like to inform the House about the sad demise of –

1. Professor Gurdial Singh ji, an eminent Punjabi-writer, novelist, on August 16, 2016. Professor Gurdial Singh ji was recognized nationally and internationally with several prizes, awards and honours. Among others, he had been proud recipient of the Jnanpith Award (2000), Padam Shri (1998), Best Fiction Book Award (four times), Shiromani Sahitkar Award (1992), Soviet Land Nehru Award (1986), Punjab Sahitya Akademi Award (1979), National Sahitya Akademi Award (1975), etc. He was felicitated by the Panjab University with Honorary Degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (honoris causa). Two of his novels Marhi Da Deeva and Anhe Ghore Da Daan, had been made into critically acclaimed films. Dr. Gurdial Singh ji will be remembered for his innumerable contributions towards the promotion of Punjabi language, literature and culture.
2. Very eminent literary persona Padma Shri Prof. Kashmiri Lal ji Zakir, left for heavenly abode on August 31, 2016. Professor Zakir was the Founder Director of Centre for Continuing Education of Panjab University established in 1977. He played a pivotal role in introducing Adult Education Program in the Panjab University. His daughter Professor Kamlesh Mohan also superannuated from the Department of History of PU. Professor Zakir ji made scholarly contributions to Urdu language and literature. He was honoured with many prominent awards, viz., National Ghalib Award (1986), Nehru National Literacy Award (1991), Shiromani

Senate Proceedings dated 3rd September 2016

Urdu Sahitkar Samman (2006), Sahir Ludhianvi Award (2007) and Fakhr-e-Haryana (2009). He was immensely popular in Pakistan as well, where he was conferred with the prestigious Nuqoosh award and Lifetime Achievement Award for meritorious service to the enrichment of Urdu prose.

3. Ms. Rajshikha, student of B.Com. 3rd year of Post Graduate Govt. College for Girls, Sector-11, Chandigarh on 2nd September 2016 during an unfortunate accident while attending Canoeing Coaching Camp at Roorkee.”

As a mark of respect to the departed souls, the Senate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Professor Gurdial Singh, Padma Shri Professor Kashmiri Lal Zakir and Ms. Rajshikha and observed two minutes’ silence, all standing, prayed to the Almighty to give peace to the departed souls and give strength and courage to the members of the bereaved families to bear irreparable loss of their dear ones.

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

II.

The Vice Chancellor said, “I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that –

1. Mahatma Gandhi Chair Professor, Smt. Ela R. Bhatt, Founder, Self Employed Women’s Association (SEWA), Ahmedabad, would be visiting Panjab University from October 1 to October 4, 2016. She will participate in the Gandhi Jayanti celebrations on 2nd October at Gandhi Bhawan. On 3rd October Smt. Bhatt will deliver prestigious 5th Panjab University Foundation Day Lecture in the University Auditorium.
2. Trustees of The Haydn Green Foundation (HGF) of UK have offered to set up their second Haydn Green Institute of Innovation and Entrepreneurship at Chandigarh. HGF has established relationship with all CRIKC organizations in Chandigarh, Chandigarh Administration and Municipal Corporation. The first Haydn Green Institute of Innovation and Entrepreneurship (HGIE) is located at the campus of University of Nottingham, UK. The letter to this effect has been received from Professor Hardev Singh, Chair Trustee of HGF.”

RESOLVED: That the information contained in Vice Chancellor’s Statement at Sr. Nos. 1 and 2, be noted.

III.

At this stage, Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa stood up to say that first of all, the Vice Chancellor should apologize to the entire House for his statement, which appeared in the Hindustan Times.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already expressed his opinion and conveyed his regret and the written statement in this regard has already been made available to them.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that they want to ask whether the newspaper has published wrongly or he (Vice Chancellor) has said this.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is all stated there and he does not wish to add anything more.

Shri Naresh Gaur enquired why does he not wish to add? He (Vice Chancellor) has already said everything and now he is saying that he does not want to add anything more. Shri Naresh Gaur and Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal jointly said that at least they should know as to what the matter is. If he (Vice Chancellor) has not said, he should say that he had not said that. He has called somebody mafia and somebody vulture. If he has not said these words, he could deny the same.

Senate Proceedings dated 3rd September 2016

Principal S.S. Sangha said that everybody should be allowed to speak on the issue and their viewpoints should also be taken.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has called them 'Gidhs'. He should tell them as to what the definition of 'Gidh' is.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already stated whatever he wishes to state. He has expressed his regret and does not wish to add anything more.

Shri Naresh Gaur again requested the Vice Chancellor to clarify whether the newspaper has published wrongly or it has been said by him.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that he has read the entire news item. In fact, such an atmosphere has been created in the journalism. He has also suffered on this count, but has been able to come out of the problem with the help of all of them. Since they have received the statement of the Vice Chancellor expressing his regret, showing certain respect to the Chair, they should accept his regret.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal jointly pointing towards the chairs said that are these not the chairs.

To this, Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that he is also with them.

Shri Naresh Gaur and Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal jointly said since in the statement that the Senators are called vultures, he (Shri Rashpal Malhotra) is also included. Secondly, all the country has come to know what the Senators of Panjab University have been called.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said that the Vice Chancellor more often than not gives such statements. Thus, it is not a new statement. In fact, after joining Panjab University as the Vice Chancellor, he is usually giving such statements.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that they should not act like this. It is his request that first of all, they should accept his (Vice Chancellor) regret. So far as second point that whether it was said by him or not is concerned, he would like to tell them that the journalists do not accept their mistake/s. He is part of a trust of certain newspaper. They have full freedom, there is communication gap. Here also, there is a communication gap. As a friend of all of them, he requests them to accept the regret and tell the Vice Chancellor that if there is a misunderstanding, it is okay. Therefore, they should progress.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that if the journalist has done something wrong, they are with the Vice Chancellor for taking action against him (journalist).

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that though the Vice Chancellor has already expressed his regret, he may repeat the regret.

Principal S.S. Sangha said that it is not right that after saying something wrong to someone, one could say that he has committed the mistake. He suggested that their views should also be listened to.

Professor Rajesh Gill addressing to Shri Rashpal Malhotra stated that he is kind and large hearted person, but the people in the Senate have also responsibility as Senators and the CEO, and the esteemed members like him to maintain the dignity of this House. And when it becomes habitual, they know what could be the context. Had there been misinterpretation or miscommunication, there should have been a rebuttal. Now, almost a week has gone, and there has been no rebuttal by the newspaper that the newspaper was at fault. If no, there has to be case of defamation. Thirdly, she has a lot of regard to him (Shri Rashpal Malhotra), but to call the Senators mafia and vultures, what could be the context. She should be told any context in which they have been called vultures. What could be context for using the word 'vultures' in public domain?

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that this is such a sensitive issue that let everybody express his/her opinion. Secondly, they should not try to put such a serious issue under the carpet by saying that he has regretted. Thirdly, he (Shri Rashpal Malhotra) has said that these journalists are very irresponsible.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra intervened to say that he has not said that they are irresponsible and has said that they are independent.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that no, he (Shri Rashpal Malhotra) said that after committing the mistakes, they (journalists) never accept.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that normally they do not accept.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that this also needs to be discussed because ultimately they all are under the scrutiny of media also.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that whether they want to fight with the journalists or correct themselves.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that first of all, he is bothered about the dignity of the office, which he is holding as a member of the Senate – irrespective of whether by way of nomination or election. Because otherwise, the generations to come will never pardon them that the Vice Chancellor had the courage to call the members of the Senate the mafia and vultures, and they took like this that no problem, he has regretted. He has only regretted the reporting and has not regretted his own words. He has regretted the wrong reporting, which has been done out of the context by the reporter of Hindustan Times, and not his words. And he says that he does not want to say anything more than what he has given in the statement. Secondly, as Professor Rajesh Gill has rightly asked, in whatever context he has used these words (mafia and vultures), he (Shri Rashpal Malhotra) should tell him, being a senior-most person, who has founded one of the most prestigious research institutions, would he ever appreciate such words used in any context. He further stated that he has been crying in the Senate for the last four years when he (Shri Malhotra) was also present, that all seniors are outsiders about the University and the Chair of the Vice Chancellor. He has been trying to tell that these are words he has been using in front of the teams of UGC and NAAC, which has been visiting the University, in the offices of Chancellor, UGC, Punjab Government, inside and outside the meetings also and also in front of the teams which had been assigned the duty of getting the University inspected. He had been requesting everybody that please prevail upon the Vice Chancellor not to use this language. Ultimately, encouraged by all his actions, the situation has come that it has been reported in a national daily, and he (Shri Malhotra) is saying that the journalists are committing the mistakes, as if the Vice Chancellor is above everybody, who is not able to commit the mistake. And he says that he does not want to add anything more except what he has already given in his statement.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that they should decide as to what they want get added from him (Vice Chancellor). Secondly, he has said that journalists are independent and normally they do not accept their mistakes because they hold/stick to their stand, due to which he has suffered a lot. During the last 15-20 years, he has been facing all kinds of problems and this is based on his own experience when he is trying to say that this is not correct, they (journalists) say that reiterate their position. This is his experience and he is not saying that the journalists are not responsible. Now, if they want the regret to come in certain other form, surely they could tell the Vice Chancellor and there would be no problem, because the idea is that he is already saying that he helps to remove the anguish of the people. He (Shri Malhotra) had talked to the Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor had said that he had not said in the context, the journalist has put this on paper. However, he (Vice Chancellor) said that he would regret. Still if they want something more to come out, they are free to suggest. However, he would suggest that keeping in view, as they had right said, the dignity of the House, the Vice Chancellor should regret, which could be in any form, because ultimately only that would come out.

Professor Rajesh Gill pointed out why he (Vice Chancellor) has expressed his regret now, i.e., at the verge of the Senate meeting. What happened in the last 7 days? It could have been published earlier also.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that there is one Editor, whom he would not like to name, and he spoke to him day before yesterday. When he pointed all this to him, he said that there are scams, etc. If there is scam, then they should have gone into them. He (Shri Malhotra) pointed out to him that the particular journalist has not been very careful, but he said, "No, No, if the head of the newspaper takes the stand, what they could do".

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that they might also have gone through the lines, which say "A news story filed in Hindustan Times (HT) of August 29, 2016 could have caused anguish to all of you, I sincerely regret the hurt caused by out of context misreporting by the City Editor of HT,...". Now, he is regretting on behalf of the City Reporter, who has misquoted him. Where he says that he has uttered these words and he unconditionally apologizes for the same.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that he thinks that whatever form they want the regret, should be finalized, so that it is put to an end.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that it is right that theirs is a democratic House where they could discuss the issues. At times, there are several issues which are controversial and they resolved them through discussion. If something has been said about somebody and wherever someone admits his/her mistake, it has to be accepted by him/her because they have to move ahead with this Senate. They do not wish that every time the Senate remains in one controversy or the other and it always remains a battlefield. The mistake has been admitted, and if still more mistake has to be got admitted, that could also be asked from the Vice Chancellor. At the same time, he would also like to state that it has not happened in this Senate for the first time, but several times bad words had been used, for which they never had tried to introspect. It is in the recording, where Senators were alleged others as "Vice Chancellor's gundey, Vice Chancellor's henchmen, Vice Chancellor's chumchey, Vice Chancellor's bootlickers, etc." At that time also, they themselves should have said that it should not have been said because all of them are responsible and they do not have any enmity with anyone. Though their groups are separate and talk differently, when they take meal, they share their plates and also meet warmly. However, if there is any mistake, they have to see that the same is corrected irrespective of on whose part the mistake has been there because it is their own house. If there is any mistake in the home, it is their duty to correct it. It is right that they could speak loudly and at the same time on low voice also, and they could seek forgiveness and also grant forgiveness. If they want to find a solution to any problem, they have to do so collectively, and move forward. If they only have to keep differences on each and every issue, he does not think they would reach anywhere in the time to come. It is not their battlefield, but it is their House. There is a lot of difference between House and battlefield. It is right that they could discuss any issue, but they have seen that several times un-parliamentary language have been used and he recalled few of those occasions (not recorded here). If some objectionable language has been used, they could point out, condemn it and get the same corrected. Sometimes they also see that the language used by them might not hurt anybody. In the end, he requested that on this issue they should talk politely and he is sure that they would be able to resolve it amicably. Though there is difference, they would find a solution.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal stood up to say that of the members present, how many are in favour of the statement given by the Vice Chancellor and how many not. Ultimately, it would be proved whether his statement was right or wrong.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that those, who are in agreement with the statement made by the Vice Chancellor, should raise their hands.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said that before this he feels that not only that his (Vice Chancellor) behaviour is not right, his subordinate, Dr. P.S. Sandhu, he also used such kinds of words for the Hon'ble members of the Senate, which is not right. It also means that he (Vice Chancellor) shelters him (Dr. P.S. Sandhu). Hence, he (Vice Chancellor) has not done a new thing. He urged the Vice Chancellor to give a concrete reply.

Shri Ashok Goyal desired that Vice Chancellor should respond.

The Vice Chancellor stated that let him tell them that he has stated whatever he has to state. The matter before them is the agenda before them. If they want to convene a special meeting, then the Senate meeting is to go on tomorrow as well. They could have full discussion on this. They could express whatever they wish, after they have considered the agenda. Let them meet tomorrow, on September 4, when they could discuss everything that has happened since he arrived as Vice Chancellor. He has no issue at all. They could go and do the research. They have all the minutes and agenda papers of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate for the last four years. Most of them have also been uploaded on the website of the University. If they want to have debate how they have performed over the last four years, and how many mistakes he has committed and they want to comment on them before the end of the present Senate, which is 31st October 2016. If they want to discuss everything tomorrow, he is prepared for it. If they want to discuss in a special meeting of the Senate, how they have performed over the last four years, before the Senate concludes on 31st of October 2016, it is also okay with him.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that it is really unfortunate that right now what he (Vice Chancellor) is saying is also out of context. He said that he is contesting election this time also and the number of voters is 506. Out of those 506, he has to approach 501 because the five are contesting. The 501 persons are asking him by jokingly "Sir, are we going to elect a vulture". What should he say? Has he become a member at the cost of his dignity?

The Vice Chancellor said, "No comment".

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Kumar stated that when his father read the newspaper, he was also saying that he (Dr. Dinesh) is contesting election and is spending so much time, only to become a vulture and mafia. He clearly says, "Son if you have to become mafia, why are you doing a service of more than Rs.60,000/- and by becoming mafia, at least you would earned a lot of money"? All the members in his family are educated and they have hurt a lot after reading this news item. Fortunately or unfortunately, they were there on that day. The moment, they read the newspaper, their expression was blank. Have they come here to become this?

The Vice Chancellor said that they could have a full discussion on it tomorrow.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired why not today and right now because it is a part of his (Vice Chancellor) statement, which he has given?

Dr. Dinesh Kumar requested the Vice Chancellor to explain it to the entire House. He also requested the Vice Chancellor to tell the entire House as to how many times he approached him (Vice Chancellor) for any favour during the last four years. Has he ever approached him (Vice Chancellor) for any favour except for the University work? How many times he has come to him (Vice Chancellor) for favour the person/s? Tell even a single such incident, where he has sought favour for personal work. He always talks about the Institution's interest. Where he has done 'mafiagiri' in it.

Professor Promila Pathak, President, PUTA, stated that it was her humble request to all of them that they should not linger on this issue as there are so many important issues relating to the teachers and the University. So they should move ahead.

To this, Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that the most important issue is the dignity of members.

Shri Naresh Gaur said, "Madam, the most important is the dignity".

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, as suggested by Hon'ble Rashpal Malhotra ji, would he (Vice Chancellor) be kind enough to explain to the House in which context these words were used, to enable the members to evaluate what in fact the reality is.

Professor R.P. Bambah, exercising his privilege of being the oldest member of the House, stated that he would like to tell them that the dignity of the House is also the dignity of the Chair (Vice Chancellor), who is the head of the House. The Vice Chancellorship is a very difficult job. There are so many aspects, which he has to look after. For example, the University is short of funds. The Vice Chancellor has made so many trips to Delhi to request the Officers, so that the people could be paid their monthly salaries. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji has also offered to help and the others have also given the moral support. However, ultimately he has to go and essentially meet everybody in their offices requesting them to give grant to the University to pay salaries to the employees. He has invited so many eminent persons, including Dr. Manmohan Singh, Dr. Y.K. Alagh and so on, because one has to work for everybody and one is tired of working. When one is tired, he is prone to wrong criticism. So far the issue of his (Vice Chancellor) salary is concerned, the Panjab University Act says that the Chancellor is the person, who appoints the Vice Chancellor and determines his terms and conditions. The Chancellor took the advice of Ministry of Human Resource & Development and thereafter, fixed his (Vice Chancellor) salary. Now, a small person in the UGC writes a very bad letter, which he should not have written. If he has any issue, he should have consulted the letter of appointment and the terms and conditions. Instead of that, he wrote a letter, which they have seen and the said letter was released to the Press before it was received in the University. In that context, one after being disturbed, sometimes one makes the mistake. Now, he (Vice Chancellor) has gracefully said that the reporting has been done out of context and misreporting has also been done, and he has regretted the anguish caused to all of them. When he said that Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal is sitting here, on that Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he has the highest regard for him (Professor Bambah) and he urged him not to mention his name in this context. He has been appalled by the statement and is further appalled by the clarification. He was appalled what was mentioned in the Press and is further appalled or more in the way he has regretted. Professor R.P. Bambah further stated that they all have experience of working with the Press. Sometimes, they do not understand the news item. Quite often he has seen that the words ascribed to him were not uttered by him. It happens before it is a question of interpretation and the Press also makes its own interpretation. Normally, they do not use the words uttered by the person. The Vice Chancellor has graceful expressed his regret and has said that he feels sorry. He thinks now they should continue with their work, especially because the work related to the recommendations of the Board of Finance, so that, in future, the University gets the grants. Instead of spending more time, let them gracefully accept his regret and also request him (Vice Chancellor) that, in future, please be very careful while using the language, especially while dealing with the Press. Press would definitely not quote what he says, so he should be careful that he is not misquoted, which might create misunderstanding. If they say there should be respect for all the Senators, the Senators should also have respect for him (Vice Chancellor). He thinks, now they should close the chapter.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that he would like to ask whether the regret has been expressed on what has been reported by the newspaper or what he (Vice Chancellor) has stated.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that Professor R.P. Bambah has thrown light on as to who appoints the Vice Chancellor and who determines his terms and conditions, including salary. If the UGC has issued a letter regarding payment of wrong allowances to him (Vice Chancellor), what is their role in that.

Shri Naresh Gaur said that it means that when they are hyper, they could say anything outside.

Professor Rupinder Tewari stated that he could understand the anguish in which Sh. Pawan Kumar Bansal might have gone through. He is one of the senior-most Professors in the University. Hopefully, it is his last Senate meeting. So far as the issue of calling them vultures and mafia is concerned, personally he feels that it has been said by the Vice Chancellor. It is not necessary that they should ask him to regret, and they should not. Everybody knows the reality. He has been here for the last 40-50 years and his father was also here. He has seen the functioning of this University for a number of the years. The present Vice Chancellor is one of the finest human beings whom he has met, but the limitation is the administrative part. For some reasons, he brought some of the persons from outside ignoring the teaching faculty, and he cited the example of Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) as Registrar and later on Col. Dr. P.S. Sandhu (Retd.) as Secretary to the Vice Chancellor. But what happens is that with the passage of time the coterie is made of, to which the usually call "yes man", which has been made here. Some people for their own benefits, are more than politicians. He (Vice Chancellor) does not know as to what they make in. He (Vice Chancellor) is favouring a particular group and except that group, he is not ready to talk to anyone. And the situation has reached a stage that they also do not want to miss a chance to raise finger against him. In this way, they fulfil their agenda and this has also happened today. His humble in this regard is, as suggested by Professor R.P. Bambah, that he (Vice Chancellor) should not close his doors for them. He should allow them to come and talk with him. If he does this, hopefully his remaining two years would also not go as has been the last four years; otherwise, the University would suffer. He requested the Vice Chancellor to extend a warm hand towards them, and if anybody including Shri Ashok Goyal comes, he should be requested to sit and narrate his problem. If he does this, all his problems would be over. If he would practice this only for next two months, definitely fruitful results would be there. Nobody doubts his (Vice Chancellor) integrity and his concern for the University. Normally, he does not indulge into the politics, but the situation in the Administrative Block is that when he goes to any official for any work, everybody says, "Sir, please get him/her transferred, because he (Col. G.S. Chadha) (Retd.) always speaks very badly", and those who are even with him (Vice Chancellor), they are also of the same opinion, if not they could raise their hands. In fact, the reality is not reaching him (Vice Chancellor). Similar is the position in the case of Secretary to the Vice Chancellor. Being in the University for such a long time, he feels that when he (Vice Chancellor) has taken two retired persons, they would certainly work for him (Vice Chancellor) and not for the University. Why should they work for the University? They would work for the Vice Chancellor because it is the question of their job. Since they are not permanent employees of the University and also being the outsiders, they do not know the functioning of the University. To know the real position, the Vice Chancellor might try to talk to any of the senior Professors, including the retirees. He suggested that once the Vice Chancellor extends a helping hand towards 4-5 persons with whom the Vice Chancellor has more differences, the entire position would be changed. The Vice Chancellor could do this informally. They are also human beings and he has talked to them and the Vice Chancellor also. Important is not as to who is right and who is wrong. So far it has been learnt as to how he should hold him/her. They have not come to the Senate for this purpose. He has been in the Senate for last 8 years, but has not been able to do much, and even today also his stand is the same. When he came, he had declared that Shri Ashok Goyal, Late Shri Gopal Krishan Chatrath ji are the outsiders, and today he is saying that the so called insiders, are more outsiders than these guys. He has seen that they had the guts/courage to take a stand, and so far as the insiders are concerned, they are worried about their own interests. Therefore, his humble request to him (Vice Chancellor) is that he should extend a helping hand towards them just for two months and he would be astonished to see that the whole situation would change. Since he (Vice Chancellor) has the potential, he would be able to take the University to newer heights.

Professor Shelley Walia stated that one understands that journalism works in a certain dubious way. Certain truths are presented and certain truths are manufactured. On this particular incident, certain people confused and certain are hurt as they do not

want to be called vultures. If they have been called vultures, there is legitimacy in their raising their voice. As he (Vice-Chancellor) said that he regrets it, let him in fact clarify that position. He thinks that the clarification to the position would be that on one side, it is the journalist who has made the mistake, on the other side, it is the Vice Chancellor who has made the mistake. So he thinks that it could be solved very amicably. If he (Vice Chancellor) was actually to clarify all this, he never said all this. But even if he said that, then it is regretful because he was, as Professor Bambah has said, tired, fatigued, at the end of the day one can be exasperated and then say a lot of things, which one does not mean to. So he would think, if they have to resolve it, it has to be done very amicably, and he thinks the resolution would only depend on the fact that he (Vice Chancellor) regrets what he has said and that he respects the House and the Senators. If those words have been uttered by him (Vice Chancellor), it is regretted and this regret, which is there in his message, is a regret really for the newspaper rather than the Senators, if one looks at the syntax of the language. In fact, they want him (Vice Chancellor) to say that "Yes, I regret as I said it. If he says this everything is solved".

The Vice Chancellor said that he has no hesitation in accepting what he is saying and he endorses what he has said.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that it seems to him that when he (Vice Chancellor) has to say something outside the Senate, his vocabulary becomes very sharp. Today, sometime he is taking the shelter of Professor R.P. Bambah, sometime Shri Rashpal Malhotra and sometime Professor Shelley Walia that he has no hesitation in endorsing what they said. It is one of the suggestions that he (Vice Chancellor) should admit that he has used these words, in whatever context, and he regrets using those words and he also wants to assure that, in future, it would not be repeated. That is what he wants to say, if he is able to translate it correctly, because he is not able to say it openly. If he has no hesitation, he should say, what he wants to say.

The Vice Chancellor said that, alright, he has no hesitation in repeating what Professor Shelley Walia has said.

To this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he (Professor Shelley Walia) has said, they have not heard.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have heard everything, but since they desire that he (Vice Chancellor) should restate it, he has no hesitation in restating that he sincerely regret the use of the word 'vultures', which was said in a certain context, but he does not want to share that context at the moment. He sincerely regrets whatever words he used and he also accept the advice of Professor Bambah considering that he occupies the office of Vice Chancellor of one of the most prestigious University of the country, having a House of Senate. The Senate as a concept (for Panjab University), dates back to even the establishment of the University. Since the Panjab University Constituent College (of Calcutta University) at Lahore had a Senate in the year 1870, when the University was created in 1882, and the notion of Senate at that time was 70, it was enlarged to a higher number for Panjab University. So the prestige that the people attached to the Senators of this University, it perhaps pre-dates to even the establishment of the University. So he understands the anguish it could cause by an inappropriate use of a word by a given Vice Chancellor, and to that extent he considers himself that he did not do things, that part of it, rightly. So he sincerely regrets. When Shri Ashok Goyal enquired should he respond now, the Vice Chancellor signalled in negative.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that in case today, he (Vice Chancellor) is also trying to snatch their freedom to speak. He probably feels that he (Vice Chancellor) after committing the blunder, wants to use his position of not even allowing them to speak.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should state (whatever he wishes) and he would come back. (Vice Chancellor took a brief break and returned).

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he would like to tell him (Vice Chancellor) that first of all, he is really pained. After getting little satisfied, he is very much pained after hearing that whatever he (Vice Chancellor) is doing, is only at the instance of Professor R.P. Bambah. Meaning thereby, he (Vice Chancellor) does not realize how much damage has been done. He does not realize that he himself also is the Chairman of the Senate, and it is his responsibility to undo it. It is only Professor R.P. Bambah who has realized and told the importance and history of the Senate and not he (Vice Chancellor). He further stated that a letter has been received from the UGC and the same has been published in the Press, before it reaches the University as explained by the Vice Chancellor and other officials of the University. He just wants to ask – did any member of the Senate in the last four years know as to how much salary he (Vice Chancellor) is getting? Did anybody know what salary he (Vice Chancellor) was getting at TIFR, wherefrom he came? Did anybody know how much was protected, what was protected and what was sanctioned by the Chancellor. Whether the Chancellor had taken the advice of Ministry of Human Resource & Development (MHRD) or elsewhere? Of course, none of the Senators knows how much salary he (Vice Chancellor) is drawing. Did any member of the Senate ever raise question about the salary being drawn by him? He could understand that the members of the Syndicate and Senate were very much aware about the salary which was suppose to be paid to the Registrar, but he is sure that if he (Ashok Goyal) does not know even the minutest details of the salary being drawn by the Vice Chancellor, he is confident that no member of the Senate knew it. It is for the first time that the UGC, which is a statutory authority working under the Audit System of constitution authority, i.e., CAG, has written a letter (probably by an Auditor) to University authority. The only defence the Vice Chancellor could have that how comes a letter written by the UGC has been published in the Press before it reaches the University. However, he gave an explanation outside the meeting, he knows that he (Vice Chancellor) is hesitating, he is sorry that instead of open heartedly saying that he is ready to explain it in what context these words were used, he says he is not ready to share the context in which these words were used. He is telling him, which he had shared with so many outside the meeting. He (Vice Chancellor) says that the issue of fixation of his salary is four years old. Since it is four years old, it is a kind of dead body or dead wood. And there are 90 vultures multiplied by 4 plus added members multiplied by half, and he made them 540 vultures, not knowing that none of the so called vultures has ever raised any objection against the salary being paid to him after getting the same protected from the Hon'ble Chancellor. If he (Vice Chancellor) meant that he is naming UGC as vulture, he (Shri Ashok Goyal) could have understood. He is simply wants to know from where the names of 540 vultures came? He is still very sorry to say that the Vice Chancellor of the University, who has been here for the last four years, does not know that it is not 540 vultures, it is only 270 because the members of the Senate remain constant, i.e., 90. As such, it is 90 plus 180, which comes to 270 and not 540. Had there been this mathematical calculation not quoted in the newspaper, he could have got the idea of what he (Vice Chancellor) is saying that to dig out the dead body is not job of the vultures and the Senators are the vultures. He would have got this idea of his (Vice Chancellor) explanation had the word 'mafia' not been used. Mafia has been used in a particular context that a Lecturer of Mathematics of an affiliated College is elected member of the Syndicate. Is it not mafia? Meaning thereby, when he (Vice Chancellor) says 540 vultures or 90 vultures, after having challenged the statutory authorities, i.e., UGC and CAG, he has challenged the authority of Hon'ble Chancellor also, who has nominated at least 36 members of the Senate, because he has called all of them vultures, and have also included all of them as mafia also. Because there are some who have been nominated, but are part of the Faculty of Medical Sciences, responsible for electing that Lecturer of Mathematics to the Syndicate. After having denounced the authority of the Hon'ble Chancellor, he came to denounce the authority of Auditors, who are considered to be the fifth pillar. After having denounced them, he has come to denounce the RTI Activists, who are working under the RTI Act, 2006, only with a view to bring transparency in the functioning of the public institutions. Not only that, the RTI Act is a creation of the Parliament. So he has tried to challenge the authority of even the Parliament. Meaning thereby, he has expressed lack of trust in the Constitution and Law of the country. After having crossed that stage, he has denounced the prestige of the Governing Body of Panjab University, i.e., the Senate. He has denounced the prestige of the Executive Government of the University, i.e., the Syndicate. He has

denounced the prestige of the academicians, who are added to the Faculties by the members of the Senate to take their expertise for the excellence of academics. Though wrongly multiplied making 540 vultures, who according to him (Vice Chancellor) are eating into the development of the University. If all these people, he (Vice Chancellor) thinks, are responsible does it not amount, except Professor Arun Kumar Grover, everybody else is wrong. And after having been denounced everybody, now he has decided to denounce the freedom of Press also by saying that he has wrongly been quoted and he has been quoted out of context. There was a suggestion, which was made, he says, of course, he (Vice Chancellor) has now admitted that he has not used these words, but has been quoted out of context. If he still realizes that the damage has been done beyond repair, let him put a resolution to be passed by the Senate to initiate legal action against the said paper, who has published it. But he has been given to understand that he (Vice Chancellor) has sent a four-line message to the Resident Editor of Hindustan Times (HT), on the same day when it was reported, and it shows the arrogance of the man, saying that his (Resident Editor) reporter has largely reported out of context. And once again to save two Senators, and refused to divulge their names as if that reporter was also working under the control of the Vice Chancellor, and he was supposed to divulge the names of those, which the Vice Chancellor wanted to know, as if the reporter was called into the Interrogation Centre in the office of the Vice Chancellor on a Sunday in the presence of the Registrar, Finance & Development Officer and Director, Public Relations. He (Vice Chancellor) in the end, rights "good luck to him and your Paper". Does it not amount to arrogance? As if he (Vice Chancellor) has said though he (reporter) has wrongly reported, though your Paper has wrongly reported, to hell with him and his Paper. This is what the message is. He (Vice Chancellor) knows it very well as to what does it mean as he also belongs to Punjab. When he has not any argument left, what do they say, everybody knows it. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) says that the newspaper, the Editor, the UGC, the Hon'ble Chancellor, the members of the Syndicate and Senate were wrong. Now, what he wants to say is that unless and until the whole context is explained to them, it is not going to satisfy the members of the Senate. Shri Malhotra Sahib, he has highest regard for you and also for Professor R.P. Bambah and if they say a word, that is command for him, but at the same time, he feels that as elders they must understand his emotions and sentiments also. He is just like their child. He simply says that if using his authority as an elder or as a Vice Chancellor, he wants to shut his mouth, he would be the last man to speak a word and he would be the last man to speak on any of the agenda item (today). And as a mark of protest on attack on the dignity of the Senators, he feels it is his moral responsibility to maintain sanctity and dignity of this House. Till he is assured by all that the Vice Chancellor is apologetic for the words, which have used by him, by explaining in what context they have been used and by resolving that the newspaper has reported wrongly and initiate action against him. Till that is not done, if he (Vice Chancellor) does not want him to speak, he would keep his mouth shut and as a mark of protest, he would not speak even a single word, if at all the agenda is discussed.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he has already stated that, and if they want him to reiterate, he would reiterate. He has already done it once, but if they want him to reiterate, he would do it. He reiterates that he regrets the use of words 'vultures and mafia'. However, he would not explain anything more. If they want discussion on how they have performed over the last four years, they could discuss the whole day tomorrow or they could fix a date till the 31st of October. Let them meet one day and go through how they have conducted themselves over the last four years. He has no hesitation in going through the minutes of each and every meeting of the Syndicate and Senate. They could also fix one full week to go through the minutes over the last four years, he is prepared to have an unending discussion, like the session was conducted when the University had to be recommenced in 1947. A few Syndicate members got together at Shimla and uninterruptedly for four days they met and then at the end, they decided that the University would be recommenced on 1st October 1947. They had a precedence of unending meeting on behalf of this University of people, who govern this University, to go through how and what they have done over the last four years. He is not hesitant to go through all those things which have happened over the last four years. Let that be also a kind of example as to how the next Senate has to perform from 1st November 2016 onwards. His tenure in the University is only up to July 2018. That means, there is

only one and a half year for those who are going to be elected on 1st October 2016 (to work with him). They would have to sit in this House for the remaining two and a half years and get presided over somebody other than him. So let them set an example. They could have one week, 10 days or 15 days to go through the proceedings of the Syndicate and Senate meetings and let that be recorded. Only they should appoint those people, who would record those proceedings, so that it remains a mirror as to how the next Senate has to function. It would also be a precedent for him as well as for the next Senate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa stated that everybody is well aware that this statement has done much damage. However, that is an issue which could be taken up later, but first it should be told whether it has come to his (Vice Chancellor) mind or does he feel that something wrong has happened. The statement should not be made just for the sake of statement. He urged the Vice Chancellor to do a little bit of introspection on it. He (Vice Chancellor) is also a student of Science and if he goes into the meaning of the words "vultures and mafia", perhaps it might not be in his mind, when he made this statement. The role of the vultures is very important in the environment and so far as he knows the mafia word has originated from Mafioso. A group, which was against the 'Jagirdari' got together to save the people of southern Italy, who were being socially exploited. If he (Vice Chancellor) has thought about it at the time of using the word 'mafia', then it is alright. However, if this word has been used in negativity, then he thinks the seat, which he (Vice Chancellor) is holding, a large message has spread, and they are finding it difficult to face in the society, including the persons with whom they have interaction. Who are of the opinion that this is what is being thought about them by their own Vice Chancellor. So he would like to say only two things – that if anybody has presented him (Vice Chancellor) by twisting the words/facts, then legal remedy is available with him, and he could file a defamation case against the person concerned. If he (Vice Chancellor) thinks that it has been wrongly said by him in any manner or he thinks that the same is actually wrong, then he should open his heart before them. If their act and conduct is really proving him (Vice Chancellor), then they could improve that. Thirdly, this is the most important issue that how could they control the message, which has gone in the Media and the people? So he thinks that they have also to ponder over and plan an action on this. It is not necessary that they see everything in negativity. Even if there is a negative person, he could be made to understand that he is saying this wrongly and it could be corrected like this. The person concerned would definitely understand. They do not wish to get the work done by twisting his/her arm. After all, this is a democratically elected House. He has recently visited certain Universities for election campaign. Everybody irrespective of whether he is teacher, student, or anybody else, was of the opinion that their Senate should also be like the Senate of Panjab University, where there should be representation. They should go into the background of the Senate and see wherefrom the people have come. Former students send their representative/s here in the form of teacher or non-teacher. Secondly, the Chief Justice of Punjab & Haryana High Court is also a member of this House and also the Chief Minister, Punjab. He (Vice Chancellor) should not make a generalized statement against the persons holding such high positions. He urged the Vice Chancellor to specifically introspect it. Before seeking apology from them, he (Vice Chancellor) should contemplate/introspect whether something wrong has actually been done by him. However, who are they to forgive him, but the only question before them is how to keep intact the image of the Institution and how to portray it for which they have to spend sometime now. Although the agenda is important, what has happened during the last few days, it is more important than that.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that since the Vice Chancellor has regretted, they should now close the chapter. He suggested that the meeting should be adjourned for a few minutes, so that they could cool down and thereafter, the meeting should be resumed to take up the agenda.

