

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 19<sup>th</sup> November 2017** at **11.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### PRESENT

1. Professor A.K. Grover Vice Chancellor ... (in the Chair)
2. Principal B.C. Josan
3. Dr. Dalip Kumar
4. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma
5. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal
6. Principal (Dr.) I.S. Sandhu
7. Shri Jarnail Singh
8. Professor Mukesh Arora
9. Principal N.R. Sharma
10. Professor Navdeep Goyal
11. Professor Pam Rajput
12. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
13. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
14. Dr. Subhash Sharma
15. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
16. Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha Registrar ... (Secretary)

Shri Lakhmir Singh, DPI (Colleges), Punjab, Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh and Shri Varinder Singh could not attend the meeting.

### **Condolence Resolution**

The Vice-Chancellor said, "With a deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the members about the sad demise of –

- (i) Prof. Krishan Gopal Iyer (Retd), Department of Sociology, on 19<sup>th</sup> October, 2017,
- (ii) Shri Rajinder Kumar, Senior Assistant, Establishment Branch, PU, a very popular official of the University, who passed away on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2017,
- (iii) Smt. Krishna Kansal, revered mother of Prof. H. K. Kansal of UIET and Prof. S. K. Kansal of Dr. SSB UICET, on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2017,

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Prof. Krishan Gopal Iyer (Retd), Shri Rajinder Kumar, Smt. Krishna Kansal and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed soul.

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

**Vice-Chancellor's  
Statement**

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

- i) At the request of Hon'ble Governor of Punjab & Administrator, UT, Chandigarh, Shri V.P. Singh Badnore, Hon'ble Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu, Vice-President of India and Chancellor, Panjab University, presided over a meeting convened in his office at New Delhi. Hon'ble Governor of Punjab apprised the Chancellor about the financial concerns of Panjab University and its importance as a premier academic institution and its pivotal role in bringing together all academic institutions and national laboratories under the umbrella of CRIKC. Vice Chancellor, Prof. Arun Kumar Grover, Registrar, Col. G.S. Chadha and FDO, Shri Vikram Nayyar and Director, UIAMS Prof. S.K. Sharma from PU and representatives from the UGC, MHRD and Vice President's Secretariat, were present in the meeting. Hon'ble Vice-President of India and Chancellor, PU, appreciated the role of Panjab University as a National Institution with its rich heritage and he assured support on behalf of his office to attend to the needs of PU.

The Hon'ble Chancellor, PU, has very kindly accepted our request to visit PU as a Chief Guest for its 67<sup>th</sup> Annual Convocation on 4<sup>th</sup> March 2018.

The power point presentation which was put out there, I shall mail the copies of that presentation to each one of you. A summary of the meeting was also made, which was shown to his Secretary before we left Delhi. The same shall also be emailed to each one of you. The background of this meeting, as you are aware, is that when the Syndicate met last time on 7<sup>th</sup> of October, 2017, before that there was a Court hearing. After that Court hearing we had received a communication from the U.T. Administration asking us to elaborate on a statement that was made by the Hon'ble Governor of Punjab before the Home Minister saying that the Panjab University is a heritage institution of great academic importance. So we were asked to substantiate that and we submitted a document to the U.T. Administration immediately and that document was also placed before the High Court subsequently. The High Court was scheduled to have a hearing in the first week of November. After the hearing in the first week of November, certain directions appeared from the Court in the newspapers and that led to convening a meeting immediately and I was called by the Secretary to Governor and informed that the Governor would like to place the case of the University before the Chancellor. I was asked to brief the Governor and prepare a presentation quickly. You will recall that a Syndicate meeting was scheduled on an earlier date but it had to be postponed because we had to go to Delhi. All that is over. Things are moving in the right direction and hopefully, by the time the

Chancellor arrives for the Convocation, there would be some solution to the financial sustainability of the Panjab University in the background of the implementation of recommendations of 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission as well as in response to several pleas which are pending before the MHRD. We have been articulating certain desires. So for the first time in the recent years, a meeting got convened at the initiative of the Chancellor, where the MHRD and UGC representatives were present along with the city administration and the Vice Chancellor. I think it is a good development. Hopefully something will emerge. The next hearing in the Court is on December 4, 2017. Hopefully many things would happen by March 4, 2018.

- ii) Smt. Krishna Sobti, a noted writer of Hindi literature and an alumna of University of Panjab at Lahore has been selected to receive Jnanpith Award-2017 for her outstanding contributions in Indian literature.  
Smt. Krishna Sobti had studied at Fateh Chand College, Lahore before independence. The College is now located in Hissar and has been a part of Kurukshetra University, since the Colleges of Haryana were disaffiliated from P.U. and assigned to the Kurukshetra University. After Professor Gurdial Singh, she is the next one from P.U. Alumni to receive this award.
- iii) Dr. Baljinder Singh, Fellow, PU and Professor at Department of Nuclear Medicine, PGIMER, Chandigarh, has been elected as President of the Society of Nuclear Medicine-India.
- iv) Panjab University signed two agreements with Hitech Formulations Limited, Chandigarh and Unique Biotech Limited, Hyderabad on October 31, 2017 under which three research technologies developed by Prof. Indu Pal Kaur, have been transferred to the two industries out of the research conducted and the patents filed by the University. This technology transfer would help to generate a revenue of Rs. 31 lakh. About 30 per cent of these earnings would accrue to the PU and the rest would be given to the inventors.
- v) Prof. Karamjeet Singh of University Business School has been selected for Best Business Academic of the Year (BBAY) Award, 2017 for his research contribution in the field of commerce and management and got silver medal at the 70<sup>th</sup> All India Commerce Conference held at Jaipur from October 12-14, 2017.
- vi) Bio-Incubator, Cluster Innovation Centre in Biotechnology, PU, has won the national jury award at the "Startup Contest-2017" organized by the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE) in collaboration with Vijnana Bharati (VIBHA) under the aegis of India International Science Festival (IISF) from October 13-16, 2017 at Chennai.

- vii) Enactus Dr. SSBUI CET, PU, has bagged 2<sup>nd</sup> position nationally in the prestigious Enactus Mahindra Competition 2017-18. The team has been awarded prize money of Rs. 1.5 lakhs and a grant money of Rs.50,000/- for its ongoing project 'Unnati'.
- viii) Under the aegis of 'Smt. Prem Lata and Prof. D.V.S. Jain Research Foundation' seven faculty members of PU will be felicitated at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Research Award Ceremony in the Department of Chemistry tomorrow i.e. on 20<sup>th</sup> November 2017. The colleagues to be felicitated are:

**Best Researcher Awards (2016)**

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | <b>Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur</b><br>Deptt. of Chemistry         | Prof. D. V. S. Jain<br>Best Researcher<br>Award (2016) |
| 2. | <b>Prof. O.P. Katare</b><br>University Instt. of Pharm. Sci. | Smt.Prem Lata Jain<br>Best Researcher<br>Award (2016)  |

**Best Publication Awards (2016)**

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1. | <b>Dr. (Ms.) Nishima Wangoo,</b><br>University Instt. of Engg. & Tech. |
| 2. | <b>Dr. Rohit K. Sharma,</b><br>Dept of Chemistry,                      |
| 3. | <b>Prof. B.S. Bhoop,</b><br>Univ. Institute of Pharm.Sci.              |
| 4. | <b>Prof. O.P. Katare,</b><br>Univ. Institute of Pharm.Sci.             |
| 5. | <b>Dr. (Ms.) Sonal Singhal,</b><br>Dept. of Chemistry                  |
| 6. | <b>Dr. (Ms.) Bimla Nehru,</b><br>Dept. of Biophysics                   |
- ix) Professor Kanchan K. Jain, Department of Statistics, has been elected as Member of International Statistical Institute, Netherlands.
- x) Ms Kanika Thakur of University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, doing research under the supervision of Prof. O.P. Katare, has been selected for Chamber Event 2017 at UK Parliament (House of Lords), London, on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017. UK Government organizes every year this event for University, students of U.K. and exchange students of Common Wealth Countries.
- xi) On the direction of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, District Legal Services Authority, UT, Chandigarh, has constituted two Family Welfare Committees and Prof. Devi Sirohi of the Department of History, has been appointed as Chairperson of one of these Committees.
- xii) Mr Vinod Kumar Chauhan, research scholar in the Dept. of Computer Science and Applications, received a Travel Grant Award from the organizers of Asian

Conference on Machine Learning (ACML) for his research work presented at Seoul in ACML-2017 from November 15-17, 2017.

- xiii) Panjab University is continuing to perform well in the various sports events during the current academic year (2017-18). In this regard an update on the performance in 2017-18 has been made available by the Directorate of Sports for perusal of the Syndicate.
- (xiv) Prof. Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor and Prof. Anil Kumar Monga, Dean Alumni Relations, attended the Fourth Annual Reunion of Panjab University Campus Students Alumni Association (Regd.) at Surrey, British Columbia, Canada on 22<sup>nd</sup> October. Prof. Grover and Prof. Monga also visited University of British Columbia, Vancouver on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver on 24<sup>th</sup> October and University of Fraser Valley, Abbotsford on 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2017 to fortify relationship(s) of PU with them.

We have had MoUs with these Universities from time to time. We have been hosting academics and senior officials from these Universities at our campus in recent years. So this project was really useful.

- (xv) Hon'ble Dr. Harsh Vardhan, Minister of Science & Technology, Minister of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and Minister of Earth Sciences, has appointed Prof. Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, PU as Member of the CSIR-Recruitment and Assessment Board (RAB) w.e.f. 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2017, for a period of three years in his capacity as Vice-President, CSIR. The Prime Minister of India as President of CSIR had earlier made him a member of the Governing Council of CSIR. Earlier the Prime Minister of India as President of CSIR has made him a member of Governing Council of CSIR whose first meeting is due on 21<sup>st</sup> of November, 2017.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to–
  - (i) Smt. Krishna Sobti, a noted writer of Hindi literature and an alumna of University of Panjab at Lahore on her being selected to receive Jnanpith Award-2017 for her outstanding contributions in Indian literature;
  - (ii) Dr. Baljinder Singh, Fellow, PU and Professor at Department of Nuclear Medicine, PGIMER, Chandigarh, on his being elected as President of the Society of Nuclear Medicine-India;

- (iii) Prof. Indu Pal Kaur, on having been transferred the three technologies developed by her out of her research to the two industries i.e. Hitech Formulations Limited, Chandigarh and Unique Biotech Limited, Hyderabad.
- (iv) Prof. Karamjeet Singh of University Business School on his being selected for Best Business Academic of the Year (BBAY) Award, 2017 for his research contribution in the field of commerce and management and got silver medal at the 70<sup>th</sup> All India Commerce Conference held at Jaipur from October 12-14, 2017.
- (v) Enactus Dr. SSBUCET, PU, on having bagged 2<sup>nd</sup> position nationally in the prestigious Enactus Mahindra Competition 2017-18 and the prize money of Rs. 1.5 lakhs and a grant money of Rs.50,000/- for its ongoing project 'Unnati'.
- (vi) The following persons on being conferred with the Best Researcher Awards (2016) and Best Publication Awards (2016) under the aegis of 'Smt. Prem Lata and Prof. D.V.S. Jain Research Foundation' at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Research Award Ceremony:

**Best Researcher Awards (2016)**

- |    |  |                     |
|----|--|---------------------|
| 1. | Dr. (Ms.) Navneet Kaur<br>Deptt. of Chemistry            | Prof. D.V.S. Jain   |
| 2. | Prof. O.P. Katare<br>University Instt. of Pharm.<br>Sci. | Smt. Prem Lata Jain |

**Best Publication Awards (2016)**

1. Dr. (Ms.) Nishima Wangoo  
University Instt. of Engg. & Tech.
2. Dr. Rohit K. Sharma  
Dept of Chemistry,
3. Prof. B.S. Bhoop  
Univ. Institute of Pharm.Sci.
4. Prof. O.P. Katare  
Univ. Institute of Pharm.Sci.
5. Dr. (Ms.) Sonal Singhal  
Dept. of Chemistry
6. Dr. (Ms.) Bimla Nehru  
Dept. of Biophysics

- (vii) Professor Kanchan K. Jain, Department of Statistics, on being elected as Member of International Statistical Institute, Netherlands.
- (viii) Ms Kanika Thakur of University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, doing research under

the supervision of Prof. O.P. Katare, on being selected for Chamber Event 2017 at UK Parliament (House of Lords), London, on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2017.

- (ix) Prof. Devi Sirohi, Department of History, on being appointed as Chairperson of one of the Committees on Family Welfare on the direction of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, District Legal Services Authority, UT, Chandigarh.
  - (x) Mr Vinod Kumar Chauhan, research scholar in the Dept. of Computer Science and Applications, on his receiving a Travel Grant Award from the organizers of Asian Conference on Machine Learning (ACML) for his research work presented at Seoul in ACML-2017.
  - (xi) Prof. Arun Kumar Grover, Vice Chancellor, P.U. on his being appointed as Member of the CSIR-Recruitment and Assessment Board (RAB) w.e.f. 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2017, for a period of three years by Hon'ble Dr. Harsh Vardhan, Minister of Science & Technology, Minister of Environment, Forest and Climate Change and Minister of Earth Sciences, in his capacity as Vice-President, CSIR.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's Statement at Sr. No. (i), (vi), (xiii) and (xiv) be noted;
  3. the Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 23.09.2017, **as per Appendix-I**, be noted.

At this point of time Dr. Dalip Kumar said, he thinks that it is for the first time that the Chancellor and Officials of the MHRD and UGC were present at one platform. So at this moment, what was their reaction, particularly, the officials of MHRD. Were they comfortable, he asked? Because, usually they heard that always they are not giving any consent as far as the financial position of the University is concerned. This time, is there the feeling of happiness from their side regarding the improvement, not only in the financial position, but also general improvement of the Panjab University. This is the only question, he would like to ask.

