

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the special meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **5<sup>th</sup> July 2016 at 10.30 a.m.** in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**PRESENT**

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Dr. Ajay Ranga
3. Professor Anil Monga
4. Shri Ashok Goyal
5. Dr. Balbir Chand Josan
6. Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi
7. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa
8. Professor Emanuel Nahar
9. Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky
10. Shri Harpreet Singh Dua
11. Principal I.S. Sandhu
12. Professor Keshav Malhotra
13. Professor Navdeep Goyal
14. Shri Raghbir Dyal
15. Dr. Shelley Walia
16. Principal Surinder Singh Sangha
17. Shri T.K. Goyal, Director Higher Education, Punjab
18. Col. G.S. Chadha Registrar ... (Secretary)

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

**Condolence Resolution**

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

- i) Smt. Shashi Bala Jain w/o Shri Satya Pal Jain, Fellow, PU, Additional Solicitor General of India and Member, Law Commission of India, on June 20, 2016;
- ii) Smt. Kartar Kaur mother of Shri Kuljit Singh Nagra, MLA and Fellow, PU, on June 29, 2016; and
- iii) Shri Ajit Singh Kang father of Professor Ranbir Kaur, Former Chairperson, Department of Laws, on July 2, 2016.

**The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Smt. Shashi Bala Jain, Smt. Kartar Kaur, and Shri Ajit Singh Kang and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.**

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

**Vice Chancellor's Statement**

1. The Vice Chancellor said, "I am pleased to inform the Hon'ble members that:

- (1) Professor (Dr.) Balram K. Gupta, alumnus of Panjab University and Director (Academics), Chandigarh

Judicial Academy, has been conferred upon with Life Time Achievement Award for overall contribution made towards judiciary through his writings and talks, at the Rotary International District 3080 Award Ceremony on June 26, 2016.

- (2) Professor Manju Jaidka, Academician and Novelist, Department of English and Cultural Studies, has been felicitated by the Chandigarh Sahitya Akademi with Life Time Award of Recognition.
- (3) Dr. Seema Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Geology, has been selected for the National Award 'Prof. R.C. Mishra Gold Medal' in Geosciences by the Wadia Institute of Himalayan Geology (WIHG), Dehradun (a DST body).
- (4) Professor K.P. Singh, Centre of Advanced Study in Geology has been adjudged as second best (five such prizes) for writing Technical Paper on "Impact of Climate Change on Water Resources and Water Security in North West Parts of India" by the Central Ground Water Authority, Ministry of Water Resources, River Development & Ganga Rejuvenation, Government of India, for First National Essay Competition under Jal Kranti Abhiyan 2015-16.
- (5) Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Engineering & Technology has been honoured with the Outstanding Engineering Institute (North) 2016 award by the ABP News National Education Awards on June 23, 2016 at Mumbai, for the second consecutive time in recognition of innovative modern and industry related curriculum, leadership, development, marketing an institute and industry interface in Engineering & Technology.
- (6) The Chandigarh Chapter of the Public Relations Council of India honoured Panjab University's Community Radio Station, Jyotirgamaya 91.2 MHz on July 1, 2016, on account of continuously running weekly show, 'Hamari Beti, programme for three years at the School of Communication Studies.
- (7) Professor Archana R. Singh, School of Communication Studies, has been nominated as a Member of the Indian Institute of Mass Communication Society for a period of two years by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting vide its notification dated 13<sup>th</sup> April 2016.
- (8) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor of Pharmacology, U.I.P.S., has been selected for a highly prestigious "UGC Research Award for 2016-18". UGC will reimburse full salary of Dr Kuhad to PU. In addition to full salary, he will also be given a research grant of Rs.3 lakh for chemicals, equipment, books and journals.
- (9) Dr. Kewal Krishan, Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology, has contributed three invited chapters

entitled 'Identification: Prints-Earprints', 'Identification: Prints-footprints' and 'Blood Grouping' to the Encyclopedia of Forensic and Legal Medicine, published by Elsevier, Oxford (2016), (Second Edition, 4 Volume Set).

- (10) Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar, Panjab University has been co-opted to the Managing Committee of Chandigarh Chapter of the Institute of Company Secretaries of India for the year 2016.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Professor (Dr.) Balram K. Gupta, alumnus of Panjab University and Director (Academics), Chandigarh Judicial Academy, on being conferred upon with Life Time Achievement Award for overall contribution made towards judiciary;
  - (ii) Professor Manju Jaidka, Academician and Novelist, Department of English and Cultural Studies, for being felicitated by the Chandigarh Sahitya Akademi with Life Time Award of Recognition;
  - (iii) Dr Seema Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Geology, on being selected for the National Award 'Prof. R.C. Mishra Gold Medal' in Geosciences;
  - (iv) Professor K.P. Singh, Centre of Advanced Study in Geology on being adjudged as second best for writing Technical Paper on "Impact of Climate Change on Water Resources and Water Security in North West Parts of India" by the Central Ground Water Authority, Ministry of Water Resources, River Development & Ganga Rejuvenation, Government of India, for First National Essay Competition under Jal Kranti Abhiyan 2015-16;
  - (v) Professor Archana R. Singh, School of Communication Studies, on being nominated as a Member of the Indian Institute of Mass Communication Society for a period of two years by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting;
  - (vi) Dr. Anurag Kuhad, Assistant Professor of Pharmacology, U.I.P.S., on being selected for a highly prestigious "UGC Research Award for 2016-18";

- (vii) Dr Kewal Krishan, Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology, for contributing three invited chapters to the Encyclopedia of Forensic and Legal Medicine; and
  - (viii) Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.), Registrar, Panjab University on his having been co-opted to the Managing Committee of Chandigarh Chapter of the Institute of Company Secretaries of India for the year 2016.
2. Appreciation of the Syndicate be placed on record for Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Engineering & Technology on having been honoured with the Outstanding Engineering Institute (North) 2016 award by the ABP News National Education Awards; and
  3. The information contained in Vice Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (6), be noted.

**Issue related to the post of Dean College Development Council**

2. Considered the issue relating to the post of Dean College Development Council, pursuant to orders dated 31.05.2016 (**Appendix-I**) of the Punjab and Haryana High Court passed in CWP No. 11292 of 2016 (Appendix-) filed by Dr. Naval Kishore, former Dean College Development Council.

- NOTE:** 1. The Senate at its meeting dated 31.03.2012 (Para VII) (**Appendix-I**) considered the recommendations of the Syndicate dated 29.02.2012 (Para 2 (xiii)) (**Appendix-I**) and approved the appointment of Dr. Naval Kishore as Dean College Development Council on tenure basis for a period of 3 years or up to a maximum age of 60 years whichever is earlier in the grade of Rs.37400-67000+GP of Rs.10000/- and allowances admissible under the University rules, on a pay to be fixed according to the rules of Panjab University. He was also allowed to retain his lien as Professor in the Department of Geology.
2. During the discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 08.03.2015 (Para 35) (**Appendix-I**) it was agreed to that the term of Professor Naval Kishore, DCDC, be extended up to 31.05.2016 i.e. up to the end of the month in which he attains the age of 60 years, which was also approved by the Senate in its meeting held on 29.03.2015 (Para C-53) (**Appendix-I**).
  3. The Syndicate at its meeting held on 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 (Para 13) (**Appendix-I**) approved the qualifications for the post of Dean

College Development Council, P.U., to be advertised. Accordingly, the post was advertised vide Advt. No.01/2016.

4. During general discussion in the meeting of the Syndicate dated 28/29.05.2016 (**Appendix-I**) the issue relating to the post of DCDC was also discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said that this special meeting of the Syndicate has been convened to consider just one item and the item is related to the post of Dean College Development Council and this meeting has been convened in pursuance of the orders dated 31.05.2016 of Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court passed in CWP No. 11292 of 2016 filed by Dr. Naval Kishore, former Dean College Development Council. This judgement and the directive of the Court was uploaded on 11<sup>th</sup> June 2016 though the judgement happened on 31.05.2016. Dr. Naval Kishore was relieved on the evening of 31.05.2016 on the basis of whatever was conveyed, Dr. Naval Kishore wanted to get relieved himself. The judgement had been uploaded on 31.05.2016. Meanwhile, the interview had been scheduled on 23.05.2016. He (Vice-Chancellor) was away and on receipt of the judgement loaded around 11.06.2016, they postponed the interview indefinitely. The Court is supposed to meet on 08.07.2016 and the Syndicate meeting has been convened as desired by the Court before the date of next hearing. The fact of the matter is that the post has been advertised as per the Syndicate decision taken in January/February 2016 and the last date of advertisement was over and the applications have been received and screened. The candidates have been shortlisted, the interview was to be conducted and had to be postponed indefinitely. The issue is before them is that what is the view of the Syndicate and whether they reiterate their old decision that the qualifications had been approved for the post, as the post would fall vacant on 1.6.2016.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they look at the judgment of the Court, it says that the counsel of the University has submitted that in fact, a decision was taken that the post would be re-advertised. However, a perusal of the judgement implies that the file produced by the learned Senior Counsel (of PU) today does not show such a decision having been taken. But, the fact is that the Syndicate had taken the decision in this regard in its meeting held on 23.01.2016/06.02.2016 that the position be re-advertised. Now, what probably the Court wants is that till a decision is taken on the issue of method of filling up the position by the competent authority, the position be not filled up. As far as competent authority is concerned, the competent authority is the Syndicate and the Syndicate has already taken a decision in its meetings held in January/February, 2016 and they should reiterate and close the matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could inform the Court the factual position and wait for the directive of the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to know two points for his own knowledge, because as per the order of the Court, the counsel of the University was also present in the Court and orders which were announced in the Court especially in view of the fact that the University counsel was present, was it not obligatory on the part of the counsel of the University to convey to the Vice Chancellor or the