The Vice Chancellor said that as suggested by Professor R.P. Bambah, the meeting is adjourned for fifteen minutes.

When the meeting was resumed, the Vice Chancellor stated that he welcomes all of them. Before they commence with the agenda, let him once again reiterate, "I am conscious that this University came into being by the demand of the people via an NGO called 'Anjuman-i-Punjab'. Before the University was commenced, as he has said just a little while ago, Panjab University Constituent College was there, which was a Constituent College of University of Calcutta, and that College had a Senate independent of the Senate of University of Calcutta. The British had made a condition to the people of Punjab that unless they contribute money, they would not commence the University. So the University came into being with the participation of members of the Senate. The members of the public whose representation either via election or nomination, were the members of the Senate. Hence, he has highest regard for the members of the Governing Body of this University. They are all aware that this University did not have a full-time Vice Chancellor for 50-60 years of its existence. The University was run initially by the Principal of Government College and the Registrar with the help of the Senators of the University, though he does not know how the Senate meetings were conducted. Probably, one of the senior members would have presided over the Senate meetings or whosoever was the Vice Chancellor with an additional support from the Principal of Government College, he would have presided over the meetings of the Senate. He is conscious of the history of the University, and he has highest regard for the members of the Senate and the members of the Governing Body of the University. The given Vice Chancellor is an Executive appointed and assigned duty by the Chancellor to have the governance of the University done. The governance of the University could not be run without the participation and cooperation of members of the Syndicate and the Senate. The Syndics are elected by the Senate via an algorithm which they have changed from time to time. So he is conscious that the University could not be run without the cooperation between the given Vice Chancellor and the Senate. So as he stated, if his out of context remarks or something which is stated out of context has led to this, he should have been conscious of this that it could lead to this. He has to do a little bit of introspection and he has to be careful as far as he is serving as an Executive of this University. He has already expressed his unconditional regret to all of them, and he would request them that they should proceed with the matter before them.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that, now, there is no need for anybody to speak further on the issue. They all understand the meaning of mafia, but they should also understand the meaning of 'maphy', i.e., forgiveness, especially when the Vice Chancellor has expressed his apology. Now, they have not to ask him hold his ears and then forgive him. He has already said 3-4 times that he feels regret. Now, they should finish this issue and proceed with the agenda.

Shri Munish Verma said that it is good decision on the part of the Vice Chancellor. Though they are less educated, but he (Vice Chancellor) is highly qualified. When these words had appeared in the Press as a statement from Vice Chancellor, they were much pained, but now he has done good by expressing regret in the House, for which he (Shri Verma) is thankful to him.

At this stage, once again a pandemonium got initiated by strong remarks of some members, but the orders set in with the interventions of others and the meeting resumed.

IV.

Considered the Enquiry Report (**Item C-2**) in respect of a faculty member of the University submitted by Justice Anand along with the relevant documents and clarification in Regulations/Rules related to teaching staff as desired by the Senate in its last meeting.

- NOTE:**
1. The copy of Enquiry Report, copies of exhibit of the enquiry and details of the proceedings as submitted by the enquiry officer were sent in sealed cover along with notice of the Senate meeting dated 27.03.2016 (**Appendix-I**).
 2. An Agenda item C-12 was placed before Senate in its meeting dated 27.3.2016 and the Senate vide Para XI (**Appendix-I**)

resolved that the matter be placed before the Senate in its next meeting along with the relevant documents and clarification on the Regulations/Rules relating to teaching staff.

3. As discussed in the meeting of the Senate dated 27.03.2016, a hard copy of the papers relating to Agenda Item C-12 was sent to all the members of the Senate vide letter dated 30.03.2016 (**Appendix-I**).
4. The office Note & Legal opinion obtained from Legal Retainer, Panjab University, regarding the procedure followed by the Panjab University in the case of Dr. Neelam Paul (Agenda item C-12 of Senate meeting dated 27.3.2016) was sent to all the members of the Senate vide letter dated 02.05.2016 (**Appendix-I**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that the item is to reconsider the enquiry report in respect of a faculty member submitted by Justice Anand along with the relevant documents. This matter has been there with them for some time. He expected each one of the members to have read the 24-page enquiry report of Justice Anand. He also expected the members to have gone through all the other attached documents. He also expected each one of the members to also have read the detailed discussion that they have had during the March meeting of the Senate. The minutes of the previous Senate meeting are there and so also are the earlier discussions that have happened over this in various other earlier meetings. The matter had been deferred to a subsequent meeting of the Senate in the context of reservation on certain issues. One of the issues was that whether the rules as stated in the Calendar where the title was written "non-teaching employees" would apply to the teaching employees of the University. All that stands clarified and there is a legal opinion attached to this. They have to take a decision. Let them not repeat everything that has been stated and recorded in the minutes of the Senate and the Syndicate. The first thing that they have to consider is that there is a report, which pronounces certain things. There was an enquiry into 4 allegations and those allegations stand amply proved and the enquiry report concludes it. There is only one small thing in that and one of the things is moral turpitude to which Justice Anand felt that moral turpitude in the general context has a different connotation. But whatever are the charges relating to that, he says that the teacher of the University ought not to have done whatever a given teacher did, and it was unbecoming of a teacher of the University. In some sense, all the four charges stand validated by Justice Anand. So the first step is what is their opinion on Justice Anand report and other things follow later, in the sense, that if somebody is guilty whether what kind of a retribution one deserves, whether the retribution has to be of minor kind or of major kind, that comes later. The first thing is that they have to ponder over it whether they agree with whatever Justice Anand report says.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that the report to him seems to be the outcome of a some kind of an understanding, a malafide intention. The concerned teacher became eligible for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor in 2009. She applies under CAS, her application goes to various Screening Committees and the Establishment and all of those have seen her bio-data. The application is sent for external views and all of them except one say that she be promoted from Associate Professor to Professor and nobody has pointed out anything wrong in the publication or anywhere in the report, nobody has pointed out. Now saying that somebody has given fraud publication that looks very strange. She appeared in the interview and was not selected, that is fine, because this is the not the first time, as many people have appeared in the interview. It is for the University to see whether to promote them or not. Now saying that somebody has fabricated the publication and so and so, what was the role of the Screening Committees and the Establishment, which, go through all the applications and recommend to proceed to further. He thought that action should be taken against all those people who recommended it, if somebody is wrong. Why did they recommend it? Are there not the experts in the subject? What they are doing? There

were Screening Committees in the Department, in the office of the Dean of University Instruction and so on and so forth. Secondly, the charge that she has sent the application to the Chancellor without routing through proper channel. Way back in February 2013, she wrote a letter to the Vice Chancellor. Several faculty members of her Department, when she was the Chairperson, have been writing to the Vice-Chancellor without routing through the Chairperson and their applications were very much accepted by the Vice-Chancellor. When the same person writes through proper channel to the Chancellor, she is found guilty of doing a wrong thing while the other persons of the department do the same thing, they have been entertained. So, why the Vice-Chancellor has adopted double standards that in one case for the same thing, one person is being punished and the other is being welcomed, and so on and so forth. Thirdly, the charge that she has sent a legal notice to the Chancellor, when a person is pushed back to the wall, what do they expect. Nobody is there to listen to her, what a person would do, she would go into depression. The problem should have been solved right here only by making some kind of arrangement and one should not force a person to write to the Chancellor. Why the problems are not solved right in the University set up. It is very funny that the Vice-Chancellor made a person to go to that extent and then to say that she is guilty. One of the charges is that she sent a paper for presentation way back in the year 2007. Everybody knows how the papers are presented in a meeting, and how the meetings are conducted by various organizations, Universities and so on and so forth. Person writes an abstract and goes to the meeting and the same abstracts are published and are either given to the members who attend the meeting or later on made available to them. In any case, once the paper has been accepted, whether presented or not, it is available for the people to be quoted for the research or anything like that. If she has not attended the meeting that does not mean that it is a great crime. But in any case the abstract is available to be quoted for future research also. Therefore, this kind of charge of guilt is absolutely malafide, and not a genuine kind of thing. As such, the report does not find anything new. It should be straightaway rejected and no action should be taken on the basis of flimsy kind of report.

The Vice-Chancellor responded that he inherited this problem. The problem is not created by him. She applied in 2010. While applying she was expected to have participated in 5 conferences – presentation or participation and she was to have 5 publications of her own. At that time, his predecessor used to write to two referees and those referees were also present, while the person was interviewed. At the time of the interview conducted by his predecessor, Professor R.C. Sobti, there was only one referee report available. Professor Akhtar Mahmood is not right when he says that all the reports were available. In the year 2011, whenever Professor Sobti conducted the interview, there was only one referee report available and that referee report they could see was from none other than her M.Phil thesis Advisor. He writes, they could see the referee report, very clearly that he does not think that the candidate has the right kind of credentials for being a Professor. He also doubts the papers which were sent to him. So, Professor Sobti had a very difficult choice and the Committee had a very difficult choice that there is a candidate who is appearing and there is such a negative report about the candidate and there are also doubts about the eligibility because she had not submitted many of the proofs relating to her API score. So Professor Sobti wrote that it should be deferred due to ineligibility. She is not happy with it and thinks that the University had a *mala fide* intention, etc. etc. So the members have to go through all these details that Justice Anand has gone through. Professor Sobti has written on the file that the case has to be placed before the Selection Committee again and asked Professor Brar who was the Dean of University Instruction at that time to check the API score. So Professor Brar in his disposition clearly stated that he did not check the validity of the papers. She said that she had participated in these conferences, she had an abstract to show which was published in the souvenir, and in some cases she had certificates given by some conferences as if she had gone and participated in those conferences. As the time went by, it turns out and she admits, this is all there in the enquiry report submitted by Justice Anand, that she knew fully well that she had not gone to the conferences. She also knew well that she did not have the proofs of those publications. Justice Anand report clearly says that all that she submitted was the transcript of those papers and she says in her defence that some official in the Establishment section told her that these were good enough as manuscripts. This is a plea that she takes. Justice Anand report

says, that this is a plea that she never made at any stage earlier. This is the plea that she starts making before Justice Anand and Justice Anand has categorically said that all those things are not correct. She was fully conscious that she had not had 5 papers. She was given many opportunities after Professor Sobti left. Many DUIs gave opportunities to her to give proof of 5 papers, till whatever date she had 5 papers and her case could have been processed further. She was adamant that she should be given the promotion only from 2009 and nothing else, and she would not submit anything, she would not do anything. Various Presidents of the Teachers Association have talked to her. Her case has gone through so many stages and so many Enquiry Committees. She was adamant and she kept on. She said that the University had *mala fide* intention. The University system had no *mala fide* intention. Neither his (Vice-Chancellor) predecessor had any *mala fide* intention nor does he have any *mala fide* intention nor the successive Dean of University Instruction had. Nobody had any *mala fide* intention. Everything that she has done is of her own making. He requested the members to read through the Justice Anand report very carefully and see that there is nothing that the University has done with the intent to harm her. If she is harmed, she has harmed herself on her own by being adamant and she did not give any supporting thing.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that let him respond to what the Vice-Chancellor has said. The Vice-Chancellor mentioned about one paper, the report of which came when Professor R.C. Sobti was the Vice-Chancellor. On that the referee asked for 10 publications rather than 5 and does not know that for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor only 5 are needed. A person who does not know what are the requirements for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, what kind of a report he could give and that shows what kind of intentions he had. What are the other reports, what do they say, why they recommended.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the second report is there and Professor Sobti did not have the benefit of second report and this is not the time to go all through this.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that he has gone into each aspect of what the Vice-Chancellor is saying and what he (Vice-Chancellor) is saying is absolutely not right, tell the truth also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the truth is before the members.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that in case she was not eligible, why her application was sent for the interview. She should have been rejected.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not answer this.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that as the Vice-Chancellor had pointed out in his opening remarks, the report that they are considering today had been available for quite some time and he is sure that all the honourable members had the time to read it. The issue as he sees is not whether she deserves promotion or not. The issue is of her conduct in the last 2/3 years. There has been an enquiry, a thorough legal enquiry by a body duly constituted under the rules of the University which has gone thoroughly into the allegations and the charges framed against her to the effect that her conduct is unbecoming of a teacher. This enquiry, he would remind his colleagues, has been conducted under Rule 5.1 of the Rules and Regulations of the Senate which has been duly conducted by a Committee headed by Justice Anand which gave ample opportunity to the person charged with some misconduct and the charges have been found to be established. In view of this, therefore the first question before them is not whether she deserves promotion or not, the question before them is whether or not they accept the report of Justice Anand. He formally moved that they accept the report and having done that they should proceed further to discuss for the action to be taken.

Shri Rashpal Malhotra said that he had not read the report. He is sorry because he is the one who felt guilty for not having read the report. In view of the fact that honourable member has expressed opinion based on the facts which he knows and the facts which the Vice-Chancellor knows based on the documents, he is sure that some

more members have something to say. Before they put more time on this item, he would suggest very humbly and taking cue from the Vice-Chancellor that he (VC) had full confidence in the Senate and full confidence in the members of the Senate that a small Committee of 4-5 members should be immediately constituted and give their final opinion within a week's time which should be acceptable to the Senate and then the matter should end. They did not know who is she, what is she. The second opinion has come in front of them and the Vice-Chancellor has said his position and respecting the Senate. Taking a cue from that, since they are having legal and administrative practitioner Shri V.K. Sibal and 2-3 members to sit down and in one week's time give their findings and suggest what action under the rules, as what Ambassador I.S. Chadha has said, should be given and that should be taken as the decision of the Senate.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that with due apologies to Shri Rashpal Malhotra, he differed with him. This is a case which has a tragic history and is not going to end here. This would certainly find its way to the court either way. He is certain of it. The more one reads, the more one gets intrigued. In real terms, he did not wish to go into the eligibility of the concerned Professor though he finds from the report that out of the 9 referees, 8 have supported and spoken in her favour. But he did not wish to add to that, that is not his domain. He could not undermine the role played by the academic bodies. He did find, with all respect to the Hon'ble Judge, he had read the report and did not agree with the report and would like to point out certain things. Whether one likes it or not, the composition of the functioning of the University is such that the Senate does matter and Senate has to take the final view. The Senate is the appointing authority and the punishing authority. Therefore, the Senate itself has to take the final decision. Even if a Committee is formed, ultimately, it again has to come to the Senate that this is the view of the Committee. There would be many who could differ with the view of the evidence. He differed with the reasoning, or the conclusion arrived at on the basis of the reasoning by the former Hon'ble Judge and he would very briefly refer to that report. Let him reiterate again that he did not wish to get into the merits of the case as far as the eligibility is concerned. He did find many disturbing things in this matter which he would like to bring to the notice of the House. Let it be very clear as to what is the case against her 'the delinquent Professor', because here it is a disciplinary proceeding in which the Hon'ble Judge has given his findings and that is what they are considering here. They could refer to page 8 of the report dealing with charge 1 and 2. He would like to be brief and would not read the entire thing and he be excused for skipping certain things. Page 8 of the report "thereby by having/refused to comply with the order of the competent authority, you committed an act of serious mis-conduct, as provided in the Punjab University Calendar (Vol.-III) under the Clause (15) enumerating acts which constitute serious mis-conduct". Those rules are provided for in the chapter titled "RULES GOVERNING CONDUCT OF UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEES" which are a part of the Vol-III of the Punjab University Calendar". Now the allegations against her, the charges against the Professor are not that she is not qualified, if she is not qualified, do not appoint her. The matter would have ended there. If the University finds that the Professor or a person is not qualified to be appointed or promoted as Professor, do not do it. The matter ends here and let her pursue it. Here, they are proceeding against her in a forum, Shri Sibal and others would excuse him as he has no knowledge of law for 33 years now, it is a sort of a criminal case against her and as the Vice-Chancellor said in the opening remarks, first deal with the report and then decide as to what is the punishment that has to be given to her. So they have that in mind that the punishment is to be very grave and the punishment as just demanded. Nevertheless, there could be minor punishment and it is in lieu of this attitude, this approach of the University that the University wishes to take action against her which could be even termination of her services. They are sitting here today and therefore with utmost caution they have to read every word and have to be caution of the fact that their decision which they take today could lead pushing her out of the service. Again for the sake of emphasis he would repeat the words, 'of having refused to comply with the orders of the competent authority', what are those orders. The Vice-Chancellor is not a party to it. The Vice-Chancellor is the CEO of the University and today presiding over the House and need not explain or reply to what every member says against or in favour. The Vice-Chancellor need not say that and let the Senate come to a final conclusion. The Vice-Chancellor need not become a judge in this case at every point after he (Shri

Bansal) says that the Vice-Chancellor wanted to clarify this. They were not casting any aspersion on the Vice-Chancellor. Though he could also with all humility refer to the conflict of interest involved in this case. He did not wish to make such comment in such sweeping statements. As he said, not having much work to do otherwise, he looked into this matter. The papers which he got took a lot of time to read. He has gone through the papers. There is not a single order anywhere which she has refused to follow. What could those orders be? "You (Dr. Neelam Paul) are the officiating Chairperson of this Department, the University is holding a function somewhere and the Vice-Chancellor says "bring all the students to that function". The University is organizing such and such function and you (Dr. Neelam Paul) have to be present there. The Chancellor of the University is coming, you (Dr. Neelam Paul) have to be present there. They say that this is the syllabus that has to be followed. These are the orders, not what we have on record. On record, they have 8 instances where repeatedly a reference is being made to prove her case that she is eligible and she has failed to do that. It is according to the Vice-Chancellor and it is according to anyone and he is not getting into that though he could argue that point also if he would argue differently otherwise. But that is not his intention at the moment. Her only refusal, her only failure to comply with the order and that is not the order, that is somebody presents the case to the Vice-Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor could say that prove your case, she has failed to prove that. Then they could not rush to proceed against her the way they have done in this case. He had not seen a single order anywhere which could be an official order which she has defied, which she has not performed. He felt that on certain points she could have used more temperate language, she could have been more polite. But as it has been said before him that she found herself pushed to the wall, somehow rightly or wrongly, that she has formed an opinion that she is being prosecuted. In this context, he would go back a little to the history as the Vice-Chancellor began by saying that he (Vice-Chancellor) inherited this case. She did make an application in the year 2010, the Vice-Chancellor was not here. On 10th October 2011, before the Vice-Chancellor came, the case was deferred for want of eligibility and there were 9 outside referees.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that in October 2011, there was only one referee report available.

Continuing Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he has read the report. He would refer to it further and coming to the facts available on page 2 of set 2, Professor Jyotishi, Vice-Chancellor, Raja Mansingh Tomar, Gwalior did not recommend her case. That was in the year 2011. Again in 2011, another Professor Bhale recommended the case. The matter was not decided. When he (Vice-Chancellor) came, he or the University even gave her, on the approval of the Senate, the power of the Chairperson which was on 1st February 2013 and the meeting of the Senate which the Vice-Chancellor presided over. That was the time when she was approved by the Senate as Chairperson. Here begins her defence. He is sorry that unfortunately it has not been adequately discussed by Hon'ble Justice Anand also. Her defence was that after she had taken over, things started to take turn. Let him digress and share, and he is going a little back and he had no personal intention to mention. He earnestly believed that when the Vice-Chancellor came here, he (Vice-Chancellor) had a right to even bring Mrs. Grover here. He expressed that view and that is the view of some of the honourable members also, that if an eminent scientist whom the Chancellor has chosen to be the Vice-Chancellor of this University has agreed to come here, they should facilitate his stay here. If his wife is competent and is in an important position elsewhere, they should not obstruct that she should come here and whatever would be that position. But this is subject to one caveat. He (Shri Bansal) did always believe that, when he had said this and unseemly debate was here, again reams and reams of paper were being wasted, hundreds of the hours of the University authority and the officials was being wasted on this, and that too when the University was starved of funds; money would also be wasted in pursuing legal matters in the courts after this also, of which he is sure. Despite all that, whatever happened, with due apologies to her (Mrs. Grover) that she may feel offended, but he is trying to be as much as responsible in this matter. Ultimately Mrs. Grover came here. The caveat he was mentioning was that there had to be an implicit understanding that Mrs. Grover would be working at a place and in a position which had been given to her, not that she would be over and above the Chairperson (of Department of Music). Here is

a point, when a person comes in public life, public, people everywhere, they accord the same respect to the spouse of the person who occupies a Chair. If Mrs. Grover were not to be a Professor in the University, all of them would have accorded the same respect as they accord to him (Vice-Chancellor) as a Vice-Chancellor. But once a person comes on the staff of the University, then that privilege as the spouse of the head of the institution goes off. The Vice-Chancellor is also bound by certain ethics, rules and regulations. Here, this was the objection of this lady (Dr. Neelam Paul) and she says that after a year of examination being held in Government College. If they go by rules if the result of an examination is declared, the students have a specified time to apply for re-examination/re-evaluation. In this case, a good number of students from a particular College had failed in the examination. They did not apply for ratification within the time. Maybe they applied and their plea was rejected. Later after almost a year, another lady and not the students, makes an application to the University saying that the re-examination should be conducted. That is where the problem begins. The Vice-Chancellor could decide and if he feels even after a year in a particular case it is in the interest of justice, he wishes somehow to keep the rules aside, modify the rules, exercising the inherent power, if he still exercises that power, he (Shri Bansal) did not find nothing wrong. But the wrong comes subsequently. Somewhere she was given the charge of Chairperson. But on 10th October, 2013, the powers are withdrawn by the Vice-Chancellor, which is mentioned on page 198 in Set 1. He felt that since she was leveling allegations against Mrs. Neera Grover, unfortunately he has to say this, the Vice-Chancellor should have, recused from this matter. Had he recused himself from this matter, he did not know who could be the authority to deal with. But the fact remains and it is compounded with more subsequent acts, that the Vice-Chancellor withdraws from her the powers as Chairperson, then there is a catena of instances. There are plethora of decisions one after the other, which are following which she says is only because Mrs. Neera Grover wanted this lady to toe her line which she, maintaining the dignity of her chair, she said when she did not oblige her and that is where the problems begin. Here, comes the point on merit, he is not going into the merit, but the circumstances when the Vice-Chancellor, said that the subsequent recommendations were not there. But, subsequently in the year 2013 when the Vice-Chancellor was here in April 2013, Professor Indrani Chakravarty, Professor Sunita Dhar, Professor Archana Dixit, Professor Subhadra K. Satsangi, Professor Ritwik Sanyal, Professor Suhasini Koratkar Dr. Vidyadhar Vyas, all 7 of them, recommended her case. There she may be wrong. If she had something with her she should have at least come to the Committee and presented her case. She did come. But she made a complaint, the Vice-Chancellor got annoyed over it and started proceeding against her to the extent that, as the Vice-Chancellor mentioned earlier, he used the word moral turpitude also. Moral turpitude against a person, what does it mean, it is beyond comprehension. That is why he said that the more you read, the more intriguing it becomes. The Judge has not accepted that. He is happy that the Judge has not accepted the word moral turpitude. But what the Judge has done. There was Committee which the Vice-Chancellor constituted. A Committee to go into the eligibility of her claim, the Committee does not go into that. The Committee also works as a disciplinary body. Did the Vice-Chancellor want him to read out the proceeding of that Committee but for the paucity of time he would not go into it. The Vice Chancellor asked him to continue with whatever he wishes to state and he was not being stopped. Mr. Bansal adds that on 30th September 2014, there is a Committee on promotion going into the complaint against her. What was the purpose of the Committee? This Committee, with due respect to all the members, some of whom may be present here, he is sorry that he had mentioned their names, converted themselves into Kangaroo court. They did not go into the eligibility, they did not go into the allegations against her that the Committee was supposed to go into. That is how they are building up the case. That is how they are going further in this matter. This Committee conducted itself and performed a job which was not assigned to it. It is on page 9 to show that the Vice-Chancellor had no malice against her, the Hon'ble Judge has referred to some points that on earlier occasions her name and that of Dr. Arvind Sharma were considered for promotion. The case of Dr. Arvind Sharma was approved while her case was not approved. She filed an RTI in all fairness because she was claiming eligibility at par with Dr. Aavind Sharma. In all fairness her application under RTI ought to have been responded to, she should have been given the information. But it was said that it is a privileged document and relates to a particular person, and she does

not get it. He (Dr. Arvind Sharma) is a public functionary. He is an officer of the University. He got promotion on the basis of certain claim which was being disputed. This lady has the same claim as Dr. Arvind Sharma but that was denied to her. Therefore, the Judge says that 'obviously, the current Vice-Chancellor was not in the picture and the deferment aforementioned cannot be attributed to him. He agrees with that it could not have been attributed to the Vice-Chancellor but the problem is a subsequent debate. All through the Judge after this point is only referring that she said this, she only gave the abstracts of her publications, she did not attend the seminar, she says that it is not the physical attendance which is important. It is that one has to submit the articles, the articles were submitted there and abstracts were published there and she claimed those but the Judge says that there were only the manuscripts. He again did not dispute it much but nevertheless those all questions would be referred to when the matter goes to the Court. The Judge does not refer to her counter allegations that it is a case of conflict of interest. And in all humility he would like to underline this, and that is very serious thing. She has been saying this not using the word conflict of interest but her problems arose because of such and such. Not a single word anywhere all through from page 8 to 17 about these, he (the Judge) is referring only to the reminders (sent to her) to please give the documents and she is not giving and therefore, the Judge says that 'the finding, thus, under Charge No.1 is that Dr. Neelam Paul wrongly claimed marks while being in the know of the fact that the UGC Regulations did not validate her claim in that behalf'. She is repeatedly saying that there were some sort of grey areas there, there was some uncertainty about it, her points have not been considered. He leaves that. The Judge further says 'the finding under Charge No.2 is that the University has been able to prove that Dr. Neelam Paul defied the competent authority by refraining from complying with the directions given to her from time to time to provide proofs of publications. The charge is, thus, held to be proved'. What should have been done (in this case)?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the point is that in the academic world if one claims some publication, if publication is mentioned in somebody's CV, even the NAAC had come to the Department and demanded the proof of publications. Here the person is seeking the promotion and when a given Vice-Chancellor constitutes a Committee and calls the experts, it is the duty of the Vice-Chancellor to make available copies of those publications if asked by the Committee. He has to do some minimum job and that what all of us were trying to do, the Dean of University Instruction and the given Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he appreciated the concern of the Vice-Chancellor. One of the experts even wrote that he would be available for the interview if the University called him. Was he called?

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is not tenable. When Shri Bansal said that the Vice-Chancellor should check all the facts, the Vice-Chancellor said that he is fully aware of the facts and the expert (he consulted) had never asked for that.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he is again coming to that point. If she has made a wrong claim, he as a member of the public, a person who is interested in the welfare of the University, he would certainly commend a person who makes false claims for any job in the University should not be accommodated. Let there be no doubt about his stand on the matter. He repeated that and repeated that for the sake of any inferences to it, any person hitherto or even later any time, if somebody makes a false claim about his/her qualification and hoodwinks the authorities and gets the job, he/she should be removed even later. He is not holding any brief for anybody but he is saying this in all fairness and the point is here that the simple thing could have been that no, no, they do not promote her. They did not do that. They started legal criminal action against her.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they had not done it until the matter had gone to the Chancellor and a legal notice and the Chancellor had demanded that.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that there is another charge. He would mention that also. He is coming to this charge. Here the Hon'ble Judge after asking many questions to the lady says 'the finding under Charge No.2 is that the University has been able to prove that Dr. Neelam Paul defied the competent authority by refraining from complying with the directions given to her from time to time'. It is defying the directions. He was trying to read it just out of the way a random remark which he made, he tried to work out the situation which could be the direction, which could be orders, defiance of which could lead to an action like this. Here, it is a case, she is trying to prove her case which the Vice-Chancellor has said that she has failed to prove. Had the matter ended here, it would have been fine. He would not have spoken on this matter. Why he chose to speak on this matter is that for that reason they are saying that she is guilty of defying the orders of the seniors and therefore they take action against her. This is the first charge. Now the charge that the Chancellor has directed. He has seen the rules to that effect and the rules clearly say that a person should not approach a minister or anybody directly. When they are talking about all sorts of transparency, they need to change that and if those rules are not changed, one ought to take a liberal view of it. What has happened in this case is that she makes an application and submits it to the Chancellor. She comes and leaves a copy in the Vice-Chancellor's office. He thought that it is adequate adherence of the rule. She cites another example saying that here in this case, the person of the office of the Vice-Chancellor admits that he received a copy of the letter and that is what normally happens. Maybe for the knowledge of all the members of the House, on many occasions when a person makes an application, he/she sends an advance copy to the concerned authority and routes the one through the normal course. In this case, she files one directly, which she should not have in his view, but she has filed, but that is not an offence that they hold guilty her of. She sends one copy to the Chancellor, she leaves one copy in the office of the Vice-Chancellor, a Clerk in the office of the Vice-Chancellor admits that he received the copy. But the Hon'ble Judge says that, no, no, this is not enough. Her problem/difficulties are not over. "In another case, she has got it diaried in her department and in this case why she did not do it". That is an irrelevant point. Once the official of the University admits that he has received a copy of this application, was anything to be proved against her, which in his view complies with the requirement. It complied with the requirement that she had moved an application there and what normally happens and what happens in this case, may be the Chancellor misread it or just referred it back, the Vice-Chancellor over read that, the Vice-Chancellor got into it more than what the Chancellor said. And if he had some knowledge of it, he knew that the letters or other things which go to the seniors, are as a routine sent back and if they go through the documents, the covering letters from the office of the Chancellor, those did not say that he is not happy over it, why has this lady approached the Chancellor. It is nowhere said. The Chancellor's office says that these papers are being forwarded to the Vice-Chancellor and here they overreact to it and frame a charge against her and say that this is the allegation against her and now she has to plead this. On that basis, in his (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal) view, it is an untenable finding. The Judge is admitting that this copy was given in the office of the Vice-Chancellor. But then he says that because she did not prove in another case, therefore, it is a false claim. From where do they infer that and therefore, the Judge says that the finding, thus is that Dr. Neelam Paul forwarded an advance copy of the relevant complaint to the Chancellor at her own level in a clandestine manner and did not get the dispatch of advance copy recorded in the dispatch register. Once the office of the Vice-Chancellor admits that she gave a copy to the office and the Judge is importing words into it to substantiate this charge and that is the allegation proved against her. In his view, this finding of allegation on charge no. 3 does not stand to scrutiny and would not stand in the court of law. Now coming to charge no.4" that the legal notice dated 4th March 2015 under the signature of Mr. Yogesh Putney, Advocate, purporting to be under your instructions, was served upon the Chancellor whereas it has to be served upon the Registrar of the University who is incharge of the administration of the University under the immediate control of the Vice-Chancellor and who represents the University in all legal proceedings". If they were to read and interpret this rule with an open mind, the conclusion could not be what they have arrived at. This is an admitted fact that she sent a legal notice to the Chancellor. He has no hesitation in saying that she should not have sent. But that is not an offence. The Chancellor would immediately forward the same to the Vice-Chancellor and he has done it. Where

is it written that the notices have to go to the Registrar? Even the President (of India) at times is also made the respondent in (some) cases. All those people, all and sundry who have nothing to do, somehow remotely connected with that, they all are made parties in various writ petitions. The rule mentioned is that 'the Registrar of the University who is in charge of the administration of the University under the immediate control of the Vice-Chancellor and who represents the University in all legal proceedings'. It is in the court even if a notice has to go to the Chancellor, the lawyer would stand up and say that it is the Registrar who has to be before you (Court), the Registrar has to represent the University, the Registrar has to represent the Chancellor and therefore, he (lawyer) is there on behalf of the Registrar. The rule nowhere says that the notice must go only to the Registrar. It does not say that. But here, the Hon'ble Judge again moves on that premise. The position is that it is the Registrar who could sue and could be sued on behalf of the University. They could not interpret it to that extent to say that since the legal notice was given to the Chancellor, and therefore, this legal action against her as to why did she send it there (is not tenable). That is why he said in the beginning that reams and reams of paper have been wasted on it, hundreds of hours have been wasted on this as also other resources of the University which were all avoidable. The Hon'ble Judge, with due respect to him, again a sort of going beyond the domain, he again says about the ambience of the University and says 'ambience, be it of any institution, is an in-built phenomenon. Any deviation/ aberration in the matter of breach of intra-institution discipline erodes/dilutes the ambience of the institution. The doer of the act may feel validated in his/her own eyes but the foundational principle of ambience does undergo a near fatal tremor thereby, nonetheless. The redressal of a grievance, of whatever magnitude, has to be endeavoured within the system itself'. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal inquired whether she has gone beyond the system? The rule says that if the Chancellor chooses to preside over the meeting of the Senate, he can come here, then the Chancellor presides. The Vice-Chancellor presides over the meetings of the Senate in the absence of the Chancellor. Chancellor is not a touch-me-not person. He is not on a pulpit, like, the Pope. He is one of them and they have to accord him respect. But when somebody finds that there is no place left to go whatsoever, the person chooses to move an application and gives a (legal) notice also, may be her lawyer should have advised not to go and she could have avoided it otherwise what purpose has it served except these proceedings against her. She could have served a notice on the Vice-Chancellor, she could have served the notice to the Registrar. But she felt that she is being pushed to the wall and in such a situation that this particular observation of the Judge goes. Otherwise, who is the person, who has vitiated the ambience. That is the question that has not been answered, and it has been wrongly put on the lady. The Judge says that "it would be apparent from the University calendar that the Registrar is recorded to be the Principal Administrative Officer of the University and it is he only who shall represent the University in all legal proceedings except where the Senate otherwise resolves to the contrary'. Who is stopping him (Registrar) now? If the case goes to the court, the Registrar will represent the University. If the lawyer has somehow advised as it often happens some advice is correct, some advice is not, it is the lawyer who thought of sending there and she would also indicate the feeling that she is not getting sympathetic ear and sent a matter there, he thought that this is not a case that they come to the conclusion they have and therefore the Senate, with all due respect to the Hon'ble Judge, should not accept the report.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa requested the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor to let them know as to how much payment has been made to the Hon'ble Judge who has been appointed as the Enquiry Officer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not relevant.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why it is not relevant, as the appointing authority is asking the Vice-Chancellor that how much money has been paid and the Vice-Chancellor is saying that it is not relevant. He had also asked two months earlier as to how much money had been paid to a particular Judge, and the Vice-Chancellor said that it was not relevant. Who else has to answer this?