The Vice Chancellor said that some documents were submitted to them before they went to New Delhi. He would make available that document and the presentation made before the Chancellor was based on that document. He would make available to them a copy of that written submission. That copy was made available to them (Chancellor's Office), a day before the meeting. He did not know that the MHRD and the UGC were being called. Even the Chancellor's Office had no indication as to who is invited and who not invited. Only they were invited. But the UGC and the MHRD officials approached the F.D.O. to know the background of the meeting twelve hours before the meeting. So, in fact, he mailed them everything while they were on way to Delhi. He does not think that the officials of MHRD and UGC had any occasion to talk to the Chairman UGC or

the Secretary, MHRD or the Minister MHRD. So, they merely participated in the meeting just to take cognisance of this. They were not authorised to give any statement on behalf of their respective offices. They were present there and the Chancellor asked them to take these things with their respective administrative heads and the Chancellor's office is expected to convene a meeting again in which the representatives of Home Office, the Finance, the MHRD Secretary and the UGC Chairman would be invited. All this could happen well before March 4. How the things would develop, it all depends on the progress first on December 4, when there is next hearing in the Court. In the October hearing of the High Court, the representatives of Punjab, UT, Haryana and the MHRD were asked to respond to the submissions made to them those copies had been made available to all the Counsels via Court. In the hearing that happened in November, no Counsel came prepared for submitting any document(s). So the Hon'ble Judge was quite concerned and he stressed and it is there in the written order of October, 6, that all of them are enjoined to give written submissions at the next hearing on December 4, 2017. Punjab has to give a written submission on the plea of the Centre Government that the deficit of Panjab University, accumulated over previous years have to be met by the Punjab Government and the Panjab University. The University has said that they have already met a larger part of the deficit. There was a Rs. 45 Crore deficit. From the enhanced income of the University, they have already met a deficit of Rs. 27 crores. So, the Punjab government is asked to meet the remaining deficit which is only 18 crores. Punjab has not increased any amount over the last several years. Only this year they have increased it from 20 to 27 crores. Now to overcome lack of their contribution over many years, if they give 18 crores rupees, then the matter is reset. The Court asked Punjab to give a response. The Advocate General, Punjab Mr. Atul Nanda, came himself and he asked for two weeks time to respond to the Court. He said that the Hon'ble Chief Minister told him that he would consult him and after two weeks time. Mr. Nanda said that he would get back to him (VC) and he is waiting for his call. As of now, he has not called and he has also been very very busy since then. But he (VC) would call him back, he did not call him within next 2-3 days. He has to go to Delhi tomorrow and he will be back on 21<sup>st</sup> evening. So from 22<sup>nd</sup> onwards, he (VC) will contact Mr. Nanda and know his response. The Vice Chancellor added that the Hon'ble Finance Minister of Punjab has convened another meeting to which he has been invited and he will take that occasion to ask the Hon'ble Finance Minister as to what is the response of Punjab Government (at an unofficial level). This is the position as far as the Punjab State is concerned. As far as Haryana is concerned, the Haryana Counsel stated that they have told the Home Ministry that they have pleaded that the colleges in the neighbourhood of Chandigarh, namely, Kalka upto the border of Himachal and upto Ambala, these colleges should get affiliated to Panjab University and in lieu of that they are willing to make as much contribution to Panjab University as is being made by Punjab, even though the number of colleges they wanted to get affiliated is very small. This was a categorical statement made by the Haryana Counsel in the Court and the Centre is supposed to be expected to it. The Counsel of the Centre, namely, Mr. Satya Pal Jain, was asked to take it up with the Central Government and get back to the Court on December 4. He understands that the Home Ministry has now solicited from the University the background in which the Haryana withdrew the affiliation of the Colleges located in Haryana. So the last notification which was Gazetted, they wanted a copy of it from us



which has been sent. This notification is in the gazette of India and that has been sent to them. The U.T. Administration has also been asked as to how they will meet the needs of the two Sectors of the University as a part of the Chandigarh City. The Hon'ble Governor and Administrator U.T. Chandigarh assured before the Chancellor that the U.T. Administration shall attend to the needs of University. But it could be in the future, as at present there is no allocation made for them upto 31<sup>st</sup> of March. Whatever budget projections are to be made by the U.T. Administration for the next financial year, hopefully, their (PU) needs would get reflected somewhere. So, he has sought a meeting with the Finance Secretary (UT) on 20<sup>th</sup> November, i.e., tomorrow.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he would also like to talk about point No. (ii) of the Vice Chancellor's statement which relates to Smt. Krishna Sobti. He wanted to know whether the name of the University at that time was University of Punjab, Lahore or it was Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that it was University of Panjab at Lahore. On being asked by Prof. Mukesh Arora whether the spellings of 'Punjab' were with 'Pu' or with 'Pa', the Vice Chancellor said that it was wrongly written with 'u', it should have been with 'a' i.e 'Panjab'. The Vice Chancellor further said that the name of Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu ji has also been misspelt and asked the Registrar to correct the spellings at both the places.

Principal B.C. Josan congratulated the Vice Chancellor on his being appointed as Member of the CSIR-Recruitment and Assessment Board (RAB) w.e.f. 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2017, for a period of three years.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma pointed out that some time back the Syndicate had taken some decisions and the implementation of those decisions has not been done.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is an issue to be discussed in the zero hour and he will take it up in the zero hour.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is the dignity of the Syndicate. He has written a letter to the Vice Chancellor, but even after three months, no reply has been received by him. He has raised only those issues in his letter which were discussed and decided here. If the decisions of the Syndicate have to be flouted and the letters written by the Fellows are not to be acknowledged in this way, then what kind of Governing Body and the Executive Government, they are. It is humiliating.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would take this issue with him (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma). He is not saying that he will not listen to him, but this is not zero hour. He will take up with him immediately after lunch and let him proceed with the agenda.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is necessary to bring it to his (Vice Chancellor) knowledge. Many decisions are taken here in the meeting, but these are not implement and if somebody sends a letter, that is not taken care of.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not accepting his accusation as this is not correct.

Dr. Rabinder Nath said that he would walk out from the meeting on this issue as the attitude of the University is wrong. The decisions taken here are not implemented and he again said that he would walk-out from the meeting.

Professor Pam Rajput, however, pleaded with Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that the Vice Chancellor is ready to listen to him after lunch and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma agreed to it.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-3 to Associate Professor Stage-4, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Chemistry, University, Chandigarh**

**2(i).** Considered the minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-II**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-3) to Associate Professor (Stage-4), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Vikas be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) to Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) in the Department of Chemistry, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme, w.e.f. **02.06.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000/-+ AGP Rs.9000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University; the post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

**Promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(ii).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-III**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Luxmi be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **29.6.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

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

**Promotion from Associate Professor Stage-4 to Professor Stage-5, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(iii).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-IV**) of the Selection Committee for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Navdeep Kaur be promoted from Associate Professor (**Stage-4**) to Professor (**Stage-5**) at University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **7.03.2012**, in the pay-scale of Rs.37400-67000 + AGP Rs.10,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbents and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(iv).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-V**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Tammanna R. Sahrawat be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f. **11.03.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(v).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Veena Puri be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at Centre for System Biology & Bioinformatics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS), **w.e.f. 01.09.2015**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(vi).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-VII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Sakshi Gautam be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) (4<sup>th</sup> Amendment 2016), **w.e.f. 15.10.2016** in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Physics, P.U. Chandigarh**

**2 (vii).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Er. Manish Dev Sharma be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Physics, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f. 29.07.2015** in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(viii).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-IX**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor/s (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor/s (Stage-2) in the Department of Anthropology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) (4<sup>th</sup> Amendment 2016), w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

1. Dr. Maninder Kaur : 28.02.2017
2. Dr. Ramesh Sahani : 06.06.2017
3. Dr. Jagmahender Singh: 03.05.2017

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Police Administration, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(ix).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-X**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Centre for Police Administration, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Kuldeep Singh be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) at Centre for Police Administration, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f 20.07.2014** in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Library & Information Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(x).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Library & Information Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Shiv Kumar be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) in the Department of Library & Information Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) (4<sup>th</sup> Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f 20.03.2017** in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

2(xi). Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Speaking on the item, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not understandable from the proceedings of the Selection Committee as to what has been approved. If they look at the proceedings, under the column, 'promoted with effect from' it is written, 'as per rules and record'. On the top of the same page, it is written that "the date of promotion from Stage-I to Stage-II is not evident, therefore, this may be ensured before considering the case of promotion". He further said that there is also a note from the Vice Chancellor. If they have a look on the CV of the candidate, it reveals that she was appointed as Assistant Professor in the scale of 8000-13500 on 28<sup>th</sup> of August, 2008. This was a scale of Lecturer which is Grade-1 and the Stage-II is the Lecturer (Sr. Scale) for which the Grade was 10000-15200. In her CV it has been mentioned that she is in the scale of 8000-13500 since 2008. If they talk about the regular service, it is from 2006 in the scale of 8000-13500. So, nowhere it has been written that she was in Stage-II.

The Vice Chancellor said that her appointment started in the pay scale of Rs. 3000 starting point scale which is not the scale of 2200-4000. As and when there is transition, such problems do occur. She was in a Sr. Lecturer's scale.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, however, said that the date has not been mentioned anywhere. There are many persons who are working in a higher scale and want to come to the equivalent teaching scale, all their promotions were considered after the date when they were designated as Lecturers or Assistant Professors.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot answer to him about the past history. Right now this is a promotion case. He (Prof. Navdeep Goyal) can point it out and he (Vice Chancellor) will bring this thing back. He does not want to get into this thing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he is also saying the same thing that they should not pass it as such till they get complete clarification.

The Vice Chancellor said that the next meeting of Syndicate is on 10<sup>th</sup> of December. Her promotion is approved and as regards the date part, they will sort it out and bring it as a proper information.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they cannot approve the promotion and it has to be deferred because till the time the period of service is not defined, they cannot decide the API score as the API score could be counted only according to the period of service. So, first they have to check the service period and if it is alright only then they can count the API score. The API score required for promotion is 100 points and her score is exactly 100 points. It is not even one point more. If there is some problem in her service period i.e. if there is minor change in the date while counting of her service, that might create a problem.

The Vice Chancellor said that they will come back to it, okay. Right now he does not have the facts, so he does not want to say anything.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is what he would like to say.

The Vice Chancellor said, okay, they will have a relook on it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the rest of the part is alright.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that the people who were similarly placed like this previously, they were not given this benefit. So, if they were not given this benefit, they need to be given this benefit. It does not mean that she is to be denied. It is okay and they will have a relook at it in the background of what he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) is saying. But if that precedent happened inappropriately, then they have to look at it. This is not inappropriate. If those were inappropriate, then they have to see, what is the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that from the bio data it is not clear how the date is to be determined.

The Vice Chancellor said that this has been verified and this was consciously done. She was in the grade of Rs.3000. Rs.3000 is the grade not starting at Rs.2200. Rs.3000 is a grade which is starting at Rs. 3000 and college lecturers were promoted from Rs.2200-4000 grade into Rs.3000-4500 before they went into a grade which was starting at Rs.3700. What has happened in her case was appropriate to the best of his mind. But he is willing to look at the past precedents and take a call not to the disadvantage of anybody.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said the issue relates to the date only.

The Vice Chancellor said that whatever, it is, but he is making himself clear as he does not want to do anything to the disadvantage of anybody.

**RESOLVED:** That the case of Dr. Dazy Zarabi for promotion from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) in the Department of Community Education and Disability Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting after clearly specifying the exact date of her promotion.

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



**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.**

**2(xii).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-XII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That the following persons be promoted from Assistant Professor/s in Information Technology (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Information Technology (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), w.e.f., the date mentioned against each, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and they would perform the duties as assigned to them:

- |                       |   |            |
|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 1. Dr. Inderdeep Kaur | : | 31.12.2013 |
| 2. Ms. Roopali        | : | 31.12.2013 |

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-1 to Assistant Professor Stage-2, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur**

**2(xiii).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage-2), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

**RESOLVED:** That Shri Rahul Jassal be promoted from Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Applications (**Stage-1**) to Assistant Professor in Computer Science & Applications (**Stage-2**) at Panjab University S.S. Giri Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f 07.11.2015** in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.7,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(xiv).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Yajvender Pal be promoted from Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronics Engg. (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor in Electrical & Electronics Engg. (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Engineering & Technology, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f. 31.12.2013**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and he would perform the duties as assigned to him.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(xv).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Meenu Saihjpal be promoted from Assistant Professor (Economics) (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (Economics) (**Stage-3**) at University Institute of Legal Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010), **w.e.f. 09.03.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

**Promotion from Assistant Professor Stage-2 to Assistant Professor Stage-3, under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at School of Punjabi Studies (Lexicography), Panjab University, Chandigarh**

**2(xvi).** Considered minutes dated 10.10.2017 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Screening-cum-Evaluation Committee for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-2) to Assistant Professor (Stage-3), under Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) at School of Punjabi Studies (Lexicography), Panjab University, Chandigarh

**RESOLVED:** That Dr. Akwinder Kaur Tanvi be promoted from Assistant Professor (**Stage-2**) to Assistant Professor (**Stage-3**) at School of Punjabi Studies (Lexicography), Panjab University, Chandigarh, under the UGC Career Advancement Scheme (CAS) (2010) (4<sup>th</sup> Amendment, 2016), **w.e.f. 18.07.2016**, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.8,000/-, at a starting pay to be fixed under the rules of Panjab University. The post would be personal to the incumbent and she would perform the duties as assigned to her.

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

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the letters of promotion to the persons promoted under Item **C-2(i) to C-2 (x) and C-2(xii) to C-2 (xvi)**, be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate and only the relevant papers would form part of the proceedings to avoid any confusion.

**Conferment of *Honoris Causa* degrees**

**3.** Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 25.09.2017 (**Appendix-XVII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that *Honoris Causa* Degree be conferred on the following as mentioned against each in the convocation to be held in 2018:

1. Smt. Sumitra Mahajan  
20, Akbar Road  
New Delhi-110001  
Email: s\_mahajan@nic.in  
Doctor of Laws  
(*Honoris Causa*)
2. Professor M.M. Sharma, FRS  
(Former President, INSA)  
2/3 Jaswant Baug (Runwal Park)  
Behind Akbarally  
Chembur, Mumbai-400071  
Email: mmsharma@bom3.vsnl.net.in  
D.Sc. (*Honoris Causa*)
3. Prof. Sir Tejinder Singh Virdee, FRS  
Department of Physics  
Faculty of Natural Sciences  
Room: 524 (CERN)  
Blackett Laboratory  
Imperial College  
South Kensington Campus  
London S W 7 2AZ  
D.Sc. (*Honoris Causa*)

Email: t.virdee@imperial.ac.uk

- NOTE:** 1. The Section 23 of the PU Act at page 9, P.U. Calendar Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

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

2. Bio-Data of Smt. Sumitra Mahajan, Professor M.M. Sharma and Professor Sir Tejinder Singh Virdee is enclosed **(Appendix-XVII)**.