Registrar that this is the order passed by the Court. If such a communication was received because as the Vice-Chancellor has conveyed that Professor Naval Kishore had informed meaning thereby that the Counsel of the University had not confirmed anything? If it is so why such a communication had not been given to the University and why the University had to wait for the orders to be uploaded till 11.6.2016 to take a decision to postpone the interview. He could understand if the Vice Chancellor was away, the way the orders had been announced by the Court. He thought, he was not sure, probably the date on which the order was announced by the Court, the Vice Chancellor was in town and of course, the argument were taking place in the morning in the court. If as the University's people were present there and knew that such and such order has been announced by the court, he did not think there was any need for them to wait for the uploading on the website or the copy of the orders to be received from the court. And the duty of the counsel is to inform that this is what the orders have been passed by the court, and the interview if at all should have been postponed on the same day thereby eliminating the element of uncertainty because ultimately they have to realise that the interview was to be held on 23.05.2016 and there are candidates who come from the far flung areas. They have to plan their visit, they have to make the bookings. He thought that they have missed the opportunity of taking care of the comfort and convenience of the candidates who were supposed to come for the interview. Secondly, as Professor Navdeep Goyal has rightly pointed out that the Court seems to have passed the order on the one ground that the University counsel has not been able to show the papers whereby the Syndicate has taken a decision. The Court has not stopped there only because he has not gone through the details of the judgement and he understood that the court says that it is not only the Syndicate and Senate and the court has said that let the decision be taken by the Syndicate and Senate. Even though the Syndicate had taken a decision he did not know where from they have to convince them that the Senate has to take the decision. That is what the orders of the court say. As Professor Navdeep Goyal has said that in January/February, 2016 they have already taken a decision to advertise the post. As per the item it looks that they have only approved the qualification for the post and there is no conscious decision to advertise the post and nowhere has it been stated that the post be advertised. This was what he was technically speaking. In February, 2016, some decision had also been taken.

The Vice Chancellor said that the factual position is that they have approved the qualifications for the post to be advertised, as the post was to going to be vacant on 1.6.2016. So, in anticipation that the post was getting vacant, they advertised the position so that they have a person as early as possible. It is in that context that the qualification had been approved and the position was going to be vacant on 1.6.2016 and screening and everything had been done. Now Dr. Naval Kishore's contention that his position as Professor could be extended only much later is irrelevant. The DCDC position had been advertised and the whole process had been done as per the practice that ought to be. When the position is going to be vacant, they have to advertise the position. The University should have advertised the position and filled it up by 31<sup>st</sup> May so that the person could have joined on 1<sup>st</sup> June. They are already delayed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he was trying to submit is in the context of what the Court has said, that should have been explained by the counsel in the Court itself. Somehow in view of the observations made by the Court, he was simply speaking on practical and technical grounds that nowhere it has been mentioned, but context has been given. Secondly, the post had been advertised. Now when it came to the notice of the Syndicate that the UGC allows the Dean College Development Council to continue up to 65 years of age, the context was that the incumbent could be given extension for another 3 years but not beyond 60 years when they extended the first tenure. That meant, in principle, they had decided to extend the term subject to the condition that it will be only up to the age of superannuation. But if the age of superannuation as far as UGC is concerned, it is 65 years. It was discussed in the meeting of the Syndicate earlier also. It was only in the context, as the Vice Chancellor was saying that it was not in the context of subsequent development as far as the stay beyond 60 years as Professor is concerned, he was also saying that it is the subsequent development that it came to the notice of the Syndicate that it is beyond 60 also that one could continue subject to the maximum of two terms of 3 years each. So, in that context, it was said that even if the advertisement had been given, the incumbent could be granted the extension. On the first day of the meeting, brutal majority was in favour, the Vice Chancellor adjourned the meeting. On the second day, on the insistence of some of the members that let it be decided by voting and the Vice Chancellor gave the ruling that he would not allow the matter to be put to vote because the item is not an agenda. As human beings, they were also part of the society, they know that during all these days, what kind of lobbying had been going on, for or against, which probably could not termed in any manner an academic exercise which they were expected to do. That is what the Vice Chancellor had been saying. It probably did not amount even to discuss the regulations, guidelines, provisions of the UGC also on merit. What he suggested was that in view of, because the Vice Chancellor said, one of the members had said that it does not behove that the Chairman of the meeting is putting such a ruling. He felt that the High Court was saying that let it be taken to the Syndicate and let it be decided. This is probably in the same spirit as they were talking on that day that let it be decided by vote. But probably the Vice Chancellor was not interested in that and that is why it has taken this shape. Because the Vice Chancellor had insisted on the second day as well as on first day that he was not in favour of giving the extension. Even today also, he feels, that to be fair, let they put this matter to vote but by secret ballot only.

The Vice Chancellor interjected to state that why had he said that the matter was not on the agenda. If the matter had been put on the agenda, then the entire history of the Dean College Development Council would have got disclosed; in the context the way the University has functioned over the last 3 decades. A document was the basis of the debate, which was of 1985. This document was not put before a given Syndicate of this University for the first time. That document had a very long and chequered history. He was not aware of all the facts, as he was not a party to that history. He had not gone through all the decisions of the Syndicate and Senate. He had pleaded with Mr. Ashok Goyal at one stage to sit with him so that all decisions which had been taken which are of some consequence for the functioning of the University, they should be collated and put together, indexed, etc., so that the same could be accessed as the

wisdom of the Syndicate from time to time. DCDC matter has been discussed in the Syndicate numerous times in the past. This 1985 document had been a part of the discussion in the Syndicate meetings in so many cases. Dean College Development Council's position, whether it is an administrative position or an academic position, this had been discussed *ad infinitum* in the proceedings of the Syndicate of this University. The post is an administrative position at present. This is what is there in practice. It is not for the first time that the post was advertised. The post was advertised in 1980s, 1990s, 2004 and again in 2011, and whether the extension can be given beyond 60 years, this has also been a matter of discussion in the past. One of the previous Dean College Development Council made similar pleas in the court that the appointment was for 3 years and it was extended for one more year and there was a court case, which was eventually dismissed. It was seen that the position of Dean College Development Council in the University's context was an administrative position and the retirement age was 60 years. That the position of the Dean College Development Council could be an academic position or administrative position and they would not be violating any UGC rules. The UGC has no clear directive whether this is an academic or administrative position. But as per practice in this University, it is an administrative position. The first Dean College Development Council was appointed in the University after the age of 60 years and went up to the age of 65 years. Thereafter, it has been an administrative position. It has a long history and there is a lot of documentation available in the records of the University. Had this been an agenda item, then he would have been able to collate all the information and put it before the members and then a conscious and informed decision could have been taken on the basis of the long history. If somebody puts it in *ad hoc* manner, he was not aware of all these things. He was not expected to respond also. Off hand if he did not know any of the facts which he had come to know only in the last 10 days after court judgement came, and he came back after 16<sup>th</sup> June, he started to learn the history of the case. The more he dug into it, the more he was confounded with newer facts, in a way he was the least informed person amongst all of them on this issue during previous sitting of this Syndicate. Most of the members know more about these things because they are a part of the governing body of the University, directly or indirectly, somebody as a member of the Senate, somebody as a voter for the Senate. The office of Dean College Development Council as a responsibility has been performed by so many colleagues, who are still a part of the teaching faculty of the University. The job of Dean College Development Council or Additional/Associate Dean College Development Council has been performed by so many colleagues and they all know and are expected to know all the history of the case. In the background of this, he is fully convinced that if any decision is to be taken on the present Dean College Development Council, it should have been taken with all the facts before them and they should not rush for voting, as somebody proposes something and most of them not knowing the facts. On hindsight, he is more than convinced that his decision not to permit voting was a correct decision. They all know it. But they have to take a decision today. They could study all these things. But as of today, one has to inform the court, they have a limited objective and the limited objective is that given the position that the present Dean College Development Council has not continued beyond 31.5.2016 as the Court has not permitted him to continue. He (DCDC) has retired as DCDC. It was an administrative position. For an administrative position, the retirement age is 60 years and they have advertised the



position, a position for which the qualifications have been approved by the Syndicate. The applications have been screened by a competent body of the University and the recommendations of the Screening Committee have been fully accepted and the interview was convened, the interview had been postponed as per the Court directive. The matter is before the Syndicate. The factual position is before them. It is in that background that he was not proposing even now that they go in for (secret) voting. Any voting at this stage, given the history of this case, could be a wrong precedence to set.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that unfortunately, he had not been able to read the document(s). But while they were discussing the case, the context which the Vice Chancellor had referred that the first Dean College Development Council was allowed to continue even up to the age of 65 years. How was he allowed and under what provision? They, in this Syndicate, could not say that nobody who was appointed as Dean College Development Council was ever allowed to continue beyond 60 years. The position was administrative right from the day one or it was an academic right from the beginning. The definition was not given thereafter only. It was in the beginning, i.e., 1985, the post of Dean College Development Council was created by the UGC and the first Dean College Development Council was allowed to go beyond the age of 60 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that the then (i.e., first) Dean College Development Council when he was appointed, he was at the age of 62 years. Thereafter, the post, he tried to locate in the financial documents (Board of Finance), it stands listed amongst the non-teaching posts. Whether it was a teaching or non-teaching position, explicitly which decision of the Syndicate says that it is academic or non-academic. He has to go through all the history of the case. Right now, the way the proceedings of the Syndicate are, he personally could not go through those proceedings of the Syndicate, each one of them, it would need time. He could not just wait and ask the people. Nobody could tell him as to in which Syndicate it has been decided that it was an administrative position. When he tried to look into all the records, records in the sense when the position was advertised in 1990s, he tried to look at the arguments given when Mr. Budhiraja, an earlier Dean College Development Council was not allowed to continue beyond 60 years, he found that his predecessor accepted the plea that it was an administrative position. He saw that his (Professor Sobti's) earlier predecessor, in 2004 when the post was advertised, it was advertised as an administrative position. In the discussion of the Syndicate meetings, there is a reference to it. He could not say that he has gone through each and everything, because 12 meetings of a Syndicate happen in a year and from 1985 or 1988 onwards, 27 years have passed meaning thereby that four hundred meetings have taken place. Had it been a scientific paper, he was supposed to know everything relating to a given paper. If he was doing something new as a Scientist, he would have assured himself that he had done something new. If somebody pointed out to him what he had been doing is not new and this was done in 1864 or 1873, he was not trained not to accept the things, he was trained to accept the things.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether any other Dean College Development Council was allowed to continue beyond the age of 60 years?