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said that the Vice-Chancellor was becoming a party at No.2 in this case, how is he becoming a party in this case. He is thankful to Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal who has explained in clear terms that the Vice-Chancellor himself is becoming a party. Whatever decision the Judge has given and the Vice-Chancellor has presented the same before the Senate, it is for the Senate to take the decision accordingly whereas the Vice-Chancellor himself is pleading the case. There is a confrontation since Mrs. Grover is working in that Department. That lady is eligible for Professor since the year 2009 and the matter is hanging till date. As Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, being a leading Advocate, has said that the Chancellor is also a part of the University and if a person did not get justice, he/she could approach him. Even that person could make even the President (of India) also a party in a case. Whatever findings the Judge has given are totally wrong and the House should not accept those findings. The expert is saying that 10 papers are required for promotion whereas the requirement is of only 5 papers. He requested the Vice-Chancellor not to become a party in this case and leave it to the House as to what the House wishes to say.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that she is indeed grateful to Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji and wished some of the Professors of the University should have taken the same case with the same analysis and with the same zeal with which he took the argument that he has made because she felt that a colleague is being evaluated, assessed while a number of such colleagues are evaluated everyday for such promotions. There are two levels at which any system operates and the University also operates similarly. There is one system which is very formal, which is very rigid, which is very official and there is another which is very informal where they try to adjust each other and help each other. There are innumerable cases where a person was not found eligible or where the API score was not up to the mark. Various Committees, Screening Committee, authorities, PUTA and everybody takes a very lenient view. People normally give an API score, a candidate who is to be evaluated gives an API score, which the Screening Committee finds unreasonable, if the candidate claims it to be 1200, the Committee cuts it down and they say that it is 450. Is it a crime? Has she committed a crime or an offence? She inquired that if hundreds of them are not tried (for such claims), why this is a crime for Dr. Neelam Paul?. Secondly, the office note in the agenda says and starts with Dr. Neelam Paul, Associate Professor, Department of Music had issued a legal notice to the Hon'ble Chancellor of the University through her legal counsel on 4th March 2015. She is grateful to Shri Bansal Ji because she had said in earlier meeting also that it should not start from here. The case starts from 2013 or even before (that), when she (Dr. Neelam Paul) filed the first complaint and the complaint was that she was having trouble in her department and the complaint was against the Vice-Chancellor. There were a couple of complaints. She would not repeat the facts, if she gives the facts, the facts remain the same and it is the interpretation which differs. Facts could not differ. Facts will always be projective and remain the same where in the reports her complaints have been mentioned. Why an enquiry was not held to examine the complaints made by Dr. Neelam Paul, why was she considered as an accused while she was the complainant and how come that she is complainant and is complaining against the Vice-Chancellor for certain problems she is facing in the Department with a very peculiar situation and the same Vice-Chancellor who is an accused in this case against whom the complaints lie is taking the decision so much so that he marks the complaints to a specific Committee and writes over there to issue a show cause notice. Before that Committee sits and examines the case, he (Vice-Chancellor) orders them to issue show cause notice. This is pre-determined, pre-conceived mind with a biased mind.

The Vice-Chancellor said that whatever Professor Rajesh Gill is saying that he had written a show cause notice, that is 2015 whereas she (Dr. Neelam Paul) writes the first letter in February 2013. More than two years have passed, so many things have happened. He just wanted to clarify that two years passed (between February 2013 and March 2015).

Professor Rajesh Gill said that the letter which the Vice-Chancellor marked to a particular Committee, he marked to the Committee to take up the case and examine it and alongside he writes that the Committee should issue a show cause notice. If the

Vice-Chancellor is giving a responsibility to a Committee to collect evidence, record statements and examine the case, how could he dictate to the Committee, and the Committee did the same, it issued the show cause notice obediently.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the Committee did not issue the show cause notice.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that in case she (Dr. Neelam Paul) submitted some publications. In the report, the charge is that she submitted a publication and she said that she went to a particular seminar and she did not physically go there and the abstract also came out, the papers are presented in absentia. They all are familiar with that. Papers might be presented in absentia. But she is amazed at the Judge's statement which writes in a poorer form, and he is writing that instead of saying that this was one presentation, he (Judge) says that she is charged of making false claims of presenting papers in conferences. How he could multiply (this), and this becomes a serious misconduct. Again, a subjectivity is involved here. If she was not eligible, if the reports were not favouring here, why she was called for an interview in the first instance, she would like to know the response to that also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not answer this because it happened in Professor Sobti's tenure.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that it does not matter, but, the case continues somewhere. In the context of this case, she felt that there are several other cases, where they have seen informally that a colleague fell short of API score and was not having eligibility, but they pushed those cases positively. However, this case was grown out of proportions. There were the reports of the examiners, which were positive, as indicated by Shri Bansal; and, therefore, there are times when even with 2 positive reports, they pushed through the cases. In this case, there were more than 3 (positive reports) and this enquiry report does not take into account any of the complaints made by Dr. Neelam Paul. Is it not biased? She also wondered that when one sends an advance copy, does one give a dispatch number to the advance copy. What is the advance copy meant for? If she submits a copy of the complaint or any letter to the Vice-Chancellor's office, takes a dispatch number and send a duplicate copy as an advance copy, then what is the relevance of advance copy if it has to have a dispatch number. And on the top of it, she agreed with Shri Bansal Ji that in this world where they were talking of liberalism, where she as a citizen of a country, as a Professor should have direct access to the Chancellor. The University, the Vice-Chancellor against whom the complaints are coming up not only by Dr. Neelam Paul but others, also, appoints another Committee, called Johl Committee, which passes more strictures making it difficult and impossible for the teachers to access the Chancellor. Is it the democracy, she wondered they were living in?

Professor Ronki Ram said that the case is that there are some promotions or some dues to a colleague. All these are cases of one's right. When they ask for promotions, or when they ask for increments, or when one asks for certain corrections in the service book. These are well taken. Here the question is that one person is making a claim. Then there are rules and regulations according to which those claims are addressed by the system. They are the members/colleagues of the University, they are also in the Senate. They know that some cases would appear either against one of them (Senate members/faculty members). They all sit here to make rules and regulations, seeing the claim. So it is a question of interpretation properly. No doubt, everyone has the right to make a claim. That claim is genuine or not, that has to be justified and it has to be as per University rules and regulations. When somebody makes a claim and that is not true, that claim is there and hence claim would be accepted. One has a right to make a claim, but the claim might not be justified. If one is not given what one is asking for, then one has again right to put his/her case more in a fresh way. If still one is not getting what would he/she do. In this case, they have an internal mechanism where they have Committees after Committees. Quite interestingly, in the internal mechanism, some of the colleagues become members of those Committees because they are the Professors, Readers, Lecturers. So those Committees are there and they try their level best because here they have members from the Colleges, members from the

University and the public, and they are all aware of the internal mechanisms of the University to decide such things. So, when a case comes, it always goes to a Committee, which asks a given colleague to make a request. But, when this particular claim came, they made extra efforts informally, as Professor Kaang and Professor Khalid were also there and they tried to ask Dr. Neelam Paul that if she had 5 papers, give those papers and she would get promotion. Whether those papers are published or not, but give the 5 prints. She said that she had given the prints to the Establishment branch. They said that if the prints are not there, she must submit another copy. Many a times this case went on. When this case started, he (present Vice-Chancellor) was not there. Suddenly something happened, case of claim to the Professorship got associated with the conflict of interest (with the present Vice Chancellor), it has been stated that everything is denied to her because Professor Grover is there, and Professor Grover is there because his wife is there. So, referring to the assertions of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal ji, he added the Committee (of which he was also a member) did not become a (Kangaroo) congregate, but it tried to solve the matter amicably. So the case is with them. If her claim is genuine, she should be given the promotion and if not, she cannot be given. So they have to take this criterion in view that if the Committee does not approve, then it is okay, and they should try to find out. If one is wrong, he/she should not be defended by the colleagues. It is not a question of some people claiming that it is wrong and some claiming it right. They should try to go ahead. If wrongly one is punished, those who are punishing wrongly, they would be punished. But if a person does not defend one's claim to be eligible, then the ground should be there also (to promote one). The Senate should not act in a partisan manner. It is a total question of transparency, the question is not against me and/or against us. But the whole problem is that this case would be seen accordingly. The case of claim has got into different blame game. It went for such a long period of time, which is unfortunate and now the matter has come, and they have to take a very fairly panoramic view.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that when he had asked last time, he wanted to know where there was a difference on rules for the teachers and non-teachers. He has read the Calendar (since then) and the rules and regulations also make a difference between teachers and non-teachers. Regulation 3.5 appearing at page 118 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I says: "The Senate or the Syndicate, as the case may be, shall have the power to terminate the appointment of a person holding an administrative or ministerial post on the ground of inefficiency, dishonesty, or serious misconduct". It is only for the non-teaching staff. Regulation 10 appearing at page 113 of Panjab University Calendar Volume-I says: "The Senate, with 2/3rd majority, shall have power to terminate the appointment of a University teacher on the ground of incapacity, inefficiency, or serious misconduct involving moral turpitude". So, there is a distinction between the major penalties for teachers and non-teachers. This is the matter, he thought (with all of them); he must share the office seemed to misguide them when it states that the rules are the same. The House might keep in mind that the Senate cannot dismiss her because there is no charge of moral turpitude. The Senate can dismiss her only on moral turpitude or inefficiency or incapacity, and they can not dismiss her on the basis of any misconduct.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that with all due respect, it is premature to discuss the point just raised by Professor R.P. Bambah, because, as the Vice-Chancellor rightly said, first they have to decide whether to accept the report or not, and these points would not arise if they do not accept the report. These points arise only after they take a decision (to accept the report). Now the question whether the report is to be accepted or not. On that issue, he has to make two points. There are two broad charges. The first one, the issue was not whether she was eligible for promotion or not, the issue was her conduct in the course of making a claim. The fact cannot be denied that she made certain claims which she failed to substantiate. She was repeatedly asked for proof to substantiate her claims which she failed to do. As Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal had said if all her claims has been true, she should have got the promotion. But there is no question that she did not or was not able to substantiate her claim for promotion despite repeated communications to her to come and do that. Of course, one could suggest that he/she did not get the promotion. But in its wisdom, the authority who dealt with this case framed the charge and now that charge, whether it is valid or not, has been probed

into by Justice Anand and he has found that the charge is established, they could differ on that. But the fact is that they cannot call into question the motives of the person who framed that charge and that charge was investigated through due process after giving her all requirements of natural justice and she knew well that and the Enquiry Committee headed by Justice Anand had held that the charges are proved. Whether or not they agree with the issue that is before them, he did not think that it is fair to question the motives of why those charges were framed. Whether the charges are valid or not as Justice Anand has placed before them, it is for them to decide whether to accept or not? The second issue is direct communication to the Chancellor and the procedure followed, which he did not think was important. But the rule clearly requires that such a communication could only be addressed with prior permission. It might happen again and again that the prior permission is not taken, is not sought and the advance copy is sent, then what happens? There is a question whether the advance copy was there or not, he did not want to go into this whole thing. His submission is that sending advance copy is not enough compliance of the requirement that one could not address such a communication without prior permission. That clearly was not taken and a charge was framed, which has been rightly upheld, in his view, by Justice Anand. He thought that those who are trying to take this rather lightly should read the language of the legal notice sent to the Chancellor, he would react the way he (Chancellor) did. It says that within a certain period if he (Chancellor) did not do this, did not do that, he would be proceeded against. The lawyer who drafted the notice did not know the law that one could not proceed against the Chancellor, one could proceed against the University and the only person for answering that is the Registrar on behalf of the University and one could not hold the Chancellor personally responsible for this and threaten him with legal action if he did not do such and such thing within a specified period. In his view, it is a serious charge. Again he would not question the motives behind the charges framed. The charge is framed and Justice Anand has upheld the charge and he agreed with that and again repeated that they should accept the report.

Professor Rashpal Malhotra said that first of all, he thanked esteemed Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal for making such a case well thought out, well argued, his all respects for him (Shri Bansal). In fact, he had not read the report. Many of the esteemed colleagues must have done that. But some might not have found time to apply the mind what Shri Bansal has applied. Keeping in view the fact that the Chancellor has been brought into this picture and the Chancellor does not know it, Chancellor sends the letter in spite of the fact that he has to say something or not, in routine the office sends the letters for action. He has received so many complaints against many people, he sends without any comments and the comments are given by the concerned department and then he peruses them, it is the normal practice. So the Chancellor is not supposed to answer it and they are answerable to him to explain their position. What Ambassador Chadha has said and after hearing Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and Professor R.P. Bambah, he thought that they could not totally disregard the report of a Judge which meant that they are undermining a judicial person and next time when they have to put somebody, he could say, no thank you very much and cite the example of the predecessor. Secondly, if what Ambassador Chadha has said is correct, he did not know because as he said that he has not read the report, there are so many things as said by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal and points made by Ambassador Chadha and some other members, they should take a view that neither the finding of Justice Anand are undermined nor the misconduct is set aside. She is a colleague and if she has not done anything, a minor punishment should be thought of. That is what he thinks of it. He has been dealing with such many things in his institution but his attitude has been different. He quoted a saying by one of the intellectuals that a Buddhist was making the statue of Budha at a beach and the waves were coming and destroying the statue again and again. A person enquired as to why he was not making it permanent and the Buddhist replied that the waves' job is to destroy and his job is to make it. Therefore, the Vice-Chancellor it is for you whether he wanted to make it or destroy it. He thought that a generous view should be taken and keeping in view the sentiments and emotions expressed, a Professor's removal is out of question. There is no point of spending so much time on this. What Shri Bansal and Ambassador have expressed, they should respect the members and whatever is to be done should be done in a generous way not by going strictly by the rules.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that a lot of discussion has taken. It was very unfortunate that most of the members have not studied the report and they want to accept the report. The case started in 2013.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it started in 2011 for promotion.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he was not talking about the promotion. He is talking about the case in which she was found guilty, which lead to re-evaluation. As it has already been said the students of the Government College applied for re-evaluation after one year. As the results are declared and the prescribed time for applying for re-evaluation is 21 days and the students did not wait for such a long period. What were the circumstances under which the students were made to apply for re-evaluation after one year? If in re-evaluation, the result of the students is improved, there are cases where the third examiner cases are also made. What were the circumstances under which the administrative and other things were put aside? She was given an understanding that she has been kept aside for some reasons. These things should have been mentioned in the report as to for whom and according to which rule the re-evaluation was done after one year. Even then, all the reports were accepted without see anything. As is the practice for organizing the conferences, there is a deadline for submitting the papers. Sometimes, it happens that the proceedings or books are published on the day of the seminar itself, having all the papers up to that day. She never said that she herself read these papers by visiting there. But the papers were submitted. It is clearly mentioned in the report of the first Committee that the papers were submitted. He thought the enquiry is biased. Keeping all these things in view, it should be kept in mind that somewhere it is not going in the right direction.

Principal R.S. Jhanji said that after hearing the honourable learned members of the House, they could not ignore certain facts. There have been instances where the cases have been challenged in the court and rejected also. In this case also, if certain discrepancies are there as pointed out by the honourable members, he thought that they could not overlook and have to be considered. Certain things have been there. He is not questioning the Committee which was formulated to assess and evaluate the case. Maybe, there might be instances also and certain facts might have been overlooked as it has been pointed out by the hon'ble members here. Why they, in the House, could not take the view of everybody and certain facts which might be included there, why they could not rectify or amend them. His suggestion is that the facts should be seen and viewed again and considered before taking any extreme step. They should also take notice of the points which have been pointed out by the members.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that first of all, he conveyed his thanks to almost all the members of the House who were able to prevail upon the Vice-Chancellor, this has enable him to take the handkerchief off his lips. (He had intended not to speak earlier). Whatever he wanted to speak, most of that has been spoken by hon'ble members in a very articulate way, especially, by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal. He wondered how it escaped his attention as to some of the glaring discrepancies, which he (Shri Goyal) would come to later on. But he has been able to find out from the statement of the Vice-Chancellor and the statement made by hon'ble Ambassador I.S. Chadha and the statement made by Shri Rashpal Malhotra is: one, that there was no issue at all till a legal notice was served upon the Chancellor which was not taken lightly. Hence, all these disciplinary proceedings, this is the crux of the statement made by the Vice-Chancellor. Second statement made by Ambassador I.S. Chadha is that there is no question of now discussing whether the charge levelled was right or wrong. It was only at the stage of framing the charges and whosoever was authorized to frame the charges, he has framed the charges and those have been duly looked into and enquired into by the Enquiry Officer who happens to be a retired Judge of the High Court. So, there is no question of now executing notice as far as charges are concerned. Another important observation has been made by Shri Rashpal Malhotra that since report is to be considered keeping in mind that the Enquiry Officer happens to be the retired Judge of the High Court. So, the question is not whether the person proceeded against had any merit in her case or the University as disciplinary authority has any merit in the case or not, the most important question is that they have to see from the point of view who the

Enquiry Officer is, because if they reject the enquiry report of a retired Judge of the High Court, it would undermine the authority of the Enquiry Officer, and no Judge thereafter would accept if they ask him/her to conduct the enquiry, these are the three main observations. So, he would start from the third. If they accept this plea, then probably no single judge would pronounce the judgment, because the judgment of single judge is supposed to be challenged before double bench (DB) and the judgment of the DB or the judgment delivered by the High Court are liable to be challenged in the Supreme Court and any appellate court could not consider the case only on one thing that since the judgment has been delivered by the Judge of the High Court or the Supreme Court, so they have to uphold it. Unfortunately, the duty has been assigned on the Senate to consider the report which has been submitted by a retired Judge of the High Court who was appointed as the Enquiry Officer. Now, if they keep this thing in mind that they could not undermine the authority of the Judge, then probably there is no scope of any discussion except to say right in the beginning that since the Enquiry Officer has been a retired Judge of the High Court, they have no option but to accept the report. In his view, he thought that this Body has full discretion while considering this report on the facts and merits of the case. As far as Ambassador I.S. Chadha is concerned, his observation is that it is only at the stage of framing the charges. Tomorrow a charge could be framed that he at 1.20 on such and such date having mike in his hand was speaking in the Senate meeting, a charge is framed against him which, in fact, is not a charge at all. But the charge has been framed it is given to the Enquiry Officer, whether by way of evidence or witnesses, or on his own admission that he was speaking and it could be said that the charge is proved. While framing the charges, one must see that whether the charge of eating 2-3 meals a day could amount to put the charge under the disciplinary proceedings. His answer is no. Thirdly, the observation of the Vice-Chancellor that had the legal notice not been sent to the Chancellor, there was no issue. He simply say that those who are the advocates, they know better when any legal notice is sent, this is the set language that if such and such action is not taken within such and such date, he/she would be responsible for the consequences for the litigation to be followed. Nor that he is going to be personally held liable for any kind of penalty on him/her and in routine, he (Chancellor) has sent it to the University. He just wanted to bring to the notice of the House that Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has read the provision that it is the Registrar who has to represent the University in all legal proceedings unless and until decided otherwise by the Senate. It is only the Senate which could decide that in some particular circumstances somebody else needs to represent the University. For example, if Registrar in his personal capacity has filed some case against the University to seek some relief, obviously the Senate would take a decision to appoint somebody else to represent the University because there is an issue of conflict of interest. But do they think anybody other than the Senate, in view of the Act, in view of the provisions of the Act, do they think that anybody other than the Senate is authorized to appoint somebody to represent the University. He could tell where the Vice-Chancellor has directed one of the officials of the University, other than the Registrar, to represent the University in legal proceedings where there is no decision of the Senate, where the writ petition was to be filed on behalf of the University and as per the provisions of the Act, it is only and only the Registrar who has to represent the University. But under the directions of the Vice-Chancellor, though he (Shri Goyal) suggested that it would be violation of the Act he referred to this also that on the one hand a particular teacher, they have charged her by serving the notice to the Chancellor and not to the Registrar where of course it is only the question of representation. But here, of his own, he (Vice-Chancellor) is violating the provisions of the Act by appointing such and such person to represent the University, his (Shri Ashok Goyal's) suggestion was overruled and the person was directed to represent the University, whatever the circumstances may be. When Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal was referring to a very serious case that the charges, of course, he has discussed, in his opinion, no charge in fact stands whether proved or not proved. One could understand from the spirit of a person who is levelling the charges by including a charge of moral turpitude too. Why, though the Supreme Court till date has not been able to define exactly what moral turpitude is. But, they, as responsible citizens, at least are able to identify 2-3 offences which are considered to be moral turpitude. He felt in rarest of the rare cases, a teacher of the University could commit an act of moral turpitude. He felt that no teacher of the University could be charged like the way she has been charged. But while making the charges, Shri Bansal

has read the provision that the power to appoint the Chairperson of a Department is with the Senate. It is the Senate which appoints the Chairperson though the power to appoint is delegated but the power still lies with the Senate. He simply wanted to ask, under which provisions the Vice-Chancellor on his own has withdrawn the powers of the Chairperson while exceeding his authority and jurisdiction. He has withdrawn the powers one by one by making her defunct Chairperson. To say that the things inflated only after the notice was served probably seems to be illogical rather the conclusion is that when she was completely thrown to the wall, left with no alternative, fully convinced that no member of the Senate, no authority of the University is going to listen to her grievances, she served the legal notice. He agreed with Shri Bansal that to serve a legal notice even on President of India is not offence as far as the Constitution of India is concerned and a legal notice is never sent through proper channel. As far as sending the letters through proper channel is concerned, which Ambassador I.S. Chadha has tried to define that it is not through proper channel, it amounts to with prior permission. He simply asked the purpose of sending the letters through proper channel is that it relates to the employer or to the office in which one is working, if one is sending the letter to some higher authority, it should be routed through so that while forwarding those letters, the authority who is routing it to the higher authority, is able to give his/her comments that in this letter such and such thing is unfounded or this has happened and that has happened. That is the only purpose of sending it through proper channel and the person who is assigned the duty of routing the letter to the higher authority, he/she does not have the discretion to keep to his/her chest and not to forward it to the person to whom it is addressed. He had said it in the Syndicate also wherein his contention was overruled as if sending the letter to the higher authority is also the discretion of the authority through whom the letter is to be sent. Could they tell him that if he sends a letter through proper channel and the Vice-Chancellor chooses not to send it to them, what alternative he has except to send an advance copy of the letter knowing fully well what is happening in this University and not only in this University, it is happening in all the set ups of the country that is where from this concept of sending advance came. Now the only difference between sending the letter through proper channel and directly is that if the letter is sent there first, it would come again for comments to the authority and only to avoid that route, they wanted the things to be expedited that as and when the letter has been submitted to the authority, he/she has to send it to the higher authority for which it is meant with comments. Now, he simply says that the charges are framed by the Vice-Chancellor. Shri Bansal has tried to explain the conflict of interest whether they agree or do not agree, once the issue is put before the courts for scrutiny, it would not be in their hands. Not only that, the Vice-Chancellor is the one who has framed the charge sheet because as per regulations, he is empowered to do that. After having framed the charge sheet, it is the Vice-Chancellor who has appointed the Enquiry Officer also because he has empowered to appoint the Enquiry Officer. After having appointed the Enquiry Officer, surprisingly, the Vice-Chancellor is also appearing as a prosecution witness before the same Enquiry Officer who has been appointed by him. Since the case of the University is to be pleaded, so obviously there must be some actions which must be attributed to the Vice-Chancellor and he, as Vice-Chancellor, has appeared in the witness box or as prosecution witness and he has been cross examined also. If they go through the video recording, when the Vice-Chancellor is appearing as a prosecution witness and the other prosecution witnesses which are appearing before the Enquiry Officer, one could easily find out the difference whether the Vice-Chancellor is appearing there as prosecution witness or an official with all records with him spread over the whole room of the Enquiry Officer having access to all the files, as he has not gone as a witness but he has gone as a prosecutor. Unfortunately, after having played all these roles, he as Vice-Chancellor chairing the meeting of the Senate in the absence of the Chancellor, is again becoming a party to the decision to be taken by the Senate. Not only that, Shri Bansal had rightly pointed out in the beginning that he (Vice-Chancellor) should not think that he would be questioned. Why should he (Vice-Chancellor) feel that he is answerable for everything. But since he (Vice-Chancellor) could not control his sentiments, he thought that it is a case for him to prove, he has been intervening in between like it was this, it was that, as if he wanted this case to be proved, this charge to be proved beyond doubt against Dr. Neelam Paul. Now coming to Professor Bambah's comments, he has read specific provision whereby he has tried to tell that under what circumstances, under which

provisions, under which procedure, a teacher could be removed presuming and assuming that there could not be any occasion for University teacher's removal. That is why a very strong system has been built up. In his view, the enquiry report needs to be rejected in one voice because he has gone to the extent of proving the charges which are non-existent, which are non-existent. To say that they are not considering the enquiry report in this today's meeting, rather they are reconsidering the enquiry report. He is surprised whether they have already considered the report and after considering the report have they given any finding that an occasion has come to reconsider the report. They are still at the stage of considering the report and for their information as punishing authority, there is no provision of reconsidering the report unless and until they have put themselves in the shoes of an appellate authority. As an appellate authority, they could reconsider. As an appellate authority, they could consider the appeal. But here the item is to reconsider the enquiry report. What is the answer left with them in the court of law when this item is wrong, they (Court) would say that the University bring the earlier decision which it had taken while considering the report, bring the grounds on which it decided to reconsider the report. He wondered as to who has framed this item. This report is full of legal lacunae, this report is full of technical lacunae. This report talks of conflict of interest, this report talks of complete bias. Why, because, if the Court asks the University, has the University ever punished till date or issued show cause notice or ever charged anybody who has made some claim and her claim could not be substantiated, has the University punished or charged anybody, the answer would be no. Everyday, they say that one has 1000 API and they say that they do not consider this and the score is 820 that means that somebody claims 1000 but actually he/she is entitled for 820, would they charge him/her even after asking that in their opinion it is 820 and if one has to file the claim to enhance the same to 1000, he/she has to give such and such papers and the candidate does not give such and such paper, would they charge that despite repeated directions, he/she has not been able to obey the instructions of the competent authority. So, his simple suggestion in this is to avoid any kind of embarrassment to the University. He is repeating that for him the first and the foremost interest is the image and prestige of the University. Not less but equally important is the dignity, image and prestige of the University teachers and of course, it is also equally important that discipline in the University is maintained. But in the name of discipline, let them not try to judge the cases on the basis of personal biases and let them try to keep away the personal conflicts and take a decision and in view of this, he requested that this report should not be accepted at all.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he wanted to respond to as Shri Goyal had referred to him. He would request his learned friend Shri Goyal, who is far more experienced as a Senator than him, not to put words in his mouth. He repeated that they could differ on the conclusion that they draw but they could not differ on facts. The fact is that a charge has been leveled. They could even disagree whether the charge should have been leveled or not. For one moment, he is not suggesting that once a charge is framed, investigated and, proved, they were bound to accept it. He never said that. He repeatedly said that they have to go through the procedure prescribed in the Calendar. It is a fact that a charge has been framed, wrongly or rightly, it has been framed. The Calendar provides the procedure for dealing with it, viz. that a notice has to be given, and an enquiry has to be held. After due process, the enquiry report comes to the Senate. The Senate decides whether or not to accept the report. The Senate is not bound by the results of the report. It is up to the Senate to decide. There could be, differences. At no stage, he implied and he wished to repeat that in his view, the charge is proved as brought out in the report. There are differences and they are discussing the differences. Please do not in any way imply that he was suggesting that once a charge is framed, it is automatically to be accepted.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he had listened very carefully to the views expressed on this controversial issue. He had a few observations. It is nobody's view that just because of Enquiry Officer is a Judge and seeing the face value, they have to accept the report. But why they appoint a judge, it is because of objectivity and expertise. There are relevant factors that here is a person who is from outside the University, there is no vested interest of any kind and who is an expert in this field. He has read the report very

carefully. It brings out the issue of academic integrity across the disciplines. If one sends a legal notice to the Chancellor, who is not involved in the day-to-day functioning of the University and who is not the proper authority to receive the legal notice threatening that if he did not take action, that person would sue the Chancellor. One could not sue the Chancellor but only the University and in that case it is the Registrar who comes into play. So many issues have been raised. Whereas the scope of this discussion they are having, they have to look at the charges and the Enquiry Officer is supposed to analyze them and give the report. Other issues which are not genuine to the discussion need not be raised. He must have seen many enquiries and this is one of the best enquiries that had come across and to his mind, the charges are proved. The question of punishment is different. That is something which they might look at only after the report is accepted and since there are number of views which have been expressed, may be it would be appropriate to take a vote on the report. If the report is accepted, then they look at this issue and if not accepted, it could be the other way.

Dr. Dinesh Kumar said that as far as the report is concerned and some of the members have raised the issue regarding the Chairperson of the Enquiry Committee, Justice Anand. He has full regard for the judiciary but he did not agree with the idea that if a High Court Judge has conducted an enquiry that could not be questioned. He did not agree with this. As far as the orders are concerned, he had also gone through the enquiry report devoting much time and he has also conducted the enquiries and has a little bit knowledge of the enquiries. But the charge, as far as disobeying the orders are concerned, he did not agree that there is any kind of disobedience because he could quote examples where the Dean of University Instruction chairs the Screening Committees and the Screening Committee has been denying so many claims of the applicants. Even then, the University by making new Screening Committees, tried to make the candidates being eligible. Here, his question is that when in a particular Department, 9 Professors and 2 outside members are saying that one person is not eligible, even then 3 members are saying that this person is eligible, his suggestion is that what action they would initiate against those 3 Professors. He did not want to go into details. Ultimately, if the member had claimed wrong, the case would have ended there by saying that the claim is not valid. As far as the advance copy is concerned, he did not have any doubt that the moment they use the word advance copy, it is sufficient to just say that it is an indication that one is sending the advance copy without permission and the copy with permission would reach in due course of time. So, that could not be considered as a charge. Regarding the notice to the Chancellor, he agreed with one thing that as far as the wording used in the legal notice, it is not appropriate. He said it for the first time when it came to the Syndicate and at that time also he categorically mentioned that to serve a legal notice is not good because it brings a bad name to the University. But since he belonged to legal profession and that there are number of Advocates and when a person approaches an Advocate, for that person whatever an Advocate says, that becomes the last word. If a person is not from a legal background, the person did not know what could be the consequences when he is going to put the signatures. He agrees as far as legal notice is concerned, but the word used is not appropriate at all. But to say that they admit the enquiry report is not appropriate, he did not agree with this thing at all. It could be challenged and he is sure that even if with 2/3 majority the Senate adopts, it could be challenged in the court of law and in the very first hearing, the Senate decision would be set aside. He is sure about.

Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang said that since they had amicably solved the earlier issue, they could solve the present issue also in an amicable manner. A Committee could look into the whole issue and reconsider the issue. If the claim of Dr. Neelam Paul is not valid, then the promotion could not be given and if the claim is valid, the promotion be given. She requested the issue should be solved amicably.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that 2-3 issues have come to light from which seems that it is a problem created because of the Vice-Chancellor or because of Dr. Neera Grover being in that department. But in his opinion, the problem is not created by the Vice-Chancellor but perhaps is created by all of them. This issue has been going on for a long time. The views which they are expressing today, if they had expressed such views earlier, the problems would have been solved earlier. Secondly, the Vice-Chancellor is

not the decision making or decision taking authority, but it is the Senate. The Senate did not take any decision for the last about 4 years. The Senate constitutes a Committee and the report is submitted to the Senate and again a Committee is constituted. He has read the charge sheet and found that during the tenure of Professor R.C. Sobti, Dr. Neelam Paul has herself accepted that she could not produce some of the papers. The enquiry report submitted by Justice Anand is a very long report, and even then if they wanted to constitute a Committee. His suggestion is that the Senate should finalise the issue without any bias.

The Vice Chancellor enquired whether anyone also wished to add anything. When none else desired to add anything, the Vice-Chancellor said that it is his duty and responsibility to respond on behalf of the office of the Vice-Chancellor, both on behalf of his predecessor as well as himself. His predecessor did whatever he did in good faith. When a candidate claims certain marks that they have attended the seminar, it was not disputed. He asked for the referee report. On the day of the interview, only one referee report was there and that referee report was from someone whom, the Committee well knew, was none other than her own supervisor for a degree which today is equivalent to M.Phil degree but when she had written that degree, it was a kind of Ph.D. degree of Banaras Hindu University. These are the circumstances under which his predecessor took decision. The supervisor writes: "I have gone through the papers and other details and my observations are like this: Publication is not up to the mark. Number of papers is only 5, even not published in any reputed indexed/ISBN/ISN Number Journal". Of course, he (Supervisor) says that 10 papers are required, that is wrong. But the five papers which are submitted did not stand validated as published. The supervisor says: "no book is published. She is not an eminent scholar. Hence, I am not recommending her case for promotion under UGC Career Advancement Scheme". Only one report was there. In the very first letter that he (Vice-Chancellor) received after he took over as Vice-Chancellor, more than 6-8 months after taking over as Vice-Chancellor, as she had assumed the officer of the Chairperson of the Department, she writes: "I was interviewed on 10th October 2011 by the Selection Panel for about 40 minutes, panel consisting of Professor R.C. Sobti, Professor V.P. Kamboj as Chancellor's nominee". Professor Kamboj, Chancellor's nominee has a very long standing, very eminent scientist, he was also the President of the Science Academy. Professor S.C. Shrikhandey of Kurukshetra, Professor C.L. Verma of Shimla, Professor Krishna Bist from Delhi and Dr. Gurpreet Kaur, who was the Dean of the Faculty of the Panjab University, and she is now a part of GNDU. The letter of Dr. Neelam Paul further mentions "after interview, I was asked to submit the list of name of the students whom I had supervised for M.Phil and Ph.D., which I immediately submitted to the Vice-Chancellor on the spot. Incidentally, these two lists were also taken twice from me by Establishment branch, one person Mr. Ramesh in November 2011 and again in December 2011 after my interview and before the declaration of the result". So clearly, she had not submitted these lists to the Committee and this is what is later on brought out also. Her score could not be verified. There was only one referee report. The referee report was of this kind that his predecessor was not in a position to recommend her promotion but he wrote that deferred due to eligibility. That meant that her case has to be put up to the Selection Committee again. So, if the matter has been put up to the Selection Committee again in the background of this report that she does not have these papers in an indexed journal, he has at least to ask for the proof. He could not convene the meeting of the Selection Committee unless the process was complete. So the matter moved. Then, she writes a letter on 8th February 2013 (page 99) wherein she says that: "I fail to understand that when I have submitted all my documents properly how was it possible that they were misplaced". She now says that the papers were misplaced by the office. She further says: "I have an apprehension that this could be a mischief to keep me away from getting my promotion on time". Many members have said as if there was a malafide intent on behalf of the office of the Vice-Chancellor. Then she says: "I hope I have been able to make it clear that the complexity in my case is not of my making, but it is because of inefficiency, incompetency and the arbitrary way of doing things where no proper processes are followed". This is a very serious accusation at the office of the Vice-Chancellor and his predecessor. She further says: "I request not to penalize me for a mistake, which I have not committed and since a competent selection Committee, and after that a high powered committee has recommended my case, so there is no point in

appearing for another interview again, because it would amount to a mockery of the whole process of my first interview and the committee's recommendation. Documents of all the above facts are available with me and can be produced whenever sought". The documents are sought numerous times by the Vice-Chancellor and are not produced. The letter of Dr. Paul further says: "appealing to your keen sense of fairness and justice, it is requested that my genuine due may kindly be given to me as I have gone through a long period of mental suffering for no fault of mine. Thanking you". So, this is 8th of February 2013. Lots of things happen for one year and then on 11th of August, a letter is sent to the Chancellor and in that the following points are made. First is: "I appeared for the interview, my Professorship has not been granted to me which was due in 2009 despite several representations and recommendations by a high powered committee nor even disclosed me the result of the interview so far. The second is: "I have been debarred from all examination dues for an indefinite period on flimsy grounds".

Shri Ashok Goyal got up and enquired as to what is the explanation to this.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal to allow him to speak as he did not interrupt him.

However, Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa interjected to state that they have read the reports.

Shri Ashok Goyal interrupted again to state that he wanted to bring to the notice of the House that how biased the Vice-Chancellor is, that in violation of the rules, whereby the Senate is empowered to appoint a person as Chairperson for 3 years, and after 3 years by rotation, the next person is appointed as Chairperson. But if there is no next person eligible to be appointed as Chairperson, he/she has to continue to be the Chairperson. But in this case, in spite of the fact that there is none, who is eligible to be appointed as Chairperson, she has been divested of the charge of the Chairperson and the Chairperson of the Department is now the Dean of University Instruction. This can be very well hinting how biased the Vice-Chancellor is.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa interjected back to add that firstly it is concerned with the Vice-Chancellor, as his wife is working in that department and the whole confrontation is because of that. Raising his voice, he opined that the Vice-Chancellor should leave the meeting and some other person should chair the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said he objected to such a statement.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Vice-Chancellor might object.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said in a raised voice that the Vice-Chancellor might object but he should leave.

At this stage, a pandemonium prevailed as many persons stood up joined in counter accusations in raised voices. The Vice-Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting for lunch, and he asked the members to come back at 3.00 p.m.

When the meeting recommenced after lunch, the Vice Chancellor stated that let him at least respond on behalf of the offices of the Vice Chancellor and the Dean of University Instruction. The system has done something and he would like the Senate to know what the internal system of the University has done. Of course, the internal system of the University is the internal system of the University, but on day-to-day basis the internal system sustains the University. It is not that one has to convene the meeting of the Syndicate or the Senate on every small issue. He may be an inexperienced person, and also not a person of law. For him (as Vice Chancellor), it is perhaps the first and the last executive office. He has never served in a public office earlier. Those of them, who are members of this august house for decades, he is just a small person (before them). This house has people, who are not only the members of this Senate, but also members of larger Governing Bodies of India. Therefore, he should

be given five minutes just to tell them the real position of the University, as the University is administered by the internal mechanism of the University. So let him say something on behalf of the office of the Vice Chancellor and the office of the Dean of University Instruction. The present Dean of University Instruction is a member of the House and the previous Dean of University Instruction was also a member of the House. Whatever they have done as members, let him articulate. Let him come to this letter which was sent by Dr. Neelam Paul to the Chancellor directly, which is a moot point. The copy of the letter did come to him and he had to respond to that. The letter says about her promotion and also said that "I have been debarred from examination duties (as stated in P.No.2) for an indefinite period on flimsy grounds without any due process and baseless allegations.....I had been working in the Department of Music since the last 22 years and have been Chairperson of the Department of Music from 2003 to 2006 and again from February 2013. In all these years, not even a single complaint has filed against me, nor there has been any incidence of indiscipline in the Department. It is only after the appointment of Professor Neera Grover, wife of Vice Chancellor that not only serious but baseless allegations have been levelled, but also I have been penalized for them whimsically by the authorities....." So what did he (as Vice Chancellor) do? He gave it to the Dean of University Instruction and made a Committee to address to her grievances in order to submit a reply to the Chancellor. He has not only to forward this letter to the Chancellor, but, answer also. So a Committee was formed under the chairmanship of Dean of University Instruction, and the Committee had Professor Madhu Raka, former Dean of University Instruction, Professor Ronki Ram, a member of the Senate, former President, PUTA, Professor Mohammed Khalid, former President, PUTA, Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, a member of the Senate and former President, PUTA, and a serving President, PUTA, who was also a member of the Senate. So they could realize that this Committee had Presidents of PUTA, both past and present and several members of the Senate, and the Committee is chaired by the Dean of University Instruction, who is also a member of the Senate. The report is little bit long which runs from page 115 to 129, and he expects that all of them to have read it. He would take just few minutes to read for them a few extracts. "Professor Mohammed Khalid said that the concerns facing the Department of Music are very serious and therefore, this Committee has been constituted in which PUTA President and some Ex-PUTA Presidents are members..... We all are sitting here together to see that the Department of Music functions smoothly, which has come under the clouds of conflicts for the last many years. He said that as PUTA President, he had gone there to solve their problems. This should not happen.... On the issue of promotion of Dr. Neelam Paul under CAS, Professor Ronki Ram stated that we request Dr. Neelam Paul once again to provide us the reprints and the photocopies of her published articles, which she claimed to have forwarded.... He vividly remembers that during his PUTA Presidentship also (i.e., many-many years ago), there was continuous dispute over some issues in the Department and so it is not with the arrival of Professor Neera Grover or the Vice Chancellor, Professor Arun Kumar Grover that the dispute has cropped up in the Department. During his PUTA Presidentship he tried his level best to solve the issues amicably, but somehow it could not reach at a conclusive end. Professor Neelam Paul said that in June 2012, about 120 Answer Books of Panjab University from the Examination Branch came to her for checking. Unfortunately, 10-12 students failed in the examination. By chance, those students belonged to the same College. She was not aware that from which College and from where these students were. These students demanded re-evaluation, but till then, the last date for applying for re-evaluation was over. The Examination Branch informed them that your time for applying for re-evaluation was over. They appeared in the compartment paper and cleared it. She said that in May, 2013, a complaint was received by the Vice Chancellor, that many students of GCG, Sector 11, were made to fail and with those students justice had not been done. One Syndicate member also strongly recommended this." So he (Vice Chancellor) did not do anything on his own and instead he was forced to do. "After that the Vice Chancellor took action and permitted them to get re-evaluation done, as a special case. After re-evaluation, the difference was of more than 15 marks and after getting evaluation done from the third examiner, as per rules, the students passed. She said that then it was presumed that she had committed mistake and that students were failed deliberately by her." He (Vice Chancellor) did not say it. The same Syndicate member, who had asked him to do it, i.e., revaluation, he is one of the Syndicate meetings was vociferous that the

University teachers fail the students of the Colleges, and it is serious that he (Vice Chancellor) was trying to protect the University colleagues, and that should not be done; rather, a penalty should be given. There were many other such complaints. So he consulted the Controller of Examinations and he told him that the people who default in examination duties could be debarred. So he debarred one person and then this thing came. He debarred her, that she would not do the examination duties, but there were several other issues. Other issue was related to some salary being paid. "Regarding Chaman Lal Verma's salary, she said that he also did not submit attendance record in the office." It is same Professor Chaman Lal Verma, who was in the expert panel in the year 2011, when her promotion was not granted. So there are so many inner things which are going on. He (Vice Chancellor) has not role in any of these things, nor has he instigated anybody. He has not taken any bias. So far as he is concerned, there is no conflict of interest. "Professor Saroj Ghosh said in that meeting if Dr. Neelam Paul could change her attitude and gets along with us amicably, then it will be fine. But this would not happen and no solution would be found. At present, at this stage, we (i.e., music teaching staff) want to work under the Chairmanship of DUI." This is there in the report of December, 2014. There it is written that "The Chairperson was not able to carry the faculty members of the Department as her team...." So there is collapse of the Administration. In the end, the Committee the concludes –

1. Dr. Neelam Paul was asked to submit copies of five publications for her CAS promotion case, which she failed to do and said that she will not submit.
2. The dispute within the faculty in the Department of Music is not after the joining of Professor Neera Grover in the Department, but the dispute was already there.
3. Whatever the faculty members of the Department of Music has said, has been recorded.
4. The action taken by the University Authorities of withdrawing certain powers from Chairperson, Dr. Neelam Paul were in the larger interest of smooth functioning of the Department of Music.

This is signed by Professor Madhu Raka, Professor Ronki Ram, Professor Mohammed Khalid, Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang, Professor Rajat Sandhir, Professor Pankaj Mala Sharma, and of course, by Professor A.K. Bhandari as DUI and Registrar also. So this is the background in which lots and lots of things have happened. This report was sent to the Chancellor and a copy of the report was also made available to Dr. Neelam Paul. She wrote another complaint to the Chancellor in the month of February and lots of more allegations were levelled. He had to appoint another Committee and the Committee met and submitted the report, which is dated 16th of February, 2015. What is the conclusion part of that report. The Committee was of the view that subsequent points mentioned in the complaint are baseless and the accusations made by her against the Vice Chancellor and Professor Neera Grover had not been supported by any substantial evidence. The Committee took a very serious view of the fact that by making such false allegations Dr. Neelam Paul has defamed the Vice Chancellor and Professor Neera Grover. The Committee recommended that under Regulation 3.2 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, page 118, the competent authority may issue a show-cause notice to Dr. Neelam Paul as to why she has made baseless allegations which have no supporting evidence, against the Vice Chancellor and Professor Neera Grover. In case, after the reply received from her, she is found to have made false and baseless allegations against the Vice Chancellor and/or her colleagues, then it may amount to gross misconduct on the part of Dr. Neelam Paul and the appropriate authority, as prescribed under Regulations 3.1 and 3.3 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, pages 117-118, may take appropriate action against her. On 19th of February, he (Vice Chancellor) wrote "I had earlier informed the Chancellor that two of five publications claimed by her are not valid, and the reasons were communicated to the Chancellor. Dr. Neelam Paul is perhaps well aware that her claim of five publications cannot be validated by her". Five publications up to 2009. Her reluctance to submit proofs of the publications stem from this. Two weeks later, a legal

notice was served on the Chancellor. So he just wanted to make a few facts clear. He is not the deciding authority, and he is just presiding over their meeting. It is their meeting and everything is before them. The report is also before them. He has nothing more/different to say. They are free to take call on the report today. If they want to defer the matter and go over and consult all of them themselves, they could do so. If they want to go through all the papers, come back and then want to give their opinion after they have had enough time to do informal consultations, and go through all the papers, which are before them, the choice is theirs. All options are theirs and he has nothing more to say.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that it is very strange that she made a complaint to the Chancellor against him (Vice Chancellor) and his wife, and he himself appoints a Committee of his subordinates. What does he expect? Does he think they would be fair?

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not fair. The Professors of this University are not subordinates. Similarly, the Presidents of PUTA and the members of the Senate are also not subordinates. However, he (Professor Mahmood) is free to say what he wants, but he would just like to submit that his colleagues are mature. Each one of them could be Vice Chancellor tomorrow. He is not the decision maker. Please leave him (Vice Chancellor) alone. He has not influenced anything. He does not think, that the Hon'ble members of this House, when they are sitting here as Senate members, they are his subordinates. Some are elected on their own, and some are nominated on their own (merit). So it is not fair for him also to say that they are his subordinates. He asked is he (Professor Mahmood) his (Vice Chancellor) subordinate?

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that what he means to say is that the Committee, which had been constituted, had been appointed by him (Vice Chancellor).

Professor Rajesh Gill remarked that the fact remains that he (Professor Arun Kumar Grover) is the Vice Chancellor and the Professors are subordinates to him. It is a fact, which could not be refuted.

Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that Dr. Rajesh Gill is also a Professor and she is also raising the voice against the Vice Chancellor, where she feels that she has not been given due justice. Two times, valid Committees were constituted by the Vice Chancellor and he has explained the position. So far as the agenda before the Senate, which is a supreme body as per the Act, is concerned, it is – “To re-consider the Enquiry Report in respect of a faculty member of the University submitted by Justice Anand”.

The Vice Chancellor said that do not say re-consider, it is to consider.

Continuing, Ms. Anu Chatrath stated that “To consider the Enquiry Report in respect of a faculty member of the University submitted by Justice Anand”. Thus, it is only consideration. But whether they have to take a decision in view of the recommendations of the Committee or Committee Report or not, and according to her, that should have been the agenda. Personally, she feels because the Enquiry Committee is headed by a former Judge of the High Court, i.e., Justice Anand, who has given finding that no malpractice was there. Regarding two other charges, she as an advocate personally feels that she has seen in a number of cases the Judges had observed that the teachers are supposed to present a conduct before the students that their examples are cited as good examples to the students. But here the teacher herself is making anti image synopsis or *pro forma* that she has presented five papers in such and such Conference, whereas it is a fact that during those days she was very much in Chandigarh. So a person present in Chandigarh could not be presumed to present papers in a Conference at a distance place. However, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has rightly pointed out that there are certain lacunae in the Enquiry Report. She feels that it would be better if a Committee comprising 3-4 persons be constituted to examine, because even if they accept the Enquiry Report, they could not take any action to oust Dr. Neelam Paul as 2-4 allegations are proved, which are minor charges. Whether she has written directly to the Chancellor, which according to the legal position. Any advocate could send a legal notice to the authorities. Since Chancellor is the

Chairperson of Panjab University, he is very much the authority of the University. On this issue, she fully agrees with Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal. So on these charges, action could not be taken. So far as supply of wrong information for claiming promotion is concerned, a Committee could be constituted to consider the Enquiry Report as well as the *pro forma* which was filled in by Dr. Neelam Paul and suggest an appropriate decision, which could be placed before the Senate, because today is the meeting in which they have been facing a financial crunch for the last so many months. As such, they have to approve the Budget. Now, it is approximately 3.30 p.m. and they have been discussing 1-2 issues since morning (10.00 a.m.). Hence, they would not be able to consider the agenda. Next time, her learned colleagues (Professors and Associate Professors) would not be able to get their salaries, and then they would neither be here nor there. Since the meetings of the Senate are held after about six months, they should discuss the issues which are of utmost importance. If they personally feel fit, a special meeting could be convened to consider a particular issue. But the today's meeting is for considering the Revised Budget, they should approve the same. So far as the case of Dr. Neelam Paul is concerned, a special Committee could be constituted.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that along with the proposal of Ms. Anu Chatrath, he would also like to make a proposal, and his proposal is: if all of them agree on this issue that this issue is of promotion where the candidate does not fulfil the qualifications. If it is so, then from here onwards, the issue has further got so many tasks into so many allegations here and there. So they could say this much. In the morning, they have resolved a much more complex issue. So they could say that let them make it clear that if on the basis of papers/facts, they are sure that she has not fulfilled the qualifications, she could not be given promotion to the higher stage. Whenever she is eligible, she is open to come, but at the same time, she should be asked to tender an apology, and she should accept it because she did not present the papers even on repeated requests. Thereafter, she started make allegations, which is not called for. So minimum this must be done.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she would like to add with the permission of the Chair that, as an Advocate, she has seen a number of cases like the appointment of Professor Neera Grover wherein observation of the Judges was that since a person sitting on the Chair has not participated in the selection process, the writ petitions are dismissed. If the person has been able to get the benefit, the credit goes to, and if he/she has not been able to get the benefit, drag Professor Neera Grover or Professor Arun Kumar Grover, and that she does not appreciate. They should not drag Professor Neera Grover in all the issues as there are thousands of faculty members in the University. If one is able to get justice or promotion according to his/her choice, it is fine, and if not on the basis of misrepresented facts, drag Professor Neera Grover, which once should not do.

Professor D.V.S. Jain remarked that it is a big crime.

The Vice Chancellor stated that the entire College lobby was against him (Vice Chancellor) that he as a Vice Chancellor was trying to protect his colleagues on the campus, and the campus Professor fail College students in their competitiveness so that the College students do not stand first in an examination, where the campus and the College students are competing. So many Syndicate members are there. In fact, he was pushed to a wall.

Professor D.V.S. Jain said that he (Vice Chancellor) should not expect the teachers to fail the students.

The Vice Chancellor said that 11 students in row were failed and the marks given were between 9 and 11. She (Dr. Neelam Paul) knows it, what she did. Whether the Calendar allows him to debar her from examination duty, he does not know, but he did it to protect the academics of this University. If he is doing things to protect the academics of this University, and if somebody thinks that while doing all these things, he

is violating the Calendar, he should be dismissed, it is alright. He is a very small person, and he has come here just to do his duty. He would go away, the day the Chancellor asks him to go away.

Professor Malkiat Chand Sidhu said that if this is an allegation on the University teachers that they are failing the students.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal enquired is it a way to conduct the meeting. Then he (Vice Chancellor) blames others when they start retaliating, and he (Vice Chancellor) feels bad. Otherwise also, even he does not say, he (Vice Chancellor) has to go, the day the Chancellor asks him to move and he has not to give an undertaking here.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Alright, he is sorry for whatever he has said".

Professor Rupinder Tewari said that he thinks that what Ms. Anu Chatrath's is saying for constitution of a Committee is a viable proposition, but the question is whether the recommendation/s of the Committee would be binding on them or would they again deliberate on the issue. He suggested that the recommendations of the Committee should be binding on them and there should be no discussion on it.

The Vice Chancellor said that it could not be binding. They could only take decision on themselves.

Professor Rupinder Tewari enquired then what would be the benefit of appointing a Committee.

Professor Anil Monga stated that the Committee should not be formed because earlier also they had constituted a Committee. They constitute the Committee, but thereafter nothing happens.

The Vice Chancellor said that the he is not recommending any Committee. In fact, he has placed all the facts before them. Whatever decision the Senate takes, he would respect that decision. This is his duty and he would do his duty.

Professor Anil Monga stated that one of the Justices was assigned the job to investigate into the matter. The Justice has investigated the matter properly and given the findings. Now it is being said that it is an issue of academic integrity. The person is making her claim, and then she is not coming forward to support her claim. When is pursued to some extent, certain problem starts arising and it reaches a stage that a notice is given to the highest authority, and the language of the notice is objectionable to such an extent that they are not ready to accept that indiscipline or serious misconduct. It is being said since morning that the person has not been given the chance. How the chance is given? Again and again they were asking the person to come forward to substantiate her claim and get the promotion. He does not understand what else the House wants. If the person concerned is not prepared to substantiate/support her claim, then what do they do? A Committee was formed and Judge was appointed, and thereafter what do they do? The matter is placed before the Senate, and then again a Committee is appointed. When the Committee gives its viewpoint, the same is also not accepted by them. What they are doing? Since he was a member of the last Committee of the Senate to go into the issue and that is why he is saying that please do not appoint another Committee. Whatever is to be done, should be done here only.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha stated that with all due deference to people who are much wiser and more experienced than him, he agrees with Professor Monga. Forming of a Committee is again putting off the decision. Why should they be so indecisive? To him, there are only two options – either they should reject the report in which case no further action is required or they should accept the report and then form a Committee to discuss as to what further action is to be taken. These are the two options. Forming another Committee without giving them any direction whether or not they accept the report, would bring the whole discussion/debate back here, and acrimony, which they

are trying to avoid, and sweep under the carpet would reappear on the surface. So let us take a decision today. If they do not like the report, reject it, and if they think that some further action is required, whether apology would do or some other action is required, those issues would arise only, if they accept the report. If they accept the report, then he suggests that they form a Committee to discuss further action, but having accepted the report. However, if they do not accept the report, no further action is called for.

On a point of order, Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said that Professor Anil Monga has spoken very nicely because he belongs to Department of Police. It seems to him that he (Professor Monga) has spoken as if the person is punished and he should also not weep. If one is victimized, he/she would definitely raise his/her voice and if need be, would write to higher authorities. He/She would right to the level wherever he/she has the reach. Madam sitting behind him (Professor Rajesh Gill) is speaking because she is a member of the Senate. Had she been not in the Senate, she might not have opened her mouth. Since he (Professor Arun Kumar Grover) is the Vice Chancellor, he is their boss and could do anything against them. Therefore, whatever Committee he (Vice Chancellor) has formed, it would naturally favour him (Vice Chancellor).

Professor R.P. Bambah enquired do they have to accept or reject the report or could they take it up charge-wise?

The Vice Chancellor said that he has just place the report before them. What they wish to do, is their wish.

Professor R.P. Bambah enquired whether it is possible to discuss charge 1, 2, 3, 4 and so on.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that it is possible.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that if there is some enquiry and they differ with some of its portion, then they have to give reason as to why they are rejecting it because they could not say that it is an *ad hoc* decision. Discussion has taken place, when they do not partially agree to the report, they have to give reason why they are partially rejecting it. Therefore, his view is that either they should accept the report or reject it.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal stated that his opinion is that always they could agree with some part and disagree with some part. As the Enquiry Officer himself has not agreed with the charge of moral turpitude. He has given his view earlier and his view is that all the charges should be actually rejected. Once they were discussing point which Professor Bambah raised, he thinks it is always possible that they could say that this point is rejected and this is accepted. As Shri Sibal says, there is no need to give the reason/s. Who would give the reason/s? Would 80-90 people give the reason/s? Those who have spoken on the issue have given the reasons. If he has spoken, he has given the reasons for rejecting all the charges. There are some other Hon'ble members, who have given the reasons for accepting the charges, which means ultimately when they talk about the report, and if they are coming to a conclusion or some consensus that some part they accept and some reject, the discussion or the proceeding of the Senate would be on the basis of that.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him add a very small issue. The charge of moral turpitude was pressed because the University Calendar, under the moral turpitude, lists dishonesty. So the charge of moral turpitude was pressed because it was felt that the claim of publications was dishonesty. What does the Judge says "The dereliction of charge number 1, though the dereliction proved to have been committed by Dr. Neelam Paul, may not be described as an act of moral turpitude, she is held to have committed an act of impropriety and also an act of unbecoming of a member of educational dispensation". So if they reject number 1, then they are also rejecting it in totality.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that, hypothetically, if they are rejecting the finding on charge 1, it does not *ipso facto* mean that they are also rejecting his argument of moral turpitude, therefore, that is revised, which is not so.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not legal person. Whatever decision they wish, they should take. He just wants to clarify that he is doing his duty. Since they are the decision makers, they should take a call on it.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that while taking decision, they are also doing their duty. In fact, everybody is discharging his/her duty. He just wants to add and submitting Shri Sibal that if they differ with the Judge, that does not debar them from difference with the Enquiry Officer's report. Shri Sibal has said that if they differ, then they have to give reason/s for difference. He is right to the extent that if the Enquiry Officer has said that the charge is not proved and the Appointing Authority or the Punishing Authority says, "No, we differ with the Enquiry Officer, who has said charge is not proved", and according to the facts on record, the Appointing Authority is of the view that charge is proved, there only the reason/s has/have to be given; otherwise, if he (Shri Goyal) is differing with the report of the Enquiry Officer, who is to challenge him that he has to give the reason/s. It is the Enquiry Officer who is aggrieved that they are not agreeing to what he has said. Why they have to give the reasons that when they differ with the Enquiry Officer, when he has said no charge is proved, and they are also saying no charge is proved because it is going to affect the person proceeded against that he/she is the aggrieved party, they have to give the reasons, so that he/she could take it up at an appropriate level, i.e., whether at the Court of Law or Appellate Authority. As far as Professor Bambah's question that could they discuss charge-wise is concerned, yes that in fact is the procedure as the Enquiry Officer, after enquiring into the charges, has said that charge one is partially proved. Meaning thereby, that it is not to the extent that it amounts to moral turpitude, and he has said that three and half charges or might be three and quarter of the charges. Similarly, it for the Punishing Authority to see that they agree with the Enquiry Officer's findings on charge 1, 2, 3, 4 or they do not agree on the findings of Enquiry Officer on such and such charges, and for that no reason/s is/are to be given, and that is what his experience is. Thirdly, some clarifications have been given by the Vice Chancellor only with a view to explain his position because some questions have been raised. He knows as he was in that Syndicate that one of the members of the Syndicate has raised this issue not once but twice, and that member of the Syndicate, who is also sitting in this House. Nonetheless it was not the decision of the Syndicate, rather it was only one member of the Syndicate, and it is not the one member of the Syndicate and he has to quote instances where 5-6 or several members of the Syndicate had raised some issues and requested the Vice Chancellor to look it, but the Vice Chancellor had not bothered to do so. The member of the Syndicate while raising this issue never meant that he (Vice Chancellor) do what is not within his power. In fact, he only wanted him (Vice Chancellor) to enquire into it and see whether justice has been given to the students of that College or not, and to see that the person who is responsible for this is taken to task. He understands that the Controller of Examinations had conveyed to him (Vice Chancellor) that in case somebody has done something wrong while doing something with the examination work, the person concerned could be debarred from the examination work. He wonders why did he not tell him that if it was not to do anything with the powers, then the Controller of Examinations himself could have debarred. Then why Controller of Examinations, the Assistant Registrar (Examinations) could have debarred. After all there is some prescribed authority and some prescribed procedure that whenever they have to take some adverse decision against somebody, at least give him/her an opportunity of hearing to explain his/her conduct. Simply because the Controller of Examinations told him (Vice Chancellor) and he debarred her because he thought that it was in the best interest of the University, and he thought that for the meeting of the Syndicate and the Senate could not be called. He wonders even if he (Vice Chancellor) has taken the action in the best interest of the University, did he not think it proper to bring it to the notice of the Syndicate in its next meeting or to the notice of the Senate in its next meeting for ratification that this has been done by him. Similarly, he (Vice Chancellor) has quoted the salary, etc. case Mr. Chaman Lal Verma. He remembers faintly that in those days, there was a lot of controversy that University rules do not permit for appointing anybody as guest faculty beyond the age of 65 years, and probably, he was beyond the age of 65 years, and he was not appointed. So might be that was the controversy. Let them not go into all those cases at this stage because for moment he (Vice Chancellor) wants to explain there are so many other things, which are going to come up, and let them should

not go into that. Simple agenda before them is that keeping in view the charges levelled and enquired into by the Enquiry Officer, whether this Enquiry Report is to be accepted in its entirety or it is to be rejected in its entirety or if not accepted or rejected in its entirety, has it to be examined charge-wise. How many charges are to be accepted as proved and how many charges are not to be accepted as proved. There is no such provision that they have to accept the Enquiry Report in its complete form or they have to reject it in its complete form. And in his opinion, he suggests that after having discussed the issue in detail before lunch and after having been explained by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal with so much articulation with all kind of legal support, the Enquiry Report be rejected.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that first of all he seeks forgiveness as he does not know the entire issue because he is late. But as said by Shri Ashok Goyal that one of the Syndicate members had raised this issue, it was he (Dr. Talwar), who had raised this issue. He also remembers that about 17-18 students were made to fail and to say that an issue raised by only one member of the Syndicate was accepted by the Vice Chancellor, but when some other issue was raised by more than 1 member (6-7 members), it was not accepted. If an issue was raised by a member and not objected to by the others, it meant the same was unanimously adopted by the Syndicate. It was not that only one member raised the issue and it was accepted on his behalf only; rather, it was accepted on behalf of the Syndicate. If there was any problem, they could have objected to it at that time itself. In fact, it was unanimously accepted at that time and at that time he had said that if a College commits even a small mistake, e.g., makes wrong admission, either a fine of Rs.1 lac or the teacher concerned is debarred. He had definitely proposed that action should be taken against the person if he/she has done something wrong. To be honest, he has not read the Enquiry Report. He is giving his clarification that it was not he alone. He had definitely raised the issue on behalf of the Syndicate and the Syndicate unanimously accepted that issue, and it was approved that if something wrong is found in it, action might be taken against her, but after neither he was a member of any Committee nor he discussed it at any other forum. What is the Enquiry Report, since has not gone through it, he does not know about it, but it is not right to say that all this has been done on the asking of one person. Sometimes even when the issue was raised by 7-8 members, the same was not accepted. Had there been any difference of opinion, the other members might have countered it at that time, but it was passed, and they all are party to it.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that probably, Dr. Dinesh Talwar has come late. In fact, it is the Vice Chancellor who had said that one of the members of the Syndicate had raised this issue in the Syndicate and that is what he is repeating. And he said that he simply endorses that he was in that Syndicate when it was raised, but to say that raising a question by one amounts to resolution by Syndicate, probably if that could have been the situation, then the Vice Chancellor could have stated that it was the Syndicate, which directed him to do so. Secondly, he did not question anything except that if something irregular was found and if she was to be debarred from the examination work, it must have been seen within whose powers it was to debar somebody from examination work even after getting this suggestion from the Controller of Examinations. This is what only he had said.