The Vice Chancellor said that Honoris Causa Degrees are to be conferred on Smt. Sumitra Mahajan, the Hon'ble Speaker of Lok Sabha, Professor M.M. Sharma, Fellow of the Royal Society, a very eminent Scientist and just in terms of reputation, successor to Dr. Shanti Sarup Bhatnagar, FRS. Professor Sharma has visited Panjab University many times. It is because of his very very high stature when they had to re-name the Chemical Engineering Department after Bhatnagar and unveil the portrait of Bhatnagar, they invited him (Prof. M.M.Sharma) to do so. He is of that class. The Vice Chancellor then briefed about Professor Tejinder Singh Virdee. Professor Tejinder Singh Virdee is the Spokesperson of CERN and the detector which detected that GOD particle, that design is of his conception. So, today he occupies similar important position at Imperial College, London that Professor Abdul Salam had in the same College. He actually has an office in the same Blackett Building where Prof. Salam worked. Professor Sir Tejinder Singh Virdee has been honoured with Honoris Causa Degrees by many universities. He had visited Panjab University, he (Vice Chancellor) did not know about him earlier, but he was in the campus. He gave a lecture in the Physics Department, probably two or three years ago. He was not born in Punjab, his parents had immigrated to England. He was born in England, but he is a very prominent scientist of U.K. and currently the Spokesperson of CERN. So, the Physics Department enjoys a position in international collaboration and today India is an Associate Member of CERN. Many of their faculty members have retired from the University, but the CERN continues to invite them. For instance, Professor Suman Bery who was made an Emeritus Professor, still goes and participates in all the experiments at CERN and fully paid by CERN collaboration.

Principal Gurdip Sharma and some other members appreciated this.

Professor Pam Rajput pointed out to correct the address of Smt. Sumitra Mahajan, which is 20 Akbar Road and not G.R.G. Road. It was the address when she was a member Parliament. She further pointed out that it looks odd that for her CV, they are quoting Wikipedia. She stated that she has already sent through email the summary biodata of all the three recipients of *Honoris Causa* Degrees including Smt. Sumitra Mahajan to the Vice Chancellor's Office.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has asked his Secretary to use the CVs sent by Professor Pam Rajput, anyway, it will be done, actually he could not find time to check it. The Vice Chancellor said that he had solicited a write-up from her (Prof. Pam Rajput) and a write-up from Professor Manjit Kaur, a write-up from UICET. He had solicited all the three write-ups. The Vice Chancellor said that agenda papers will be changed. He instructed the Deputy Registrar (General) that when the agenda papers would be bound-up for the record of the University, the revised agenda papers should be bound up

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the *Honoris Causa* Degrees be conferred on the following persons as mentioned against each in the Convocation to be held in 2018:.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. Smt. Sumitra Mahajan<br>20, Akbar Road<br>New Delhi-110001<br>Email: s_mahajan@nic.in  | Doctor of Laws<br>( <i>Honoris Causa</i> ) |
| 2. Professor M.M. Sharma, FRS<br>(Former President, INSA)<br>2/3 Jaswant Baug (Runwal Park)<br>Behind Akbarally<br>Chembur, Mumbai-400071<br>Email: mmsharma@bom3.vsnl.net.in   | D.Sc. ( <i>Honoris Causa</i> )             |
| 3. Prof. Sir Tejinder Singh Virdee, FRS<br>Department of Physics<br>Faculty of Natural Sciences<br>Room: 524 (CERN)<br>Blackett Laboratory<br>Imperial College<br>South Kensington Campus<br>London S W 7 2AZ<br>Email: t.virdee@imperial.ac.uk | D.Sc. ( <i>Honoris Causa</i> )             |

### **Conferment of various Rattan Awards**

**4.** Considered recommendation of the Committee dated 25.09.2017 (**Appendix-XVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor that the awards Khel Rattan, Gian Rattan and Udyog Rattan, be conferred on the following persons in the Convocation to be held in 2018.

- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Shri Milkha Singh<br># 725, Sector-8/B<br>Chandigarh | Khel Rattan |
| 2. Professor B.N. Goswamy                               | Gyan Rattan |

Professor Emeritus  
# 171, Sector-19/A  
Chandigarh  
Email: bngoswamy@gmail.com

3. Shri Sunil Kant Munjal Udyog Rattan  
Chancellor, BML Munjal University  
Corporate Office:  
BML Munjal University  
12<sup>nd</sup> Floor Tower-2, NBCC Plaza  
Sector-5, Pushp Vihar  
New Delhi-110017

**NOTE:** Bio-data of Shri Milkha Singh, Professor B.N. Goswamy and Shri Sunil Kant Munjal is enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

The Vice informed that this year's Khel Rattan Awards is for Shri Milkha Singh, Gyan Rattan Award for Professor B.N. Goswamy and Udyog Rattan Award for Shri Sunil Kant Munjal. Shri Sunil Kant Munjal comes three times to Chandigarh because he is the Chairperson of the Governing Council of ISB, Mohali.

Professor Pam Rajput said that the CV of Smt. Sumitra Mahajan, no doubt, would be enclosed, but it should also be mentioned that she is the only women who has gone into the Guinness Book of World Records for getting elected eight times from the same constituency. She further informed that Geeta Mukherjee was elected seven times from the same constituency.

Dr. Dalip Kumar asked the Vice Chancellor if the corrections pointed out by the members would be incorporated in Item No. C-4 also to which the Vice Chancellor said, it, yes, it would be incorporate definitely. He felt sorry for it. He was conscious that it should not have come from the Wikipedia, that is why he had requisitioned the CV of all the dignitaries from various persons. When he received the agenda papers, he could not check it up and he apologised for that.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma wanted to know the procedure for recommending the names of persons for the award of various Honoris Causa Degrees and Awards and who introduces or proposes their names for these awards.

The Vice Chancellor said that as such there is no procedure for it. A given Vice Chancellor proposes the names and this is the practice. It is not written anywhere. When he joined the University as Vice Chancellor, he figured it out by talking to his predecessors and he also saw some proceedings that Professor Sobti had made a Committee. The names were presented to that Committee and the Committee approved these names. So, he has also just been proposing the names, every year constituting a Committee and that Committee approves the names. No names are, per se, by putting an advertisement or making a call for such things. He just followed the practice that has been there in this University. He understands, ever since the University started this, this has been followed. Now what is the benchmark? The benchmark is that they can look at the list of people who have been awarded honoris causa degrees. So, people of certain stature/standing have been given these degrees. So, it is like

that. At any given time, there could be many people of that standing. A given Vice Chancellor proposes some names which, to his or her wisdom, at that point of time would add to the stature of an event like this. So in the contemporary time that they are living. Shri Som Nath Chatterjee was given an honoris causa degree. In that spirit, when somebody said that they should get some eminent women statesman of India also. So it is a casual suggestion made to me that the these degrees/awards be given to these persons. He felt convinced about it and put it to the Committee. He has not put any competitive names. The Committee just accepted the names that he had put to them. Similarly, when it came to Shri Tejinder Singh Virdee, since the GOD Particle discussed in the domain of Science, he felt that he is the person of Indian Origin, somebody who is in the footsteps of Abdus Salam, so he thought that it would catch the imagination of young people in their region. Sir Tejinder Singh Virdee would come here, he will go and visit the academic institutions in Punjab. Young people of Punjab will take pride that there is someone whose origin is Punjab. He understands that his village is somewhere on way to Jalandhar. He felt that when he would come here and he would visit Golden Temple, it could generate some public awareness about his name in Punjab. They would have one amongst them whose contribution is so important that it led to a Nobel Prize winning discovery and who has been honoured by many foreign Universities already. However, they can say that since he (Vice Chancellor) is from Physics Department, it can be his bias to propose his name. When he proposed his name, then Professor D.V.S. Jain said if he (Vice Chancellor) is proposing someone like Tejinder Singh Virdee, they have forgotten to honour Professor M.M. Sharma, FRS. Professor M.M. Sharma again is a great sympathiser of this University. He was also President of the Indian National Science Academy and he was elected President of the Indian National Science Academy in the ICSSR Seminar Hall of Panjab University when the Executive Committee of INSA met there that year. So, it was Professor D.V.S. Jain's suggestion that if they are honouring Sir Tejinder Singh Virdee, FRS, they could also honour Professor M.M. Sharma, FRS. So, he had no hesitation to accept that suggestion and the Committee went along with it. The Committee did not suggest him any other name when it came to Smt. Sumitra Mahajan.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he (Vice Chancellor) knows very much more than him and he welcomes it, but if they suggest him some name, they can join that person also. He had also given him a name of some person and the Vice Chancellor has said it is alright. He is father of Psychiatry and he (Vice Chancellor) can ask anybody about his contribution to the society. But he would not like to name him but the Vice Chancellor said that he is no more now. The Vice Chancellor said that perhaps he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) has given his the name of Professor Chugh, but Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he has given him the name of Professor Vig.

Continuing, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Professor N.N. Vig is known as the father of Psychiatry and he (Vice Chancellor) had said that he knows him. He has started Psychiatry Department in AIIMS, PGI etc. and even today he is providing free service to the people. He further said that he (Prof. N.N. Vig) is not his relative.

The Vice Chancellor said that he confused him with Nephrology and he had that thing in mind when they were discussing the issue.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further said that Professor B.N. Goswamy has already been conferred with Padam shree and Padam Bhushan and it would have been better if he was conferred with honoris causa degree because he deserves as his contribution is much more. So, it his suggestions that he should be given the highest award.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the award which has been given to Professor B.N. Goswamy is the highest award.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he should have been given out of the first three awards.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they have been given the honorary degrees.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that all are already having the degrees, but the question is to honour a person and Professor Goswamy is one of the great intellectuals.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked, was it (Gian Rattan) not better than honoris causa degree.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he would not like to indulge in any controversy, but it was his feeling that he really deserves it

**RESOLVED:** That Khel Rattan, Gyan Rattan and Udyog Rattan awards, be conferred on the following persons in the Convocation to be held in 2018:

- |  |              |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Shri Milkha Singh<br># 725, Sector-8/B<br>Chandigarh  | Khel Rattan  |
| 2. Professor B.N. Goswamy<br>Professor Emeritus<br># 171, Sector-19/A<br>Chandigarh<br>Email: bngoswamy@gmail.com  | Gyan Rattan  |
| 3. Shri Sunil Kant Munjal<br>Chancellor<br>BML Munjal University<br><u>Corporate Office:</u><br>BML Munjal University<br>12 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Tower-2, NBCC Plaza<br>Sector-5, Pushp Vihar<br>New Delhi-110017 | Udyog Rattan |

**Conferment of designation of Honorary Professor on Dr. Arvind Gupta**

**5.** Considered the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on Dr. Arvind Gupta, Former Deputy National Security Advisor and Secretary, National Security Council Secretariat (NSCS), Government of India, Former Director General, Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis (IDSA), New Delhi, and Indian Foreign Service (Retd.) & Visiting Member Tata Institute for Fundamental Research, in the Department



of Defence and National Security Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh, to help the department in utilizing his rich experience and also enhance the growth & development of the department in long run.

**NOTE:** 1. The Academic and Administrative Committee of the Department of Defence and National Security Studies in its meeting dated 25.09.2017 (**Appendix-XIX**) has recommended that Dr. Arvind Gupta be appointed as Honorary Professor in Department of Defence and National Security Studies.

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

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

3. Curriculum Vitae of Dr. Arvind Gupta enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).

The Vice Chancellor while briefing the members about Dr. Arvind Gupta said that Dr. Arvind Gupta was the Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair Professor and the Director General of Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis, New Delhi. Thereafter, he was Deputy National Security Adviser. He has retired from there. There is a Think Tank by the name of Institute of Vivekanand Studiers in New Delhi. He is now the Director of that Think Tank. He has also visited Panjab University twice and has given lectures. He has been generally advising how to take forward the strategic analysis agenda of Panjab University. He is very supportive that Chandigarh and Panjab University should emerge as a place where serious thinking happens about the strategic and the governance issues at the University. He says that there are many Think Tanks in Delhi, but they are so close to the political leadership that often they are not able to make the analysis in a very objective manner. It gets coloured by political influence. He is very supportive that they should create at Chandigarh a Think Tank which is close to Delhi but not that much influenced by this thing. He is willing to come and give lectures here, willing to work with General K.J. Singh and enrich this Gian Setu that has been registered as a Society. They also have the role, even the kind of intellectual resource that is there in the city and they are now a metropolis of three million people consisting of Chandigarh, Mohali, Zirakpur. So, there should be a Think Tank at U.T., Chandigarh, which should be taken seriously.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor be conferred on Dr. Arvind Gupta, Former Deputy National Security Advisor and Secretary, National Security Council Secretariat (NSCS), Government of India, Former Director General, Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis (IDSA), New Delhi, and Indian Foreign Service (Retd.) & Visiting Member, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, in the Department of Defence and National Security Studies, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 12.07.2017 regarding CAS promotion**

**6.** Considered recommendation dated 12.07.2017 (**Appendix-XX**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to the CAS promotion cases of the following faculty members, who were already promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards, without capping on API score as per UGC Regulations, 2010 on the basis of the observations of RAO (**Appendix-XX**) as per 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment that:

1. Dr. Preeti Gupta, Assistant Professor, UIET, is eligible for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage 2) w.e.f. 08.03.2014 i.e. the last date of attending the conference from 6-8 March, 2014 (instead of the date given earlier i.e. 06.10.2013, as she fulfilled the requisite API score of 40.00 (with capping) on the said date.
2. Dr. Neeraj Sharma, Assistant Professor, UIET, is eligible for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage 2) w.e.f. 08.11.2014 i.e. the last date of attending the conference from 7-8 November, 2014 (instead of the date given earlier i.e. 06.10.2013, as she fulfilled the requisite API score of 40.00 (with capping) on the said date.
3. Dr. Ravinder Kaur, Associate Professor, Department of Geography, is eligible for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) w.e.f. 30.06.2014 i.e. the last date of last publication in June, 2014 (instead of 08.01.2014, the date given earlier) as she fulfilled the requisite API score of 120 (with capping) on the said date.

Initiating discussion on this item Professor Mukesh Arora wanted to know that when these persons were promoted w.e.f. 24.07.2013, then why the recommendation is made to promote them from another date.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that there was an objection from the R.A.O. They have very difficult situation. Unnecessary objections are being put in giving the teachers their rightful due. They are not respecting that the M.Phil/Ph.D increments should be given to the people. The things which are done very easily in other universities in different States, given the complex structure of governance of their University, they face difficulties.