The Vice Chancellor said that they know better.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that from some file, the Vice Chancellor must have come to know that somebody was appointed beyond the age of 60 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that he came to know the case of Professor Gosal, as he accessed a file by asking from the office.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he appreciated that it is completely unfair to know the Vice Chancellor would know the history of the Syndicate and the Senate during the meetings held in the last 30 years. He could understand but at the same time, the Vice Chancellor would also appreciate that it is not humanly possible for the members of the Syndicate also. Maybe some of the officers are new and they did not have access to systematic files relating to the earlier decisions, may be they also did not know. Now, what he is saying that one fact has come to light that somebody was allowed to continue up to 65 years. What were the circumstances that meant that they could not cite that 60 means 60. It is also a subsequent development. Had the Vice Chancellor known on that day when they gave the extension for the second tenure, may be they would have given him second full tenure since it was not in the knowledge of anybody. They thought that it was 60 years as per the instructions of the UGC. So they extended the term. But definitely a decision was taken that the next term subject to the maximum age of 60 years be granted. Secondly, he did not know whether the Vice Chancellor had seen it or not. The Vice Chancellor had seen that as per regulations and as per the advertisement, when Principal Budhiraja was appointed, it was a tenure. It is this Syndicate and Senate only which took the decision to convert the tenure post to be a regular post to be treated as appointed on probation. In this case, the tenure was not extended. It was decided by this Syndicate and Senate only that he (Principal Budhiraja) be deemed to be appointed on probation and he was treated as a regular employee till the age of 60 years. That decision was also taken by the Syndicate and Senate. The regulations and the guidelines of the UGC have remained the same. He felt that in the light of the fact that this University only had allowed a particular person to continue up to the age of 65 years, keeping in mind the guidelines of the UGC, this University only had allowed a tenure post to be converted into a regular post, and the appointment was deemed from retrospective date, inclusive of the probation period. He felt that it is very much within the right of this Syndicate and Senate to take any decision in terms of the UGC regulations and also keeping in view the true spirit of the order of the court. That is why he was suggesting that it is never too late that the decision should be done by a secret ballot.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they look at the recent history, when the post was advertised in the year 2004 or later on or even this time, every time the position has been advertised and it is advertised only if approved by the Syndicate and every time it was advertised up to the age of 60 years. When they look at the last incumbent, Principal Budhiraja, he was appointed in 2004 on a tenure post for 3 years, which was up to 2007. In 2007, his term was again extended up to the age of 60 years in the same manner as of Professor Naval Kishore and then in 2008, he represented to the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Ashok Goyal interjected to add that Principal Budhiraja's case not at par with that of Dr. Naval Kishore, as his term was extended up to the age of 60 years.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in case of Dr. Naval Kishore, if they look at the proceedings, he was allowed the extension because new NCTE guidelines were being processed and the University was processing approvals and extensions relating to those and the whole House thought that at that stage if he was not allowed to continue, probably there would be a problem in that process and he be allowed to continue for some time. It was specifically said 'okay' if he is attaining the age of 60 years, then only he was allowed extension, and just to avoid any ambiguity, he was allowed to continue till 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2016. At this stage now, the officiating charge of Dean College Development Council has been given to somebody, who is working efficiently, he did not think that there is any need to relook into the situation regarding Professor Naval Kishore. Syndicate should therefore reiterate their earlier decision and they should go ahead with that.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him again interject. The factual position in the University at the moment is that Dean College Development Council is a non-teaching position and the retirement age in the University at the moment for teaching and non-teaching is 60 years. The University did pass a regulation that it should be made 65 years for teachers, as per the directive of the UGC for the teachers. That regulation of PU has not been endorsed by the MHRD till date. There have been various court cases relating to it. In some cases, the petitions have been dismissed, however, there have also been occasions in the past that the teachers have been allowed to continue beyond 60 years. At some stage, context of reference was 62 years and now it is 65 years. But as of today, the retirement age in PU is 60 years. Of course, some interim relief has been provided by this very Judge to the teaching faculty. He did not know what the judgment would be, which stands reserved. As of today, the age of retirement is 60 years. There is no question, non-teaching staff is not being given any extension. The Librarian has been given extension, as it is a special position in the hierarchy of the UGC positions. No extension has been given to any non-teaching at the moment, as far as operative part of the University functioning is concerned, the retirement age is 60 years. The court has not granted stay to a retired person who was on a non-teaching post. The position at the moment is that the post of DCDC has been advertised. The University counsel failed to convince the judge, may be, everything happened in a hurry. 29<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 being Sunday and the writ petition was filed on 30<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 and on 31<sup>st</sup> May, there were arguments. Maybe the University Counsel could not put across or the judge could not appreciate, what was shown to him, he (Vice Chancellor) was not present in the court. The file had been made available in which the Minutes of Syndicate Meeting(s) were there. The minutes could not be read and/or conveyed, there could be some lacunae. But, the fact of the matter is that it is a non-teaching position. Nobody is occupying any non-teaching position beyond 60 years as of today. The DCDC position has been advertised as per the qualifications approved by the Syndicate. Applications have come and the candidates have been shortlisted. The moot point is that if the judge had given his judgement in writing on 31<sup>st</sup> May, 2016 itself and had uploaded on the same day, the interview may not have been fixed. He was given to understand that the Judge has passed the order that result (of the

interviews) be not declared, as it had happened in the case of Deputy Registrar, when they were allowed to proceed with the interview and the result was not to be declared. He was given to believe that they could proceed with the interview and the result is not to be declared. The order of the court came on Saturday June 11,2016. The next day was Sunday and after that he left for Bengaluru. After coming back from Bengaluru, he took the decision to postpone the interview. He proposed that they could tell to the Court and leave the matter to the court. He was not favouring that they should do any secret voting or any other thing. Just do what the court wants. He reiterated that DCDC remains is a non-teaching post.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he just wanted to enquire that who decided that this is a non-teaching post.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had not decided it and it is written in the University's history that it is a non-teaching post. If they want to convert it to a teaching post, they could bring an agenda item.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was just trying to tell the Vice Chancellor that at par with the same post, the post of Director, Adult & Continuing Education was a non-teaching post and in that case in spite of the fact that applications were invited by as per norms applicable for non-teaching posts. However, the University later took a stand that it is a teaching post, just because the person who was appointed was taking the classes. That is why he has been saying that it is the Syndicate and Senate to decide, in the absence of the clear cut guidelines. As the Vice Chancellor was also saying that neither the UGC nor the University has specified, the decision could have been taken in that light also. Now to say that it is a non-teaching position and as far as non-teaching is concerned, the retirement age is 60 years. As far as retirement is concerned, it is 60 years for both. It is under the interim orders of the court that some teachers are continuing (beyond 60 years) it was only in that particular background that a person who essentially is a teacher is holding the post of Dean College Development Council and in the capacity of a teacher he has got the stay, it was suggested that he (Dr. Naval Kishore) should be allowed to continue on the post of Dean College Development Council also. Now, the Vice Chancellor has been saying that this matter should not be put to vote. He thought that ultimately this, the majority decision would prevail. He asserted that let the majority be determined by way of a secret ballot.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not permitting something which is not permissible. It is a non-teaching post, for it he cannot permit any decision making beyond 60 years at this stage by secret voting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should reiterate the earlier decision.

Professor Keshav Malhotra that he has the UGC guidelines on DCDC.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could bring it in an agenda item to discuss the UGC guidelines.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that UGC guidelines does not say that this is a non-teaching post. The terminology used is Dean. Why the Vice Chancellor is telling that the decision that he is proposing is wrong.

The Vice Chancellor said that they could bring it as an agenda and take decision for the future.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this document was referred in the last meeting also and they do not know why this document has not found a place here. If it is there, then discussion on it is a part of the agenda.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that this terminology, i.e., Director, Dean has been used and the scale of a Professor used to be (Rs.1500-2500), which was not the scale of a non-teaching position. The University has not declared it as a non-teaching post. They assume that this is a teaching post because it is in the Professor salary. So, if there is any confusion at this stage, Panjab University should seek clarification from the UGC.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as the Vice Chancellor had already told that why they were not permitted to discuss the matter.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not saying this.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that the Vice Chancellor had given a statement that those documents were not available in the earlier meetings of the Syndicate and that was why the Vice Chancellor did not permit the discussion.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not know that there was any such document. He did not know the history of all these things. He did not know what happened in Principal Budhiraja's case. He did not know what happened in Professor Gosal's case.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now he (Vice Chancellor) knows it that he (Principal Budhiraja) was on probation.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that as they were discussing the matter today, those documents have not been provided.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have been considering only a limited item.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they have been discussing about the post of Dean College Development Council, which is a very open ended item and they understand that the Vice Chancellor is open to everything. But now they feel that it is not so.