Professor Rajesh Gill stated that so far as her (Dr. Neelam Paul) promotion case is concerned, she thinks that the Enquiry Report concerns certain charges and one of the major charges is where the Enquiry Officer has termed as serious misconduct relates to misrepresentation of certain facts. She thinks that it would be a repetition by saying as so many people have already said it. They know how the promotion procedure is followed in this University. In this case, if it is taken as her being eligible or ineligible and let her be told whether she is eligible for this post or not. Let them not take it a case of serious misconduct. There are lapses, lacunae and procedural lacunae in the Enquiry Report. Even the charges which have been levelled against her – whether relating to issuance of legal notice or approaching the Chancellor directly or even misrepresentation of facts, so therefore, let them not make it a criminal case against her. Therefore, the report should be immediately rejected on the floor.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he seconds the proposal made by Shri Ashok Goyal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that simply on the saying of somebody, the Enquiry Report could not be rejected.

Professor Ronki Ram stated that he would like to make a request to the members that they had already deferred API score June 2013 to October/November 2014. Certain people were of the opinion that this is a supreme body and it had done this, and some of the friends were suggesting that it should be deferred up to December 2014. Thereafter, they reverted it and they said that their demand could not be met. They had approved several times that they are Central University, but what he means is that it is a responsible body and they all are sitting here, and they should take such a decision which seems to be legitimate in the eyes of the society so that people think that they keep everything transparent and take decisions objectively. They have no intention to harm anybody and had at all no intention to dismiss anybody from the service, but they have to take some hard decision, if they want to take the University to newer heights, and then they have to remove the shortcomings, wherever they are. If anybody commits mistake irrespective of whether he/she is a teacher or non-teacher or whosoever he/she might be, and if he/she accepts his/her mistake, they should have courage to forgive him/her. However, in this case, how could it be possible that either the Enquiry Report is accepted or rejected in its entirety? To accept the Enquiry Report does not mean that she should be hanged, and similarly rejection of the report also does not mean that she should be completely forgiven. The Vice Chancellor had told them as to how the case became lengthy. Something might have happened, and that is why the case is there for the last so many years. If they today decide that she is exonerated, then all the decisions would be taken like this because such cases would continue to come to them. He only wants to say is, as said by Principal N.R. Sharma, that besides them other people are also watching them. First of all, their own conscience is watching them. Therefore, they should take a decision by becoming impartial. Their intention should not be vindictive, and they should not harm anybody. If they try to find a minimum solution, only then they would move forward. They are all colleagues and friends, and they have to see that the University moves forward.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish stated that quite a long discussion had taken place, and as suggested by Shri Rashpal Malhotra, a Committee should be formed. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has discussed the report in detail and made them aware of many things, but since there is difference of opinion amongst the members, he feels that there is still a scope for discussion. Therefore, the consideration of the item should be deferred and another meeting of the Senate should be convened in the month of October. Though all the friends have spoken quite nicely, since it is question of career of somebody, they have to see the merits and demerits of the case as also said by Ms. Anu Chatrath that a Committee should be constituted. However, even if a Committee is constituted, further problems would be there. He feels that if the consideration of the matter is deferred, the members would be able to get one or one and half months more time and the matter should be discussed in the Senate when it would meet in the month of October 2016.

Principal Gurdip Sharma stated that during the discussion, it has been pointed out that there are certain lacunae/technicalities, which they need to discuss, but one thing is crystal clear that there is a defiance of authorities. Therefore, she should not go without warning or censure. Whether they accept this report or reject it, but the signal must go that nobody is allowed to defy the orders of the authorities. If she has to take her right/s, she should have submitted those papers, whenever demanded. He is neither a technical person nor a legal one. Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal has rightly pointed out several lacunae, but it is crystal clear and he is of firm opinion that either she should be warned or censured.

Shri Jarnail Singh stated that all the Hon'ble members have given their opinion on the Enquiry Report of Justice Anand. If they reject the Enquiry Report, it would not only promote indiscipline in the Department but also promote shirkers in the

Department. In his opinion, the report should be accepted and whatever charges for punishment be referred to a Sub-Committee.

Professor Dinesh K. Gupta stated that the matter on which the faculty member was asked to present certain documents as evidence of research papers, the faculty member should have submitted those documents to the Committee. Under what circumstances those documents were not submitted, he (Professor Gupta) is not aware of. However, he is of the opinion that those documents should have been submitted to the Committee and the matter should have been resolved then and there.

Professor R.P. Bambah proposed that they should accept number 4, viz. that she did very improper thing by threatening the Chancellor. So far as numbers 1, 2 and 3 are concerned, they might give her the benefit of doubt.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that means, she has not submitted false papers.

Professor R.P. Bambah said, "No, she has not proved/substantiated her claim and she has not got promotion along with others".

The Vice Chancellor said that she has given that she had not gone to the Conference/s.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that there is difference as she has said that she has participated. What does the participation means? She has sent papers, which have been accepted there and put in the Souvenir. So she might be naïve and ignorant, therefore, she should be given the benefit of doubt as she might have thought that sending/accepting papers is participation. That is why, he is saying that she could be given the benefit of doubt.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that for 1, 2 and 3, a warning could be given to her.

The Vice Chancellor said that this issue (No. 1) could be easily resolved by the UGC. Hence, this could be referred to the UGC.

On a point of order, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that participation means, physical participation, and it does not mean that only the papers were to be sent for presentation in the Conference. She personally feels that if they reject the report, it means that though they are talking since morning about the introspection, the Professors as the teaching faculty must also introspect. In fact, they have to set example/s for their students. They have to present the conduct which is taken as a good conduct, which could be set good example for their students. If they are cheating the authorities for get promotion on the basis of false documents, which are actually not correct, then they are giving/setting wrong precedence.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that she (Dr. Neelam Paul) has mentioned it very clearly that there was no clarity about the requirement/s, and even up to the stage when the candidates appeared for selection, there were umpteen number of cases where members give some API score on their own. He does not want to refer to any particular case, though there are certain cases before him from today's agenda papers also. They in fact give very highly inflated or otherwise they feel it is like that, but the Selection Committee brings it down substantially. It is happening continuously, and there she has said that clarification was not given as to what was the requirement then. There are issues, and he urged that they should not gloss over the issue. They could not catch one word and say hold her guilty and hang her. It could not be done. It has been repeatedly said here. She has pointed out many things that those points have not been discussed by the Hon'ble Judge, who was working as an Enquiry Officer, and he has ignored all those points.

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that she was making a claim, which was to be verified by the Expert Committee, and it was not that she was meeting certain people,

who would argue her case. In his view, she mistakenly thought that this is participation, but the experts did not accept the same, and she did not get anything out of it. In a way, she has already been penalized as they did not accept her claim. Now, to say that her claim is a dishonesty, he thinks is going to hurt her. In fact, people are ignorant. Certain people write articles in the newspapers, including 'The Tribune and The Hindustan Times' and call them research papers and they claim them as such. So the question is that everywhere there is lack of clarity. If somebody is naïve or ignorant, that does not mean he/she is a criminal. He is only giving her the benefit of doubt. Even if she had thought that she could get away with it, she still could not be punished because after all her claim was to be verified by the experts, who know each and every aspect of the matter. He would feel that having got all these, she must get a warning and must also apologize to the Chancellor, but at the same time, they should take slightly a compassionate view that alright she is a colleague, stupid, foolish and might be naïve or ignorant and at the moment, they excuse her giving her the benefit of doubt, but she would definitely not get away with it. She must get a warning and must apologize to the Chancellor because it is an act, which she should not have done.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that his opinion is that in view of the scattered views from all the members, it should be discussed in a very elaborate manner, the way it has already been discussed. He felt that it be deferred or if the Chairperson of the House deems fit anything else, he is authorized.

Dr. R.P.S. Josh said that as said by Professor R.P. Bambah, a chance should be given to her and she be asked to submit the papers within a week. If she submits the papers, then it is okay otherwise her case be rejected. Secondly, as suggested by Professor R.P. Bambah, she should apologize to the Chancellor for issuing the notice. In the meantime, the item could be deferred.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that it is already 4.10 p.m. and they have spent 5-6 hours on this issue and he thinks that they are not reaching a concluding stage. As the report had been sent to all the members, his request to the House is that they should see the report from social, academic, legal angle and the issue be deferred as there are other important issues to be discussed and they should take a decision on those issues also.

Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that he would make a compromise suggestion. There seems to be a general feeling that, she has done something wrong but not so serious as Justice Anand report makes it out to be. Therefore, the question is how they should proceed. If in a House of this size, they go charge by charge, argue for and against, whether or not it is proven or whether it is proven partially, it would not be practical. His suggestion is that they take a decision that based on the report of Justice Anand, they form a small Committee. They do not reject the report. They say that they do not accept it in toto but they are also not rejecting it and on that basis, they form a small Committee to discuss further, to come up with suggestion for further action. They could come up with suggestions of the kind that are being made; that an apology would be sufficient, withholding the promotion would be sufficient. They could not discuss each change one by one as it would be impossible to reach a consensus. So, take the decision that the House, based on the report of Justice Anand, forms a small Committee of Senators to discuss what further action should be taken on the report.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that based on the enquiry report, the Vice-Chancellor as the prescribed authority is willing to give a minor punishment and if he gives the minor punishment, then he could do it without further action. If they want to give a major punishment, then they have to issue show cause notice, then to be replied and again have to discuss it. So, based on the report, the Vice-Chancellor as the prescribed authority agrees to give the minor punishment and the Vice-Chancellor is authorized to pass the orders and it again does not come to the Senate.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he did not think this to be a very viable and legally sustainable course to adopt because once they say that based on the report, the Vice-Chancellor might award the punishment. This is something different. This is holding the person guilty and then passing of the function of the Senate to the

Vice-Chancellor. As he earlier said, the Senate is the appointing and the punishing authority. Have they chosen just to give a minor penalty any time earlier, then there would have been different situation. But here, they have gone through the rigour of it. And there is a view particularly very articulated and strong view of Ambassador I.S. Chadha repeatedly saying that this report has to be accepted and with all the humility he would say that he has totally opposite view on this and this report needs to be rejected and for rejecting the report, he has given the reasons. He has said that the points raised by the lady Professor have not been discussed. Therefore, the report is a fallacious report and it deserves to be rejected. Why they are trying to adopt a different system? He thought that what Professor R.P. Bambah has said in the first suggestion all the suggestions could be validly accepted. If they make a compromise on that suggestion of his, then there is no suggestion which could be accepted. Take the decision whatever. There has been suggestion also that they put it off today and may be in the intervening one month or so the people consider the matter again and if there are tempers that might cool down by then and it would be a different view then. Maybe after having all the discussion, everyone comes to a unanimous view later. But then giving across half cooked idea would not serve the purpose.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is not a technical person. As a student of management, he sees the things that way. This has been discussion so many times and years and they have spent so much energy and time on this issue. Even then they could not do anything. Whatever is to be done, the matter should be closed today itself. His suggestion is that no further action should be taken so that they could devote time for other affairs of the University. Secondly, he favoured the first suggestion of Professor R.P. Bambah. Sufficient is a regret. Today is a regret day as earlier also an issue has been regretted. As suggested by Professor R.P. Bambah, if she regrets to the Chancellor, it should be sufficient and everything would be satisfied and everything would be fine. His feeling is that the matter should not be further extended.

Shri V.K. Sibal said that he wanted to revert back to the suggestion that if report is accepted and consequently the Senate also takes a decision, the punishment to be fined. If that happens, it goes to the prescribed authority and he could do whatever he thinks proper. That would be a best solution otherwise there are very different views.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that she had one query that if she is not given the benefit of the papers which are in dispute, whether she becomes eligible for promotion or not.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the promotion has never been denied to her.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the point, as raised by Ms. Anu Chatrath as also by Professor R.P. Bambah, is that she presented the paper, it is not the issue because when they adopt the API score and take into account the publication that publication is not of presentation. There is no dispute over that. The dispute is that minimum 5 papers should be there and those 5 papers should be published. He wanted to put it on record for the information of the House that the University has taken a decision that if the journals in Music or other similar disciplines are not so reputed having ISSN/ISBN, then they say that if the papers are not published, the papers which have been written/read somewhere could be submitted. Still see the gravity. She was asked to submit the evidence of the papers which were written by her and whichever paper she has written have not been published in any journal. Despite that if she has said that she has submitted the papers, it also becomes a major point that she has tried to mislead the University in addition to the notice given to the Chancellor. She should also regret that she could not submit the papers and making it clear that she has 5 papers. The paper presentation is a separate.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that he wanted to say that after detailed discussion on the report, the Senate felt that based on the report, a warning should be issued to Mrs. Neelam Paul and for further caution in future so that she is more cautious in future before making such claims. The second part, she should be told to withdraw the notice which she has given to the Chancellor. On this condition, if she agrees then, they could finish the matter.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that it should not be based on the report as it would make a different view. As Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said, he is giving an idea that after detailed discussion on the matter, the Senate expresses its unhappiness over this attitude of her and decides that in this particular case after issuing a warning to her or censure or reprimand, the matter be closed. The other matter would remain pending if eligible she gets the promotion and if not, she will not.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that there are two issues in it – one relates to her promotion and the other is disciplinary action. So far as the case of promotion is concerned, it should be left to her academic record which could be decided by the Committee constituted for the purpose in accordance with the UGC rules. If she is eligible, she would get the promotion otherwise not. So far as the other issue of disciplinary action is concerned on which a lot of discussion has taken place and as elaborated by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, since morning the matter is being discussed point-wise. It is not necessary that if a Judge of the High Court has given a report, the same would be 100% correct. Earlier also several cases had come, where such reports were not correct. Therefore, his suggestion is that whatever decision is to be taken, i.e., either warning or censure or anything else, should be taken by the House today itself and the matter should be closed forever.

Dr. Preet Mohinder Pal Singh said that since morning he has been listening to the discussion being held from which it has come out that minor/major punishment could be given as per the provisions of the Panjab University Calendar. He suggested that as per Panjab University Calendar if minor punishment is to be given, but whatever right is due to her, that should also be given to her.

Professor Akhtar Mahmood said that Dr. Neelam Paul had done some irregularity in the Department and she was removed from the Chairperson. She did something while marking the answer sheets and she was debarred from the examination duty. He did not know how many times they would punish a person for the same thing.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Professor Akhtar Mahmood. Dr. Neelam Paul was removed from the Chairpersonship. Again on the issue of evaluation, she was debarred from the examination duties and the period for which she was debarred is already over. Even if there were some charges against her, she had been punished for the same. She could not be punished again and again. When she thought that she was not being listened to, that is why she made a representation to the Chancellor. This issue be closed. So far as her promotion case is concerned, if she is having the required papers, she could get the promotion otherwise not.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that now she should be forgiven.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him pick up and rearticulate what Professor R.P. Bambah has said. They express no opinion on the report – reject or accept. But on the basis of the report after, after having discussion on the report, the person concerned is asked to apologize to the Chancellor and she should also express regret for whatever anguish she caused to the system by not complying to the request made to her to provide the papers as so many Committees have met over the issue. If she does that and thereafter submits her papers, her promotion case would be considered.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he felt that if they say and record and come to a conclusion on behalf of the Senate that she caused anguish to the system, that would be unfair to her. If he (Vice-Chancellor) was suggesting a way out then they could not interpret words and do it. They could simply say that after having discussed the report in detail for 4-5 hours, the Senate feels that she should express regrets over this matter and withdraw the notice given to the Chancellor by her.

At this stage, several members spoke together and pandemonium prevailed.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that if the Senate passed a resolution that she must apologize to the Chancellor, regret to the Vice-Chancellor and withdraw the notice given

to the Chancellor. If she does not do this then she is defying the Senate which is a grave misconduct.

The Vice-Chancellor said that she (Dr. Neelam Paul) has to express regret and withdraw the notice given to the Chancellor. When one of the members suggested that she should also express her regret to the Vice-Chancellor and a couple of members objected to it, the Vice-Chancellor said, okay, she might not express her regret to him rather should regret to the members of the Senate as he is just a small person.

Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang said that she (Dr. Neelam Paul) should express her regret to the Chancellor as he has a dignity.

To this, the Vice-Chancellor enquired what about the dignity of the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, "Sir, what about the dignity of the members of the Senate".

The Vice-Chancellor said, "Alright, she should do whatever she has to do to the Chancellor".

Professor R.P. Bambah said that Dr. Neelam Paul should also express her regret to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that some of the members are not agreeable to this.

Professor R.P. Bambah suggested that Dr. Neelam Paul should apologize to the Chancellor, withdraw the notice given to him and also express regret to the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired what she has said to the Vice-Chancellor for which she is asked to express her regret. By asking her to regret to the Vice-Chancellor also, they are further complicating the matter.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said that when Dr. Neelam Paul had written to the Chancellor, why should she regret to the Vice-Chancellor?

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Neelam Paul had levelled serious allegations against him and his wife.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when the cat is out of the bag, that is why this issue is being raised.

At this stage, on a again a din prevailed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Dr. Neelam Paul did it in February 2016.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that no enquiry has been made to look into those complaints. So, they could not punish her.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that Dr. Neelam Paul should also be cautious.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that Dr. Neelam Paul should regret to the Vice-Chancellor as well as the Chancellor.

Some of the members said, no.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that if they are talking of the regrets this way, then they are accepting all the charges against her.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said, "Pawanji, there is nothing in the enquiry report about those". Since there is nothing there in the enquiry report about those allegations, it does not amount that they are accepting the report.

Professor Rajesh Gill said that they have first to investigate the allegations.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said that then why he (Vice-Chancellor) had become a party.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the Vice-Chancellor has been made a party forcefully.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish requested the members to address to the Chair.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the family of the Vice-Chancellor should not be dragged into this issue. She has seen in the court that if the benefit is given to someone, the Vice-Chancellor is fine to him/her and to those, who do not get the benefit, the Vice-Chancellor is blamed. The family should not be dragged into the academic affairs. She enquired what is the role of Professor Neera Grover in the promotion cases of faculty members? One alleges *mala fide* against a person when a benefit is not given. If Professor Neera Grover is given certain kinds of benefits, only then the mala fide could be against her.

At this stage, a din prevailed.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the torture, harassment, humiliation which the Vice-Chancellor and his family has faced, is not appropriate. To drag the family of the Vice-Chancellor everywhere is also not appropriate. She felt that Dr. Neelam Paul must feel regret for that. Regarding the observation of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal that it amounts to accepting or rejecting the report, she fully agreed with him, but there is nothing in the enquiry report about those allegations. So feeling regret for the allegation which she has levelled against Professor Neera Grover, it does not amount to accepting or rejecting the report.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the members not to have further discussion on his wife in this thing.

At this stage, a din prevailed and the Vice-Chancellor adjourned the meeting for a few minutes.

When the meeting resumed, Ambassador I.S. Chadha said that that he suggests that they resolve that after detailed discussion on the report, the Senate decided to ask Dr. Neelam Paul to apologize to the Chancellor, withdraw the legal notice given to the Chancellor and also to apologize to the Chancellor both for sending the legal notice and the contents of the notice.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that if Dr. Neelam Paul agrees, the matter ends and if not, the matter should be placed before the Senate again.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he wants to say, what has been said by Ambassador I.S. Chadha in the last part, that would not be acceptable, because she should express her regret to the Chancellor and withdraw the legal notice, would be sufficient otherwise for what she would be apologizing if not for the contents of the notice. If they further explain, they would be back to square one.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the moment it is written that the legal notice sent may pleased be treated as withdrawn, the contents are covered in that. At the most, she could be asked to write that the inconvenience caused to all concerned including the office of the Chancellor and the University in the matter is regretted and she apologizes for the same.

After detailed discussion on the enquiry report submitted by Justice Anand, it was –

RESOLVED: That Dr. Neelam Paul, Department of Music, Panjab University, Chandigarh, be directed to apologize to the Chancellor and express regret for the inconvenience caused to all concerned in the University as well as withdraw the legal notice issued to the Chancellor by her lawyer on her behalf.

V. Consideration of following **Items C-3 and C-4 on the agenda** was deferred:

C-3. That the period of re-employment of Dr. V.K. Chopra, Professor of English (Retd.), Department of Evening Studies (**Item C-3**), be curtailed/cut-down from five years.

(Syndicate dated 1.05.2016, Para 3)

NOTE: 1. An Agenda item C-37 was placed before the Senate in its meeting dated 27.3.2016 and the Senate vide Para XXXII (Appendix) has resolved that proper item be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

It was further resolved that till a final decision is taken in the matter, the status quo be maintained.

2. As desired by the Senate a proper item along with an office note (Appendix) was placed before the meeting dated 1.5.2016. The proceedings of the Syndicate meeting are attached (Appendix).

3. A detailed office note enclosed (Appendix).

C-4. To consider the reports of PUCASH and Standing Committee (**Item C-4**) pursuant to the letter/s received from the Chancellor's Office.

(Papers in sealed and closed covers)

VI. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in Item C-5 on the agenda were read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-5. That the following recommendations of the Committee dated 13.07.2016, be approved:

- (i) That UGC 3rd Amendment be adopted with effect from May 4, 2016 and 4th Amendment with effect from July 11, 2016.
- (ii) That as per Para 3, page 22, UGC 4th Amendment, the Dean of University Instruction, Panjab University, be authorized to issue the requisite certificate, signed by the Supervisor(s) and the Chairperson concerned, to the candidates registered for Ph.D. degree in the Panjab University prior to July 11, 2009.
- (iii) In the light of UGC 4th Amendment, a Commerce be constituted to revisit the templates and applications forms for direct recruitment as well as Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) promotions and to suggest modifications.
- (iv) That as the UGC has stipulated in 4th Amendment, under

Category-III at page 25, the marks for Research Publications be given only if the papers are published in either Refereed/Reputed Journals as notified by the UGC, therefore, no teaching post be advertised till UGC comes out/approves the list of notified Journals.

(Syndicate meeting dated 22.7.2016 (Para 3))

VII. Considered the recommendations of the Board of Finance **(Item C-6)** contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 01.08.2016 (Items 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, Item 23(b) for ratification and Items 5, 12, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25 & 26 for information), as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 19.08.2016 (Para 2):

Item 1

That –

1. the Revised Estimates (Non-Plan) of 2016-2017 and other Non-Recurring provisions (as per Appendix I to V) duly recommended by the Estimate Committee, be approved. The summarized position of Non-Plan budget is as below:

(FIGURES IN LAC OF RUPEES)

	NON-PLAN	Actuals	Estimates for the Current year 2016-2017	
		2015-2016	Original	Revised
A	Revenue Receipts	20957.73	21061.38	24951.25
B	Expenditure			
	(i) Employee Cost	36179.51	43040.27	41272.63
	(ii) Other Expenditure	6961.93	8693.04	8938.67
	Total (i & ii)	43141.44	51733.31	50211.30
C	Deficit (Non-Plan) (A-B)	22183.71	30671.93	25260.05
D	Contribution of Government of Punjab			2000.00
E	Net deficit desired to be met by MHRD/UGC			23260.05
F	Uncovered deficit of previous years (Rs.1626.16 lacs for 2014-15 and Rs.2885.85 lacs for 2015-16)			4512.01
G	Total deficit desired to be met by MHRD/ UGC			27772.06

2. fresh appointments in future shall be made only on need basis with due justification after getting the same approved from the Board of Finance.
3. the University should take steps to enhance its revenue from all possible means, specially the income from estates.
4. Wherever possible, savings be affected by resorting to austerity measures.

Item 4

That the amount of subsidy for Youth/Heritage Festival be enhanced from the financial year 2016-2017 as under:

1. Zonal Youth Festival from Rs.1,50,000 to Rs.1,80,000 & Inter Zonal Youth Festival from Rs.7,00,000 to Rs.8,00,000.
2. Zonal Heritage Festival from Rs.50,000 to Rs.80,000 & Inter Zonal Heritage Festival from Rs.3,00,000 to 3,50,000.

Senate Proceedings dated 3rd September 2016

3. Youth Festivals, Seminars, Conferences of Co-Curricular Activities from Rs.32,00,000 to Rs.35,00,000.
4. Heritage Festival from Rs.12,00,000 to Rs.15,00,000.

Item 6

That the case of re-designation of Sh. Amar Nath (Electrician, AC Joshi Library) to that of Jr. Technician/Technician (Grade-II) in pursuance of the decision already taken by the BOF/Syndicate meetings dated 17.10.2012 & 22.12.2012 respectively, be approved as a measure personal to him by ignoring the ratio of 50:30:20 and on vacation of the post (on his retirement or otherwise), this post shall be part of the total cadre of Jr. Technician(Electrician) in the Construction Office, in accordance with the previous decision of the Senate meeting dated 6.12.2009 (circulated by the Estt. Branch vide No. 23826-35/Estt. dated 25.11.2014) with the condition that this should not be quoted as a precedent **(Appendix-XXXIX) (Page 158)**.

NOTE: 1. The service particulars of Shri Amar Nath are as under:

Name	Designation/ Department	Date of Appointment	Pay scale Un revised(UN) Revised (R)	To be designated as	Due date of re-designation/ promotional benefit
Sh. Amar Nath	Electrician, AC Joshi Library, PU	25.9.1996	950-1800(UR) (1.1.1986) 3120-5160(R) (1.1.1996)	Junior Technician (Electrician) (3120- 5160)	25.9.1996 (notionally)
			1200-2130(UR) (1.1.1986) 4020-6200(R) (1.1.1996) 5910-20200 + GP 2400 (1.1.2006)(R) 5910-20200 + GP 2800 (1.12.2011)(R)	Technician (Electrician) Grade-II (4020- 6200)	25.9..2004 to 5.12.2009 (notionally) (after completion of 8 years service 6.12.2009 onwards (as per decision of the senate dated 06.12.2009) (With financial benefits)
			4550-7220 (UR) (1.1.1996) 5910-20200 + GP 3000 (1.1.2006)(R) 10300-34800 = GP 3200 (R)(1.12.2011)	Technician (Electrician) Grade-I 10300- 34800+GP 3200	The Technician Grade-I will only be given to him when a Technician Grade-II (Sh. Raghubir Chand Const. Office) in the main cadre of Electrician having total length of service less than him got the stage of Technician Grade-I

Further the following Electrician working in the departments(other than Const. Office) be merged in the main cadre of Junior Technician (Electrician)(5910-20200+GP 1900) in the Const. Office and they be placed at the

tail in the present seniority i.e. after the last appointed/promoted Junior Tech.(Electrician) namely Sh. Sulinder Singh in the Const. Office.

Name of Employee	Department	Date of Joining
Sh. Narinder Paul	PU Ext. Lib. Ludhiana	3.7.2009
Sh. Balwinder Singh	VVBIS&IS Hoshiarpur	10.7.2009
Sh. Kundan Rajak	Construction Office	13.12.2013
Sh. Sunil	Laws	24.12.2013
Sh. Sushil Kumar	Dental College	25.2.2014

Financial Liabilities : Rs. 1,04,960/-(approx.)

2. On the circulation of the above orders, the Audit observed that in the decision of the BOF meeting dated 17.10.2012, there is no mention for giving the re-designation to the employee on the basis of service span i.e. 8 years or by ignoring the ratio of 50:30:20 and desired that this should be got approved from the same competent authority at the first instance.
3. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 4.11.2012, on the recommendations of the BOF (meeting dated 4.11.2012) already resolved that Sh. Amar Nath, Electrician be re-designated in the scale of Technician Grade-III, II & I as per Punjab Govt. Notification No. 7/1/97-FPI-7370 dated 19.5.1998 already adopted in the case of re-designation of skilled & Semi-Skilled Staff working in the Works Department w.e.f. 1.1.1996 (notionally) & w.e.f. 6.12.2009 (with financial benefits) (the date on which the Senate has approved).
4. The Punjab Govt. in their Notification No. 7/1/97-FPI-7370 dated 19.5.1998 (**Appendix-XL) (Page-159 to 162)**), as stated above, has given the re-designation of Technician Grade -III , II & I to their employees in the ratio of 50:30:20 as there are many slots of posts are available. But in the present case, the ratio of 50:30:20 has not been implemented being a single/isolated post in the University (other than main cadre of Electrician in the Const. Office). Therefore, it has been decided to re-designate him as Technician -III, II and I by ignoring the ratio of 50:30:20 and by counting his service span of 8 years as is being followed in the case of Laboratory Technician Group-IV, III , II & I in the University.
5. The above case was discussed in the meetings of the Board of Finance dated 17.08.2015 & 15.02.2016 vide Agenda Item No.14 & 23, respectively in which it was resolved that a clarification be sought from the Punjab Govt. as to how the formula of ratio of 50:30:20 is to be applied in case where there is single post in a cadre. In pursuance of that the office received information from the Punjab Govt. vide letter No. 7/15/16-1FP1/698474/1 dated 26.02.2016 (**Appendix - XLI) (Page-163)**) has clarified that:

“The Technicians were placed in the ratio of 50:30:20 in accordance with the report of 4th Pay Commission. In the 5th Pay Commission, only Conversion Table is issued and none of the particular category was divided in the ratio. But the scales are given by the Cabinet Sub-Committee to the Junior Technicians & Technicians Grade – II & I and they were not divided into the ratio of 50:30:20, therefore it is advised to administrative offices that such posts will not be divided in the ratio as per recommendations of the 5th Pay Commission.”

Item 8

That the appointment of Dr. Anil Pareek, President, Medical and Clinical Research, IPCA Laboratories Ltd., Mumbai as Special Advisor (Honorary) for the Bio-Medico-Pharma Research for a tenure of 5 years with the following annual budget provision from the financial year 2016-2017 be approved **(Appendix- XLIII) (Page-169):**

Sr. No	Budget Head	Cost (Rs.) per visit	Cost (Rs.) per year
1.	Travel by Air India (Mumbai to Chandigarh to and fro) @ 20,000/- X 4 times in year	20,000	80,000
2.	Accommodation in the University Guest House @ Rs.250/- for 7 days X 4 times in year	1,750	7,000
3.	Honorarium for five sessions @ Rs.4,000/- X 4 = 16,000/- per visit X 4 times in year	16,000	64,000
	Total tentative expenditure per year (4 visits)	37,750	1,51,000
	Total tentative expenditure for five years (1,51,000/- per year X 5 years)		7,55,000

Item 9

That the latest Punjab Government rates with regard to stitching charges as well as purchase of cloth for Uniform be adopted in toto and accordingly the rates of the stitching charges as well as purchase of cloth of Uniform of the Class ‘C’ employees of Panjab University, be revised and the following colour scheme of uniform as proposed by the ‘C’ class association be also approved. It shall take effect from the date of decision of the competent authority:

Sr. No	Item	Old Existing Color	New Approved Color
1.	Pant	Khaki	Navy Blue
2.	Shirt	Khaki	Sky Blue

Additional financial liability Rs. 8.00 lac p.a. (approx.)

Item 11

That the provision of General Administration sub-head Temporary Establishment/Contractual Services/ Hiring Services/Out sourcing/Casual workers be enhanced from Rs.3,50,00,000 to Rs.14,71,75,800.

Financial Liabilities : NIL

- NOTE:** (i) Clerks/Accountant/Physiotherapist, Peon/ Helpers as per **(Appendix-L) (Page-186)**, have been appointed on daily wage/contract basis against the provision of vacant sanctioned posts. The Salary of such persons are being charged to the budget head-Temporary Establishment/Contractual Services/Hiring Services/Outsourcing/ Casual Workers.
- (ii) The provision of such vacant sanction posts has not been included in the revised estimate of 2016-2017.

Item 14

That the teaching as well as Non-teaching employees working in the vacation departments of the University may be granted Mobile Allowance during the period of vacations except in those cases where the employees goes on Ex-India leave for their personal work. During such period mobile allowance shall not be admissible.

- NOTE:** (i) The Panjab University sanctioned the Mobile Allowance to all the University employees w.e.f. 01.10.2011 in terms of Punjab Govt. Notification No.3/28/2011-4FP/612 dated 03.10.2011.
- (ii) The University also adopted the Punjab Govt. Notification No.23/3/2012-4/FP-II/502 dated 18.10.2012 whereby following clarification was furnished:

“in case of employee remain on LTC or leave for 10 days or more (other than Casual Leave), then he/she shall not be entitled for Mobile Allowance for that period.”

- (iii) The RAO vide letter No.RAO/2013/668, dated 10.12.2013 has requested to adopt the Punjab Govt. Notification No. 23/3/2012-4FP2/387 dated 16.08.2013 to the employees of Panjab University as the Mobile Allowance is being granted by the Panjab University on Punjab Govt. pattern.
- (iv) The Committee dated 16.07.2014 constituted by the Vice Chancellor in respect of admissibility of Mobile Allowance to the Officers/Officials working during vacations in Departments/ Centres/ Institutes/ Constituent Colleges in view of Punjab Govt. Notification No. 23/3/2012-4FP2/ 387 dated 16.08.2013 recommended that:

“Since the nature of work in the University set up is distinct and different than that of the Education Department of the Punjab Government, it would be counterproductive if the Mobile Allowance to the employees during the period of vacations is discontinued. Hence, the teaching as well as Non-Teaching employees working in the vacation departments of the University may

be granted Mobile Allowance during the period of vacations except in those cases where the employees goes on Ex-India leave for their personal work. During such period Mobile Allowance shall not be admissible.”