Shri Jarnail Singh asked, can they not put a cap on the role of R.A.O. that he has to implement the decisions of the governing body. He said that the Vice Chancellor has also made efforts for this, but the audit people do not understand the things.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it is a humiliation for the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that they are dependent on Central Government and Punjab Government for their sustenance. But they are not the only people who are troubled by the local audit department of the U.T. Administration. This department has emerged as a force in itself. They put objections wherever they like.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that these people should act as facilitators. No doubt, there should be a check, but it should not stop everything. It creates embarrassment to everyone.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has written so many detailed notes regarding Ph.D. increments.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would like to say one thing that the Panjab University has given some written submission in the High Court which is totally wrong and that should be withdrawn.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot control what the Panjab University has submitted in the Court.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it might not be possible for the Vice Chancellor to control all these things, but they can take a decision today in the Syndicate relating to this.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they should first clinch the issue of R.A.O. as many members have to speak on this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that under the Faculty Recharge Programme of the UGC, Assistant Professors are appointed. They do not see whether someone has done Ph.D. under the 2009 regulations or not. They have given five increments to all those who have done Ph.D. There is one person Dr. Dilbagh Singh in their University. He has done his Ph.D. before 2009 and he has been given five increments. The UGC has appointed him and he has been given increments only by the UGC. On the other hand, since, the word "as per 2009 guidelines" has been written in the UGC regulations, so their R.A.O. is opposing the increments. But in the reply filed by the university it has been written that since they have not given in writing that their Ph.D. is as per 2009 regulations, so they (University) cannot give them increments.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the persons who have done Ph.D. after 2009, it is as per the UGC guidelines and the five conditions which have been imposed, those are also applicable to those who have done Ph.D. prior to 2009. But the office is asking for a certificate even from those who have done Ph.D. after 2009. He said that now the Ph.D. degree is being got done as per the UGC guidelines.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is why he had taken the help of Professor A.K. Bhandari thinking that he knows the evolution.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he does not blame anybody, but they can withdraw the reply filed in the Court to which the Vice

Chancellor said, yes, they can do it. He further said that perhaps the Registrar might not have this much time to see everything minutely.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the persons who are coming from other Universities to do Ph.D., they need to be checked. Certificate is necessary only from those who have done Ph.D. prior to 2009.

Principal Iqbal Singh mentioned about the candidate who was enrolled for Ph.D. in 2010 and completed his Ph.D. in 2015, but even then the D.P.I. (Colleges), Punjab asked for a certificate from him. He has then told the D.P.I (Colleges), Punjab that they are asking for such a certificate wrongly. Then they got a certificate from the University, but he told the D.P.I. that their University is working with a system. He further told the D.P.I. that the universities situated at far off places would immediately give such certificates to the Ph.D. students just by taking some money from them. The D.P.I. then showed him the certificates issued by such universities. The problem is that the University wants to keep a check on everything, but the mischievous people found a way to get their work done. Thus their students suffer, but the students belonging to such university, just pay some amount and get the required certificate.

Continuing, he further said that when they talk of the extension for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professor, he would like to say that Principal is considered as a teacher. A Principal is a teacher first and then Principal. But the R.A.O. does not understand this. The Syndicate has given an increment to the Principals of three constituent colleges on which the R.A.O. has raised an objection on it. They should ask the R.A.O., does he not consider the Principal a teacher or does he think that the post of Principal is a non-teaching post. One year has elapsed, but the increment has not been given to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have seen how his salary was stopped for three months. The same thing has happened with the Registrar as his salary issue was not settled for three years. But now the MHRD has cleared it and now it will go to the Board of Finance.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if the increment is not given to them, then they will ask the R.A.O. to give them in writing that a Principal is not considered a teacher.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the definition of a teacher is clearly mentioned in Calendar Volume-I.

The Vice Chancellor said that let whole of the time be not spent on this as they have a long agenda. He has a meeting with the Finance Secretary, where he was planning to take up these things. He asked if the F.D.O. has anything to add at this stage.

The Finance and Development of Officer said that the only thing that there are certainly issues where the observations are correct. Right in this case the date of promotion has been postponed on the basis of observation of R.A.O. But there are many instances where the observations are unreasonable also. In the case of pay protection, it has been admitted and the arrears have been sent.

Regarding the advance increment which the Syndicate has allowed, the R.A.O. has asked, where is the specific rule which gives power to the appointing body to allow advance increment. He showed that rule in the UGC Regulations that at the time of selecting the competent persons, the appointing body can allow higher start also. The he has some specific and mechanical kind of questions that this speaks only about teachers and not Principals. Then he asked him to first clear this pay protection case and then he would revert back.

The Vice Chancellor proposed that they resolve that Principals are the teachers first and Principals later. No non-teacher can ever be appointed as a Principal, other than the IAS Officer who have been asked to officiate as Principals. Principals are appointed only if they have the desired API score. The Vice Chancellor further said that it is for his (R.A.O) satisfaction that they hereby resolved that Principals are teachers first and they are Teachers-Principals like that of Principal-Director of Dental College.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they have to take six periods a week to which Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they have workload.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should resolve that this Syndicate expresses anguish at this objection of the R.A.O. and let it go to the Finance Secretary.

Professor Pam Rajput suggested to quote the relevant portion from the Calendar.

The Vice Chancellor informed that Professor Bambah has given him two increments as a Professor after he had joined as a Professor in Panjab University. However, the Vice Chancellor said that he would take up this with the Finance Secretary. The Vice Chancellor also read out the relevant portion given in Panjab University Regulations, Chapter VIII(E), which says that 'teacher' shall include the Principal, etc.;

Professor Pam Rajput suggested to include this part in the resolution that they are passing.

The Vice Chancellor said that they will record in the proceedings and then express anguish.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that Principal N.R. Sharma, Principal Gurdip Sharma and he himself are taking six periods teaching load.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that someone had done Ph.D. in 1988 and he was got selected as Principal. He was asked by the Dean who was present there had asked him to bring this in writing that he has done his Ph.D. as per the 2009 regulations for Ph.D. He said, perhaps it is not necessary to which the Vice Chancellor said that even his own Ph.D. is not according to such regulations. The Vice Chancellor, however, said that the R.A.O. is improving himself and hopefully he will improve further.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendation dated 12.07.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, with regard to the

CAS promotion cases of the following faculty members, who were already promoted from 24.07.2013 onwards, without capping on API score as per UGC Regulations, 2010, on the basis of the observations of RAO (**Appendix-XX**) as per 2<sup>nd</sup> amendment, **as per Appendix-XX**, be approved:

1. Dr. Preeti Gupta, Assistant Professor, UIET, is eligible for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage 2) w.e.f. 08.03.2014 i.e. the last date of attending the conference from 6-8 March, 2014 (instead of the date given earlier i.e. 06.10.2013, as she fulfilled the requisite API score of 40.00 (with capping) on the said date.
2. Dr. Neeraj Sharma, Assistant Professor, UIET, is eligible for promotion from Assistant Professor (Stage-1) to Assistant Professor (Stage 2) w.e.f. 08.11.2014 i.e. the last date of attending the conference from 7-8 November, 2014 (instead of the date given earlier i.e. 06.10.2013, as she fulfilled the requisite API score of 40.00 (with capping) on the said date.
3. Dr. Ravinder Kaur, Associate Professor, Department of Geography, is eligible for promotion from Associate Professor (Stage-4) to Professor (Stage-5) w.e.f. 30.06.2014 i.e., the last date of last publication in June, 2014 (instead of 08.01.2014, the date given earlier) as she fulfilled the requisite API score of 120 (with capping) on the said date.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That –

1. the Syndicate expressed its anguish on the objection raised by the RAO on the issue of grant of one increment to the Principals of the Constituent Colleges, as under the Panjab University Regulations, Chapter VIII(E), ‘teacher’ shall include the Principal, etc.; this be conveyed to Finance Secretary.
2. the affidavit submitted by the Panjab University in the High Court on the issue of grant of increments for Ph.D. be withdrawn and a revised affidavit be submitted after rectifying the inadequacies.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 18.08.2017 on the issue of CAS promotion and direct recruitment**

**7.** Considered minutes dated 18.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine and give its recommendations on the issues pointed out in the letter dated 19.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) regarding CAS promotion and direct recruitment.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 18.08.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine and give its recommendations on the issues pointed out in the letter dated 19.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXI**) regarding CAS promotion and direct recruitment, **as per Appendix-XXI**, be approved.

**Item No. C-8** was taken up after consideration of **Item No. C-10**.

**Interim Report of the Committee on the issue of fire incident**

9. Considered the deferred Item No. 35 of the Syndicate meeting dated 23.09.2017 relating to interim Report (**Appendix-XXII**) of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to look into the following points:

- (i) To ascertain the cause of the fire.
- (ii) Was it accidental or otherwise?
- (iii) What records stand lost? How much of the lost records can be retrieved/re-constructed?
- (iv) Does anyone stand to benefit from the lost record(s)? If yes, can such beneficiaries be identified/enumerated?
- (v) Any other item that may arise or be raised relating to different sections of the Accounts Department or the area involved in fire and;
- (vi) The committee could recommend measures to be put in place that such accidents do not happen in this building as well as other buildings of the University

**NOTE:** 1. The Committee has given its finding with regard to query Nos. (i to iv) defined under 'Scope of enquiry' referred by the Vice-Chancellor. Since, the proceedings relating to afore-said issued had been closed on 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2017 and it had been opined by the Committee to submit an interim report, as the query Nos. v and vi would require more time for eliciting further information.

2. The interim report of the above Committee was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 35) (**Appendix-XXII**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

On being asked by Principal Hardiljit Singh as to whether the complete report has been received or not, it was informed that report on point number (v) and (vi) of the agenda item is yet to be received. He said many things have been written in the report, such as there is no alarm system. They have also discussed about the gauge of the wires.

Principal B.C. Josan said that all these things would be covered under point number (v) & (vi), to which Principal Gosal said that then it could be discussed at that time when the report on these points would be available.

However, the Vice Chancellor requested him to say whatever he would like to say as he did not want to restrain him.

Continuing, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that if the fire broke out at night, there should be alarm system. He further said that it has been claimed that 80% of the record could be retrieved from the Computers. He enquired as to what would happen to the remaining 20% record.

The Finance & Development Officer while clarifying this point said that they have never said that the whole record cannot be retrieved. They have just said that they have reconstructed 80% of the record and the remaining 20% is being retrieved.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked as to how they would reconstruct the remaining record. He said that he was given to understand that some departments have said that they have the photocopies of the bills which they have submitted. In the same breath he asked how they would prepare the service books. He also wanted to know the number of service books what have burnt.

The Finance & Development Officer said that a total of 400 service books were burnt, out of which 250 have been reconstructed and the efforts are being made to reconstruct the remaining 150 service books. He further added that they have never said that the remaining service books could not be reconstructed. They have detail of every transaction and they have supporting documents of those transactions. He informed that the data is not only saved in the local computer, but it is also saved in the Central Server and the Central Server is lying somewhere else.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal further pointed out that it has been mentioned in the report that the beneficiary cannot be pinpointed. He also said that there are some more points in the report to which the Vice Chancellor requested him to say what he would like to say about those points.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is a very serious issue and that is why he did not like to restrain him. He should say whatever he likes to say.

Principal Gosal said that he would look at the report again and then talk about the other points to which the Vice Chancellor said that they would take up this issue again after lunch after as does not want to cut-short the discussion on this issue. If they did not discuss this issue, the society will say that they have not discussed the issue or they would say that the Vice Chancellor has not allowed to discuss this issue, which he does not want. So, they should discuss this issue very patiently and bring out everything and it will be recorded for posterity also.

**RESOLVED:** That the report with respect to the first four (i to iv) points of references to the Committee be accepted. The recommendation of the remaining two points of references (v & vi) would be put up to the Syndicate as and when received.

When the issue related to Professor Navdeep Goyal under **Item No.C-10** was taken up for consideration, he absented himself from the meeting.



**Minutes of the  
Committee dated  
15.09.2017 to  
study/examine the  
summary reports  
submitted by CVO**

**10.** Considered the deferred Item No. 34 of the Syndicate meeting dated 23.09.2017 relating to minutes dated 15.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 (Para 6) (**Appendix-XXIII**), to study/examine the summary reports submitted by the CVO Panjab University in detail.

**NOTE:** The above minutes were placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 34) (**Appendix-XXIII**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

Referring to Sr. No. (2) of the Status and Summary report submitted by the CVO, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Professor V.K. Chopra has alleged about some irregularities that they have purchased some items at a very high price and the D.S.W. did not take notice of it. Secondly, the coolers were purchased from Pyramid Company. He further said that they gave advertisement in three newspapers i.e. The Tribune, Dainik Bhaskar and Ajit. There were two bidders i.e. L-1 and L-2. L-1 was Guru Nanak Radios. The specifications given by the University were not available with the Guru Nanak Radios. Then they purchased the articles from the bidder L-2 i.e. Electro Power which is not wrong in any way. While citing another case, he said that once they received inferior quality tracksuits and when the same was pointed out to the bidder, he said that these are as per the specifications. Here, in this case, whatever specifications were given, the articles were purchased according to that. To his mind there is nothing wrong in it. Professor Chopra had raised another issue regarding purchase of A.C. One of the Syndicate members has said that they have paid 10000/- more for the AC. But the CVO team has enquired about the rate and they are convinced that the rate is genuine. So, in this issue, there is nothing wrong. Thirdly, in order to open the tenders, a Committee is constituted and the persons whose relative is bidding, he should not be a member of the Committee. He added that Professor Navdeep Goyal was not a member of that Committee. When he was not a member of that Committee, how an objection could be raised on Professor Navdeep Goyal. There is another objection regarding International Hostel. The contractor who was working there earlier refused to work when he came to know that some problem is going to be there for him. Principal Gosal said that he was given to understand the new Contractor to whom the work of International Hostel was given, he was given 40% more amount than the earlier one. He further said that about the rate of AC, the CVO team has stated that they have enquired and the purchase is alright and there is nothing wrong in it. The CVO has pointed out about a very small mistake about the figure of Rs 39837/- which has been wrongly written as Rs. 39337/-. It could be a clerical/technical mistake. It was also alleged that the pre-audit has not been got done. He clarified that that no pre-audit of the hostel fund was being done earlier, but now it is being done. They said that the tender cannot be pre-audited partially, because there was hostel fund as well as amalgamated fund. Though they get pre-audit of the amalgamated fund, but when there is joint tender, so there cannot be partial pre-audit. Therefore, the pre-audit objection had been proved to be wrong. Another point is about the quantity to be purchased. He mentioned that when they ask for rate, the quantity may be somewhat else. The quantity is decided by the Committee. So, this objection is also wrong. So, he requested that the CVO report is correct, ACs, Coolers and the issue of tenders, all are

alright. As regards the 40% more expenditure on International Hostel, F.D.O. would tell about it. There was nothing wrong in the tenders. He (Professor Navdeep Goyal) was not in the Committee. It is wrong to say that if a relative of someone is running a Company, then he cannot apply for any work in that institution. Why, he asked. They have just to see whether his rate is lowest or not. If items are not available with L-1, then they have to purchase the items from L-2. So, the purchase of articles from L-2 is all correct and, therefore, he requested that this case should be finalised.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there were two purchase Committees and the meeting was held twice.