A din prevailed.

The Vice Chancellor pleaded that he be allowed to conduct the meeting. They were discussing the issue of Dean College Development Council pursuant to the Court order and pursuant to the order is whether the post has been advertised, what is it that they considered the qualifications to be advertised. But, perhaps, they did not explicitly say that it should be advertised. He had advertised the post because the post was going to be vacant from 1.6.2016.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that they were discussing an item.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not discussing the item but only a limited part of the item.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it is the perception of the Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they want the reconsideration of the item according to this issue whether the Dean College Development Council is a teaching or a non-teaching position, they should give him everything. He would distribute everything.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor could revise his perception if he could read the orders of the Court. The Court has nowhere said that whether the post was advertised or not. The Court says in para 3 "hence, the competent authority to make the appointment to the post in question, admittedly being the Senate of the University, upon the recommendations made by the Syndicate, therefore, whether the petitioner is to continue or not to continue, or whether the post is to be advertised afresh, is a decision to be taken by the said authority". It says "this matter is, therefore, adjourned to 08.07.2016". Whereas, as of today there is no stay operating. In the meanwhile, till a decision is taken on the method of filling up the post by the competent authority. In the meanwhile, the meeting of the Syndicate be held to decide on the recommendations to be made to the Senate and thereafter, the matter be put up before the Senate. The decision to be taken by the competent authority, shall be taken before the next date of hearing."

The Vice Chancellor responded that the decision had already been taken by the competent authority that the post is to be advertised with these qualifications. That is already a decision taken.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that whether the incumbent is to continue or not.

The Vice Chancellor said that where is the question of opening this again and again.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that meant that the Vice Chancellor was questioning the order passed by the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was not questioning.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what else.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is his (Shri Ashok Goyal) interpretation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Vice Chancellor thought that he is the sole proprietor of the Syndicate and would not allow anybody to speak, he is the only who has the right to speak and nobody is allowed to intervene.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not correct that he was not permitting anybody. He (Shri Ashok Goyal) had not taken the

permission to speak and he has to take the permission to speak. It is he(Vice Chancellor) who has to conduct the meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should finally take a decision.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that otherwise there was no need to call a meeting of the Syndicate and he (Vice Chancellor) should have informed that this is the decision of the Syndicate.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the University counsel has not been able to put forth the view of the University that they had already taken a decision, the post had been advertised. They should go ahead with the advertisement.

Principal B.C. Josan, on being asked his opinion by the Vice Chancellor, said that he reiterated the earlier decision taken by the Syndicate.

Professor Emanuel Nahar said that as per the documents, the appointment letter and the advertisement, the post is a tenure post for 3 years and could be extended up to the age of 60 years. This decision had already been passed. There is no doubt about it. This time, the decision has already been taken for the advertisement. The applications have been received and the process is complete, there is no question to extend the term of Professor Naval Kishore beyond 31.5.2016.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that in this case, the issue is that whether it is a teaching or a non-teaching post. It is a non-teaching post, the reason being that in all the advertisements, the advertisement issued in 2011 which is annexed with the documents and the advertisement of 2016, in both the advertisements, it has been specifically mentioned that it is a tenure post for 3 years which could be extended for another 3 years or maximum up to the age of 60 years. There is no teaching post which is a tenure post in Panjab University. No teacher is appointed on regular basis for a period of 1/2/3 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been done. The Director, Adult Education has been appointed. If somebody is misleading, it could be clarified.

Continuing, Dr. Ajay Ranga said that as per the UGC Guidelines of 2010, the petition which he (Dr. Naval Kishore) has filed and the application which he has addressed to the Vice Chancellor for seeking some relief filed on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2016, in his application, he is seeking two things. One, he (Dr. Naval Kishore) is demanding that his case be considered on the parity of other teachers in Panjab University whereas this post is a non-teaching post. He is working, he is demanding for renewal, extension as Dean College Development Council on the basis of other teaching posts. So, the rule of the teaching positions could not be applied to the non-teaching. Thirdly, the decision regarding his extension has been already taken by the Syndicate, to his (Dr. Ajay Ranga) knowledge and it is very clear that the decision was taken due to some reasons for giving him extension up to 31.05.2016. It was not because he was retiring. Principal I.S. Sandhu has specifically quoted in that Syndicate that approval of many colleges, inspections of the colleges and the honourable members of this House have been raising time to time the voice of the

teachers that their approvals are not being granted by the University, their approvals, confirmations are still pending, because of these reasons, he (Dr. Naval Kishore) has been given the extension up to 31<sup>st</sup> May 2016. It was not because he was retiring but because of the circumstances. Secondly, to appoint new person on this post, it is a very important position with heavy workload on this post. It has been specifically mentioned in the discussion that anybody who would come here in the Panjab University on regular basis on this post, they need to have to take a long time in which the process of affiliation, approval of the Colleges, confirmation of the teachers would unnecessarily delayed. Just to speed up the job and resolve this matter, this approval was granted. He has heard the case of Mr. Budhiraja in Panjab University. On the similar grounds, the case was filed by Mr. Budhiraja in the Punjab and Haryana High Court. The decision in that case was given by Double Bench of the High Court and the matter was dismissed by the Court. On the same ground on the same UGC regulation, he approached the Court when his case was rejected. Similarly, both the cases of Mr. Budhiraja's and Dr. Naval Kishore's have almost the similar grounds. So, the matter which has already been decided by the same House, that could not be taken into consideration once again. Whereas the same decision should have been informed to the Court on the same day by the counsel of the Panjab University so that the Court could not issue this directive. If they would have told these things to the Court that the decision has already been taken, the post has already been advertised and the process for the selection of Dean College Development Council is already on, he did not think that the Court would have passed such an order. He would reiterate the decisions which they have already taken, i.e., no extension to Professor Naval Kishore beyond May 31, 2016 and continue with the process of filling the post.

Principal Charanjit Kaur Sohi said that as they have already discussed issue in the previous meeting. The counsel of Panjab University has not been able to project the facts. They should do that, that the post has been advertised and the applications have been received and the Court should be informed of all this.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he endorsed the viewpoints of Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky and Professor Emanuel Nahar and also whatever Dr. Ajay Ranga has said.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they need to tell the counsel that the Syndicate has decided to advertise the post and also about the Double Bench decision.

Professor Anil Monga said that initially the appointment was made for 3 years which was extended for another year and till he (Dr. Naval Kishore) attains the age of 60 years and after that they took a decision that anyone working on administrative post would not be allowed to serve beyond 60 years and the Vice Chancellor was authorised. As per the decision taken by the Syndicate, they just now have appointed the Dean of University Instruction. At the moment, he did not understand that he could take any other position. It is very clear that they have already taken a decision to advertise the post of Dean College Development Council and he reiterated the same.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the term of the Dean College Development Council was coming to an end in March, 2015 and his proposal was to give extension to the Dean College Development



Council for one year because so many approval/affiliation cases were pending. At that time, the post was not advertised and he was of the view that, that might take 4-5 months to complete the whole process. That was the reason that the Dean College Development Council was given extension till he attains the age of 60 years, to which all the members agreed and the Dean College Development Council was given the extension up to 31.05.2016. He further said that there is no need to re-advertise and he endorsed the viewpoint put forth by Dr. Ajay Ranga and there is no need to give the extension and the post be filled up as per the process set in motion.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he had gone through the judgment and was of the opinion that the Judge is focusing on two issues. One is that the Judge wants that they have to decide whether the petitioner has to continue or not. Secondly, the Judge wants that they should take a decision whether they advertise the post or not. He thought that one would be correlated to the other. If they consider one, then it would reflect on the other. He is of the opinion that first of all, in his mind and he felt that when they say that the Dean College Development Council is a non-teaching post or a non-teaching appointment, it is rather an un-academic argument. He thought that a person who is the Dean of Colleges, should be termed as academic Dean at par with other Deans. He did not understand that why the Dean College Development Council which covers the Colleges across the State and Colleges where very academic issues come up like assignment, Ph.D., etc. whether those should be conducted or not. Dean of the Colleges is an academic person. He thought that they would make a big mistake by saying that it is not an academic issue. The people who take a very objective decision and if they look at it objectively, Dr. Naval Kishore has been through this particular assignment of looking after the Colleges. He was given the extension also and his contribution to this office has been quite substantial. He is of the opinion that keeping in mind his (Dr. Naval Kishore) record and the fact that the UGC notification that the post can carry on up to 65 years, so if he can carry on till 65, they could consider it that if the UGC is allowing it and they were not going against any regulation, why do not they in fact consider the idea of giving the extension up to 65 years. It is for the House to decide and the Vice Chancellor has heard the views of everyone. He suggested that the secret ballot voting would be the right decision.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had made his views very clearly known. As far as his experience goes that there is nothing clear from the University regulations and also in the UGC guidelines, they look forward to some of the instructions or regulations or the rules of other neighbouring Universities. So much so, they have in the past depended upon the PTU also. So, in his view, the only way to decide the matter is by way of secret ballot keeping in mind one thing very clearly that if the Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar could appoint the Dean College Development Council beyond the age of 60 years, where the present Dean College Development Council is continuing rather appointed beyond the age of 60 years, why it could not be done in the Panjab University. He said that it should be decided by a secret ballot.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he was of the view that the post of Dean College Development Council is an academic position. This is a thought of the UGC guidelines which have been issued for the College Development Council. If he reads the same, the