- (v) The matter was put up before the Board of Finance in its meeting held on 5.9.2014, vide Agenda Item No.8, and it was decided **that practice being followed regarding payment of Mobile Allowance to the teachers/ employees during vacations be confirmed from other Universities of Punjab at the first instance and matter be brought before the Board of Finance thereafter (Appendix-LVIII) (Page 205-206).**

- (vi) In pursuance of the decision of the Board of Finance, the following neighbouring Universities situated in the Punjab were requested in respect of clarification regarding admissibility of Mobile Allowance during vacation in the Departments, Institutes, Centres, etc. in their Universities and they replied as under:

1. The Deputy Registrar, HRD, Punjab Technical University, Jalandhar vide letter No.PTU/DR/HRD/7076 dated 10.3.2015 informed that:

“that Punjab Technical University has never adopted the Punjab Govt. Notification No.23/3/2012-4FP2/387 dated 16.8.2013 for its employees” (Appendix -LIX) (Page 207).

2. Superintendent (Budget), Punjab Agriculture University, Ludhiana vide E-mail dated 8 & 9 July,2015 informed that:

“Punjab Agriculture University has granted the Mobile Allowance to its employees (teaching/non-teaching) on the pattern of Punjab Government. So far as the Notification No.23/3/2012-4FP.2/387 dated 19.8.2013, it is clarified that the Punjab Agriculture University, Ludhiana is a research institute and there is no provision of vacations for the teachers and employees of the P.A.U. Therefore, the Punjab Govt. notification dated 16.8.2013 is not applicable in the Punjab Agriculture University”. (Appendix-LX) (Page 208).

3. Deputy Registrar (Accounts), Punjabi University, Patiala vide letter No.1502 dated 3.5.2016 informed that:

“The Syndicate in its meeting dated 29.3.2016, Para No.15.85 has allowed to adopt the Punjab Govt. Notification No. No.23/3/2012-4 FP2/387 dated 16.8.2013 and clarified that “in case of employee

remain on LTC or leave for 10 days or more (other than Casual Leave), and the employees who are continue on vacations then he/she shall not be entitled for Mobile Allowance for that period” (Appendix-LXI) (Page 209).

4. Assistant Registrar (Accounts), Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar vide letter No.3406/A dated 4.5.2016 informed that

“that Guru Nanak Dev University has adopted the Punjab Govt. Notification No.23/3/2012-4 FP2/387 dated 16.8.2013 in toto as per terms and conditions laid down to its employees” (Appendix-LXII) (Page 210).

Item 15

That the honorarium of Rs.2500/-p.m. being paid to the ‘Photographer on call’ in the Public Relation Department of Panjab University be enhanced to Rs.5000/-p.m.

Additional Financial liability : 30,000/-per annum

NOTE: The Board of Finance at its meeting held on 17.2.2012, sanctioned the provision of Rs.30,000/-for honorarium to Photographer on call @ 2500/-p.m. in Public Relation Department.

Item 17

That the amount of Honorarium to be paid to a faculty member assigned with the responsibility to supervise the Refrigeration Equipment Repairs Unit (RERU) of Department of Chemical Engineering & Technology be enhanced from Rs.800/-p.m. (fixed) to Rs.2500/- p.m. (fixed).

NOTE: The provision of honorarium paid to a faculty member was enhanced to Rs.800/- p.m. (fixed) during 1999.

Item 18

That the following facilities be provided to the eminent persons to be invited for heading the prestigious chairs from ‘Foundation for Higher Education & Research Fund’:

Sr. No.	Name of Chairs	Facilities
1.	Dr. Manmohan Singh Chair Professor in Economics	1. Business Class Air-fare
2.	Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair Professor in Public Administration	2. Car with driver (if there is requirement).
3.	Mahatma Gandhi Chair Professor	
4.	Rajiv Gandhi Chair Professor in Contemporary Studies	3. Accommodation in a Hotel/P.U. Guest House (as per requirement).
5.	Jawahar Lal Nehru Chair Professor in Technology	
6.	Sri Aurobindo Chair Professor in Philosophy	4. Honorarium @ Rs.5,000/- per day.
7.	B.R. Ambedkar Chair Professor in Political Science	5. Besides above, suitable fare

8.	Tagore Professor of Indian Literature	and hospitality be also provided for an attendant (if there is a requirement).
----	---------------------------------------	--

NOTE: The Syndicate at its meeting held on 20.09.2015 approved the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee dated 25.08.2015:

“that the above prestigious Chairs be such that very eminent persons from different walks of life, whose interaction with the University would add to the intellectual capital/social responsibility of the University, to visit the University for suitable intervals to interact with the students, faculty and other members of the University. They would occupy the chairs for a short duration. These chairs be not earmarked for any subject or department; they should be treated as University Chairs for the whole University. Such invited persons should be provided facilities, like, accommodation, air-fare, University transport, besides, honorarium. The Committee urged the Vice Chancellor to explore the possibility of inviting eminent people on these prestigious Chairs in near future. The budgetary provision for these Chairs be made out of the ‘Foundation for Higher Education in Research.’”

Item 23

(B) To note the action taken by the Vice Chancellor :

- (I) in anticipation of the approval of the Board of Finance/ Syndicate/Senate approving the following recommendation of the Committee dated 27.01.2016 constituted by the Registrar **(Appendix-LXXV)(Page 415 - 416)** to look into the issue of promotion of Lab. & Technical Staff (Group-IV & Group-III) in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology from the financial year 2016-17 as below:
- A. Out of six (06) vacant posts of Programming Assistant, five posts of the Programming Assistant in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3800 with initial pay of Rs.14590/-be converted to Junior Technician (Group-III) in the identical pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP 3800 with initial pay of Rs.14590/-(as there will be no additional financial liability).
 - B. Out of eight (08) vacant posts of Senior Technician (G-II), three (03) posts of Senior Technician (G-II) in the pay-scale of Rs.10300-34800+GP 4400 with initial pay of Rs.17420/-be converted to that of Junior Technician (G-III) in the pay scale of Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3800 with initial pay of Rs.14590/-.

Thus the total number of Post of Junior Technician (Group – III) will be increased from two (2) to Ten (10) in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology for the promotional avenues of the Laboratory and Technical Staff in Group – IV category in the UIET without involving any financial liability.

Furthermore as a result of A and B above, out of Twenty Five (25) vacant posts of Group – IV, Eight (08) posts of Junior Technician (Group-IV) in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology will also be abolished. Therefore after abolition of Eight posts of Junior Technician (Group – IV) in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology, the total sanctioned strength of Group – IV in the University Institute of Engineering & Technology will be Fifty posts instead of Fifty Eight posts.

NOTE: (i) As per budget estimates 2015- 2016, the position of filled and vacant posts of Technical posts existing in U.I.E.T. at Chandigarh as under:

UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY				
Sanctioned Posts as per budget Estimates 2015-16	Sanctioned Strength	Filled	Vacant	Remarks
System Manager Rs.15600-39100 + GP 7600	1	1	..	
Sr. Workshop Superintendent Rs.15600-39100 + GP 7600	1	..	1	
Programmers Rs.15600-39100 + GP 5400	6	6	..	
Workshop Instructor Rs.10300-34800 + GP 5000	8	7	1	
Technical Officer Rs.10300-34800 + GP 5000	6	4	2	
Programming Assistant Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3800	10	4	6	Out of 6 vacant posts of Programming Assistants, Five posts be converted to that of Junior Technicians (G-III).
Sr. Technicians/A.T.O. (Group-II) Rs.10300-34800 + GP 4400	28	20	8	Out of 8 vacant posts of Sr. Technicians/A.T.O., Three vacant posts be converted to that of Junior Technicians (G-III).
Jr. Technicians (Group - III) Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3800	2	2	..	
Jr. Technicians/Workshop Attendants (Group - IV) Rs.10300-34800 + GP 3200/ 3600	58	33	25	Out of 25 Vacant posts of Junior Technicians (G-IV) Eight posts of Junior Technicians (G-IV) will be abolished.

(ii) An office order issued in this regard vide letter No.3720-24/Estt. dated 11.03.2016 is available as **(Appendix-LXXVI) (Page 417)**.

(II) in sanctioning Honorarium (including the transportation charges) to Prof. Meenakshi Malhotra, University Business School, @ Rs. 4000/- p.m. w.e.f 16.11.2015 for holding the additional charge of the post of Chief Vigilance Officer.

- NOTE:** 1. The Senate in its meeting dated 27.9.2015 (Para C-35, Item No.16), on the recommendations of the BOF/ Syndicate meetings dated 17.8.2015 & 30.8.2015, respectively has sanctioned/ revised the honorarium (including the transportation charges to the following officers as mentioned against each w.e.f. 6.4.2015:

Sr. No.	Designation	Existing Honorarium (p.m.)	Revised Honorarium (p.m.)
1	Dean University Instructions	Rs.2000/-	Rs.5000/-
2	Dean Research	Rs.2000/-	Rs.4000/-
3	Dean Students Welfare(Men& Women)	Rs.2000/-	Rs.3500/- each
4	Dean International Students	Rs.2000/-	Rs.3000/-
5	Dean Alumni Relations	Rs.2000/-	Rs.3000/-
6	Wardens	Rs.1000/-	Rs.2500/- each
7	Advisor & Secretary to Vice Chancellor	NIL	Rs.3000/-
8	N.S.S. Programme Coordinator	NIL	Rs.2500/-
9	Chief of University Security	NIL	Rs.2500/-
10	Director (IQAC)	NIL	Rs.3500/-
11	Associate Director/Secretary (IQAC)	NIL	Rs.2500/-

2. A detail office note is available as per **(Appendix-LXXVII) (Page 418 to 420)**.

Item 5

To note that the increase in the limit of present honorarium of Rs.50000/- p.m. to Rs.80,000/- p.m. payable to a person appointed as visiting Professor from outside the country, and of Rs.40,000/- per month to Rs.60,000/- p.m. payable to the superannuated persons appointed as Visiting Professor from within country is not recommended.

Item 12

To note that after considering the assurance given by Shri Jatinder Yadav, IAS, his proposal has been agreed to, that the U.T. Administration had already deputed additional staff (Auditors) and strengthened the system for conducting the pre and post audit of the University Accounts and, therefore, the team of Local Audit Department, Chandigarh be allowed to carry out the same and there is no need to extend the term of IPAI.

Item 16

To note that an opinion be sought from the UGC on the case of pay fixation of Dr P.S. Sandhu, Colonel (Retired), Secretary to Vice Chancellor after giving them all possible options.

Item 19

To note that the cases of Pensioners for grant of benefit of addition in qualifying service under Panjab University Employee Pension Regulation 3.9 as per **(Appendix - LXVIII) (Page 229 to 241)**, be sent to the Special Secretary Finance, U.T. Chandigarh to consider the same on merit, keeping in view the recommendation of the University for each such individual case as well as the Panjab University Pension Regulations. If need be, a joint meeting could also be convened.

Item 20

To note that University should again send a reply to the CAG in the light of discussions with all supporting documents to settle the para. Till then the status quo be maintained on the issue of admissibility of Secretariat Pay to the Ministerial cadre of Panjab University (in terms of Punjab Govt. Notification issued from time to time) in view of observations of the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, Office of the Principal Director of Audit (Central), Chandigarh in respect of Audit Para "Irregular payment of Secretariat pay to University employees Rs.8.72 crore".

Item 21

To note that the proposed promotion policy (along with justification) for Dental College be sent to the UGC for its concurrence. Further it has been agreed to, that Prof. Navdeep Goyal and Prof. Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Ajay Ranga would pursue this matter on behalf of the Panjab University.

Item 22

Noted and ratified the recommendations of the Screening Committees constituted by the Vice Chancellor, with regard to Screening and review of the applications of promotion (by applying capping on API score as per UGC 2nd Amendment) of Teachers who had already been promoted under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) from 24.07.2013 onwards (without applying Capping on API), in view of letter dated 06.04.2016 of UGC as per **(Appendix- LXXII) (Page 361 to 398)**.

Item 24

To note that the comments of the MHRD be sought on the issue of grant of higher start to Col. G.S. Chadha, Registrar, by granting two increments on the minimum of the pay of Rs.43000 +GP Rs.10000 in the pay band of Rs.37400-67000 w.e.f. the date of joining, by giving comprehensive detail of the case.

Item 25

To note that the issue of fixing the revised pay of all the Professors appointed by direct selection at a stage not below Rs.43000/- in the Pay Band IV of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP 10000 in terms of Clause 4.0 of schedule for clause 6.8.0. of UGC Regulations on minimum qualifications for appointment of Teachers and Academic Staff in University, be again referred to UGC along with the reply of the UGC as posted on CPGRAMS for its formal approval.

Item 26

To note that the matter with regard to provision for payment of Honorarium @ Rs.3000/- p.m. to the Associate Dean of Student Welfare, be sent to MHRD for their comments.

(Minutes of Board of Finance dated 01.08.2016 available in separate volume)

Professor R.P. Bambah stated that he would like to express his own opinion and also wants the Senate to express its appreciation to the great efforts made by the Vice Chancellor, which he has been making for getting the funds to the University so that the salaries and pension is paid to the employees and the pensioners in time. They should also express their gratitude for Shri Satya Pal Jain for extending all kinds of help. They should also put on record the moral support extended by Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal intervened to say that he does not claim anything.

Continuing, Professor R.P. Bambah stated that Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal had said that he would go along with them. Secondly, he would also like to put on record the great efforts made by the Vice Chancellor to create interaction between the students and the faculty and to the best minds in the country. They have now Professor Yoginder K. Alagh, on earlier occasions Dr. Ashok Sen, Professor Manjul Bhargava, have visited, recently Shri Gulzar came and in near future Ms. Ela Bhatt would come. These are very positive developments which have recently been made in the University. There is something about the Chairs in the Budget and it should be understood that the accommodation provided to these persons also include boarding as they should not charge them for the food, etc. If they did not include boarding, the audit might object to it.

Referring to Sub-Item 6, Shri V.K. Sibal pointed out that it is an unusual recommendation and is personal measure to the person, which is outside the policy. It has also been written that this should not be quoted as a precedent because it looks as if the persons similarly placed would not get this benefit.

When the Vice Chancellor asked the Finance & Development Officer to explain, Shri Ashok Goyal said that a new practice has been introduced. Where the Vice Chancellor is to address the Senate, the officers of the University is addressing to the Senate. At least they should maintain decorum up to some extent.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a small technicality. Otherwise, the Finance & Development Officer would give the explanation in writing to him and he would read the same for them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that alright, this time they could allow the Finance & Development Officer to explain, but in future it should be kept in mind.

It was clarified that, as has been rightly pointed out, it was a very special circumstance and unusual also as long time back the technical cadre was merged with a cadre, but these 4-5 persons, who were working in different departments, could not be merged. Now, they were merging them in said cadre as per rules, but they have to be placed below the last person in that cadre. Hence, this person for whom the exemption is being granted has to lose his seniority in the previous cadre. The matter was thoroughly discussed in the meeting of the Board of Finance and keeping in view the peculiar circumstances, the Board agreed to this special arrangement. So far as other persons are concerned, they are not suffering on any account.

Referring to Sub-Item 8, Professor Akhtar Mahmood pointed out that Dr. Anil Pareek is being appointed as a Special Advisor (Honorary) for the Bio-Medico-Pharma Research. He enquired as to what does it mean? According to him, it is a wrong terminology 'Bio-Medico-Pharma'. He enquired as to what Dr. Anil is supposed to do in this University?

The Vice Chancellor clarified that this is a proposal from University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences. After discussion with the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Professor O.P. Katare, Director, Research has opined that his (Dr. Anil Pareek) association with the University would help would promote the outreach of the University in this field with the industry. There would be cross flow of their people, including students, from various disciplines, as they would be able to go and work with them and so on and so fourth, and he would also come here and interact. This matter was highly appreciated when the discussion came in the meeting of the Board of Finance. So this is a proposal from the Director, Research Promotion Cell, which he has given after talking to all his colleagues. So in a sense, the Proposal has come from one of the oldest professional institutions of the University.

Ms. Anu Chatrath enquired as to which post is held by Col. P.S. Sandhu? Is he Private Secretary to the Vice Chancellor?

The Vice Chancellor said that he is Secretary to the Vice Chancellor (SVC).

Ms. Anu Chatrath enquired in which capacity he is attending/participating in the meetings of the Committee and also the meetings of the Board of Finance? Because she is not able to digest and understand that a person, who is just appointed as a Personal Secretary to the Vice Chancellor, his job is not sit in the meetings of the elected bodies and he should also not be member of any Committee as he is not holding any post. He is just holding a post in his (Vice Chancellor) office and his job is to assist him in his official work.

Dr. Lilu Ram said that he also supports the views expressed by Ms. Anu Chatrath because this is a case where all of them should agree.

Ms. Anu Chatrath requested the Vice Chancellor to see to it because he is not holding any post.

The Vice Chancellor said, "alright, he has noted it".

Shri Ashok Goyal, "No Sir". It is not a question of noting. He stated that he endorses 100% what Ms Anu Chatrath has said. It is not only sitting in the meeting/s of the Board of Finance. It was pointed out three years earlier also that the Vice Chancellor while constituting the Committee/s must look into as to who are the ones, who are entitled to be the members of the Committee/s. So much so there are certain Committees where the Secretary to Vice Chancellor has been made the Chairman of the Committees. There are so many Academic Committees where the Secretary to Vice Chancellor has been made the member of the Committees. And the Secretary to the Vice Chancellor visits various Departments to represent the Vice Chancellor to know as to what is happening in the Department/s.

The Vice Chancellor said that not in academic matters.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said, "in academic matters". If he is saying, he is saying with full responsibility. He requested the Vice Chancellor to look into it and see that it does not happen.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that he only sends him to see construction jobs in Departments, bath rooms, toilets in Hostels, Guest Houses, etc.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that also, he should go and report.

The Vice Chancellor said that since he could not go everywhere, he sends him (SVC).

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then he (Vice Chancellor) should send some other officer because Ms. Anu Chatrath is right that he (SVC) is only to perform his duties in his office. He is only there to assist him (Vice Chancellor) for secretarial assistance in the office of the Vice Chancellor. In fact, he is sent to the affiliated Colleges also and he knows at least one such College.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (SVC) has not gone to any College as a member of the Inspection Committee or so.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired in which capacity he (SVC) is visiting the affiliated Colleges?

Ms. Anu Chatrath pointed out that he (SVC) visited Homoeopathic College & Hospital, Sector 26, Chandigarh, as a member of the Committee which was supposed to suggest promotion.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not sent him (SVC) as a member, it may be checked.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that she (Anu Chatrath) is right, he (SVC) is a member of one of the Committees constituted to look into the promotion cases of Homoeopathic College & Hospital.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would check it up.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, “anyway”, please ensure that he (SVC) is not member of any of the Committee which are functioning in the University.

The Vice Chancellor said, “Okay Fine, the point is well taken”.

Referring to Sub-Item 20, Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha, after going through the Item, stated that before 01.01.1978 the pay-scales of Panjab University Non-Teaching employees were higher than the Punjab Government. Citing an example, he said that the pay-scale of Clerks of Panjab University was Rs.120-300, whereas the pay-scale of Clerks in the Punjab Government was Rs.110-200. Similarly, the pay-scale of peons of Panjab University was Rs.70-100, whereas the pay-scale of Clerks in the Punjab Government was Rs.70-95. In the same manner, the pay-scale of Assistants and Stenographers of Panjab University was Rs.250-425, however, the pay-scale of their counterparts in the Punjab Government was Rs.200-450. Thereafter, the Punjab Government pointed out that the pay-scales of Panjab University is higher due to which they are facing problem in the Government, and from then onwards a parity was asked to be maintained. Resultantly, the pay-scales in the Panjab University were brought down, e.g., the starting/initial pay-scale of Clerks was brought down from Rs.120 to Rs.110. Thereafter, again on 6.03.1980 in the meeting of Board of Finance (Item 9), Shri S.N. Pandita, Joint Secretary, IAS, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Education and Culture, Government of India, New Delhi, Shri R.P. Ohja, IAS, Commissioner for Finance and Secretary to Government of Punjab, Chandigarh and Shri Ram Gopal, IAS, Finance Secretary, Chandigarh, all these representatives of the Governments accepted that the University employees would be given pay-scales equal to the employees of Punjab Civil Secretariat. And in that it was written “that in terms of the Punjab Civil Services (Revised Scales of Pay) Rules, 1979 and the recommendations of the Committee at Appendix-V, the scales of pay attached to the various posts with nomenclatures/pay-scales in common with the Punjab Civil Secretariat in the ministerial establishment as also Office Superintendents, P.As. and Senior Scale Stenographers, etc. in the University be also revised with effect from 01.01.1978 in the manner provided (as for the Punjab Civil Secretariat) as per the said Notification including payment of arrears on that account and the fixation of pay be done in accordance with the orders issued by the Punjab Government from time to time”. Recently, the audit has objected that the Special Pay being given to the University employees should be withdrawn and the excess account paid to them should be recovered, which is totally wrong. The senior University employees allowed reduction in their pay-scales. They sacrificed only because they thought that the younger generation should not suffer and whatever is available to the employees of the Punjab Civil Secretariat should automatically be given to them. Although the Governments, including Secretaries, change as also the employees, but they should maintain the parity and he would like to thank all those, who have pleaded in their favour in the meeting of the Board of Finance. Now, the consideration of the item has been deferred till the next meeting of the Board of Finance. In the end, he requested the House, members of the Board of Finance, the Vice Chancellor and the Registrar to extend all kinds of help to get this audit para settled, and it should be seen that the Secretariat Pay should not be withdrawn at any cost.

On a point of order, Ms. Anu Chatrath said that, keeping in view all the facts pointed out by Shri Ravinder Mohan Trikha, they had taken a decision in the meeting of the Board of Finance that the University would make a detailed reply, mentioning all the facts, to them to get this audit para settled. She thinks that for giving the reply and getting the audit para settled, all are one.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Finance & Development Officer to send a copy of the reply to all the members of the Senate through e-mail, and if there is any lacuna left, the same should be pointed out so that they could make a resubmission.

On a point of order, Dr. Dinesh Talwar enquired if the Board of Finance has deferred an item, could the Senate not ratify the same? If it is a genuine item, it should be approved as the recommendations of the Board of Finance are to be ultimately considered by the Senate, being a superior body.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that since it is a financial matter, unless and until it is approved by the Board of Finance, they (Senate) could not do anything. When Dr. Dinesh Talwar further pleaded, the Vice Chancellor said that if they asked the University to recover the excess amount, they do not have any authority nor to recover the amount; otherwise, they might stop releasing the grant to the University.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations of the Board of Finance contained in the minutes of its meeting dated 01.08.2016 (Items 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, Item 23(b) for ratification and Items 5, 12, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25 & 26 for information), as endorsed by the Syndicate dated 19.08.2016 (Para 2), be approved.

VIII. The recommendations of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-7 on the agenda** were read out, viz. –

C-7. That –

- (1) opening of two new P.U. Constituent Colleges at Ferozepur and Dharamkot (Moga) w.e.f. the session 2016-17;
- (2) the admissions to these Colleges for the session 2016-17 be made in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

NOTE: (i) The last date for admissions to these Colleges has been extended up to 31st August, 2016.

(ii) The Vice-Chancellor has been authorized to grant all the related approvals for these Colleges, on behalf of the Syndicate.

(iii) The Vice-Chancellor has also been authorized to grant approval of admissions on case to case basis in other Colleges up to 31st August, 2016, on behalf of the Syndicate.

(Syndicate meeting dated 19.8.2016, Para 3)

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that since they had already taken a decision, this item should not have come for consideration. As he was looking at the inspection report (page 42), 5 members of the Syndicate had visited these Colleges and in the report it is mentioned that neither the infrastructure nor the building was there. But anyhow, he understood that there is some compulsion from the Government. He wanted to point out the financial viewpoint. As far as the Constituent Colleges are concerned, as the Vice-Chancellor had also pointed out in the meeting with the CM, that the expenditure is about Rs.9.69 crore and the revenue is only Rs.2.6 crore meaning thereby that they are running short of about Rs.8 crore. Earlier, the Government had agreed to give Rs.1.5 crore each College but now the University wanted to raise it to Rs.2 crore. Even to that provision, 10% should be added every year. Under the compulsion they have to start these Colleges. But when the 4 Constituent Colleges were started earlier, at that time also, he had raised the issue that it would be liability to the University. The problem is that the 7th Pay Commission is coming up and they were asking for 10% increase which meant that the Government would stick to only 10% increase. If the Government is giving Rs.8 crore, 10% of which is Rs.8,00,000/- whereas the salaries would increase by

25%. The Punjab Government had already frozen the grant to the University at Rs.20 crore. In the times to come if they have to make the recruitment and once the employment has been made, those persons would become the employees of Panjab University, the liability would increase. His proposal is that everything should be in black and white and no question of 10 or 20%, they could have an agreement with the Punjab Government that whatever is deficit on these Colleges, that should be met by the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they have not given up that stand. When the 4 Constituent Colleges were started, the grant was of Rs.1.5 crore per College. He had met the Education Minister, Mr. Rakhra and got it recorded that it is the responsibility of the Punjab Government to make available all the money for these Colleges. At the moment it is Rs.2 crore and 10% increase was asked in the sense that the Punjab Government must make a provision in the Punjab Government budget estimates every year that at least 10% should be increased. Whenever the 7th Pay Commission is implemented it would be more than 10% which the Punjab Government would have to pay. Till date the 7th Pay Commission report has not come and he could not force the Punjab Government that in anticipation of 7th Pay Commission, a provision should be made.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that instead of fixing the percentage, the total responsibility for the expenditure on these Constituent Colleges should be of the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Government has to give all the money and the Colleges had been opened only on that premise.

Professor Karamjeet Singh said that there is no MoU signed for these Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could pass a resolution in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he thought that it was decided in the Syndicate that a MoU must be signed with the Punjab Government that they undertake to bear all the recurring expenses of these Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would prepare a draft and send the same to the Government. He had personally got such things recorded which were not there earlier. It would be recorded in today's minutes. It is already recorded in the Board of Finance that taking the year 2013-14 as the base year, they must ask 12% increase from every quarter, so that at least 12% should be increased every year by Punjab Government as well, effective from 2013-14. This is the minimum requirement that they are asking from the Government(s). He would write a letter to the Punjab Government.

Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal said that he could not understand that what the Punjab Government is giving only Rs.20 crore. It should have been much more than that, as per the ratio of 40%, even that money is not being paid by the Punjab Government, whereas the understanding was that they would give the grant to the University which was their share as per the Reorganization Act of 1966. The Punjab Government has not kept that promise. Since it is the duty of the Government to open the Government Colleges why the Punjab Government is asking the University to open Constituent Colleges? He did not really understand the rationale behind this as to why the Punjab Government is asking the University. At some stage, it would become a problem for the University. Whether it is the Government Colleges or the aided Colleges, the function of the University is to grant the affiliation, inspection as for other Colleges. If the Constituent Colleges are to be opened, it would become a responsibility of the University and could not keep it in the lurch. If the Constituent Colleges are not taken care of by the Punjab Government, the University could not say that they would do nothing for these Colleges because these would be the Constituent Colleges of the University. His opinion is that why it is being done by the Government. There should be no deficiency on the part of the University that later on it becomes a problem for it. If the Government could say that the total financing of these Colleges would be done by

them and these would be known as Constituent Colleges of the University, then it could be fine. Otherwise they should think over it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that for the information of Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, he would like to say that all these apprehensions were expressed in the Syndicate. He has no hesitation in expressing that for whatever reason, they have gone out of the way to allow these Colleges to function as Constituent Colleges of Panjab University. The earlier proposal which was sent by the Government of Punjab was that these Colleges to be opened as Government Colleges and to be administered by Panjab University. They said, they could not. The only idea of the Government is that all those who are employed in these Colleges should become the liability of the Panjab University by saying that they would meet all the expenses. Tomorrow, as they have done in the case of grant of 40% which they are supposed to give but are not giving, if they did not fulfill their promise even if the University has signed MoU, what would be the position of the University? Can the University deny the salary to all the persons employed there on the plea that the funds are yet to be released by the Punjab Government? If not, then wherefrom the University is going to meet that expenditure when the substantial amount of grant is not received from the Government of India. How could they explain that why they have taken over this liability from the Punjab Government? Of course, the Vice-Chancellor has put in all his best efforts to ensure that no such eventuality comes, but from the past experience that they have been facing, this kind of situation now and then, the Vice-Chancellor needs to clarify and take the inputs from the members of the House as to what are the conditions which needed to be put into the MoU so that they did not face any kind of embarrassment at a later stage.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in the letter dated 11.08.2016 from the Punjab Government, it is clearly mentioned that “the two Colleges situated at Dharamkot and Ferozpur which were given to the University as per the orders of the Hon’ble Chief Minister dated 23.05.2016 are to be run on the same pattern as of the already running 4 Constituent Colleges. The status of these Colleges would not be that of Government Colleges but the Constituent Colleges of the University. Therefore, you are requested to deploy the Principal and other staff in these Colleges as has been done in other Constituent Colleges so that these Colleges are run without any delay. As far as the recurring expenditure to run these colleges is concerned, in this regard you have already been informed that appropriate grant would be given by the Government. In continuation of that you are informed that to run these Colleges, a grant of Rs.1 crore for the expenditure for first three months has been sanctioned”. It means that the Government would provide the whole grant for these Colleges and are to be run by the University. As the Government says that these Colleges would not be given the status of Government Colleges but would be Constituent Colleges which implies that these would not be like other affiliated Colleges. Such Colleges have not only been given to the Panjab University but also to the Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University are under the direct control of the Punjab Government and whether these Universities could run or not, it is the responsibility of the Punjab Government. It had already been discussed in the Syndicate meeting and he had objected to appropriate grant, it should have been mentioned a fixed grant whether the Government would give Rs.2 crore or Rs.2.5 crore per College. As some of the members are raising objection, they are right. Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University should not be compared with Panjab University. It is the responsibility of the State Government whether they give the grant to those Universities or not. If the Punjab Government gives a grant of Rs.1 crore and then stop it, then the University would have to pay the salaries of the teachers and other staff. Therefore, if any suggestions are coming forward they should take up and tie up with the Punjab Government as to how much grant would be given.

Dr. R.P.S. Josh said that they could understand as to what is the situation of the Government Colleges of Punjab.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was pointed out in the Syndicate meeting that actually 100% expenditure is to be reimbursed. Now to compare Punjabi University with Panjab University probably is befooling themselves because the Guru Nanak Dev University and Punjabi University are not paying even half the salary to the teachers in the Constituent Colleges. Could the Panjab University do so? Any deficit or shortage of funds in those Universities is the responsibility of the Punjab Government. But here the case is different. It was said in the Syndicate that unless and until the University enters into an agreement by way of Memorandum of Understanding because here the item has come as in anticipation of approval of the Senate. It was assumed that by the time the meeting of the Senate takes place, MoU would be signed. He would like to tell that they are going to face the problem and Panjab University in its present situation could not just afford to spend even a single pie extra as they have limited resources to meet their own needs and wherefrom are they going to meet that expenditure. Unless and until they are assured within next 15 days, that everything would be in place before 30th September. It is better even to face the wrath of the Punjab Government but their foremost duty is to save the Panjab University.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate that it seems that they are in a hurry to open these Colleges. He had asked the DPI that it should be categorically clear whether these Colleges would be Government Colleges or Constituent Colleges as the Constituent College was the scheme of the Central Government. Whether any estimate has been sent to the Government?

The Vice-Chancellor said that the estimate had been sent to the Government and in response to that this grant of Rs.1 crore had been sanctioned. They are going to have a meeting of Senate in October and he would send a MoU to the Punjab Government and whatever would be the response, the same would be placed before the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the status in the meantime.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that in the meantime, the item be deferred.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Colleges are already functional.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this matter should also be placed before the Board of Finance.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Senate resolved to ratify the decision of the Syndicate subject to the condition that MoU is in place by a specified date failing which permission granted to run these Colleges stands withdrawn. Otherwise they did not want *fate accompli*.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is the decision of the members and he would not recommend it that once they do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice-Chancellor to suggest as to what they could do.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that the apprehensions expressed by various members are very valid. He is also apprehensive that the Central Government Committee which is looking into the deficiency and the grants of the University would also question the University as to why they are accepting more liabilities. It is going to be a very dangerous thing. One way, off the cuff he would suggest is that if a MoU is there, the University should insist on a corpus as fixed deposit, whose interest would be enough to run these Colleges otherwise the University would face difficulties very soon. Even earlier, as the Vice-Chancellor had been discussing, somebody is going to raise objection that already the University has deficit and why it is accepting more liabilities. If the University did not get any assurance through the MoU, then they could treat those Colleges as Government Colleges and could affiliate those Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this could also be put in the MoU that if the Punjab Government did not accept the terms and conditions of the University, these Colleges would be given back to the Punjab Government.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the meantime no regular appointments be made by the Panjab University.