At this point of time, the Vice Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to recuse himself for this item.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he would like to speak on the next item to which the Vice Chancellor said that they can discuss and that there is no hurry.

Continuing, Shri Jarnail Singh said that Professor Navdeep Goyal has countersigned the minutes later on and in the first meeting the Chairperson of the Committee did not arrive to attend the meeting when the tenders were to be opened. All the venders have come, so someone has to open the tenders as the meeting could not be postponed. That was their observation, but the same was not recorded in the previous meeting and requested that it should be recorded now. Secondly, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has not attended the meeting, whereas his signatures are there on the documents. So, this is a wrong allegations and this should not be there. Therefore, it should be filed.

The Vice Chancellor said that consideration item which being decided to be filed, they would record it and after the discussion, this is to be filed.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there are 32 item and a Committee was constituted to go through these items. For these 32 items, there are four types of recommendations, such as which item is pending and at what level it is pending. There are three more important observation in recommendations i.e. 'filed', 'withdrawn', 'closed'. They have made a hype that there are 32 times. First of all, they should remove the three items which have been 'filed', 'withdrawn' or 'closed' as these items have no relevance.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to who has made the hype. The Vice Chancellor further said that whatever is written in the newspapers and or whatever has been got published in the newspapers, they cannot do anything in this democratic system. If they try to curb it, then people will say that they are muzzling the things. So they have to just accept that these are the vagaries of functioning in the democratic system of India. So, they should not have anxiety. They will record it, so that in future, there should be a summary attached to this document. There should be an office note, mentioning the items and the type of items. Only the items of serious consideration should be pointed out to the Syndicate. There are 32 items. It should not look that they are not attending to the items. So while recording these things in the minutes, they (CVO) will put this

note, which is not there. They should specifically mention the number of items and also mention as to which items need consideration of the Syndicate and such and such items were discussed and what was the outcome. After that there should be a closing summary as to what happened in that item.

The Vice Chancellor then asked Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal to speak on the issue on which he had desired to speak earlier.

Principal Hardiljit Singh said that Dr. R.K. Singla has complained against some of the examiners who evaluated more than the prescribed number of answer books. He was of the opinion that this is not a big issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has a concern with point No. 6 of the Summary report of the C.V.O regarding C.B.I. case relating to Professor O.P. Katare. This issue is coming again and again to the Syndicate.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that a Committee has been formed for this issue, but its meeting could not be held.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that two Coordinators were appointed one is Dr. S.K. Rattan and the other Dr. R.K. Singla who belong to DAV College, Sector-10. He said, he does not know whether the Chief Coordinator who was appointed there could evaluate the papers here or not. Dr. Rattan evaluated the papers from April 8 to June 5 and Dr. Singla from 1st May to June 11. The Controller has said that the instructions are there in the zonal book of instructions.

Principal B.C. Josan informed that Dr. Rattan was Assistant Coordinator.

Principal Hardiljit Singh asked Principal Josan about the number of Centres to which Dr. Principal Josan replied that there were about 6-7 centres.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if there is post of Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator, then the Coordinator will take payment for Coordinator work and Assistant Coordinator will take payment for Assistant Coordinator. So if a person has received payment from two places at the same time, it comes under the purview of dual duty.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked if any post of Assistant Coordinator exists.

The Controller of Examinations said that there is one Chief Coordinator either Principal or the nominee of the Principal before the commencement of examinations. If there are two Centres, then one Coordinator is appointed and if the number of centres is more than two, then there would be two Coordinators. There is no Assistant Coordinator. If Centres are 4 or 5, there would one Chief Coordinator and two Coordinators.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that apart from this issue, he would like to suggest to his colleagues that such information is asked for from them time and again through R.T.I. Almost Principal of

the Colleges used to be the Coordinator. Though he has no regular teacher in his college, but he appoints one of his teachers as Coordinator because he (Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu) has to attend to the Syndicate meetings and many other meetings, so he does not have time to act as Coordinator. He, therefore, suggested that though there is involvement of a very small amount, but may put us in a state of great difficulty. Only that person should be appointed Coordinator, who could spare himself from other duties to attend to the duties of a Coordinator, otherwise he come under the purview of dual duty and they cannot avoid it. He added that he did not act as Coordinator in the last 3 years as he did not find time to perform the duty of Coordinator.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he also did not perform this duty since the last 11 years.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it could not be there that a person should claim payments from two sides by working simultaneously for two different assignments.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the person in questions has claimed payment both for evaluating the papers and also for performing the duty as Coordinator.

Principal B.C. Josan suggested that instructions should be sent by the University that dual duty should not be performed.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Coordinator cannot perform other duties.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that in spite of the fact that all the persons know about this rule, they take salary to the tune of Rs. 2 lacs, but even then they do not prevent themselves to perform dual duties.

Many of the members suggested that a circular to this effect be sent by the Controller of Examinations.

Principal B.C. Josan said that it should also be added in the instructions that the Chief Coordinator would not go for flying duty.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if someone is appointed as Coordinators from 9 to 5 in a Centre, then it becomes his duty to be present in the Centre for this time.

Principal B.C. Josan said that everything should be made clear in the instruction which are sent to the colleges which was supported by the members.

This was agreed to.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would like to talk about Case No.11 of the Summary report of the CVO. This is one of the complaints which was given by him only. The complaint has not been seen fully. When they talk about the furniture of the hostels, he said that when a hostel comes up the case for purchase of furniture is processed by the XEN Office since the last many years. When he made this complaint, it was made, in particular, about Hostel

No.10. When they were asked to take up the charge, they had a doubt about the quality and he said that the Vice Chancellor has also seen it. He then made a Committee consisting of Dr. Amrinder Singh and Dr. Harish and they were requested to check it. One, some almirahs were purchases and they were asked to check the gauge. The gauge was not upto the mark even after paint, it was rather very less. It was 24 whereas it should have been 20. The other is regarding beds. In this what has been actually done is that the specification given was 6' 3" or something like that. So, for a piece of plywood of 6' is different, but if the size is increase by two or three inches, the rate is charged for a piece 8 feet. Specification was made in such a way so that any other may not apply. But, actually they took plywood board piece of 6' i.e. the standard size. When it was properly, it was found that everything is wrong. Then he made a complaint to the Vice Chancellor which was sent by the Vice Chancellor to the XEN. The XEN issued a warning to the Contractor and in his own record he was blacklisted. Neither, the notice regarding blacklisting the contractor was notified nor he was prevented from doing work.

The Vice Chancellor intervened to ask if he is still working to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that currently he is not doing the work.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that after that much care was exercised. This vender, namely, Bedi Steel, if they see his old record, particularly, if they start with Boys Hostel Nos. 7, 8 Girls Hostel Nos. 7, 8 & 9, whole material has been purchased from this person. That is why he has written in the complaint that only the furniture of Hostel No. 10 is not to be checked, but the whole material has to be checked. Even the furniture supplied at Hoshiarpur has been given by this person. The Mess Canteen of the four hostels at Hoshiarpur has been allotted to his brothers. The whole furniture used to be purchased from him. It was to the extent that he started saying, tell him who is to be appointed the Warden. That was the kind of influence he was having.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma asked Professor Navdeep Goyal as to which year he was talking about to which he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) said it was of 2009-10. On this Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it means when he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) was in full control of the things.

The Vice Chancellor requested to avoid such frivolous words because everything is being recorded.

Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about whatever has been supplied, many allegations were there. He suggested whatever has been supplied by him in the hostels, it should be got checked from a Committee already constituted or from a new Committee, roughly of those hostels which have come up in 2006-07 or after that, because the furniture of almost all the hostels has been supplied him.

The Vice Chancellor asked to solicit information from the XEN where material was supplied by this Contractor in the University, period of supply, who were his competitors, what was the specifications of the things advertised and what was exactly supplied. It was in view of this statement that for Hostel No. 10, they advertised

plywood piece of 6'3" but the piece of 6' was actually supplied. The Vice Chancellor wanted to know whether such a trick has been used in the previous supplies. They should ask the XEN office and they should must give an authorised statement and find out who were the Wardens at those times.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said Wardens may not be there at that time because the Wardens are appointed late.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Navdeep Goyal to find out because someone must have received the material. They should find out who received the material, who authorised to give the tenders, who accepted the tenders or whether the teachers were involved in this process or it is the job which was done entirely by the XEN Office.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he would like to bring it to the notice of the Vice Chancellor long back i.e. 4-5 year back, but you did not allow me to speak on this issue. There was need to know, what equipment was actually required and what was purchased at Hoshiarpur during those years.

The Vice Chancellor said that they did not have a full time Director at Hoshiarpur. When he came here, the first confrontation that he had, was a strike at Hoshiarpur, complaining so many things. That was why he had constituted a Committee headed by Professor S.V. Kessar to find out a Director for Hoshiarpur. This is a very long story. He had to put in Professor Bhajan Kaur as Honorary Director.

Shri Jarnail Singh further said that it might be checked whether all the things which have been purchased for the hostels were actually required or not and from where these things were purchased.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the advertisement specifications were given for LED, but actually LCDs were supplied which are comparatively has a very cheaper. So, there are many such things which have happened at Hoshiarpur. One can easily find out as those things will still be there.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that requisitions from different people were got called and such things were purchased which were not required.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said everything is clear and they have accepted the mistake. Such mistakes had not happened at one place, it had happened at many places. When the mistake had come to fore, the person who is defending it, is still in job. He said that they have the right to file a case against that person, if it is legally possible and the losses should be recovered from him.

The Vice Chancellor said that one he has stated it and if they do not do anything, then the society would be after them. Whatever, he was saying, they should be conscious about it and follow it up. If it is not followed by their own colleagues, the society will follow it to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said, 'obviously'.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor asked to Registrar to get a follow up report. He said that they should clarify the matter, it is possible that the people are saying this on the basis of hearsay, but

the factual situation may be something else. So give XEN an opportunity to respond to whatever has been said.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as stated by Shri Jarnail Singh, as to what has been ordered and what was received, there should be an enquiry into this matter.

At this stage Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked as to what decision has been taken in the earlier meeting of Syndicate in respect of Case No. 6 of the CVO summary report.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma wanted to know whether the CBI has any substantial evidence in this matter to which the Vice Chancellor said that they do not have any such evidence. Continuing, he said they should get it examined as seven years back their decision was somewhat different. If they get the matter legally examining and then do something, it would be better.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested to send it again to the Senate.

However, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should get it examined from a Committee, it would be better. If they are giving some more evidence, it would be better that it is vetted or examined to which the Vice Chancellor said 'ok'.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Navdeep Goyal as to what he would like to say in this matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said informed that a Committee was formed to look into this case and perhaps a meeting of that Committee was also scheduled to be held, but the same could not be held as the members (Dr. Dalip Kumar, D.H.E., Professor Bhupinder Singh Bhoop) did not turn up. But, the information which he has got, in this particular case, is that the Court has given relief to the other party by saying that their documents are wrong. If the main respondent has got the relief, then there is no issue at all.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that instead of reiterating their earlier decision, they should re-examine it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the CBI is raising this issue again and again and if they give clean chit to him without looking into the issue, people will think that they want to favour him. So, it is better to refer it back to the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor said that as Professor Navdeep Goyal has stated that a Committee is already looking into this matter, so he requested him to take up this matter urgently so that before the Senate meeting of December, this matter should have been resolved. The Vice Chancellor informed that the next meeting of the Syndicate is scheduled for 10<sup>th</sup> of December and today they will take up the items upto 5.00 p.m. At 4.00 p.m. they would take a call as to which items are urgent.

Referring to Case No. 20 of the Summary Report of the CVO, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know as to what has happened in the case of examinations, such as the examination for Tehsildars etc. which the University was earlier conducting and now

which have been stopped. He wanted to know their status. He said that it gives a very bad impression that their question papers are leaked.

The Vice Chancellor informed that the process of conducting of examinations by the UIAMS, which had been stalled, it has been recommenced. Though, he said, he does not know how many more offers they have got, but he will get back to him (Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal).

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal again stated that it was being said that the papers have leaked. He wanted to know about it.

The Vice Chancellor said that the question paper which was said to be leaked, it was leaked from the Press.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said, it may have leaked from the Press, but it is their responsibility. Why they engage such a press where the papers are leaked. That press should be changed or debarred. If he is not wrong, if it is the same Press, then the B.Ed. paper was also printed wrongly. He asked why they do not change the Press due to which they have to face embarrassment.

The Vice Chancellor said that in the Press where the paper was leaked, this act was done by a very lowly employee. The owner was not involved. The employee who has done this has been arrested.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal that employee might have made a scapegoat. God knows who has actually done it.

The Vice Chancellor said that he cannot answer these things. They have done all that which they can do.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know about the report. It was informed that the report is not attached. He said that the report should have been attached with it as it is a very serious matter.

The Vice Chancellor read out the recommendations of the Committee dated 15.9.2017 of CVO summary report at Case No. 20 which says "Investigations are being done by the Vigilance Department, Punjab. The matter is under process". The Vice Chancellor further said that the Vigilance has washed its hand off. Now Punjab Vigilance Department is investigating the case and its report is still awaited to which the members said it is 'ok'.

Dr. Dalip Kumar talked about the meeting of the Committee which held under the Chairmanship of Shri Jarnail Singh. He said after that there were some cases which were closed or filed. He said that he would like to talk about Case No. 22. He read out the last para of the report of CVO which states as under:

"The TA/DA bill submitted by Col. (Retd.) P.S. Sandhu, SVC, for his official visit to Ludhiana on 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> January, 2016, contains signatures of the then Dean College Development Council – Prof. Naval Kishore and has been countersigned by the Vice Chancellor being the Competent Authority and Controlling Officer for the purpose of TA/DA in



accordance to rule 9.3. (i) (a) at page 101-102 of P.U. Accounts Manual, 2012. The bill has been checked by the Accounts branch and audited by the R.A.O. on 24.02.2016 in accordance to the Rule 9.9 (ii) of the P.U. Accounts Manual, 2012 (quoted above). The payment has been made vide cheque No. 283465 dated 26.02.2016”.