College Development Council may consist of the Vice Chancellor, Coordinator/Dean/Director. Dean is always a term used for an academic position and a few senior teachers working in the teaching departments, particularly those who took COSIP/COHSIF, some Principals of the affiliated Colleges. This means that only an academic Reader or Professor or of that kind can lead the College Development Council. Not only this, the College Development Council would serve as academic guide to the College system. How come that a non-academic person could guide an academic college system? On the other hand, and ensure interaction between the academic facilities of the University Departments to the teachers. If they go through what are the guidelines of the UGC, one is very much convinced that the position of Dean College Development Council is an academic one and if they go through the neighbouring Universities, the Deans are continuing beyond 60 years following the exact pattern of the UGC guidelines. In his view, the clarification may be sought from the UGC and the information be collected from the neighbouring Universities before taking a decision that whether this post is an academic or a non-teaching post.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that his point is very clear that he considers the post of Dean College Development Council as an academic post. Even the UGC has also said that the Dean College Development Council may be appointed for a term of 3 years and can be extended for 3 years or till 65 years. His proposal is that they should go for voting and there should not be any controversy.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that from the beginning till date, not many regular Deans have been appointed. But when the Deans were appointed, there were some other rules for Dr. Gosal and when Mr. Budhiraja came, the rules were changed and when Dr. Naval came, the rules were again changed. Every time the rules are changed and why these were changed because there were no clear cut guidelines. As they took the decision earlier, that decision was not clear because in some cases they take clear cut decisions. Had they taken a clear cut decision in the matter, this situation might have not arisen. Therefore, they should take a clear cut decision by way of secret voting. As he said at the outset that as they stick to the age of 60 years, but rules have been changed/flouted in the case of Dr. Gosal, Principal Budhiraja and now Dr. Naval Kishore. So, the decision has to be taken by the Syndicate as they take other decisions. Hence, the matter be decided by secret ballot.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that according to the UGC guidelines, Dean College Development Council is an academic post and Dean College Development Council is an academic head. They should consider the case according to the UGC guidelines, as an academic post. As has been suggested that the information could be sought from neighbouring Universities especially from Punjab which are allowing the persons to continue beyond 60 years, that should also be made applicable in the Panjab University. Somehow, the documents concerning to this meeting available in the University which could not be presented today, should also be looked into as in case of Professor Gosal. Even if, they thought that they have to take a decision today itself, that should be taken by way of secret ballot strictly.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that he had come for the meeting just for an urgent agenda of Punjab Government with regard to the opening

up of new Colleges. He further stated that since he was not a part of the earlier meeting, he could not comment on it.

Dr. Ajay Ranga said that Guru Ghasidas University, Bilaspur, M.P., a Central University, has advertised the post of Dean College Development Council which is available on the website of the University. They have declared that Dean College Development Council post is a non-teaching post.

Concluding, the Vice Chancellor said that they have to go by what the ground situation of the University is. As of today, the post of Dean College Development Council is listed as a non-teaching position and for the non-teaching posts, the ground situation is that the retirement age is 60 years. Exception had been there in the case of Dr. Gosal. After that the position has been advertised repeatedly and advertised only up to 60 years. His predecessors, one of them in Mr. Budhiraja's case accepted the plea that it is a non-teaching position. Dr. Naval Kishore was not given extension on that day. He was to retire on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2016. They have advertised the position following the norms. Dean College Development Council has to be an academic. If Dean College Development Council is not to be an academic, then how could they say that Professor's position qualifications would apply. Qualifications of a Professor or a Principal of a NAAC accredited College would be applicable. The existing Professors and the College Principals of NAAC accredited Colleges are by default eligible, irrespective of their API scores. But, in addition to this, they decided that if somebody qualifies to be a Professor with the current API score, he/she would also be eligible. So, it is a position prima facie to be occupied by an academician. There are no two opinions on it. But in the current day Panjab University, let them not worry about other Universities, because they are a premier University and every University has its own practices and norms. Context as of today is that it is a non-teaching position, it has been advertised as non-teaching position as a tenure position for 3 years, which can be given the extension up to the age of 60 years. So every appreciation that could be given to the present Dean College Development Council, they have given to him. So, Professor Naval's term was suggested to be extended by a year, which he later on modified as 14 months. Every possible appreciation has been given to the Dean College Development Council. They have advertised the position now. They have now listened to the opinion of all of them. He found that 9 members are endorsing that they should continue the process, whereas some of the members are saying that the matter be decided by a secret voting. It is the month of July and he joined this University as Vice Chancellor in July 2012 and during these 4 years, he had not gone for any secret voting on the floor of the Syndicate. He did not want to set up a new precedent. They had taken the decisions by majority. The conclusion is that of the 16 members present, 9 are of the opinion that they endorse that the advertisement has been done and they should proceed with it if the Court permits to proceed with it. 9 members have said that what they have done, the post which was advertised and the interview which had been postponed, if the Court permits them, they should proceed with it, they would proceed accordingly. The proceedings of the meeting along with the videography could be submitted to the Court and let the Court decide. 6 of the colleagues are of the opinion that the matter be decided by way of secret voting but he was not proposing that.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the opinion is very clear as 9 members are in favour of continuing with the process.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that one member has not said anything.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that it is a kind of voting.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a voting but not a secret voting and he is not accepting that.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua enquired as to what is the difference between secret and open voting.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor had given the ruling and he did not think that they have any right to contest and that the Vice Chancellor is not in favour of holding a secret voting, which has not been done since last 4 years. Probably, there is no purpose of discussing it further. What he was saying that since the matter has to go to the Court, let the decision be recorded as history, that is why some clarification has been sought. 9 members are endorsing the viewpoint of what decision was taken in the meeting of Syndicate held in January/February 2016, and 6 are of the opinion that the matter be decided by a secret voting and the Vice Chancellor had given the ruling and said that if the Court permits, they would go ahead with the interview and that probably should not be the language because that goes without saying that without the permission of the Court, they could not do anything. If they say that if the Court permits, they only have to tell the decision of the Syndicate and whatever is to be conveyed to the Court, let the same be resolved here because that is their plea before the Court that whatever order the Court has passed that in view of the post was advertised as per the decision of the Syndicate, they should be allowed to go ahead. This is what the Vice Chancellor was saying practically. What is to be conveyed to the Court that should be properly worded.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever transpired they would do it and circulate the same to the members.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the resolved part be recorded here.

Shri Raghbir Dyal also suggested that the resolved part be recorded.

The Vice Chancellor said that the resolved part is that 9 members endorse the process of interview commenced as a consequence of Syndicate decision taken in January/February 2016. They have advertised the post and further proceed with it. 6 members are of the view that secret voting should be taken whether Professor Naval Kishore should be given an extension, should be allowed to continue in view of his continuation as a Professor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the opinion of the remaining 9 members should also be recorded.

The Vice Chancellor said that 9 members are not in favour of giving extension and 6 are saying that there should be a secret voting.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the secret voting could be done only if some persons are reluctant to opine publicly.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what he was saying is that 9 members are endorsing the viewpoint whatever the Vice Chancellor had said and 6 are saying that the matter regarding permitting Professor Naval Kishore to continue or not should be decided by a secret voting.

The Vice Chancellor said that 9 members are recommending not to continue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that it should be written as there is a decision of the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said, alright.

**RESOLVED:** 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.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** 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).

At this stage, Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab said that the Punjab Government is going to start 11 new Constituent Colleges in Punjab out of which, 2 Colleges in the districts of Moga and Ferozepur are to be affiliated with Panjab University falling within its jurisdiction. He further stated that he had personally visited both these places and found that the buildings are complete for running the courses from the current academic session, i.e., 2016-17 and the Punjab Government had already earmarked funds for infrastructure to be provided at these places.

Thereafter, the detailed discussion started.

The Vice Chancellor appreciated that Shri T.K. Goyal, Director, Higher Education, Punjab had come for the meeting, who is an ex-officio member of the Syndicate. They have affiliated Colleges in Punjab. So, his presence is highly valued by the Syndicate meeting. Normally, they did not allow anybody to raise any item other than the agenda as zero hour is meant for raising such matters. But as a mark of respect to the position that that he (Shri Goyal) holds, he (Vice Chancellor) was permitting him to say whatever he wanted.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that he was just requesting the hon'ble members that the Punjab Government has opened 11 new Colleges with an investment of Rs.156 crores. Out of these 11 Colleges, 2 are affiliated with Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Colleges are not yet affiliated with Panjab University and they have not received any application for affiliation so far.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that actually the Colleges fall within the jurisdiction of Panjab University. One of the Colleges is at Dharamkot, District Moga and the other is at Ferozepur. Since the buildings are complete. So, the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Punjab has desired that they may make these Colleges functional from this academic session. This would be helpful to the local people as it is the demand of the local people and it would be beneficial to the Punjab people and it would lead to the more GER also. So, his humble request to all the members is to allow making these Colleges functional from this academic session.