Dr. R.P.S. Josh said that there are 1873 sanctioned posts of teachers in the Government Colleges and less than 700 teachers are working. The Government has issued the letter reducing the salary from Rs.21,600/- to Rs.15,600/-. The concern of the members is right. The permission could be granted only after having the MoU signed.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said that for the session 2016-17 for a College at Hoshiarpur, they had applied and the Inspection Committee had inspected the College on 18th July and this is relevant to this item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is a matter of zero hour and it could be discussed at that time.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that as said by Shri Ashok Goyal that no regular appointments be made in these Colleges. When it relates to the Private Colleges, no course is given without making the regular appointments. This is a very contradictory statement from the Chairman of the Affiliation Committee. They should appoint regular faculty in all the Constituent Colleges irrespective of the fact that whether they receive the grant or not.

Shri Ashok Goyal then proposed that this item may not be ratified.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in the MoU they could request the Punjab Government that Panjab University is, no doubt, willing to take these Colleges provided regular teachers are appointed there and the University wanted to maintain good standards of education in these new Colleges. As there are so many private Colleges are opening in Punjab and if the Punjab Government wanted to open these Colleges, it is good that these Colleges should be opened as these would serve the rural areas and the students would get benefit. The question is as to how to arrange for the salaries of the teachers to be appointed in these Colleges. They could negotiate with the Punjab Government that all the expenditure including the salaries should be borne by the Government and Panjab University would manage these Colleges. They could write to the Punjab Government that the Government is doing a good thing and they are ready to help them provided the Government provides all the expenditure and Panjab University would do the management of these Colleges very efficiently and affiliation fee should also be given to the University because the University is in financial crunch. If the Government could do something like this, then it is okay. The grant of Rs.20 crore is not much and the Government should also cooperate with the University. The University could negotiate with the Government on this issue and in this way they could win the confidence of the Punjab Government and the University would not go into losses and would maintain good services to these areas as the students would study in these Colleges instead of private Colleges.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that this is a political issue as the elections are due.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that the University has taken the responsibility of making the teachers' recruitment in these Colleges and do the management. He requested that the employees to be recruited in these Colleges, teaching or non-teaching, should be the employees of Punjab Government for which the recruitment process would be done by the Panjab University. But their appointment should be on behalf of Punjab Government and not on behalf of Panjab University otherwise the liability of the staff would be on the University. The appointment letters should be issued by the Punjab Government and not by Panjab University.

Shri Jagpal Singh said that what Dr. Ajay Ranga has said is right. The Punjab Government could not run the Government College at Guru Har Sahai and has handed over the same to the University. The fee of these Colleges is very less and they are paying full salaries to the teachers. The deficit is not reducing and it has become a liability on the University. The Punjab Government has about 50 Government Colleges with a sanctioned strength of about 2200 teachers. Since the year 2002, whenever a teacher retires, the posts are being abolished and now about 700 posts of regular teachers are left. The present Government is saying for giving the grants and if a new Government comes and stops the grants to the University, then what would be the future of these Colleges and it would be a liability on the University. Therefore, the University should run the already 4 Constituent Colleges properly and not open these two new Colleges. If these two Colleges are to be opened then all the requirements of the University should be met so that the University might not face the problems in future.

Principal I.S. Sandhu endorsed the viewpoints expressed by Shri Jagpal Singh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all such things would be conveyed to the Punjab Government by convening a meeting.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar pointed out that when he was in the Syndicate, it was decided not to allow the opening of the Colleges till all the deficiencies are complied with, the compliance might be right or wrong. They all know about the situation of the 4 Constituent Colleges already set up. They have appointed only the regular Principals in these Colleges. However, there might exist some faculty which are not appointed on regular basis and the whole expenditure on these Colleges is almost being borne by the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not true as every pie on the salary is being paid by the Punjab Government.

Continuing, Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that there should be clear-cut assurance from the Punjab Government. What Dr. Ajay Ranga has said is right. The Punjab Government should provide all the infrastructure and if the appointment letters are issued by the Government, then that would not be a liability on the University. Otherwise, ultimately the whole burden would be on the University. The grants of the University are already diminishing as the Vice-Chancellor had himself made a statement that it is becoming very difficult to pay the salaries. If the University could not pay the salaries to its own staff, how could they pay the salaries to the staff of these two Colleges?

The Vice-Chancellor said that if the Central Government does not give the revised budget, the University would close from the next semester. So, the matter is very-very serious and their biggest struggle, at the moment, is to urge the Central Government that the revised estimates be accepted. If the revised estimate is not accepted then all the things stated are mere exercises, which would prove to be futile as the University could close from 1st January, 2017. This matter in all seriousness would be conveyed to the Punjab Government and a draft MoU would be sent in which it would be clearly mentioned that the Government would have to bear all the expenses of these 6 Constituent Colleges and Government would also upgrade the infrastructure from time to time. The duty of the Government does not end by just giving the buildings and the furniture to start the Colleges. He has got 3 experienced Principals who know so much about the University and have been the members of the Syndicate and Senate and are presently the members of the Senate, they would send their estimates relating to all the recurring expenses of these Colleges and a consolidated document would be prepared on yearly basis. The University would have an algorithm of creating a budget estimate and the revised estimates of these Colleges, which would be sent by these Principals. He would also like to add to it that all the recurring expenditure on the Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni, which was opened on the request of the Punjab Government, should also be borne by the Punjab Government. He requested the members to help him in this matter and they shall try to place it before the Government.

Shri V.K. Sibal suggested that MoU is just an expression of intention and is not forceful, so there should be an agreement.

The Vice-Chancellor said that instead of MoU an agreement would be prepared and if the members wished to defer the matter till the meeting to be held in October, they could do so. In the meantime, they would prepare an agreement and would be put up to the Government.

Professor Shelley Walia said that in future let them ensure that a nudge does not turn into a push. He had noticed that the DPI had persuaded them and before 20 days of the opening of the College, they had sent an inspection team which came back with a very dismal report. He is amazed to see with a very slip shod manner in which the Colleges are started without the infrastructure in place, without the money being in place. Therefore, if in future the Government for certain political reasons pushes the University into such kind of schemes, let them ensure that the whole process should start one year in advance so that everything is in place.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that Principal I.S. Sandhu, Principal N.R. Sharma and Principal Kuldip Singh, the newly appointed Principals, would visit these Colleges before the Senate meets next time and would give him a brief write up for all these Colleges and the item is deferred till the next meeting.

RESOLVED: That –

- (1) in view of the discussions held, the consideration of the item be deferred. In the meanwhile, an agreement pertaining to bearing all the expenses by the Punjab Government for running these two Colleges be executed;
- (2) a Committee including Principal I.S. Sandhu, Principal N.R. Sharma, Principal Kuldip Singh be constituted to visit the proposed Colleges, prepare the detailed budget estimates and submit the report to be considered in the next meeting; and
- (3) from the financial year 2017-18, the budget of all the Constituent Colleges including the Panjab University Rural Centre, Kauni (Muktsar) which had been handed over to the Panjab University be prepared together and submitted to the Punjab Government for providing the whole expenditure.

IX. Considered the recommendations of the Syndicate **dated 19.08.2016 Para 4 (Item C-8** on the agenda) that –

- (1) Honorary degree of Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Dr. N.S. Kapany, Bay Area, San Francisco United States of America, 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 (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*);
- (2) Honorary degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Professor Murlu Manohar Joshi, Member of Parliament, (Lok Sabha), Former Cabinet Minister for Home Affairs, Human Resource Development and Science & Technology & Ocean Development, 6, Raisina Road, New Delhi-110001, 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 Science (D.Litt.) (*honoris causa*);
- (3) Honorary degree of Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Prof. G.S. Khush, FRS, Res. 39399, Block Hawk Place Davis, CA

95616-7008, USA, 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 (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*); and

- (4) Honorary degree of Doctor of Law (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Hon'ble Justice Jagdish Singh Khehar, Supreme Court of India, Tilak Marg, New Delhi-110001, 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 Law (*honoris causa*).

The Vice Chancellor said that he was happy to share with the members that Dr. N.S. Kapany and Dr. G.S. Khush are two such eminent persons of Punjab who came/born in the pre-partition India. One of them studied at the Agricultural College in Ludhiana which was a part of the Panjab University and the other one at a College in Agra and then worked in Indian Ordnance Factory. One of these persons has solved the hunger problem of the entire world. The rice yielding variety introduced by him had raised the production by 5-10 times depending on the area. The second person again is someone who had a thought when he was a High School student whether the light can be made to travel along a non-straight manner by using the principle of total internal inference. With this thought, he had reached England and he shared it with his supervisor. The supervisor put him in contact with a glass manufacturing company and by 1954 he had demonstrated the science behind the motion of "fiber optics". Two decades down the line, somebody turned the same thought into a practical reality. Dr. Kapany did not get a Nobel Prize but he is considered an unsung hero like Dr. J.C. Bose. He is a great inspirational person. He has spent a lot to promote the Punjabi culture and created an organization in California to help so many causes. There is a memorial lecture in the name of his mother and Professor Ronki Ram was invited to deliver such a lecture in 2016. If such persons visit Panjab University and interact with us, their inspirational presence would be beneficial for the University. Dr. Khush had come to Chandigarh and Professor R.P. Bambah had arranged a meeting with Dr. Khush and he (Vice Chancellor) had a pleasure to meet him.

Professor R.P. Bambah said that there is no Nobel Prize in Agriculture. But Dr. Khush is the only Indian who has got a coveted prize which is equal to Nobel Prize in Agriculture.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are people who say that Dr. Khush should be nominated for Peace Prize as he has solved the hunger problem of the world which has sustained peace in the world. He would personally like to recommend the name of Dr. Khush for Nobel Peace Prize. Then they have Professor Murli Manohar Joshi was trained as a scientist. But keep aside the science, the kind of contributions that he has made to the nation, there are contributions of a Statesmen. He is a great thinker and his presence is sought by the governing councils of the premier institutes of India not as a Minister but because he is a person, he is an intellect of that kind. So, Professor Murli Manohar Joshi is recommended for the degree of D.Litt. Panjab University had given the degree of D.Litt. (*Honoris Causa*) to Dr. Manmohan Singh many years ago. The fourth person is Justice Jagdish Singh Khehar. He is coming to the University on 1st October as Chief Guest for the convocation of Department of Laws. He would be the next Chief Justice of India in December 2016. He is happy to share with the members that the next President of the Indian National Science Academy is also a Panjab University alumnus. Director General of CSIR is also a Panjab University alumnus. These are the people who have studied at this very campus. They have walked around the present Panjab University campus. He is looking forward to the presence of Justice Khehar in the University as the Chief Guest on October 1, 2016.

RESOLVED: That, it be recommended to the Chancellor, that in accordance with Section 23 at page 9 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, *honoris causa* degrees be conferred upon the following persons:

Senate Proceedings dated 3rd September 2016

- (1) Honorary degree of Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Dr. N.S. Kapany, Bay Area, San Francisco United States of America, 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 (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*);
- (2) Honorary degree of Doctor of Literature (D.Litt.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Professor Murlu Manohar Joshi, Member of Parliament, (Lok Sabha), Former Cabinet Minister for Home Affairs, Human Resource Development and Science & Technology & Ocean Development, 6, Raisina Road, New Delhi-110001, 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 Science (D.Litt.) (*honoris causa*);
- (3) Honorary degree of Doctor of Science (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Prof. G.S. Khush, FRS, Res. 39399, Block Hawk Place Davis, CA 95616-7008, USA, 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 (D.Sc.) (*honoris causa*); and
- (4) Honorary degree of Doctor of Law (*honoris causa*) be conferred on Hon'ble Justice Jagdish Singh Khehar, Supreme Court of India, Tilak Marg, New Delhi-110001, 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 Law (*honoris causa*).

X.

The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-9 on the agenda** was read out, viz. –

- C-9.** That, as recommended by the Screening Committee dated 20.05.2016, (constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to screen the applications of the teachers promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards till the date of capping on API score for promotion, pursuant to Letter No. F.11-1/2009 (PS) dated 06.04.2016 received from the Under Secretary, University Grants Commission, New Delhi), the following faculty members, be promoted as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty members/ Department/ Institute /Centre	Date of Promotion
I. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2)		
1.	Dr. Prabhdeep Brar UIFT	22.12.2013
2.	Ms. Kumari Monika P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur	03.09.2013
3.	Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam UIHTM	13.10.2013
4.	Dr. Vishal Sharma Forensic Science & Criminology	07.12.2013
5.	Ms. Charu UIET (ECE)	07.10.2013
6.	Ms. Nidhi UIET (ECE)	17.10.2013
7.	Mr. Amandeep Singh Wadhwa UIET (Mech. Engg.)	04.09.2013
8.	Dr. Prashant Jindal UIET (Mech. Engg.)	22.09.2013

Senate Proceedings dated 3rd September 2016

9.	Dr. (Ms.) Aman Kaura P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur (Chemistry)	07.10.2013
10.	Ms. Suman P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur (Chemistry)	07.01.2014
11.	Dr. Bimal Rai Department of Physics	07.06.2014
12.	Ms. Anju Berwal UILS (Law)	18.08.2013
13.	Dr. Karan Jawanda UILS	01.08.2013
14.	Ms. Sarpreet Kaur UIET (EEE)	07.10.2013
15.	Ms. Preetika Sharma UIET (EEE)	06.10.2013
16.	Shri Neeraj Sharma UIET (ECE)	06.10.2013
17.	Shri Jaswinder Singh Mehta UIET (Mechanical Engg.)	04.09.2013
18.	Ms. Preeti Gupta UIET (ECE)	06.10.2013
II. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3)		
19.	Dr. (Mrs.) Ashish Virk P.U.R.C. Ludhiana	01.07.2014
20.	Dr. Shruti Bedi UILS	05.10.2013
21.	Dr. Aman Amrit Cheema nee Ranu P.U.R.C. Ludhiana	26.07.2013
22.	Dr. Manju Gera USOL	07.09.2014
23.	Dr. Monica Bedi UBS	01.07.2014
24.	Dr. Rani Mehta Department of Sociology	26.08.2013
25.	Dr. Ram Mehar USOL	14.10.2014
26.	Dr. Jasmeet Gulati UILS	12.07.2014
27.	Dr. (Mrs.) Jyoti Rattan Department of Laws	01.07.2014
28.	Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar Department of Physics	24.08.2013
29.	Dr. Ashok Kumar Department of Physics	24.08.2013
30.	Dr. (Mrs.) Sunita Srivastawa Department of Physics	24.08.2013
31.	Dr. Supreet Kaur USOL	07.09.2014
32.	Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary Department of Chemistry	05.02.2014
33.	Dr. Nishi Sharma UIAMS	28.08.2013
34.	Dr. Kalpana Dahiya UIET (Mathematics)	03.02.2014
35.	Dr. Navneet Agnihotri Department of Biochemistry	27.08.2013

36.	Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi UIAMS	08.04.2014
III. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4)		
37.	Dr. Gulshan Kumar UILS	01.01.2014
38.	Dr. Vandana Arora Department of Laws	22.12.2013
39.	Dr. Sarabjit Kaur UILS	07.08.2013
IV. Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5)		
40.	Dr. (Mrs.) Gunmala Suri UBS	18.12.2013
41.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma Department of Evening Studies-MDRC	31.10.2013
42.	Dr. Jasminder Singh Dhillon PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib	31.07.2013
43.	Dr. Archana R. Singh School of Communication Studies	12.01.2014
44.	Dr. Indu Chhabra Department of Computer Science and Applications	27.03.2014
45.	Dr. Surya Kant Tripathi Department of Physics	24.12.2013
46.	Dr. Ravinder Kaur Department of Geography	08.01.2014
47.	Dr. (Ms) Suman Makkar nee Suman Bala Vohra Department of Evening Studies-MDRC (Economics)	30.04.2014
48.	Dr. Harsh Gandhar USOL (Economics)	15.04.2014
49.	Dr. Geeta Mangla Bansal USOL (Commerce)	06.05.2014

(Syndicate meeting dated 31.7.2016 Para 12)

Professor Karamjeet Singh stated that he is unable to comprehend from what is written. He pointed out that it has been written "That, as recommended by the Screening Committee dated 20.05.2016, (constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to screen the applications of the teachers promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards..." The next portion needed to be deleted and in the end it is to be written that "as they meet the UGC requirement with capping as per second amendment with effect from the date mentioned against their names", so that, in future, they do not face any problem on this account. Secondly, the persons have done a lot of work and cleared 49 cases. In fact, there were 55 cases in total, out of which 49 have been cleared. So far as remaining six cases are concerned, on them the UGC has no objection. He suggested that the persons concerned should be called again and their screening be done, so that the issue is settled once for all, and it should be taken up on priority basis. The persons concerned should be asked to submit whatever they wished to so that the benefit could be given to them. Thirdly, there is a Director at Panjab University Swami Sarvanand Giri Regional Centre, Bajwara, Hoshiarpur, whose case has not been placed before the Senate. It should be checked. Perhaps, it has been missed out by the office.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that though the Committee might have seen the cases, somewhere the assessment period has been mentioned as three years, somewhere it is 4 years and somewhere 5 years. Perhaps, for stage-1, the period is five years, stage-2, the period is four years and stage-3, the period is three years. He suggested

that it should be checked/verified, so that they do not face any humiliation at a later stage.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that what Shri Harpreet Singh Dua is saying probably as he is getting is that let them not confuse it that it is different for stage-1, different for stage-2 and different for stage-3. What he says is that from stage-4 to stage-5, whether three years is the assessment period or it is 4 years or 5 years. He says that in certain cases, the period is more than three years. Whether any such clarification has been taken from the UGC or it is being done by the Committee of the University. If in any case, the period is more than three years, that should not be cleared unless and until they take clarification from the UGC. That is what, he (Shri Dua) wants to say.

The Vice Chancellor directed the Dean of University Instruction to see to it.

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Screening Committee dated 20.05.2016, (constituted by the Vice Chancellor, to screen the applications of the teachers promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards as they meet the UGC requirement with capping as per second amendment with effect from the date mentioned against their names, be promoted as under:

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty members/ Department/ Institute /Centre	Date of Promotion
I. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2)		
1.	Dr. Prabhdeep Brar UIFT	22.12.2013
2.	Ms. Kumari Monika P.U. S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur	03.09.2013
3.	Dr. Prashant Kumar Gautam UIHTM	13.10.2013
4.	Dr. Vishal Sharma Forensic Science & Criminology	07.12.2013
5.	Ms. Charu UIET (ECE)	07.10.2013
6.	Ms. Nidhi UIET (ECE)	17.10.2013
7.	Mr. Amandeep Singh Wadhwa UIET (Mech. Engg.)	04.09.2013
8.	Dr. Prashant Jindal UIET (Mech. Engg.)	22.09.2013
9.	Dr. (Ms.) Aman Kaura P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur (Chemistry)	07.10.2013
10.	Ms. Suman P.U.S.S. Giri Regional Centre Hoshiarpur (Chemistry)	07.01.2014
11.	Dr. Bimal Rai Department of Physics	07.06.2014
12.	Ms. Anju Berwal UILS (Law)	18.08.2013
13.	Dr. Karan Jawanda UILS	01.08.2013
14.	Ms. Sarpreet Kaur UIET (EEE)	07.10.2013
15.	Ms. Preetika Sharma UIET (EEE)	06.10.2013
16.	Shri Neeraj Sharma UIET (ECE)	06.10.2013

17.	Shri Jaswinder Singh Mehta UIET (Mechanical Engg.)	04.09.2013
18.	Ms. Preeti Gupta UIET (ECE)	06.10.2013
II. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3)		
19.	Dr. (Mrs.) Ashish Virk P.U.R.C. Ludhiana	01.07.2014
20.	Dr. Shruti Bedi UILS	05.10.2013
21.	Dr. Aman Amrit Cheema nee Ranu P.U.R.C. Ludhiana	26.07.2013
22.	Dr. Manju Gera USOL	07.09.2014
23.	Dr. Monica Bedi UBS	01.07.2014
24.	Dr. Rani Mehta Department of Sociology	26.08.2013
25.	Dr. Ram Mehar USOL	14.10.2014
26.	Dr. Jasmeet Gulati UILS	12.07.2014
27.	Dr. (Mrs.) Jyoti Rattan Department of Laws	01.07.2014
28.	Dr. Vipin Bhatnagar Department of Physics	24.08.2013
29.	Dr. Ashok Kumar Department of Physics	24.08.2013
30.	Dr. (Mrs.) Sunita Srivastawa Department of Physics	24.08.2013
31.	Dr. Supreet Kaur USOL	07.09.2014
32.	Dr. Ganga Ram Chaudhary Department of Chemistry	05.02.2014
33.	Dr. Nishi Sharma UIAMS	28.08.2013
34.	Dr. Kalpana Dahiya UIET (Mathematics)	03.02.2014
35.	Dr. Navneet Agnihotri Department of Biochemistry	27.08.2013
36.	Dr. Anupreet Kaur Mavi UIAMS	08.04.2014
III. Promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4)		
37.	Dr. Gulshan Kumar UILS	01.01.2014
38.	Dr. Vandana Arora Department of Laws	22.12.2013
39.	Dr. Sarabjit Kaur UILS	07.08.2013
IV. Promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5)		
40.	Dr. (Mrs.) Gunmala Suri UBS	18.12.2013
41.	Dr. Neeraj Sharma Department of Evening Studies-MDRC	31.10.2013
42.	Dr. Jaswinder Singh Dhillon PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib	31.07.2013

43.	Dr. Archana R. Singh School of Communication Studies	12.01.2014
44.	Dr. Indu Chhabra Department of Computer Science and Applications	27.03.2014
45.	Dr. Surya Kant Tripathi Department of Physics	24.12.2013
46.	Dr. Ravinder Kaur Department of Geography	08.01.2014
47.	Dr. (Ms) Suman Makkar nee Suman Bala Vohra Department of Evening Studies-MDRC (Economics)	30.04.2014
48.	Dr. Harsh Gandhar USOL (Economics)	15.04.2014
49.	Dr. Geeta Mangla Bansal USOL (Commerce)	06.05.2014

XI. The recommendation of the Syndicate contained in **Item C-10 on the agenda** was read out and unanimously approved, i.e. –

C-10 . That the following faculty members, be confirmed in their post w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

(i) University Institute of Legal Studies

Sr. No.	Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
#1.	Dr. Rattan Singh	Professor	06.12.1967	07.05.2015	23.04.2016
#2.	Dr. (Ms.) Rajinder Kaur	Professor	30.08.1976	24.04.2015	24.04.2016

In order of merit

(ii) P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana

Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
Dr. Harmeet Singh Sandhu	Professor	06.04.1970	07.05.2015	07.05.2016

(iii) University Institute of Engineering & Technology

Name of the faculty member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Date of confirmation
Dr. (Mrs.) Nishima	Assistant Professor	01.08.1980	12.03.2015	12.03.2016

NOTE: Confirmation of all the above will be subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, in CWP No. 17501 of 2011.

(Syndicate meeting dated 31.7.2016 Para 7)

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor said that he would look at the Calendar, i.e., October month and hold a meeting of the Senate in the month of October.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested the Vice Chancellor to fix the next meeting of the Senate in consultation with at least 2-3 members.

The Vice Chancellor said, "Okay Fine".

XII. The information contained in **Item I-1 to I-4 & I-6** on the agenda was read out and noted, i.e. –

I-1. To note recommendations of the Committee dated 19.03.2016 constituted by the Vice Chancellor, pursuant to decision of the Senate dated 27.09.2015 (Para LV) along with additional papers.

(Syndicate dated 1/15.5.2016 Para 16)

NOTE: 1. In the Senate meeting dated 27.3.2016 (Para XXXV) (**Appendix-II**), the Vice Chancellor said that the papers related to the item were sent to the members in a sealed cover on 21st March relating to the recommendation of a Committee which looked into the Garg Committee report relating to the conduct of one of the members of the House. There is an action taken report. There was a Garg Committee the report of which was put up in the Senate and the Senate had directed certain things to be done and this is the output of that. He requested the members to have a look and take up as the time progresses.

This was agreed to.

2. The report of the Enquiry Committee pursuant to the Syndicate meeting dated 26.04.2014 was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.01.2015 as Item No. 44 and it was resolved that for the time being, the consideration of the item be deferred and the item be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting and all the relevant documents/annexures be supplied to the members in sealed envelopes. The matter was again placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 08.03.2015 as Item No.29 and it was resolved that the report of the Enquiry Committee be forwarded to the Senate.

The Senate at its meeting held on 27.09.2015 (Para LV) (Item C-63) considered the enquiry report forwarded by the Syndicate and it was resolved that:

- (1) the report of the Enquiry Committee, pursuant to a discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 26.04.2014, be accepted; and
- (2) a Committee, comprising members of Senate and the Syndicate, be constituted to give input/recommendations to the Vice Chancellor ensuring that no injustice is done to any individual and at the same time, the operating system in the University is made foolproof.

Pursuant to the decision of the Senate, the Committee was constituted and recommendations of the Committee were sent to the Fellows vide letter No. S.T. 2902-300 dated 21.03.2016. In addition to this some additional papers concerning to Action Taken Report in respect of Senate Para LV dated 27.09.2015 were also sent to the Fellows.

A copy of letter No. 12094-97/C dated 29.6.2016 sent to Special Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab and D.P.I., (Colleges), Chandigarh enclosed (**Appendix-II**).

- I-2.** That it be reiterated that the University had written to the UGC on 9th September 2015 that since no specific names of the officials of the University, who are alleged to be connived, the University does not accept that any of its official had actually connived with Principal S.S. Randhawa.

(Syndicate dated 1/15.5.2016 Para 19)

NOTE: It was also resolved that the Registrar would write a letter to the UGC, clarifying the position and fill up all the gaps. Accordingly, a letter (**Appendix-III**) has been sent to the UGC.

- I-3.** That the Panjab University to have inclusive policy in the Governing Bodies of the University regarding the representation of reserved categories in consonance with the UGC guidelines and reservation policy of the Government. However, the matter be referred to two already constituted Governance Reforms Committees to recommend the modalities for implementation of the same.

(Syndicate dated 1/15.5.2016 Para 5)

- NOTE:**
1. As decided by the Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29.5.2016 the matter has been referred to the Governance Reforms Committee to recommend the modalities for implementation of the same.
 2. A copy of the letter No. 1343/VC/ds dated 19.05.2016 sent to Chairman, UGC in response to communication dated 25.8.2006 and copy of the same sent to office of the Chancellor in response to their letter dated 7.4.2016 enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

- I-4.** To note the following decision of the Syndicate dated 5.7.2016 (Para 2) (**Appendix-V**).

- (i) that, by majority decision (nine in favour, six against and one abstained), Professor Naval Kishore, be not given any further continuation as Dean College Development Council (a non-teaching position in Panjab University) beyond 31.05.2016.

- (ii) to continue (nine in favour) the process set in motion to select new Dean College Development Council as per qualifications earlier approved by the Syndicate (meeting(s) dated 23.01.2016/ 06.02.2016) and already advertised (Advt. No. 01/2016).

I-5. Withdrawn Item.

I-6. To note the Audit Report (**Appendix-VI**) relating to Pension Account submitted by Shri Amrik Singh Bhatia, IA&S (Accountant (General) (Retd.)).

NOTE: The Audit report as mentioned above is being placed before the Syndicate for consideration in its meeting to be held on 31.07.2016.

XIII. ZERO HOUR

Principal N.R. Sharma said that firstly he would like to request to the House that as per B.Ed. regulation 2009, the qualification of Principal was M.A. with 50 % marks and M.Ed. with 55% marks. As per B. Ed., regulation 2004, the qualification was M.A and M.Ed with 55% marks in each. Now the teacher who had been working for the last 10 years, if he gets shifted to some other place, if he applies in semi government, he is told that he was not qualifying as per latest norms of NCTE. He said that in his view, some of the old people who had been gold medalists of their times and who had served for 10 years, he suggested that the House should take a suitable decision in this regard. The formula of 2009 should be applicable to these teachers.

Principal N.R. Sharma raised another issue of non payment of salary to the Principals of the B.Ed. Colleges for the last six months. He said that the issue should be resolved by gathering information from the management. He said that University should take action in case any application for non disbursement is submitted by the teachers, principals.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that thirdly he wanted to say that in the PU Campus, except the Computer and Engineering Departments, there is a facility of migration. He suggested that there should also be a migration facility in Computer Sciences and Engineering Institutes in the Panjab University Campus.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said that first of all, he wanted to draw the attention of the Vice Chancellor to an issue. He said that on 18th of July, an inspection team visited the College at Hoshiarpur which after putting certain conditions such as staff recruitment and library staff, given its inspection report, till date they have not received any communication in this regard from the concerned branch and neither any renewal has been done so far. This would lead to wastage of one year. He said that if they get the letter even upto 31st, it would serve the purpose. He further stated that the University was issuing affiliation to its Colleges in anticipation, even if there are so many objections, but they were ready to do through the Colleges and they were not getting the permission. To which the house is objecting, they are given in anticipation. He said that they should be given the letter with one week's time to comply with.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa said that in December 2015 he was appointed as Flying Squad at Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur. He went there and observed that mass copying was being done. He said that he contacted the University authorities and informed them that as there was a massive mass copying in the Examination, the examination should be scratched. The authorities asked him to come. There was a scuffle and it is only they know how they escaped the site. After that a committee was constituted comprising Professor Yograj Angrish, Dr. I.S. Sandhu and he himself. Two meetings were held and it was decided that the examination centre of the College be cancelled for at least a period of three years and the re-examination should be conducted. He has no information about the closure of the examination centre there. He

is surprised to see that examinations are still going on there with copying. He said that what happened to them, that after December till the recently conducted examination, he has been debarred from the flying squad. He is unable to know as to why it is so. He said that Dr. Panda and Dr. Gosal has also not been in the flying squad. It is a kind of humiliation and despite being the members of this House, they are not being included in the flying squads for the reasons known to the authorities. This was not good if the members of the House feel humiliated. On one hand they should be given the letter relating to the College and on the other hand, their duty in flying squad be resumed.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that in the year 2009, there was constituted a Committee headed by Professor Naval Kishore in which the members were Prof. Dinesh Kumar Gupta, the present Dean of University Instruction, Prof. Karamjeet Singh, Dr. Ravi Inder and Dr. K.L. Dudeja. The term of reference of the Committee was to discuss about delinking the admission process of MBA programme of PURC Ludhiana from the academic session 2010-2011. The committee met on 3rd September 2009 at 4.00 p.m. In this meeting the decision was taken that there will be a separate advertisement and separate version for MBA programme at PURC Ludhiana. As per MBA programme at PURC Ludhiana, as the MBA programme at the PURC Ludhiana is at the stage of infancy, the admissions proposed to be made for the self financing course at PURC Ludhiana only on the basis of CAT irrespective of any cut off unlike in UBS, PU, Chandigarh, where the cut off is 10% scores (5% in case of SC/ST candidate). Fourth condition was CAT result of those candidates who are authorised any programme at PURC, Ludhiana will be arranged by UBS. She stated that in view of this decision, because admission notice in Ludhiana, advertisement was issued for filling/inviting application for MBA two year programme, on 30th December, 2015 and later on, the last date was extended till 7th May, 2016. After making the admissions, approximately 29 seats of various reserved categories were lying vacant and on the basis of that, because the number of seats were lying vacant, the matter was considered by the BOC, PURC, Ludhiana and they sought permission that a separate new advertisement be issued inviting applications from the candidates. The request was considered and decision was taken by BOC that in view of the number of representations and number of candidates who appeared in the CAT and who were willing to take admission, advertisement rough draft was sent to the DUI office, but it was rejected. She said that she does not know what is the reason. She said that in the last Senate meeting, she raised the issue. The Director, PURC, Ludhiana, has specifically made a request that there were a number of seats lying vacant, and if the seats become available in Chandigarh, because of migration etc., there would be very less students at Ludhiana. Kindly permit them to make the admissions because there is no point on the part of the initial date of extending till 7th of May and only after making the admissions, there can be no further vacancies in the institution. She thinks that on one hand they were suffering from financial crunch and on the other hand seats are wasted just on technical issues. There are thousands of judgements which say that keeping in view the academic interest, no seat should be allowed to go waste. She said that 19 seats have been wasted without any reason ignoring the real decision of 2009, that they should be allowed to make the admission on the basis of CAT score. She said that the request of PURC, Ludhiana stating the reasons, their request should be considered keeping in view the academic interest as well as the financial position of the University, because it is a self financing course.