Continuing Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the summary report needs to be redrafted because there are many cases which have been filed and the meeting of the Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Jarnail Singh was held on 15.9.2017. The filed or closed cases should also be tabled which will give clarity about the update of the case. He, therefore, requested Shri Jarnail Singh to mention such type of things also even after the meeting which was held on 15.9.2017.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Shri Jarnail Singh to get a softcopy of the summary report proforma. An additional column be added to it which should give the status of the case i.e. whatever action has been taken on the issue, that should be recorded.

This was agreed to.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know the orders made by the Vice Chancellor in Case No.22 relating to the T.A. bill of Secretary to Vice Chancellor. He asked whether he has gone there to attend a meeting or in some Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (SVC) has gone there to attend a meeting. He has been deputed for some work at Ludhiana. He went there by a route which was much longer than the minimum distance between his place of residence and Ludhiana.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it is not the problem whether he has gone there by this route or that route, but the question is what for he has gone to the College at Alamgir.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu while replying to Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there was a complaint and he was also in the Committee. He said now that he does not fully remember as to what was the complaint, but he remembers that there was a Committee consisting of three persons i.e. he himself, Shri Jarnail Singh and Secretary to Vice Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said that the complaint is about the additional distance covered by him to which Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that is not the problem. The Vice Chancellor further said that whatever they can do is that, they can pay for the minimum distance to which the members said it is not fair.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the complaints made by Prof. V.K. Chopra and Dr. R.K. Singla might be viewed properly. If there is nothing in the case then why they send such cases to the Committee and waste their time.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he did not send it to the Committee then people would say that the Vice Chancellor has not sent the case intentionally to the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor stated that they have already dealt with Case No. 28 which was regarding fee concession. At this stage the Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Dalip Kumar is right and they should add another column in the proforma. The Vice Chancellor further said if there is any other case left, they will take up that case immediately after the lunch.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know as to what was the issue at Case No.24.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should not take notice of anonymous complaints. This was endorsed by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and many other members. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma further said that they should entertain only those complaints which are accompanied by an affidavit from complainant.

The Vice Chancellor said that once a letter comes from the Chancellor's Office and if they say to take cognisance of that letter, he cannot say to the Chancellor that the complaint is unsigned.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that Shri Jarnail Singh has clearly written at Case No. 15 that this complaint has been filed being unsigned.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said there is also a Court ruling in this regard.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu also said that the unsigned complaint might not be entertained.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is for the first time that the CVO's report have come to the Syndicate and they are discussing it spending quality time. Earlier, there has not been any precedent of this kind. What they are doing today it is happening almost for the first time, so they are setting up a precedent. That is why he has not done it in a hurry because he has to protect the authority of the Governing Body.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired as to what has been done in Case No. 30 relating to the case Ph.D. enrolment of Balwinder Singh to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is under process. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal further said, if it is under process, then why it has been brought here.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is the recommendation of the Committee. On being asked by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal which Committee has looked into this case, the Vice Chancellor said it was a Committee headed by Shri Jarnail Singh.

On being asked by the Vice Chancellor to throw light on the issue, Shri Jarnail Singh said that at the moment he did not remember as to what has been written on the file.

The Vice Chancellor said that they will call for the file after lunch and then see what has been written there on it.

At this moment, the Vice Chancellor went outside for some time.

When the Vice Chancellor joined the meeting again, he asked Shri Jarnail Singh if there is any case left under Item No. C-10, except the Ph.D. enrolment case of Shri Balwinder Singh. The Vice Chancellor further said that they will come back to this small item later.

Referring to Case No.33 of Item No. C-10, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked as to what is the complaint.

The Registrar while explaining about this case said that this person (Mr. Daya Ram, Peon) who was working in the Press, gone on leave and he joined the office late after the expiry of the leave. Therefore, his office did not allow him to join. So, he started marking his attendance in the Estt. Branch. The enquiry was going on. It was given to understand that since he has joined in the Estt. Branch and thus he should be given salary from the date he has joined in the Estt. Branch. As far as the disputed period is concerned, the punishment would be decided and he would be given that punishment.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Rajinder Singla in his complaint has said that the University is running short of money and the persons who could be denied to pay the money, the University is not denying them. However, the Vice Chancellor further said that if they deny a lowest category person, his living wage, when he is coming to the office, they felt that it should not be done.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that there is a problem in it. When a person goes on leave after getting his leave sanctioned and if does not join back his duty after the lapse of his sanctioned leave, is it not his (Head of the office) duty to issue him a letter.

The Registrar said that the disciplinary proceedings against him are going on.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu that this should have been done earlier. If the person has not joined after the expiry of his leave period, the Head of the Department should have issued him a letter within 3-4 days after the expiry of his leave period asking him as to why he has not joined the office.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that whatever the Committee has done and whatever punishment was given to him, it is alright. But the question which he would like to point out is that when he went to join in his department, he was not allowed and asked to get orders from the Estt. Branch. But the Estt. Branch people allowed him to join here and by doing so the negligence committed by him has been legitimised and he was given the salary. This is what Dr. R.K. Singla has said in his complaint that when he was working in Press, he should have been sent to the Press. Perhaps the Vice Chancellor might remember that the Manager Press has come to him and he was feeling very much humiliated at this. He wanted to know when they have given everything to him, then for what the enquiry is being conducted. Though it may be the argument that he is a poor fellow, but again it is still there that he should not have been allowed to join in the Estt. Branch. He should have been sent to the office where he was working. He concluded though there is a lapse, what now the matter has been finalized and the punishment as required has been given to him.

The Vice Chancellor said that some personal differences have developed there and this guy insulted the Manager Press. So, the matter did not remain professional and it took some other colour.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that when he has committed this type blunder, then why he has been allowed to join in the Estt. Branch and with whose orders this done.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu that what Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma has stated is alright. There is great need to take care of such things. If the things are done in such a way, then what remains with the Chairman or Head of the Branch. It was the duty of Estt. Branch to send the person to his department/office for joining.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is one example, but the other example is that of Professor Chopra when a judgement from the Supreme Court comes, a member of their Syndicate accepted his joining report and sent it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said this is wrong.

The Vice Chancellor further said that somebody was on leave. After his leave, he joined the department. Without giving him teaching load, his salary bill was sent. That thing is then used that he was a on leave and it was said that he was entitled for leave. One was the case of Professor Chopra and the other was Professor Manjit Singh. So, lot of arbitrary things happen where the senior executives hardly involved in that decision making. It is said that they are living as a family, they have long years of service to this institution. Then it is said that if some small mistake is committed. Then they say 'ok' if in the interest of smooth functioning of the institute. From here onwards, let some lesson be learnt. So, whatever has happened, they should move on in their life. This is how the things will happen. Therefore, some punishment has to be there, otherwise there would be jungle raj. That is why such lenient views are taken. But it is good that they are taking cognisance of it and it is being recorded and they would learn from it that what has happened, it should not have happened. The Estt. People should not have allowed him to do that. They just learn lessons, but in their system some such things do happen. They can only prevent it in the future. At the moment, they cannot do much.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that his salary for the period he remained absent should not be paid to him and rest has been done by the Committee. He should be issued a letter that if he repeated this, his services would be dispensed with.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) recommendation of the Committee at Sr.No.1 to 4, 7 to 10, 12 to 33 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted;
- (2) recommendation of the Committee at Sr.No. 5 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted and it be added in the guidelines for appointment of Chief Coordinators/Coordinators of Examination

Centres that they would not perform any other duty while working as Chief Coordinators/Coordinators;

- (3) recommendation of the Committee at Sr.No.6, of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be referred to the same Committee which is already looking into the case;
- (4) recommendation of the Committee at Sr.No. 11 of the status and summary reports submitted by the CVO be noted; and information from the XEN be solicited on the following points:
  - (i) information about the supplier (Dwivedi Furniture) who had supplied the items in the University during that period;
  - (ii) the list of competitors for the tenders;
  - (iii) the details of the specifications of the tender and the specifications of the items supplied;
  - (iv) the names of the persons who approved the tenders and received the material;
  - (v) legal opinion be sought on the possibility of filing a police complaint against Dwivedi Furniture.
- (5) the complaints which have already been recommended by the CVO as 'filed/withdrawn' be not placed before the Syndicate; and
- (6) an additional column be created in the status and summary report table showing the action taken on the issues.

**Item No. C-8** was taken up after consideration of **Item No. C-10**.

**Letter of Dr. Ashish Jain dated 20.09.2017**

8. Considered letter dated 20.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXIV**) received from Dr. Ashish Jain, Principal-cum-Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 16) (**Appendix-XXIV**) considered observations of the Vice-Chancellor dated 19.07.2017 with regard to letter dated 12.06.2017 (**Appendix-XXIV**) of Principal-cum-Professor Dr. HSJ Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital and resolved that the concern and anguish of the Syndicate be conveyed to Principal-cum-Professor of Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Science & Hospital, P.U., Chandigarh on the letter written by him to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice Chancellor said let him give a small background of the issue. This is a matter which should not come to the Syndicate again and again. Unnecessarily, the time of the Governing Body is being wasted. The matter is that the University wanted to start a Dental College for which there was no precedent. Dental College faculty had to be recruited and for that they have to follow D.C.I. norms for appointing faculty at different levels, i.e., different from appointing faculty with the same nomenclature in the UGC system. For instance, they cannot make someone a Professor until he has completed the desired service as Associate Professor. They cannot appoint someone a Principal until he has completed the desired service as Professor. So, when the Dental College commenced, D.C.I. has no Career Advancement Scheme. But for making appointments they are to follow D.C.I. norms. When the Dental College was started, they recruited people as per the D.C.I. norms, but using the salary structure and the salary grade which were in the Punjab Government because there were Dental Colleges in Punjab. The University and Chandigarh Administration did not have any precedent of Dental College. Since they follow service conditions of Punjab for non teaching staff. Even for teaching staff, in some sense, service conditions, such as pension etc., they follow Punjab Government rules. So, they are in a hybrid state. They inducted faculty in the Dental College respecting the D.C.I. but giving people the Punjab scales as for the dental doctors. This was done in some Pay Commission. Now they go from one Pay Commission to other Pay Commission. When they went from one Pay Commission to other Pay Commission, they then left their pay scales of Punjab and translated everyone in the UGC Pay Scales. For instance, in the case of Dental Colleges, starting salary of a Professor in Punjab was more than the starting salary of Professors in UGC scales (16400-22400). But the scale of Professor for Dental College in Punjab was 18100-22100. In this scale the starting point was higher, but the ending point was lower than the UGC scale of a Professor. So, now their pay scale in the 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission has become the same which was for other Professors of UGC. But, there was no Career Advancement Scheme in the DCI scale. He struggled continuously for 4-5 years to get Career Advancement Scheme. A Committee under the Chairpersonship of

Professor Talwar was constituted. Professor Talwar was the Director of PGI and also holding higher positions in ICMR. He (Vice Chancellor) thought he (Dr. Talwar) will use his wisdom and help to get a promotion policy. Finally, a promotion policy was received, but it was not the promotion policy like that of Career Advancement Scheme promotion policy. That policy is still not clear. The current Principal of the Dental College is not appointed by advertising the position of a Dental College. He was a Professor and he was given the charge of a Principal. Now he is acting as Principal, but when they introduced rotation policy, the Dental College was considered a department of the University. The Syndicate, i.e., the Governing Body, had passed that the rotation policy would be applicable to all the departments. There was also an agitation against the Director of UILS because there are also Bar Council rules as to who could be the Principal or Director of UILS. In the background of this, uniformity for all was put into practice. In December 2014, it was decided that rotation will be made applicable in all the departments and everybody will be given appointment for three years. So, Professor Ashish Jain was appointed as Head of the Dental College given the title 'Principal for a period of three years' from December 2014. But he did not like it as he wants to be a Principal till retirement. So, ever since this happened, he is facing music of all kinds. From 2015, seven inspections took place for recognition of more specialities in MDS. The seven Inspection Committees which visited the Institute at different times for grant of affiliation for seven different course, one line was got written from them that there is no regular Principal. It is being done without changing any comma or full stop. That forms the basis and a reply is called for from them. They replied it, but the reply was not filed in a proper way. The Director Principal does not file the reply in proper way.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked as to what reply they had given. Had they said that this is the department of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said, 'yes' they had replied that it was the decision of the Syndicate. Nobody ever objected, but this time the three specialities were cancelled because of this reason. Then the case was filed in the Court, but they lost the case there. Then they filed a LPA and they were given one day time to fill up the seats. So they could not fill all the seats within the deadline of one day. With a great difficulty, the issue was got sorted and they lost money on that account as they could not get students for those specialities. That problems was solved last year with great difficulty. Now, this year he received a letter that his (Professor Ashish Jain) seniority should be as per the Punjab scales and he should be replied within two weeks.

Principal Gurdip Sharma asked if he had asked for seniority or pay.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is already getting more pay. He felt that this is too much. It is being demanded from him that he should give the reply within two weeks. Even a Senate member does not give any deadline like this. Can a Chairperson of a department write to the Vice Chancellor like this? Then the matter was brought to the Syndicate and the Syndicate just expressed its anguish that no Chairperson should do like this. The anguish of the Syndicate was conveyed to him. Now they can see what he has written.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that in his letter he (Professor Jain) has categorically said that he did not ask for anything this time and felt sorry to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has not at all felt sorry.

The Vice Chancellor read out some portion of the letter sent by Professor Ashish Jain which states as under:

“It is pertinent to state here that, I had submitted my letter to worthy Vice-Chancellor . Be that as it may, I may again reiterate and clarify that my letter dated 12.06.2017 does not amount to resorting to any coercive method and it was merely a request for taking decision of the rights of an employee. Further, the request to consider the issue and take a decision within 15 days was in view of the significance of the matter involved. However, I have yet not received any decision regarding the issue raised in my request.

In view of the facts and circumstances given above, it is humbly requested that:

- (i) the comments so made and recorded may kindly be dropped from the minutes,
- (ii) decision regarding the issue raised in my request letter dated 12.06.17 which is still awaited may please be taken at the earliest and conveyed to me.”