The Vice Chancellor said that what is there in the Colleges other than the building.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that earlier there were 19 Constituent Colleges, out of which 4 are affiliated with Panjab University which the Panjab University is running.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that of the 4 Constituent Colleges of Panjab University, 3 Constituent Colleges which came into being via a directive of the Central Government under a very special scheme. In that scheme, the Punjab Government attached one of the existing Government Colleges and it was added to it as a Constituent College and they accepted that plea of the Punjab Government that 3+1, they would run as Constituent Colleges. Now, as Shri Goyal stated that these are Government Colleges and suddenly switched as if these Government Colleges have to be run as Constituent Colleges. At the moment, he had no proposal with him of a concrete kind that these are to be Constituent Colleges. There is no proposal before the

governing body of the University that the responsibility of two more Constituent Colleges has to be assumed by the Panjab University because if the Panjab University has to assume that responsibility, then many things have to follow in a sequential manner. That process has not yet been commenced.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that regarding this, the main issue is of funding.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not funding alone. They have to provide all the wherewithal for it. They have to provide faculty, appoint non-teaching staff and provide the infrastructure also in those Colleges. When he came, 3 Constituent Colleges were of one kind and another one which was added to it, it was having mats instead of furniture. After a week of his arrival, 400 students of those Colleges came to Panjab University and were staging a protest on the Panjab University campus because the basic amenities were not there in the College. So, he faced that difficulty.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that on behalf of the Punjab Government, he assured that all the facilities would be there. He conveyed that the Punjab Government has sanctioned special budget for the furniture and other infrastructure for the labs. He said that they would purchase these things and would give to the University by the end of this month and could be even before that. They would be given furniture and everything. Regarding recurring expenditure of salary, his request is that the University may appoint the teaching and non-teaching staff. As was done earlier, they would compensate the University for that. There would not be any financial burden.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now they have the financial burden of 4 Constituent Colleges. The Punjab Government has promised Rs.1.5 crores per College. This amount is not adequate to run the Colleges. They are unsure whether they would receive full grant that is needed to run those Colleges. It is not only that they need the salary for the teachers but also need salary for the non-teaching staff to run those Colleges.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that regarding these two Colleges, they would take care that all the recurring expenditure of the teaching and non-teaching would be taken care of by the Punjab Government.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is a proposal and if the Punjab Government wanted this to happen, then all kinds of concessions have to be given as there is a process involved in it. An exception has to be made to accommodate the request. The competent body to grant that exception is the governing body of the University. Governing body of the University is the Syndicate of which, Shri Goyal is also a member and he has to convince the colleagues here. Whether some of the members would be willing to go and see whether the basic requirements are in place and toward their recommendations before the next meeting of the Syndicate scheduled to be held on 31<sup>st</sup> July.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that since the admission process dates are approaching, the request be considered.

The Vice Chancellor said that the admission could not be done unless these things are in place. How the admissions could be permitted if the necessary requirements are not in place.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that otherwise it would be a wastage of one academic session.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that a Committee could be formed.

The Vice Chancellor said that, that is what he was saying that the Principals of the Colleges have the experience.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the last date for submission of application for affiliation is November. Since a fine of Rs.2 lacs is being imposed on the Colleges for B.A., B.Sc., B.Ed. courses, what about these Colleges.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the Punjab Government could pay the fine also and the fine could be more.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that since now the Punjab Government is paying attention to the higher education, it is good and they should give some concession. If they go to the rural areas of any district of Punjab and see the situation. The Punjab Government has taken an initiative and they must appreciate it and give concession so that the Government could start the Colleges from the current session.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that these Colleges are being opened in the remote areas.

Principal B.C. Josan said that the Colleges could be allowed and the other Colleges should not be fined.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him go one by one which would facilitate the discussion.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that if any member thinks that he has an important issue that should be discussed. When they are using the resources of the State and the University for the conduct of the Syndicate meeting and have spent so much time in discussing an item, what difference would it make if they discuss more issues which are pertaining to the education and when they were here to discuss. When they have come for the day and using the University resources, more items could also be discussed. If it seems that it needed an elaborate discussion, the same could be brought as an agenda item and which they think that a decision could be taken on the floor of the House, they should discuss and take the decision.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there should be uniformity.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have a zero hour in every meeting.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that today also the zero hour could be observed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor kept on changing his own ruling. Just because they respect him (Vice Chancellor), he keeps changing his own ruling just after 15 minutes. The Vice Chancellor had said that he wanted all of them to do it. Before allowing the DPI, the Vice Chancellor had said that it is



a very exceptional case. The Vice Chancellor gave the ruling that first of all no table agenda item, second that nobody is to raise any issue except that the Vice Chancellor had given the permission and said that it is only agenda item. When the issue was discussed not only once but continuously on two days about Dean College Development Council and the Vice Chancellor gave the ruling that unless and until it is an agenda item, he would allow no discussion. Now the Vice Chancellor says that they could discuss. Let it be decided for once and all that also without agenda item, they could discuss. Sometimes the Vice Chancellor says something else and sometimes says something else. Without agenda, he might not be knowing or the details, the other members might not be knowing or the Vice Chancellor might not be knowing at all or vice-versa. He thought the item has to be brought except in case of emergent situation as the Vice Chancellor also brings the agenda item as current item on the table of the House. As for zero hour if everybody is unanimous that all of them are well aware of these facts about this case, he could understand it as an exceptional case and such a decision could be taken. But to say that any member whosever thinks it important should be discussed even if there is no agenda item, then probably it is not as per the decorum of the meeting. Secondly, as one member has rightly put and as the Vice Chancellor also, he has said that if any exception has to be made, it is within the power of the executive body. He would like to know for his knowledge that is there any provision that the exception could be made by the executive government. The Vice Chancellor asked Shri Goyal to convince everybody. If it is not in anybody's hand, the Vice Chancellor could just convey that and if it is within the power of the Syndicate, he could convey it to the Syndicate that as per this provision, the Syndicate could do it. And then as per agenda item, if it is to be considered as regular agenda keeping in view the emergency which Shri Goyal as explained, then so many things have to be included into that. If it is their opinion that he would suggest that a special meeting of Syndicate could also take place provided it is within the power to take the decision in the matter instead of saying by the Vice Chancellor that he would now ask one by one. This probably is not good especially when the Vice Chancellor had given the ruling. Even he had also an important item to discuss but he withdrew himself as the Vice Chancellor would not allow it and would discuss after the meeting and if a solution is found out, alright and if no solution could come out, the same could be brought as an agenda item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said at the moment, the item is not being discussed. As one of the members suggested, they could form a Committee to visit the Colleges and see the availability of the infrastructure.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that the Vice Chancellor could be authorised.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they strictly go by this thing, then there are norms for commencing a new College and a certain time table to be followed and that is not occasionally but very often, violated. Sometimes, a fine could be imposed. They had discussed a request from Andaman College. The College had very typical problems. They had said that if the Ministry approved the proposal, then they could consider. Till date there is no response from the Ministry.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could consider the proposal.

The Vice Chancellor said that the proposal is an oral one.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is nothing concrete.

The Vice Chancellor requested Shri T.K. Goyal to submit a concrete proposal.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that an agenda item could be brought on the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that as Principal Surinder Singh Sangha had talked about forming a Committee, 2-3 members could volunteer and visit the Colleges and after that the proposal could be submitted. The same could be conducted either in a special meeting of the Syndicate or in the next meeting to be held on 31<sup>st</sup> July.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that the meeting of 31<sup>st</sup> July would be too late. Some of the members could visit the Colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that the teachers have also to be recruited.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that they could authorise the Vice Chancellor to form a Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that let the Committee be constituted here itself. He requested the members to volunteer for the Committee as Principal Surinder Singh Sangha had already volunteered. The names of other members put forward were: Principal B.C. Josan, Principal I.S. Sandhu, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dr. Ajay Ranga. Principal Surinder Singh Sangha would coordinate with Professor Keshav Malhotra and the Dean College Development Council. He said that the things should be in place so that the students did not face the problems.

Shri T.K. Goyal said that he had personally visited there and the all the things are in place. The Committee could visit the Colleges within a day or two.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Committee would visit and submit the report. Only then they could decide whether a special meeting is needed or the matter could be discussed on 31<sup>st</sup> July.

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee comprising Principal Surinder Singh Sangha, Principal B.C. Josan, Principal I.S. Sandhu, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Professor Emanuel Nahar, Dr. Ajay Ranga, Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky and Dean College Development Council be constituted to visit both the places and submit a report.

At this stage, the members started general discussion.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that he would like to raise 2-3 points. First, for the Registered Graduate Constituency of Senate, the polling booths which were set up in the year 2012, the list should be followed as it is for the time being. If any addition or deletion is to be made in that list, it should be done in consultation with the representatives of the constituency.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that perhaps Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa has forgotten that a Committee had already been constituted for this purpose. He as well as other members of the Committee present here understood that no meeting of the Committee has taken place. Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa is right that the list of booths of the year 2012 be repeated. He thought that they have to see that more number of booths have also to be created because at some of the booths the number of voters has gone beyond 2000. At least, the list of 2012 is to be continued and in addition to that whatever additional booths are to be created, those should be created. The Committee had been constituted to take care of that and the Committee had never met.

It was informed that the meeting of the Committee would be conducted immediately. There was some data that at 1-2 booths no voting had taken place.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not so whether the voting was done or not. In Bihar and U.P. in the general elections, there are some villages where not even a single vote is cast, that did not mean that the booth is to be deleted.

It was informed that the booths could be clubbed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they go through the history. In Himachal Pradesh, one booth is away from the other booth to the extent of 90 km. in hilly area. Only keeping this thing in view that the people of a place like Kangra would go to Palampur for voting or from Palampur to Kangra, they know who is interested in voting at Chandigarh. Following this, they have not to see that how many voters were there but have to see how conveniently the voters could come to cast the vote. They have to consider this thing. So geographically first, number of voters registered in that area is second. They have been taking decisions earlier to set up a booth even where there are 50 voters.