Ms. Anu Chatrath further raised another issue that they must have remembered that in the past the University had taken a decision and a committee was constituted that the students who had been admitted at PURC Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur and if they have any health problem, they could be allowed to join classes at UILS, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

The Vice Chancellor intervened that she should make a point.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that it was later on pointed out by the Vice Chancellor that as the infrastructure was limited, they should not allow, in spite of the number of students facing the thalassaemia problem. They rejected their medical certificates and they were instructed to attend the classes where they have got admission. She pointed

out that now she has come to know that a student, one Saurav Mittal S/o one Ramesh Mittal, made a request that he had got admission at Chandigarh, Department of Law in three years Law and he has made a request without any medical certificate that as his mother not feeling well, so he may be allowed to be shifted from Chandigarh to PURC Ludhiana. The application was sent to the DUI office, which further forwarded it to the Department of Laws on 30th of July for comments. The Chairperson of Department of Laws gave opinion that there was no provision in the Calendar for making such kind of a migration or transfer on the medical grounds of the parents and the medical certificate was not attached. Irrespective of the opinion given by the Chairperson of the Department of Laws, irrespective of the fact that there was no statutory provision, ignoring the decision taken where the candidate who were not allowed themselves were suffering on the medical ground and that meeting was very much chaired by the DUI, the DUI passed orders that this student be transferred from Department of Laws, Panjab University to PURC, Ludhiana. She said that whether she could question that at the relevant point of time, she should be told about the provision of law under which these permissions have been granted by the Committee. She questioned that if they have decided to undo the decision taken on earlier occasion, decided to send the students at the places where they had got the admission, it means that some persons came to that Madam, she was the one who was saying that there were no provisions that students cannot be permitted on medical grounds, on the medical grounds of the parents of the student, the students could be transferred without any provision and ignoring that he did not appear for counselling. They were facing that show him the face, he will tell him the law which was to be applied. She said that there should be no discrimination. It should be equally applied for all the students. She further stated that if once the same person took the decision irrespective of the fact that there was no provision, they should not allow and because of this letter of Saurav Mittal, the candidates were approaching to them and what reply is to be given to them. She said that the same person, same authority took this decision. She said that she was of the view that they should follow the same yardstick for all the students. On the ground that the mother was not feeling well, ignoring that there was no provision, ignoring that he did not appear for counselling, ignoring that no medical certificate of the mother had been attached, he has been transferred from the PU Department of Law to PURC, Ludhiana. She requested the Vice Chancellor that they should not be put in an embarrassing position that they face difficulty in facing the residents who came to them as an elected representative. It was her humble request to him (the Vice Chancellor).

The Vice Chancellor said that for the last four years, he had not come across the case that somebody had been asking for transfer from Chandigarh to Ludhiana. He said that this was the rarest of the rare case. It was in that context that the DUI had responded.

Professor Dinesh Gupta said that two set of cases should not be compared. That in the first case, some requests were made for transfer from Regional Centre to Chandigarh which was denied later. He said that he himself chaired that meeting. The second meeting was chaired by the worthy Vice Chancellor. In the minutes of the meeting, it was very much clear if there were any hardship gap that would be addressed by the Vice Chancellor. It had not been decided at all. So, they rejected the cases of transfer from Hoshiarpur and Ludhiana to Chandigarh. There were too many cases. It was discussed in the Committee that if in any case, the Vice Chancellor had the power, this committee should be disbanded. He said that this was his opinion. In the instant case about which the honourable member of the house had referred to, he said that this case is that the candidate is only child whose mother had got leg fractured and child had got admission in the 3 years law at PU Law department. He said that as the student had got admission at Panjab University, he, obviously had no need to appear for counselling at PURC Ludhiana. Because the leg of his mother gone fractured, and it was decided by the University authorities that for one semester, he should be transferred from PU Law department to PURC Ludhiana and the case will be reviewed after that. He said that there was nothing wrong if the University had helped the student in hardship cases. This was the background of the case.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said the wording of the transfer order states that he be transferred from Chandigarh to Ludhiana and not for a Semester. She stated that she had been having the copy of the order.

The Dean of University Instruction said that Mrs. Anu Chatrath was not having complete information. He further stated that the claims of Mrs. Anu were not true. Rather he has the proof to prove his version. He further said that he (the DUI) had used the words, migration also.

Mrs. Anu Chatrath said that all such cases should be decided by the Syndicate so that no favouritism is done to anybody in the prescribed criteria. She also said that things should not be such that whosoever is known he gets his work done.

The Vice Chancellor said that this was the rarest of the rare cases and there was no favouritism.

Shri Munish Verma said that a student of five year law who had met with an accident and the case is with Dr. Sangeeta Bhalla and the student could not take the examination. He requested the Vice Chancellor to look into the matter.

Shri Munish Verma said that there was another case of Malout from where the students of Handball had qualified for Maharaja Ranjit Singh trophy and it has been stated by the Sports Office that they had no information that there are some students of sports playing hand ball, they may be allowed to play match.

Shri Munish Verma stated that in the last, he wanted to make a little request. The Semester system has now been started and the students with old system, should be given golden chance in the month of October and March, 2016 and 2017. It should be allowed so that no students remain uninformed. They should be asked to come and fill the forms and the scheme should be applied to all the courses.

Dr. Surjit Singh Randhawa endorsed the views expressed by Shri Munish Verma and further added that it was so compulsory.

Ms. Anu Chatrath enquired as to whether they would let 19-21 seats in self financing courses to go waste. She said that the Vice Chancellor should take a decision as he was chairing as the academic head. She further added that it would not be in the academic interest to let go waste the 21 seats in self financing courses. Otherwise, there would be no purpose of making the admissions.

The Vice Chancellor said that there was also a question of the quality of the students.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the students had appeared in the CAT.

The Vice Chancellor said that they would be looking into it. He further said that the students should be good enough. The people have not enough merit, if they come and if some concessions are to be given to them, it would be looked into.

On the request of various members to decide in the matter of golden chance in this very meeting or authorise the Controller of Examination, the Vice Chancellor said that he has as much as sympathy one can have, he would look into it and after looking into the history of golden chance, shall take a favourable decision. He said that he should not be forced to take an instant decision.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he has requested in this house for so many times that the Security Staff of the Panjab University belongs to class B cadre as per the recruitment procedure. He said that the security staff of Panjab University is very important part of the University administration. He suggested that they should be given the status of B class employees instead of class C employees. This would make no

difference to the University on account of their conversion from C to B Class employees. The benefit is given to other categories of the staff. Their demand is genuine one.

Professor Ronki Ram raised the issue of traffic parking. He said that the strength of the students have been on the increase in the Panjab University. The law auditorium is used for holding many functions and this causes parking problem in front of the building. The area in the backside of the Emerging Areas Department is used for parking purposes. He suggested that there should be two to three speed breakers put on the road starting from Gandhi Bhawan to Law auditorium to avoid accidents.

Professor Ronki Ram also raised the issue of huge littering by the students and visitors in the surrounding area of Student Centre. The students/visitors do not put the waste into the dustbins. He said that it should be the duty of the shop owners of the Student Centre to make cleanliness arrangements. He suggested that the Registrar should issue instructions to the shopkeepers for ensuring stoppage of littering in the area. He further said that some of the area has been earmarked for parking and some area is used for organising various University functions.

Professor Ronki Ram pointed out that children are often seen playing cricket in that area. The cricket playing should be checked as there are so many other spots in the University to play Cricket. He said that the Gandhi Bhawan has been given the status of heritage importance and the area surrounding to it keeps a very good look, hence it should be preserved properly.

The Vice Chancellor said that until and unless the revised budget estimates are approved by the government, no extra financial liability could be undertaken by the University. He further added that they did not know as to where the University stands. Without budgetary clearances, nothing could be done at the moment.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he has received 10 applications from the students as at the Regional Centre Muktsar, some seats of Law have been lying vacant. If the Vice Chancellor allow them, they could get admission. The students wish that they be given admission. He said that by allowing the admission in the vacant seats, the University would get extra income.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal further said that as has been stated by Dr. S.S. Randhawa, the people make fun of him that the Vice Chancellor has deleted his name from the Inspection Committees. He said that this time his name has been deleted from the Flying Squad. He said that in Guru Nanak College, Ferozepur, maximum number of UMC cases have been made by him. This could be verified from the records. No fellow could claim of more cases than me. He stated that he had not helped anyone to copy. He said that he had come to know that the Vice Chancellor has deleted the name of the four persons from the Flying Squad team with his green ink pen which included S.S. Randhawa, Shri Munish Verma, including him and someone else. He sarcastically, thanked the Vice Chancellor for deleting their names and making them free for the time to come.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma raised the issue of death of Raj Shikha, whose condolence has been held in the Senate today. He said that it was a very serious case and it needs to be enquired into that how that girl went there, without the permission of the Principal. The department never informed the Principal that, that girl was going to Roorkee. He said that all the Universities are having their camps at the Sukhna Lake, the boys camps are there and the girls are being sent to Roorkee. He requested the Vice Chancellor to probe it, enquire it and report back how this girl went there without the permission of Principal and how other girls went there without the permission.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that he wanted to talk about two things. He stated that in the year 2014-15, it had been decided by the Syndicate that as the qualified Principals were not available, by making advertisement by the management and on the merit basis, the posts be filled. In case the Principals are not available even after advertisement, then the present Principals, whether he is having required qualification or not and whether he

has 400-500 scores or not, he should be allowed to continue for the period of one year and after that if the term of the Principal is to be extended, the post be re-advertised. He said that he had come to know that a decision had been made in the Syndicate that the term of the Principal would be for 2 years. He said that he was feeling strongly that the University had advertised three posts of Principals of constituent Colleges of the Panjab University. The University had selected the Principal from amongst the already working teachers of the Colleges, out of which one was already a Principal and other two are teachers in the Colleges and they were having sufficient enough points that the University had easily posted them as Principals after making selection. He said that what the management was doing is that someone 'X' goes in the College as nominee and reports that none was found suitable, the present Principal should continue and the X goes to the College of Y, he states there that none found suitable, let the present continue.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar further said that the Punjab Government and in 7-8 College of UT Government, they have made promotions to the post of Professors in their Colleges. He said that in the affiliated Colleges of Punjab and U.T., there are no avenues for promotions. He stated that the mere chance that was with them that the teachers could become Principals, with the connivance of the management, it has become a common thing that declare that none found suitable and the old one, be made to continue.

Dr. Dinesh Talwar said that he was raising the issue of research centres in the Colleges, since the year 2004 that in DAV Colleges, there were around 80 students pursuing Ph.D. and they know that fact that the formula of none found suitable would be applicable and the current Principal would continue. He said that he feels so, that it be reviewed. He said that the decision was made by the Syndicate and the Senate could reverse the decision. He said that they have been blocked by taking this decision that nobody from the College now would become the Principal in a College where incumbent Principal is very close to the management. There are instances that those incumbent Principals who were not very close to the management, they have joined their new place promptly. Guru Nanak College, Ludhiana, where no requirement of Principal was there, the College has been given the Principal. He said that they have started a very awful system. In the College where continuity is to be favoured, that is done by saying that none found suitable. No one would become suitable, because none found suitable is to be said by themselves. What happens is that X in place of Y and Y in place of X says that none found suitable. He said that he is saying so in the form of an example, rather he could name the person concerned about which he is talking. He has the hesitation because one of the two persons is present here. He said that either the committees are constituted sub-consciously or the persons concerned are fortunate. The Committee make the favour in the continuity of the incumbent Principals by declaring that none found suitable. He requested the Vice Chancellor that this should be reviewed so that the deserving candidate could avail the chance of promotion. He cautioned that there would be unrest in the Colleges to the extent that working teachers would be demoralised. He said that it was his humble submission.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that issue of admission at Ludhiana which has been raised by Ms. Anu Chatrath, a committee should be constituted as early as possible. He further said that it was necessary that the aspect of quality should also be seen. As has been told by the Director, there are sufficient good applicants also. He said that on one hand the seats would be filled and the University would escape of the financial loss. The already appointed teachers cannot be retrenched, the salaries shall have to be paid to them. He further said that it should also be looked into whether there were any other reasons except the quality issue, in the matter. It should be enquired into.

Professor Yog Raj Angrish said that with respect to the other issue, he has met the Registrar 2-3 times and the Registrar was doing efforts. The issue is that the 2-3 big shops behind the buildings of the Arts Block, starting from the Hut to the canteen behind the UBS, have been lying vacant for the last 6-7 months. They have not been rented out. He said that a procedure was worked out that to increase the income, the shops be rented out at minimum fixed rates. They have been writing letter that the shops be rented out at the earliest. He said that there are 3-4 shops in the same line

and these shops cannot be rented out at equal rates. The rent rates could be as per the volume of the sale of each shop. Some shops might have the sale of rupees one lac while the others can earn fifty thousand per month. In the same way a big market was constructed in Sector 14, only one person had given e-tendering, but that too could not succeed. He suggested that to avoid financial loss, it should be rented out at a feasible rate through traditional method or open auction, by constituting a Committee. He added that the rates of some of the shops in shopping complex needed to be revised. A booth was rented out on certain conditions laid down by a committee of which Professor Ronki Ram was the chairman. It was written in the agreement that the rates would be revised after every two years. He said that there were sufficient number of shops whose rent rates could be revised. He said that he had met Mr. Jagmohan, the Assistant Registrar on the suggestion of the Registrar and a personal request had also been made to him and a project had also been given and he had replied in a passive way. He (Mr. Jagmohan) said that it appears that it could not be done soon. He (Professor Angrish) said that he had asked Shri Jagmohan to discuss it with the Registrar. He stated that they have to face the students who come to them and request him to get the Hut opened so that they could have tea facility etc. adjoining to the Department.

Shri Keshav Malhotra said that e-tender was coming on Monday.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there was a particular set of people, as has been stated by him in the Syndicate also, who are included in the Selection Committees and Inspection and a particular set of people is ignored to be the members of Selection and Inspection Committee for the last so many years. He said that this should be looked into. He further stated that he was not saying that it was being done deliberately and even if it is being done unintentionally, he requested the Vice Chancellor to look into it. How it was happening, how it was being manipulated and who were the people who were able to manage to get their names included in each and every College. He stated that he could tell them about a College, whether there was any inspection, any selection, selection of any subject, inspection of any subject, a particular person have to be member of that Committee. He requested the Vice Chancellor to check that and remove such discrepancies.

Shri Ashok Goyal further pointed out that as has been raised by Professor Gosal that even in the Flying Squad, some names have been deleted, he said that he is sure that the Vice Chancellor while deleting the names must have some background in his mind. He said that he would request the Vice Chancellor that it should at least be shared with some so that if any doubt were there, those should be cleared. Citing an example, he stated that it has also been raised that A was going in A College and said that none found suitable and B was going to B College where from the person had come to the A College and said that none found suitable. He said that this needed to be probed. Secondly, he said that he did not know whether it has been brought to the notice of the Vice Chancellor or not, the Vice Chancellor's nominee being the same on two different Selection Committees and the candidate being the same appearing both the Selection Committees, in one Selection Committee, the Vice Chancellor's nominee said that the candidate was not eligible and after a span of few days, when the next interview was held, the Vice Chancellor's nominee declared the same candidate as eligible. He said that if what he was saying was true, and he was saying with full responsibility and this needed to be looked into as to why such serious lapses are taking place. To his view, it cannot be such, unless and until some management manipulations were there.

Raising another issue, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was not sure, it has been said by the Vice-Chancellor, he appreciate that to fill the seats does not mean that they should compromise with the quality of the students. By taking care of the self financed courses, he did not mean that they admit sub-standard students, this issue is debatable as to what was the definition of the sub-standard students. He said that he had a case where there was a reservation for NRI students. Nowadays, there is reservation for Scheduled Caste, reservation for Scheduled Tribes categories and so on, when the admission are not made in these categories, ultimately the seats are converted into general category. He stated that if the NRI seats are at par with those seats of SC/ST categories, he wonders under what provisions these NRI seats are not converted to that

of General category. If NRI seats are over and above the sanctioned seats, he could understand, but if the NRI seats are within the sanctioned strength and if they have kept one percent seats reserved for NRIs, and if they have converted these into general category seats, definitely the students would not be of better quality, but comparatively the standard of the students would be good enough, from the students if the seats were filled with NRI students. If those NRI seats have not been converted into General Category seats, this was the first lapse which has been committed and thereafter, when it is brought to the notice that these seats were to be converted and then they say sorry that the last date is over. He said that alright, he would be the last man to say that make admissions after last date, if there was a deadline, the real deadline, but he wanted that the responsibility to be fixed why those seats have not been converted and who was responsible for causing huge financial loss to the University for not converting the seats and filling them before the deadline. He said that even now, those seats would be converted and those who were in the waiting list in the General Category, they must be admitted. On the intervention of the Vice Chancellor, he said that he did not want any answer, he wanted to discuss the issue. He wished that his information might be wrong, but in case, his information was right, he was talking out of his conviction.

Another issue was raised by Shri Ashok Goyal regarding migration or transfer of student from Chandigarh to Ludhiana. He said that he did not know as to why the student was transferred for a semester or for a year. He said that it was also true that, this was the rarest of the rare case that somebody wanted to Ludhiana from Chandigarh because there was no occasion for him to appear for counselling at Ludhiana as he had already got admission at Chandigarh, but it might be that due to his circumstances, he might have chosen to shift to Ludhiana. He said that to his view, nothing wrong has been done. He expressed that what about the vacant seat which has been created at Chandigarh by the student who had shifted to Ludhiana. The last date was over, the vacant seat was lying there at Chandigarh, he would simply like to say that the student had to be migrated from Chandigarh to Ludhiana, why the one, on number one in merit from Ludhiana should not be shifted to Chandigarh so that their seats should not go waste. The candidate who wanted to come from Ludhiana to Chandigarh on seniority in merit basis, he is also helped as we have helped the one who have to go from Chandigarh to Ludhiana and it will only be possible if he has been transferred or migrated from Chandigarh to Ludhiana.

Raising the another issue, Shri Ashok Goyal said that as a member of the Senate and Syndicate, he remembered that the appointment of Dean Student Welfare was made up to 31st of July, 2016. His term expired on 31st of July 2016 and to his knowledge, the Syndicate and Senate had not extended the term of Dean Student Welfare. He said that he wanted to ask as to under which provisions and under which power the present DSW was continuing as such for which the authority was vested with the Senate. Specially, the meeting of the Syndicate took place itself on 31st of July, 2016 followed by another meeting of the Syndicate on 19th of August, 2016 and followed by this meeting of that day on 3rd September, 2016. Now if he did not ask, the University system was completely being destroyed and if he asked, unfortunately, he was misunderstood at the cost of creating this mistrust in him. He said that he would like to have answers as to under what circumstances or what forced not to bring it to the meeting of 31st of July, 2016. He asked if they have passed an order on 31st of July, why it was not shared with the Syndicate of 19th of August, 2016. If due to one reason or the other, it was not shared with the Syndicate of 19th of August, why the item had not been brought here for information.

The Vice Chancellor said that the item was brought in the Syndicate of 19th of August, 2016.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why the item was not brought in the meeting of 31st of July, 2016.

The Vice Chancellor said that he took the decision after the Syndicate meeting of 31st of July, 2016.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to remind that the similar was the situation in the year 2013 also. When it was discussed in the Syndicate and it was specifically resolved that now since the Vice Chancellor has already passed the orders in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, they had no alternative except to certify it. In 2013, the Vice Chancellor had assured that from now onwards, it will never be done in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate. Now again in 2016, to say it was just a chance. He said that he wondered that why the office had not put it to the Vice Chancellor that the term of appointment of such and such had been expiring on such and such date and this item needed to be taken into the Syndicate. He (the Vice Chancellor) knew that the Chancellor had nominated one particular person by virtue of his holding that position and the position he had been holding by way of getting mandate from the competent body and the competent body is yet to examine as to whether the extension is to be granted or not to be granted, by virtue of the post which he was holding, without jurisdiction, he had been continuing as nominated member of the Senate also. He said that as to why it pained him. He discussed it with the Vice Chancellor on 31st of July, 2016. He said that he discussed it with the Vice Chancellor for two hours in the presence of the Registrar.

Shri Ashok Goyal further stated that he had specifically mentioned that there are serious charges against the Dean Student Welfare and he had discussed those charges with the Vice Chancellor and he had given some particulars and details also. He had given some names and also had told about the irregularities and by passing of the procedures. He said that he had told that there were some serious grave discrepancies which may bring bad name to the University to which the Vice Chancellor had instructed the Registrar in my presence, to tell the CVO to expedite the ongoing investigation into the matter and bring to the notice of the CVO that the information given by him on that day. After fifteen days of that, he asked the Registrar about any progress, he replied that they were looking into it. After five days of that, he met the Registrar personally to ask what had happened. The Registrar called the CVO in his office and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was assured that within a week or maximum of 10 days the report would be submitted and he was talking today that, after 20 days, nothing has come as yet. But he was surprised that in the presence of the Registrar, the CVO said that the issue about which he (Shri Ashok Goyal) was talking, has not reached to her as yet and the Registrar said that no, no, they have certainly sent it to her and the CVO again replied that she has not received that as yet. He further said that to his information till 3rd of September, she had not those details with her and she was investigating only that part which was referred to her by the Syndicate. He further said that as to why he was discussing this with the Vice Chancellor is that this was as per the mandate of the Syndicate and that if any of the member had any further information, he may share it with him (the Vice-Chancellor), the Registrar, or the CVO and now Sir, he was simply asking that tomorrow, if what is alleged, is found to be correct, do you (the Vice Chancellor) could escape the responsibility. He simply wanted to know whether a particular person who is being alleged, was the real brother of the Dean Student Welfare, who have been awarded the contract at a place which is under the direct control of DSW. He wanted a simple answer 'Yes' or 'No'. He was not questioning into whether the contract has been given rightly or wrongly to him. His simple question was to know about his being real brother of DSW or not and till date after a period of one and half month, he has not received the answer.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) should give in writing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was the duty of the Vice-Chancellor to put in record what is being sought by the members and he did not want to introduce a new concept that the members of the Syndicate and Senate have to give in writing. He said that he was the member of the governing body and as such he takes every responsibility that he is ready to undergo any kind of punishment in case he is found to be wrong. He said that if in one and a half month's time, they have not been able to find the relationship between the awardee of the Contract and one who was functioning at the helm of the affair. He wondered as to what kind of enquiry they were holding and when the clean chit is to be given whether through Standing Committee or CVO, the report is procured even within a time of one week and placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would talk to the CVO.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that why he was saying so. He has no hesitation in sharing with the house that in case this issue is pushed under the carpet, he would be taking it up at any of the level, it is not blackmailing, he did not want to leave it because University was getting bad name on this account.

Raising another issue of CMJ University, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had raised some points about the degree of CMJ University. He stated that he had raised the issue twice. He said that two months earlier, he had discussed it in the Syndicate that one of the honourable member of the Senate, Dr. Jagwant Singh had written a letter to the Vice Chancellor that since some of the cases of the candidates having the degree from CMJ University have been approved by the Vice Chancellor, as usual and there were some who are placed at similar level having Ph.D. degree from CMJ University, but they were rendered ineligible by some of the policies of the University. He said that Dr. Jagwant Singh wanted the same and those candidates also wanted the same that either the persons holding the degree of CMJ University are eligible or they are not eligible. If one is eligible, all were eligible and if one is ineligible, all are ineligible and if one is not eligible, all are not eligible. To his view, it cannot be the case that some are eligible and some are not eligible having the same degree at the same time. He said that he had requested in the Syndicate that either split this issue by bringing the item in the Syndicate or Senate or the Vice Chancellor take decision at his own level. He further said that despite his telling that his stand in the case was very-very clear and it was known to everybody and he still say with full responsibility that those degrees are not the valid degrees on the basis of which the approval of appointments have been done. He wanted to give an information that one of those candidates whom Dr. Jagwant Singh helped in a letter, appeared for selection somewhere, was not selected, whether on merit or by virtue of having CMJ degree. He had filed a writ petition in Punjab & Haryana High court stating that if some cases have been approved by Panjab University, why his case had not been considered and why he has not been selected in spite of the fact that he had been teaching in the same College for the last many years. The candidate said that he had been told verbally that he had not been selected because he was having degree of CMJ University and when he (Shri Ashok Goyal) spoken to the Principal of the College, the Principal said that they were in a dilemma as to how to respond in the Court because they have written 4 letters to the University asking about the status of these degrees within a span of two months. But they were yet to get reply followed by the reminder which has been received three days back. Explaining his helplessness to the University that please, for God sake, clarify as they have to respond to the writ petition before High Court. But unfortunately, though the Panjab University is also a party to the writ petition, but the judge has issued notice only to that College. He said that it was only that College who is accountable to the High Court and they do not know as to what reply is to be given to the Court. He requested the Vice Chancellor to kindly look into it on priority.

Dr. Lilu Ram said that the first point he would like to make was regarding the qualifications under NCTE regulation 2009. There were 50% marks required postgraduate degree and 55% marks were required for selection as Assistant Professor in Education Colleges alongwith NET in Education. Now in 2014, NCTE regulation, this has been revised that there would be 55% marks in each in PG degree as well as in M.Ed. degree alongwith NET. He pointed out that in some of the Colleges, the teachers are working and they have been approved by the University. The Punjab government has been undergoing recruitment in aided Colleges, and wherever the teachers apply for those posts, they are made ineligible. At certain point of time, they are found eligible and they have been approved by the University. He said that there was a Syndicate decision that once approved, was always approved. If a candidate is approved in a affiliated College, he is approved forever. He said that if that condition is applied, the person should be eligible for that post for aided post or casual. His humble request to this House is that this should be applicable for those, who are already approved, must be considered eligible under the new regulation as well.

Dr. Lilu Ram said that the second point that he was to make is regarding M.Ed. admissions. The University conducted M.Ed. admissions last year and Colleges were part of the admission process. From his year onwards, a Committee was constituted probably in May in which it was decided that the Colleges would make admission at their own level and the University would follow the same procedure which was going on in other departments. He said that as they were connecting the M.Ed. admission at the central level, this decision should have been intimated to the Colleges at the very point of the decision of the Committee. In the written order issued, after the 31st of July, till that all the admissions were over and now, even in Chandigarh, not even a single candidate is coming for admissions. He questioned as to who was responsible for this. Let them know. Could there be not any mechanism, that they should have been made known well in time. Now another question arised out of this is that what should be the last date for admissions. Now such admission deadline has been made in the coming session which has been conveyed to the Colleges.

Dr. Lilu Ram said that another point that he has to make was regarding Shahi Sports College. He said that this college was suffering because of insufficiency of the University because many courses approved by the University, which are going on in the College, he was unable to understand what was wrong or what was right. He said that one of the course namely BPSE which has been approved by the UGC and that has been written, the order has been issued, this course is now approved and the College should approach the University and the University would decide about the syllabi and all other things. Since the admission process has already been over. Again this year, they have been denied. He said that the College should not suffer on account of our inefficiency.

Dr. Lilu Ram said that another point that he wants to raise is that many of our teachers are undergoing Ph.D. work in remote areas particularly in Jalalabad and Fazilka and they face lot of difficulties while coming to this University for consulting research variables. He questioned as to whether they could have a mechanism in which they could make research and other material accessible at the Regional Centres so that they could come at the nearest station for consultation, for example, the Journals which are on line, could they have access over there, how and what mechanism should they adopt.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that he would like to raise some points, he said that some seats of NRIs have been lying vacant and some of the students of General Category were waiting for their admission and they have come to know that some of the seats have been lying vacant under NRI category and they want to be admitted against these vacant seats. He said that there were two ways, one is to get migration from the College to the parent department against the NRI seats by paying NRI fee. Another is to take fresh admission but because we say that the seats are vacant or not, they bothered not to worry, the deadline was over. He said that unfortunately it was against the provisions of the Calendar that if one has taken admission in one College and wanted to shift to another College even within the dates valid for admission, he has to seek migration but as per the administrative instruction of the University, one can apply for migration only after the registration return is received from the College that means after September. The regulations say that even if one gets admission and want to migrate from one College to another College he can get it. But the administrative instructions were contrary to that.

The Vice Chancellor said that this was a serious thing and they would sit together with the Dean of University Instruction to look into it.

Ms. Anu Chatrath said that the vacant seats available with all the departments should have been filled by extending the date of admission.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that when the teachers apply and they all are well aware of the fact that they would not be appointed despite of fulfilling all the qualifications. All the eligible candidates of the same College having 400 points cannot apply. He said that whatever has been done in the past, that was right but now it should be seen from the time onwards. He said that the attention of the Vice Chancellor remains towards research and other things, the persons who was forming the

Committees which is not known to them, those persons should be changed. The mirror of that persons stop working at a certain degree. It otherwise makes no difference but, what was the conflict perception, that image is going somewhat down. He said that he has raised this issue three to four times in the meeting of the Syndicate. This is said that if something went wrong with anybody it gives a bad reflection here in the University. He said that a particular panel was very much there. He said that before 4-5 years, nobody knew the name of Mr. Harpreet Singh Dua. He said that he has been naming himself, as he does not think it proper to name others. He said that whatever has happened, he brought it to the notice of the Vice Chancellor time and again. He further stated that they are ready to accept the things either these are said by Vice Chancellor, Registrar or Secretary to Vice Chancellor, provided it is transparent. He said that if the transparency is limited to expel some of the people only, then they have no need of such type of transparency. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that all the decisions he has got made in the Syndicate from the January onwards regarding PF to the College teachers, till date no committees have been constituted. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua pointed out that despite of the repeated requests, the documents relating to construction of College Bhawan has not been provided to them.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that if any deficiency or discrepancy is pointed out to the Colleges, the Colleges think as if they were their enemy. He said that the things are not such. He said that what happened is that some people have formed a squad which has hand in gloves with the Management Committees and Principals of the Colleges. He said that what damage they have done to the Colleges is that the University has started conducting Principal conferences in the Colleges and that is too, in those Colleges which are the big exploiters, the exploitation in the way that they take the salary back after disbursement. This phenomenon persisted despite of the repeated notices. He said that nobody would like to admit his child in the College because the system has been so deteriorated that even the functionaries of the Colleges would not like their wards to study in those Colleges. The University officers visit the Colleges on prize distribution and convocation functions only. He said that at least it should be seen as to which Colleges are good one and which are not. He was the least vocalic in the Syndicate meetings, this may be the reason that he is not being taken seriously.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he wanted to raise another issue of preferential treatment to the Selection Committee members over the fellows in the University Guest House. He said that perhaps the Fellow is more important than the selection committee members. The fellows are not served with the lunch. Two of the fellows were misbehaved. He said that there were the strict orders from the Registrar that the fellow should happen sitting in the dining hall and also that unless the outsider (selection committee members) reaches the Guest House, no lunch would be started to be served.

The Vice Chancellor questioned as to if this was correct.

Endorsing the statement of Shri Dua, Shri Ashok Goyal said that one of the fellow had come for Syndicate meeting and he was not served lunch. He said that he tried to intervene and it was said that there were clear cut orders from the Registrar. He further said that it looks as if they were telling lie.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would check it and he will not hold the lunch and from the time onwards, no selection committee would be held in the Guest House.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that he had time and again pointed out that the stay orders has been taken by some of the B.Ed. Colleges regarding disbursing salary on the basis of basic pay only. He said that the University should chalk out the programme as to how to get the stay orders vacated.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has already asked the SLO so many times to do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he wanted to get it verified from the Registrar that as to whether any application has been filed by the Registrar. This issue was raised 1½ years back, then 1 year back and now for the last 6 months and the Vice Chancellor said that he has told the SLO and in his view the SLO is not responsible for that.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had three law officers, they have to inspect and do the things in many ways. He (the Vice Chancellor) had constituted committees so many times and he could do only that.

On this, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice-Chancellor should not show his helplessness. He further said that he simply wanted to know as to whether there was any noting in the file given by DCDC or Registrar instructing the Counsel to file an application for stay vacation. He said that the answer is No. He stated that he could tell, why the answer is No. He said that he could tell them about number of notings which has not only been given by the Registrar, but by the Vice Chancellor also that file an application for vacation of stay. In that case file has not been touched but in other cases, which has been subsequently filed, subsequently interim relief has been given, there the orders are that file the application for vacation of stay but in that case where hundred and hundred of teachers were suffering because of the high handedness on the part of the management, the University took no note. He further said that he wanted to bring it to the notice of the Vice Chancellor and this also to be noted that the Registrar as Returning Officer has been very-very strict by following rules, but here in the case where a Principal who has not only been approved by the University has not only been allowed to continue as a regular Principal, his name has been included in the voter's list of Principals. The Principal belongs to the Chandigarh and nowhere else.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Syndicate meeting is to be held in the next month and he wanted that the members be given the document that has been put by the University to get the stay vacated.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua further said that contract documents of the College Bhawan be sent to all the Senate members.

The Vice Chancellor said that it has been done in all the meetings and the building was given two years ago and it all has taken place earlier and he was not responsible for that.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was not only the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor alone, yet it was the responsibility of all of them. He further said that he (the Vice Chancellor) was not admitting to himself and also not to them.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it means that he would not be given the contract documents of the College Bhawan.

On this the Vice Chancellor said that Shri Dua had every right to demand papers. Shri Dua thanked the Vice Chancellor for responding to his demand.

The Vice Chancellor said that as many as more kar sewaks would come forward, the University would flourish more.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he wanted to give some suggestions. He said that as has been stated by Shri H.S.Dua that some get it included in the Selection Committees and some not. He said that Professor Sobti, the former Vice Chancellor was used to prepare a chart in which the names were included and against the names, it was mentioned as to which College one would go. He suggested that the Vice Chancellor should start preparing such a list so that one knows as to which committee, his/her name has been included.

The Vice Chancellor said that these all were desirable things.

Senate Proceedings dated 3rd September 2016

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that it was not the fault of the Registrar or the DCDC, the Colleges are not giving the proper information, the Colleges are being run in the fake names. He said that he was not saying that there came any confrontation but he was saying that in so many Colleges, this has been going on.

The Vice Chancellor said that these were their issue, they should do it and do the business of the University and why he would stop them from doing this.

Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.)
Registrar

Confirmed

Professor Arun Kumar Grover
Vice-Chancellor