The Vice Chancellor, on the words written by Dr. Ashish Jain in his letter ‘rights of the employee’ the Vice Chancellor said, is it the right of the employee to say the Vice Chancellor to reply him within fifteen days. On another word i.e. ‘significance of the matter involved’ the Vice Chancellor asked, what is the significance of the matter involved. Is it because that his term is ending in December, 2017.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said, what he has done this year. All the Committees which visited the Dental College on different dates, every committee has written a line in the last, there is no authenticated proof of stipend paid to the PG students. They had been giving the same money ever since the MDS course is running. Suddenly this line appears. After 4-5 days he received a letter, signed by all PG students, forwarded by the Principal that the students are demanding that they be given stipend on the basis of Punjab. The University is paying Rs. 10 thousand whereas Punjab is paying about 30 to 40 thousand. Theirs is a self sustaining institute. They just get 4-5 or 6 lacs of fee from them. He (Vice Chancellor) went there and held a meeting with the students, but the Principal was not there in the office. When he enquired about the Principal, nobody was able to tell where he is. Nobody was aware when he would come. Then his P.A. made a phone call and told him that he would come after 11.00 a.m., but nobody was aware about it. He was somewhere in Sector-8. He asked for the time table and saw that his name is not there in the time table. When it was asked as to when he takes the class, it was given to understand that it is upto to him only. When enquired about other teachers, it was told that all of them take the classes as and when they wish. The Dean of University Instruction was also with



him. There was no record of duties of the staff and faculty. The DCI says that there should be biometric attendance, but there was no such system. Either there is no record or partial record. Why the DCI did not write about that. Is it not the job of the Principal to protect the institute. It is 11<sup>th</sup> year of the Institute. He had held so many meetings with them that the Dental College has been there for the service of the citizens. This is the only Dental Institute in the city. He asked them to prepare a blueprint that they showcase the Dental Hospital for the service of the city. They cannot sustain this Dental Institute with their own resources. To make a case that the U.T. Administration must provide money for upgrading the infrastructure for this hospital facility which is for the city. They must showcase, what it is meant for. It has meant to have a dental hospital in the city. But no blueprint has been prepared for decade of service by Dental Institute so far. He has been asking for it since the last year. He has also talked to the Health Secretary and also with Shri J.P. Nadda, Hon'ble Union Health Minister. Both are ready to come here. But first they should create the event. So this person provides no leadership and nothing of the sort. How does the Vice Chancellor respond to such things. He took the D.U.I. with him. They can have a meeting with the D.U.I. so that they can assess on their own that this is not an ego issue with a given Vice Chancellor and that also an outgoing Vice Chancellor, but a serving Professor of the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first they should reiterate the old decision.

Professor Pam Rajput intervened to say that rotation of headship stands.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no question of his demanding seniority as per the Punjab government. It is not an issue.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the everything should be linked with the appointment letter.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are all as per University rules. In Panjab University rules it is nowhere written that his seniority would be as per the Punjab government rules.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that whatever they have been deciding here that the seniority would not be given as Punjab Government, it should be replied to him.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have no power to revise the conditions of service which are there in the appointment letter.

Dr. Subhash Sharma while supporting the view point of Professor Mukesh Arora said that they should send him the reply. He further said that they could also make a Committee of 2-3 persons and resolve the issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he did not recommend this. Why they want to talk to such a person who is defying them and causing anguish to the Vice Chancellor again and again.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that a Committee should be constituted to hold an enquiry to see what he is doing. The Committee should look into the whole issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no issue as such to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said the issue which he has talked about, it a very serious issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that the issue is that of indiscipline.

However, some of the members including Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there is no need of constituting any Committee.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he should know what rules have been mentioned in his appointment letter.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there should be any problem in giving a reply to him.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he should be given a single line reply that his services are governed by the rules as indicated in his appointment letter.

Principal Gurdip Sharma while endorsing the view point of several members said that a reply should be sent to him.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked whether they had replied him earlier to which Dr. Subhash Sharma told him that the anguish of the Syndicate was conveyed to him, but he did not reply.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has no reply to it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma requested the Vice Chancellor that they should give him the reply that his request cannot be acceded to and the issue should be closed. He should be informed that as per his appointment letter, his requested could not be accepted.

This was agreed to.

**RESOLVED:** That since the services of Dr. Ashish Jain are governed by Panjab University rules, his request including the issue for seniority as per the Punjab Government rules be not acceded to.

The Controller of Examinations absented himself from the meeting when **Item No.C-11** was taken up for consideration.

**Minutes of the  
Committee regarding  
University  
Examinations 2017**

**11.** Considered the deferred Item No. 22 of the Syndicate meeting dated 23.09.2017 relating to minutes of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding University Examinations 2017.

**NOTE:** The above minutes were placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 22) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

Initiating discussion on the item, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Dr. Amit Joshi has made a complaint some time ago. His statement has also been recorded in the month of May. The statement of C.O.E. has also been recorded. About 5-6 months have passed. He asked as to why the case is not decided.

The Vice Chancellor said that he talked to Professor Rajat Sandhir, a Senator of the University, even yesterday. He told him that Dr. Inder Pal Singh has asked for more time to come. Dr. Inder Pal Singh is refusing to cooperate.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that if he is not coming, at least the report should come.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the whole case is that of Dr. Inder Pal Singh and not of Dr. Amit Joshi. He told that they went to Garhshakar and some Superintendent who was deputed in that Centre was not as per rules. Actually, this complaint was that of Dr. Inder Pal Singh and Dr. Amit Joshi has been made a scapegoat. Both of them had gone there. The other witness has been influenced and that is why he is trying to delay the case. So, they should think that this case should be decided.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has time and again requested Professor Rajat Sandhir to give the report.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that six months have passed and if somebody is not cooperating and to scuttle the case in this way is not fair. The case was that of Dr. Inder Pal Singh and Dr. Amit Joshi had just accompanied him to plead the case. It was a separate issue that he indulged in some argument with him. But he has role in this and he should attend the enquiry as he is a witness.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should convey him the anguish of the Syndicate over the delay and give him an ultimate of seven days to report. Once the report is received, he will not wait for the Syndicate and that report would be sent to them in a sealed envelope.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he has come to know about an issue which is related to their examination system, but at the moment he would not disclose it. Very serious issues are coming up. He requested that the Committees which have been formed to look

into the various issues be requested to give their report at the earliest and the report should be placed before the Syndicate because those reports are connected to their examination system. Their examination system is spoiling day by day. He requested to look into all such issues.

The Vice Chancellor said, let them should discuss it during lunch before they pass a resolution. But, he will convey to the Controller of Examinations the spirit and the concern of the Syndicate about tightening the examination system in view of the examinations which are happening. Further, the suggestions/solution which they would like to give him as to how the examination system could be tightened, he would talk to them later.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said he would also like to say that unfortunately many such things has happened as stated by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal. He has been a member of a Committee. He would also like to say, what they have seen in that case, has never happened in the history of the University. He could reveal the whole thing if he could be given ten minutes. He had been teaching for the last 40 years, but they have never thought, what has happened. If the things would be delayed like this, it would be a disservice to the University. Whatever he had given in writing to the Vice Chancellor, he had sent it to the Committee. But, the Bari Committee had rebutted everything. Today, he would like to challenge that all what he has given in writing, is based on documents. If those are proved to be wrong, he will quit the Senate. So, he requested that the report of the enquiry should expedite. He informed that the Bari Committee report is not based on facts and it is totally wrong and it. He again requested to expedite the report.

Principal Gurdip Sharma requested that the report should be submitted in a time-bound period.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there is a need to strengthen this system as they are getting bad name on this.

The Vice Chancellor said that 60% of their internal income is coming from the examination system. So this system should not be allowed to be spoiled.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that they could know about the loopholes only from the reports of the Committees and then they can plug the loopholes.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that there should not be any delay in convening the meeting and the reports should be submitted immediately.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that Principal B.C. Josan be requested to hold the meeting at the earliest. It was finally suggested that the meeting be convened by Principal Josan on 23<sup>rd</sup> November in the afternoon.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested that meeting of both the Committees head by Principal Josan and Professor Rajat Sandhir be convened at the earliest and their report be sent to them

in a sealed cover to the which the Vice Chancellor said that he will do it.

**RESOLVED:** That the anguish of the Syndicate be conveyed to the Chairperson of the Committee for slow progress in the case and he be directed to hold the meeting and submit the report within a week.

**Appointment of Professors on various Chairs**

**12.** Considered the deferred Item No. 31 of the Syndicate meeting dated 23.09.2017 regarding names of the Professors for appointment on various Chairs- Category I, in the departments of the University, as per list dated 17.08.2017 and 08.09.2017, duly recommended by the Academic and Administrative Committees of the department/s, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 14).

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 31) while approving the recommendations of the Committee dated 03.11.2016 regarding Chair in Category-1 has also resolved that the list of persons to be appointed on these Chairs be placed before the Syndicate.

The recommendation of the Syndicate dated 21.01.2017 (Para 14) was considered and approved by the Senate in its meeting dated 26.03.2017 (Para XXIII).

A copy of the circular dated 09.02.2017 vide which the Chairpersons of the Departments were requested to send the name of the Senior most Professors to be appointed on the various Chairs is enclosed.

2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 31) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this item had earlier also been placed before the Syndicate and they discussed it in detail and it was decided that let they wait for the names to be proposed for different Chairs. According to him, in some cases assigning of a particular Chair does not seem to be appropriate to the senior most person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this matter had already been discussed and taken care and they are not to reopen this question at this stage. Right now it is just assigning the Chairs to the persons. The only thing which was worth considering was that if there is a Chair in the Department of Punjabi but they are having Professors of Punjabi subject in other departments also. Let a seniority of the Professors of Punjabi be made. Similar is the case in other subjects like Political Science, Public Administration etc. He requested the members to provide him a consolidated list of Professors of same subject working in different departments and thereafter the same could be placed before the Syndicate for consideration.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could finalise it even today as some names have been suggested.

The Vice-Chancellor said that since they are meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December again, they should provide him the list by then. He suggested that a Committee of Syndics be formed which will prepare this list.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there are two Chairs lying vacant in the Department of Punjabi. One is Guru Ravi Dass Chair and the other one is Guru Nanak Sikh Studies.

The Vice-Chancellor clarified that the Guru Nanak Sikh Studies Chair could not be assigned to anyone till Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang is there.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Professor Kaang is continuing as per the Court orders and they could not take a decision till the decision of the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what Professor Kaang is teaching as an academic member. She might not remain as Chair Professor but she would continue to associate with the Department.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the Guru Ravi Dass Chair could be assigned to Professor Gurpal Singh Sandhu who is the senior most Professor in the subject of Punjabi.

The Vice-Chancellor said he completely authorises the members to give him a list of Professors for each Chair keeping in view their seniority.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the details of 17 Chairs have been provided. As said by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, he also requested to assign Guru Ravi Dass Chair to Professor Gurpal Singh Sandhu.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should not decide like this and wait up to the next meeting of the Syndicate to be held on 10<sup>th</sup> December. He requested Principal I.S. Sandhu, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Professor Pam Rajput and Professor Navdeep Goyal to provide him the list.

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee consisting of the following persons be constituted for providing the details of the Chairs and the names of the senior Professors to be considered for appointment as Chair Professors to be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting:

1. Professor Pam Rajput
2. Professor Navdeep Goyal
3. Principal I.S. Sandhu
4. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal

**Writing off items of  
Department of Laws**

**13.** Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 22.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXV**) that the following item in the Department of Laws, P.U., be written off as the same is unserviceable:

Particulars	Quantity	Date	of	Rate in Rs.	Total	Entry in
-------------	----------	------	----	-------------	-------	----------

		<b>Purchase</b>		<b>Amount</b>	<b>Property Register</b>
Photocopy Machine	1	08.08.1988	1,43,827/-	1,43,827/-	102

**NOTE:** As per rule appearing at pages 503 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the competent authority to write off losses is as under:

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

**RESOLVED:** That the following item of the Department of Laws, P.U., be written off as the same is unserviceable:

<b>Particulars</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Date of Purchase</b>	<b>Rate in Rs.</b>	<b>Total Amount</b>	<b>Entry in Property Register</b>
Photocopy Machine	1	08.08.1988	1,43,827/-	1,43,827/-	102

**Item No. C-14** and **C-16** were taken up together for consideration.

**Representation of Dr. Vinay Sofat, General Secretary, PCCTU and President/Secretary, DTU, Hoshiarpur regarding violation of rules in re-employment/extension of Principals**

**14.** Considered:

- (i) letter No. VPS/15/2/R/PU/2017 dated 03.10.2017 received from Smt. Hurbi Shakeel, Private Secretary to the Vice-President of India, New Delhi, sending therewith the representation dated 28.09.2017 of Dr. Vinay Sophat, General Secretary, Punjab & Chandigarh College Teachers Union, regarding alleged violation of UGC Regulations and Punjab Govt. Rules by Panjab University in respect of re-employment of Principals in affiliated Colleges of P.U.
- (ii) representation dated 18.09.2017 received from President/Secretary, District Teachers Unit, Hoshiarpur, regarding violation of UGC Regulations and Punjab Government Guidelines in respect of extension in age to Principals upto 65 years that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against her name.

**Letter dated 10.10.2017 received from Registrar Education (C), O/o Director Higher Education, Chandigarh Administration**

**16.** Considered letter No.453 DHE-UT-C7-24(25)2010 dated 10.10.2017 received from Registrar Education (C), For Director Higher Education, Chandigarh Administration, regarding anarchy in the administration in Panjab University with regard to Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that the items C-14 and C-16 be taken up together.

The Vice-Chancellor said that few years ago they took a decision that where the Principals are not available, the Managements would advertise the posts and if no one is available, then the existing

Principal would be given the extension. They arrived at an algorithm of extension of 2+2+1 years. No one challenged this algorithm as they were no representations. When they thought of changing that algorithm of 2+2+1 to 3+2, the problems started. They were hoping that since there were court cases going and a decision was expected till those persons completed the age of 65 years. But the decision from the court did not come. For some strange reason, the College teachers were separated from the case and the University teachers were kept in that case on the premise that in the University technically the teachers are re-employed as if they are the getting the salary of re-employed but the break of one day which earlier used to be given in their service, that break was not given until the Court decides the case. So, it is a very complex situation which has arisen of which there is no precedence. The case of the University teachers is going on and the break has not been given but their salary has been frozen as if they are re-employed.

It was clarified (by the Finance and Development Officer) that when the teachers went in revision, the order was to pay the salary which they were drawing before the dismissal of the petition.