It was informed that the day after tomorrow, a meeting of the Committee would be convened.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that there was a problem related with the sports category in the ongoing B.Com. admissions.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not a matter to be considered by the Syndicate.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the matter is related with the reservation policy. The definition of the sportsperson is not correct.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa could discuss the matter with him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the admissions to B.Com. in Chandigarh are over. Even if there is something wrong, how could that be put right.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the third matter is related with the approval of the Colleges teachers. The letter of approval of the College teachers are not provided to the concerned teachers directly but the same are sent to the College Principals and the College Managements did not provide the letters to the teachers. This was also supported by Principal I.S. Sandhu. He requested that the letters of approval of the teachers should be sent directly to the teachers separately at all the available addresses and should not be routed through the Principal or the Management as the Managements harass the teachers.

It was informed that earlier the practice was that the letters were sent to the Principals. Then a decision was taken that it should be sent to the official also. Therefore, the letters would be sent to the officials concerned.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that a person came to the University to get the letter of approval but the same was denied to him/her. It is the age of RTI and they were denying the letter to the concerned person itself.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that in the office copy it has been ticked that the copy has been sent to the concerned person but actually the same had not been sent. Even if they request and the concerned person is available, the letter is not being given.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the letters of approval could be put on the website.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that some good Managements provide the letters while others keep the letters with them.

The Vice Chancellor said that it should be rectified immediately. They should not disapprove any action on behalf of the University.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that some of the approvals were pending for more than 2 years. He requested that the approvals should be made time-bound. The elections to the Senate are to be held and the votes of the teachers have to be prepared.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he would like to thank the members of the Syndicate for creation of evaluation Centre at Muktsar and another historical and landmark decision for holding the entrance test of OCET at the Regional Centres. The tests were conducted in a transparent and very good manner. More than 1000 students appeared at the Centres. He would again thank the members. As said by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa regarding the setting up of booths, he would like to request that the meeting of the Committee be convened at a mutually convenient date as the admissions in the Colleges are going on. He had seen there is a disparity regarding the number of electorates. In his area, they would otherwise discuss it in

the meeting, the areas like Muktsar, Malout, Ferozepur, Abohar and Fazilka are densely populated. In these areas during the last 5-6 years, so many votes have been prepared because the candidates from these areas contest the election in the Registered Graduate Constituency. He has seen that instead of creating additional booths, the voters have been adjusted in the existing booths. In some of the booths, the number of votes is 2100-2200. It should be checked. The ballot paper is very lengthy being the number of contestants about 50-60. The election process being a time consuming one, the percentage of voting does down. He requested that a Committee could be formed to suggest the number of electorate per booth to be fixed. He has seen the list of voters of Chandigarh and found that from Sector 1 to 35, there are 1000 voters at one booth whereas in Sectors 37, 40, 41, the number of voters is about 2000. As also said by Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa, he requested that there should be uniformity. Some of the Colleges, which have recently opened like at Mundki, Nihalsingh Wala, have so many voters and have to go to other places to cast the votes. These things needed to be discussed minutely. He requested that the meeting of the Committee be convened at a mutual convenient date so that these things could be discussed. He had an idea that preparation of about 15,000 votes is pending for those candidates whose multiple forms are there. Otherwise, it is the prerogative of the Returning Officer to take a decision, but his submission is that those forms which have been submitted with the identity proofs, those votes should be prepared. He had also come to know that even 7 forms of a single candidate had been filled up but it is not known who has filled up those forms.

The Vice Chancellor said that somebody told that such kinds of votes are being made by others and not by the voters themselves.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that one thing is that 7 different persons have got filled up the form from a candidate that could be understood. But if one has filled up the form of someone else and it is not in the knowledge of that person. If someone wanted that the vote of a particular might not be prepared, someone would fill up the form of that person also and there is objection to it as that person had already filled up the form. So, without the knowledge of the persons, the persons were being enrolled. For example, if somebody is residing at Abohar and the vote had been prepared at Hoshiarpur without the knowledge of that person as he says that he has even not visited Hoshiarpur.

It was informed that only those forms with identity proofs would be entertained.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that in case of multiple forms, even the form with identity is kept pending. It should be cleared.

It was informed that such forms have been cleared.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that a supplementary list of such forms should be prepared.

It was informed that the list would be prepared after scrutiny.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the supplementary list is to be prepared, could they add anything to that list also.

It was informed that there are cases of change of address also.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they take the cases of change of address, then when would the objections be invited. Would they ask for the objections after the change of address?

It was informed that the dates have already been given and it is as per the schedule.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that could they add in the supplementary list?

It was informed that after scrutiny if it is found.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that Shri Ashok Goyal was talking about the Graduate Constituency. A teacher from some College had sent the list of 5 persons, but their names did not appear in the list.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as a Returning Officer, he might be aware that there are different ways for claims that if certain names have not been included, which should have been included, that is covered under claim, i.e., someone to say that his name has not been included, which should have been included in the preliminary list. Thereafter, there is objection that this name has wrongly been included. Objections could not cover those whose names have not been included. In fact, objection could only cover those whose names have wrongly been included. But what Principal I.S. Sandhu is talking, it related to claims under the head of objections. That is why, the regulation says that since there is a provision of change of address, one could change his/her address. Citing an example, he said that suppose he is resident of Patiala and he wants to seek election from a reserved seat of Chandigarh, and since he is not a resident of Chandigarh, he make an application to change his address from Patiala to Chandigarh. As per Regulations, unless and until he gave enough proof, e.g., Identity Card, Voter ID, Land Documents, Ration Card, Aadhar Card, etc., his request for change of address could not be considered. If right or wrong they have changed the address, then the objector has right to object to that saying that he is a resident of Patiala, he is serving there and is not holding any land in Chandigarh, he is not serving and residing here, so his address of Chandigarh should not be considered. However, in the absence of objection, the Returning Officer has taken the decision. If he has an objection that the person has given wrong address, then the objector has the right to that these are the proofs, which show that he is a resident of that place. That is why he is saying that first the requests for change of address should come, thereafter, the objection might be there. Secondly, in the case of Faculties, Principals, and Teachers, firstly they issue the preliminary list, thereafter the claims are sought. Unless and until the claims are received, how could one have an opportunity to object? Citing an example, he said that there are 100 names in the preliminary list and thereafter they add thirty more names in that list on the basis of claims. One has the right to object to 30 names, but he has not been shown those names. As such, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua had asked on 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> of June the list of the claimants, who had requested to include their names, to enable him to raise objection. However, even after 15 days, no reply has been received. When a clarification was tried to be given, Shri Ashok Goyal said that the query was made by Shri Dua through an e-mail. He was not there; hence, a verbal query was made to him also. When the

Returning Officer informed that he was not there, Shri Ashok Goyal that by that time the last date of objection/s was already over, which was 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2016. He does not have the complete list even till date. Since the last date of objection/s is over, he (Returning Officer) should tell him as to how the objection/s could be raised. After 2<sup>nd</sup> July, on the basis of preliminary list, the claims decided, and on the basis of objections, the final register is to be made available on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2016. What the University is doing, they think as if the 12<sup>th</sup> July is the last date for including any name. Then what is the sanctity of the preliminary list, and if that is the case, why is the 1<sup>st</sup> March for the Graduates' Constituency. Could they include any name after 31<sup>st</sup> March, if one has not applied or if somebody has graduated now?

It was said that that could be done within the same date.

Continuing further, Shri Ashok Goyal stated that now, their results are being declared, and if somebody says that he has done graduation, he should be registered as Graduate. Why could they not make him when they are making others? They are making them by following the wrong practice. This is what he wanted to bring to their notice. They have to go strictly as per the law.

It was informed that a Review Meeting is supposed to be there, wherein such things would be considered.

Shri Ashok Goyal stated that he had also suggested in the previous meeting that though he does not know much, he should be invited to the meeting/s, because ultimately, he does not want any problem in the election.

Shri Raghbir Dyal stated that the 15,000 votes, which are pending, are not covered under claims and objections. In fact, decision on that is to be taken by the Returning Officer, and that too, before the release of Supplementary List, and only thereafter, claims and objections would come. Claims and objections related to only 50 to 100 votes, where there is problem of DMC, year, eligibility, etc. First of all, decision should be taken on 15,000 votes, which are pending, and supplementary 2 should be released, so that they know that these cases have been cleared. Thereafter, claims and objections would come.

It was informed that decision on this has already been taken.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that but the list of the same has not been released so far.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it has been written in the Supplementary Register that these (relating to multiple) have been kept pending and the decision of the Returning Officer shall be final. This is the position as on date.

Shri Raghbir Dyal suggested that the Returning Officer should clear them and release the Supplementary 2.

This was agreed to.

Dr. Ajay Ranga stated that this issue is being raised for the last so many years that the Certificates from the candidates belonging to reserved categories, i.e., SCs/STs, BCs, OBC, as per the policy of

the State Government is required from the Naib Tehsildar, Tehsildar, SDM and above. The lowest level is Naib Tehsildar. But the University in its Hand Book of Information says that the said certificate must be from the Tehsildar or above. Wherever Naib Tehsildar is there, Tehsildar would never issue the Certificate. Resultantly, their people (employees of the University) insisted that the Certificate must be from the Tehsildar or above, and they do not accept the certificate issued by the Naib Tehsildar. Resultantly, the candidates, who came from far off places, e.g., Abohar, Fazilka, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, etc., could not take admission in the University. And those, who by chance got certificate from Tehsildar or SDM or above, are admitted by the University. He, therefore, requested that since as per the State Government Policy, the Naib Tehsildar is authorised to issue SCs/STs, BCs, OBC, etc. certificates, they should include it in their Hand Book of Information and accept the certificate issued by the Naib Tehsildar. In fact, it should be mentioned in the Hand Book of Information that the SCs/STs, BCs, OBC, etc. certificate issued by the competent authority would be accepted. There is also a rule that any certificate is subject to verification. If they do not get the verification done, it is their mistake. However, if the certificate is issued by the competent authority, the same should be accepted.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua stated that a Committee has been constituted for finalization of rules, etc. He suggested that a couple of representatives from the affiliated Colleges should be made members of the said Committee. The rules were framed about 20 years ago and booths in certain Colleges are within the premises and certain new Colleges have been clubbed with specific Colleges. Similarly, there are Colleges, in which booths are there, but the votes of the teachers for Graduates' Constituency are cast in other Colleges. However, the vote of the Principal is cast in the same College. He has been suggesting this for the last about 15 years, but nothing is being done in this regard.

Shri Ashok Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that Shri Harpreet Singh Dua should be made a member of the Committee concerned.

Shri Harpreet Singh Dua said that it was also discussed to the Syndicate as to what would be the status of those teachers, who have been appointed by the Punjab Government on Contract basis. Till date, even they do not know whether their vote is there not.

It was clarified that since regular appointment of the teachers is required, if the appointment of the teacher is regular, only then he is entitled to vote. The Calendar is very clear that for being eligible to cast vote, to the appointment of the teacher must be on regular basis.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the moment they enrol him/her as voter, that means they accept him/her as teacher irrespective of whether he/she is getting a salary of Rs.21,600/- per month or even less. In fact, the appointments of the teachers have been made by the Government on contract basis likely to be absorbed on regular basis after a period of three years. However, they are nobody to force upon the Punjab Government to absorb them after a period of three years. Latesty, he has been told by his friends that the colleges have been told that forget they are not going to give them more than Rs.15,600/- per month.



The Vice-Chancellor said that they would not run the Constituent Colleges by appointing teachers on a meagre salary of Rs.15,600/- per month.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that he is not talking about P.U. Constituent Colleges, but of those for whom a new notification has come that the teachers would be paid a salary of Rs.15,600/- per month, and the University has given them the approvals. The University has sent the approvals despite the fact that they are there only for a period of three years. They do not know what would be their fate after a period of three years. But they would say that their appointments have been approved by the University on a salary of Rs.15,600/- per month, which in fact, has never been the intention of the University. It has also been discussed in the Syndicate twice that they (the teachers) would not be allowed to be enrolled to the Electoral College. He does not know where the decision has been taken that they would be enrolled as teachers in the Electoral College. In spite of the decision of the Syndicate, a member of the Senate has written to the DCDC to tell whether those teachers would be members of the Electoral College, and the DCDC wrote, "Yes", they would be members of the Electoral College subject to their absorption by the Punjab Government after a period of three years. He does not know as to what does it mean as they are enrolling them to the Electoral College now, but they could be absorbed after a period of three years?

The Vice-Chancellor said that let him see the file and only thereafter, he could make any statement.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that he wanted to inform them that he was recruited in 1989 on *ad hoc* basis in the pay-scale of Rs.2200-4000. Though his appointment was approved by the Panjab University, he was made member of the Electoral College only when his result was declared by the Punjab Public Service Commission (PPSC) in the year 1996.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was sorry as he could have completed by saying that he (Vice Chancellor) could have given the approval, subject to the condition that they would not be to made part of the Electoral College because otherwise, they would have permanent lien as their appointments have been approved by the University. Earlier, approval to such appointments was given stating that the appointment is approved for such and such session only. But now after giving the approval, they have put those persons in the electoral roll. So it should be kept in mind that there were some people who have not even been approved by the University, but their names were included in the College returns. By mistake, so many such persons have been included and the University says that they did not have the approval.

Shri Harmohinder Singh Lucky said that recently International Yoga Day was celebrated. The University had organised the training camps from 21<sup>st</sup> May onwards. Beginning with a few hundreds, the strength of the participants reached up to 2500 up to the event. Out of those, only 1000 students could make it to the event at Capitol Complex about 1200-1500 took part in the event at the Panjab University. Those students who could not make it to the Capitol Complex but were practising in the University for about one month, at least a certificate of appreciation or participation should be given to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they were issuing the certificates to the participants even if one had been practising somewhere else for most of the duration and had practised in the University for the last two days. However, it could take some time.

Some of the members enquired if there was any change in the holiday on 6<sup>th</sup> July on account of Id-Ul-Fitr.

It was informed that at the moment, there is no information about the change in Chandigarh.

The Vice Chancellor said that change in the holiday could disturb the admissions and examinations schedule, the holiday would remain on 6<sup>th</sup> July. However, special casual leave could be granted to the individuals.

Shri Ashok Goyal raised an issue related with the validity of the Ph.D. degree of CMJ University. He understood that one of the members of the Senate has also written a letter to Vice Chancellor that if they had taken a decision that, though he had not gone through the letter, it seems that the Syndicate, after clarifying everything, has approved the appointment of some of the teachers. But in view of the decision taken in the year 2013, no clarification has been sent and there are so many candidates who are applicants for the post of Lecturer, which are under process of recruitment, that member has requested that the clarification be issued to all the Colleges and the concerned what is the status of the degrees. He has mentioned only the Ph.D. As on today, the decision of the Syndicate of 2013 stands and it has never been reversed. It is only in view of some of the approvals which have been granted by the University that he has raised the issue. His (Shri Ashok Goyal) request is that this issue should be clinched at the earliest. His views on the issue are clearly known. He is ready to assist the University in now substantiating what he had been saying in contrast to what in fact the decision the University has taken. But leaving aside what he felt and others felt, it should be clinched once and for all. If something had rightly been done, the benefit should be extended to all and if it had wrongly been done, then the University should not hesitate in withdrawing that decision. He did not think that he was asking for too much because there is lot of controversy. He would like to bring to their notice that, there are 2-3 cases, at least, which were pending in the University, which were submitted to the University much before those cases which have been approved and those cases which were submitted to the University before those are yet to be approved and which are of similar nature. That is why the people feel that why they do not get it decided and the member of the Senate, Dr. Jagwant Singh has rightly said that it should be clarified this way or that way. As and when his services are required, as earlier also he had offered, he is at the services of the University.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that there is news in the press that those who have been registered for M.Phil or Ph.D. before 11.07.2009 are exempted from NET. He enquired whether any notification had been received in this regard.

The Vice Chancellor said that nothing such had been received officially.

Continuing, Shri Raghbir Dyal said that as the Government Colleges have their own panel, some such candidates have applied for recruitment. So, they were in a dilemma whether such candidates could be invited for the interview or not because they did not have any notification.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no notification from the UGC.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the 4<sup>th</sup> May news which was titled M.Phil/Ph.D., no exemption has now been given nor it was earlier. It is only for Ph.D. But till it is not notified, they stand with the earlier notification.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there is a big lacuna. It is mentioned that those who had done M.Phil. or Ph.D. before such a date would be exempted from NET and would also be eligible to be appointed as Lecturer provided that the course work, etc. the requirement for Ph.D. were complete but for M.Phil. nothing has been mentioned. As if somebody who has done M.Phil., he/she is better. He wanted to bring to their notice that there are some officials of the University who have started conveying to the Colleges that they may recruit M.Phil. also and they would get it approved. He knew that it is not going to be approved. But then what is the fault of those innocent people.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had not given any such thing.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there was a candidate and they did not invite him/her for the interview. When he/she appeared at some other College, some experts selected him/her. Therefore, the clarification in this regard should be sent to the Colleges.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that these guidelines should be on the table of the Selection Committee.

Shri Raghbir Dyal requested that it should be put on the website of the Dean College Development Council that the earlier instructions of NET and Ph.D. of 2009 stand.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that at least those who are sent for selecting and recommending as members of the Selection Committee, the eligibility criteria should be made available to those persons.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that, that is why he was saying that it should be on the table of the Selection Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that these instructions should be given.

Professor Shelley Walia said that he had just received a message from Silicon Valley from a friend saying that while they were in the meeting, why do not they take the larva out of the coolers. Why he is saying this because they have to cut a sorry figure all over the city, all over the country and all over the world. This message is coming from California. They have not taken any action and he thought that the Vice Chancellor should send letters to all the Chairpersons across the board that they should make sure that before

there is an epidemic in the University, the coolers be in good condition.

It was informed that instructions to concerned departments have already been issued for necessary actions for prevention of any medical/health hazzard.

Dr. Dayal Partap Singh Randhawa said that the HoDs could be asked to help.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not an easy thing to do. The HoDs are not ready to do that and some has to stand there.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that the NSS people could do this.

The Vice Chancellor said that when they invited the NSS people, they did not come and have to be called personally from their homes. Even in the yoga camps also, no person from the NSS or NCC came. He had visited the local Colleges at 6.00 a.m. and seen that sometimes there were just 2/5/7 persons for the yoga.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said that when they organise the camps, all the students come for those camps.

The Vice Chancellor said that even where all the NCC persons were expected to come, there were not more than 15 persons.

Shri Raghbir Dyal said that the NCC people fully participate.

Professor Shelley Walia said that the Wardens should be involved and what about the administrative block.

It was informed that they have drained the coolers and have to be equipped.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not for the first time that Dengu/Malaria has happened in Chandigarh.

Professor Shelley Walia said that Press note should be given.

It was informed that the Hindustan Times has covered it. They are doing fogging of all the areas.

The Vice Chancellor said that till heart awakening is not there, there could be no improvements. Even the people did not clean the coolers of their homes.

G.S. Chadha  
Registrar

Confirmed

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