The Vice-Chancellor said that right now the situation is complex and the teachers are continuing as if there is no service break. But when it comes to financial benefits, there is a question mark. Now, the College teachers are obviously very anguished that they are not being heard but a colleague of them, who is a teacher like them, became a Principal by virtue of his merit and could continue up to the age of 65 years in the same institution. Why it is so, because there is a decision of the Syndicate that the posts be advertised and if no person is available, to run the institution, the Principal could continue. So, this is generating all kinds of protests like representations by the teachers to all quarters, filing of PILs. If no action is taken, the representations are also marked to the authorities in Delhi. So, he had no option but to bring this to notice of governing body. It is in that background that these are the representations. So, now what they could do. One is that, he did not know whether it is correct to suggest, they go back to the situation of 2+2+1 where there was no issue at all.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there is something wrong in the earlier decision. The decision that they had taken is right but as they had decided that after insertion of advertisement twice and non availability of persons, the existing Principal could be re-appointed in the same institution. What is happening is that if a retired person from Chandigarh wanted to apply somewhere else, he/she could not be appointed. Earlier, it was a case of 'once approved always approved', but it is not so at the moment. Only a person fulfilling the new conditions could be considered in such cases. But the Colleges are allowing a person from other Colleges to join because in some of the Colleges persons are not interested. Professor Ronki Ram had gone to a College for selection and such an appointment had been made. It could create problems for the University as the appointment could not be made until the person fulfils the requirement of 400 API score. If such appointments without fulfilling the requirement of API scores are done, it is a wrong decision. The decision of re-appointment was to consider the same Principal in the same College after advertising the position twice. But the Managements are appointing after giving the second advertisement which is not



permissible. He further said that from the information contained in a document marked by the Vice-Chancellor to the Dean College Development Council, it appears that a person has been appointed for 6 years, meaning that 1 year extra has been given. He suggested that it should be got checked. The decision of the Syndicate in this regard is for extension of 2+2+1 years but for the same College. For some other College, the person would have to fulfil the new conditions.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that could they appoint a person retired at the age of 60 years from Guru Nanak Dev University in Panjab University at the age of 62 years. They could not make such an appointment. The decision of the University was to give the extension in the same College. The conditions for such cases were different because a salary of Rs.37400/- is given and they wanted that the Colleges could have the Principal as they had no other alternative. The able Principals could continue in such Colleges. The people come from unaided Colleges because such persons are working on a salary of Rs.15600/-. The decision to grant the extension to the Principals in the same Colleges is a right decision. But he did not know as to how the approvals are granted to a person retired from one College and appointed in some other College as the person is not eligible because the requirement of 400 points is not fulfilled. If such cases have been approved, then it is wrong.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such decisions could be reversed.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that a 3<sup>rd</sup> Committee was formed and it should be got checked by the Dean College Development Council that where it is mentioned that on the second advertisement any retired approved Principal from any College of Panjab University could be appointed. It is a decision of the Syndicate and the person could be from any College but not from the same College. This was changed to 'from any College'. This decision could be got checked. All such Principals have been appointed on the basis of this decision that any retired approved Principal from any College of Panjab University could be appointed.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that only a person fulfilling the requirement of API score could be appointed in such a case.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this was the decision which had been taken. However, if need be, it could be reviewed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the spirit was only to continue the same Principal. If a person from outside is to be appointed, then everybody has to compete.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if something has been done wrongly, that should be amended.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it could be reconsidered but there should be no academic dilution.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this relaxation was only for extension of an existing Principal. The second issue just slipped through. Let them go back and read all the discussions held on the issue.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that even the beneficiary (Principal B.C. Josan) is the Chairman of the Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that Principal B.C. Josan is not the Chairman of the Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the extension for 3+2 years is a different issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever decision has been taken should continue. However, they could take a decision for future.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could look all the Syndicate discussions and they could defer the item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal talked on how and why the decision was taken. This decision was taken in May, 2014 and there was some reason behind. What was happening was that the UGC adopted the API formula in 2010 and after that the UGC was continuously changing that formula. Then the UGC prepared the formula of capping in 2013 even if the same was adopted by the University after one year. One issue was that eligible candidates were not available and the second one was that the Punjab Government took a decision that whoever is appointed as Principal, the appointment would be on a salary of Rs.37,400/-. The senior teachers working on aided post drawing a salary of more than Rs.1 lac did not apply for the post of the Principal. Since there were not many persons applying for the post of Principal, keeping that in view the Syndicate took that decision. When this decision was taken, the recommendation of the Committee was for one year. When the matter came to the Syndicate and it was thought that there might be some problems, the period was enhanced to two years. So it became 2+2+1 years. The UGC changed the rules in the year 2013 and again two times in the year 2016. So, the situation still is almost the similar. If they talk about the affiliated Colleges of Panjab University, he has a data that more than 60 Colleges are functioning without Principals. The Colleges have also advertised the posts. One of such Colleges is in Chandigarh also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no dearth of eligible Associate Professors for the post of Principal but how could the regular teachers work as Principal on a salary of Rs.37,400/-.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that obviously because of all these difficulties, it is a fact that 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of Panjab University affiliated Colleges are functioning without Principals. So, the Syndicate took the decision keeping in view the difficulty in availability of Principals so that the Colleges could have the benefit of experienced persons and the Principals be allowed to continue. Secondly, when they talk about the complaint where it is mentioned that the UGC rules are being violated like the age of 65 years, which is as per UGC rules. So, there is no issue of retirement. Secondly, the UGC rule for tenure of Principals is 5+5 years which the Punjab Government has fixed at 10 years. Some discussion had been held on this issue but it has not been implemented. If they talk about the implementation of that decision, that would be applicable only to those Principals who have to be appointed for 5 years. He said that under Item C-16, an issue has been raised this decision has been taken only for the Principals

but not for the Professor, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors. He suggested that the extension should be granted to the Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors on the lines of the Principals because there are so many Colleges in the remote areas where even after advertising the posts, the candidates are not available.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is very difficult and not possible. It is not correct to say so. With so much of unemployment in this country, when an advertisement is issued so many people apply for a post.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that as the retired Principals are appointed, it is just a formality and those Principals do not go to the Colleges. It is just like fulfilling of the conditions by the Managements to run the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this decision was taken not to deprive the large Colleges of experienced Principals. So, they have to remember this and no addition should be made to this. If they wanted to do it for 3+2 years instead of 2+2+1 years, they could do it.

Shri Jarnail Singh added that Mrs. Chawla was a member of the Syndicate. Since she had to retire, she raised this issue that their cases should also be considered for the Constituent Colleges to which the Vice-Chancellor had abruptly denied.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this decision was taken by a Committee and if the members wanted to undo that, they could do.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that for the last three months, they have been receiving the e-mails and letters on this issue. As Professor Navdeep Goyal has given a less number, he pointed out that on 50% of the posts, officiating Principals are working which would be clear from the preliminary list of voters for the Senate election of Principal in February. Since the reply has to be given to the Vice-President of India from this House, he provided the data of the Principals working on extension on 3+2 years which is just 3% of the total posts. He has seen an advertisement in The Tribune where 4 affiliated Colleges of Panjab University have given the advertisement. The office of Dean College Development Council could provide the statistical information as to how many Principals have been appointed in the open selection.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the reason behind is the Punjab Government decision to pay the salary of Rs.37,400/-. If the full salary had been paid, such a problem would not have arisen. This is a difficulty which the Punjab Government has created and he would take up this issue with the Finance Minister. He had already taken up with this issue with Mr. S.K. Sandhu, IAS, who agreed at that time that it should be reviewed as it is ruining the Colleges.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that Ms. Navjot Kaur, a Principal has won the court case of pay protection.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to publicise this and requested to provide a copy of the judgment so that when he meets the Finance Minister, he could plead the case.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that as the Vice-Chancellor is taking up the case of the Principals, he requested, as he had already requested in the Senate also, that the case of the contractual teachers who have been appointed on a salary of Rs.21,600/- should also be taken up simultaneously

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has already taken up and firmly told Shri Rakesh Popli, DHE, UT that no approval would be given to the teachers appointed on a salary of Rs.21600/-.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu requested that similar is the case of the teachers of Punjab and requested the Vice-Chancellor to take up the case with the Punjab Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could talk with the Governor that it is wrong. Since the recommendations of the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission are to be implemented, then the basic pay of 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission should be given.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu requested to take up the matter with the Finance Minister.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the salary of Rs.21,600/- being paid to the teachers is less than even the salary of a guest teacher. The payment of salary of Rs.21,600/- to teachers is not acceptable at all. Shri Rakesh Popli, DHE had replied that they have made the contractual appointment of teachers in the U.T. at a salary of Rs.50,000/- to which he (Vice-Chancellor) requested the DHE to ensure it that no College of the U.T. pays a salary less than Rs.50,000/-.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the DAV College Management is paying a salary of Rs.25,800/- to the temporary teachers whereas the newly appointed teachers are being paid a salary of Rs.21,600/-.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is not acceptable.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that on the issue of payment of Rs.21600/-, the Education Colleges filed a court case and now the Degree Colleges have also started paying Rs.21600/-.

The Vice-Chancellor proposed that the Syndicate expressed anguish and resolved that the cases of the teachers appointed on a salary of Rs.21,600/- would not be approved by the University. Such cases of U.T. would not be approved at any cost. They would also appeal to the Punjab Government if those teachers appointed on a salary of Rs.21,600/- who are going to complete the period of 3 years are not paid the full pay scale, the approval earlier would not be continued. If the Punjab Government did not fulfil the conditions, then the Syndicate reserved its right to review and if necessary, the approval would be cancelled.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they could take such a harsh decision but it should not affect the teachers' interests.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the private Colleges pay the salary of Rs.21,600/- and the University does not grant approval in

such cases due to which the teachers are suffering. He suggested that to the proposal made by the Vice-Chancellor, it also be added that if on completion of 3 years of service on the salary of Rs.21,600/-, the Colleges did not pay the full pay-scale, then the affiliation of the Colleges would be withdrawn. Only then the Managements of the Colleges would pay the full salary otherwise not.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to bring in a properly worded resolution in this regard.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested that they should make efforts to get the stay vacated which had been granted by the High Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would contact the Advocate.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu suggested that the case of not granting the approval in which they are going to take a decision be not taken at the moment. But they should pressurise the Government and the Managements to give proper pay scale to the teachers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this decision has to be taken in respect of the U.T. Colleges to which some of the members agreed.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that in the meantime they could ask the Managements and the Government that they should pay the full pay scales to the teachers being appointed instead of paying Rs.21,600/-.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu has made it very clear. As they are talking the grant-in-aid posts, under the same umbrella the Managements are adopting it for the unaided posts. There should be no disparity.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could ask the Punjab Government at least to pay Rs.50,000/- which is being paid by the U.T. Administration.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has delivered a judgment for payment of equal pay for equal work. Ultimately, the people would have to file the contempt of Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the members could articulate on behalf of the teaching community.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that in the Government Colleges, the selections are not made and the promotions are being made. As everyone knows that some of the Principals are also not having Ph.D. degree and the approvals are being granted. At the moment, about 18 posts of the Principals are lying vacant in the Government Colleges and the same are not being filled up. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to take up this matter also with Sh. Manpreet Singh, Finance Minister. Secondly, Dr. Vinay Sophat had talked to him and said that whatever decision had earlier been taken by the Syndicate, let that prevail as it is. But, it should not be followed in future. He has come to know that whenever one goes on a Selection Committee, it is being told to the members that the candidate should have a 400 score as required by the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment. If they look at this criteria,

according to him, not more than 2-4 Principals would be available having 400 points. It also needed to be looked into. He requested that a letter should be written to the Colleges asking them to consider the work done by the teachers before the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment. He requested that the Principals be appointed in the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Mukesh Arora to give a note

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he would submit the cases.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there should be a clarity. The posts which had been advertised after 11<sup>th</sup> July 2016, the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment would be applicable as they have already adopted it. There should be no doubt about it. What Professor Mukesh Arora has said is that the Syndicate had taken a decision that the publications of the teachers before the adoption of the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment and the UGC list should be considered. Until that decision taken by the Syndicate is communicated, it would not be known to the Colleges. He requested that this notification be issued by the Dean College Development Council which should also be given to the Vice-Chancellor's nominees on the Selection Committees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the minutes of the September meeting of Syndicate still have not been approved as the same had not been prepared till the first week of October when he left for Canada. He came back on 30<sup>th</sup> October and has received 3 files of the minutes of the 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting of Syndicate. Thereafter, there was a court case and he also had to go to Delhi and India-Canada meet. So, the minutes could not be finalised and it might be quite possible that a few notifications which had to be issued on the basis of the discussions could not be issued. The part of the reason for delay in the issuance of the notification is that the discussion had not been approved and provided to the office of the Dean College Development Council and Controller of Examinations for circulation. The notification has to be done and it be made a part of the resolved part.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired as to how many responses they have got from the Colleges about the number of vacant positions of the Principals.

It was clarified (by the Controller of Examinations) that the letters regarding the vacant posts of the Principals had been sent to all the Colleges and reply from 52 Colleges had been received till yesterday. Regarding the gratuity and PF, letter had been issued followed by two reminders in response to which reply from 72 Colleges had been received till yesterday.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired about the responses received in the replies.

It was informed (by the Controller of Examinations) that in the replies submitted by the Colleges, it is mentioned that the process is on. All this data would be compiled and reported.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Dean College Development Council to prepare the consolidated summary and place the same before the Syndicate in its meeting to be held on 10<sup>th</sup> December. He

further said that the issues that started during the term of the current Syndicate, the members should know about the status.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that there is another problem related with this issue. He said that before the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment of 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, the Colleges used to promote the teachers from Stage-1 to 2 and 2 to 3. After 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 so many promotion cases for Associate Professors are pending for the last more than one year. In this way, they could get persons for the posts of Principals as most of those persons were eligible and having the required API score. Two Colleges had sent their own panel which was refused by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) which was correct as per the rules. He had requested the Dean College Development Council and the D.R. (Colleges) and would like to point out here also that for the promotion to the post of Associate Professor and also from stage -1 to 2, a panel comprising of 1-2 Professors from the University be sent to the Colleges as is done in the case of promotion under CAS. The other members would be Principal of the College, Chairman of the Committee and the Head of the Department.

The Vice-Chancellor said that now there are so many Professors in the Colleges and they need not depend on the University Professors.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there is a condition of minimum 2 Professors of the UGC. Therefore, there should be two Professors on the Committee instead of one.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that the Professors of the Colleges from Punjab and U.T. could be appointed as members of the Selection Committees as also there are so many persons who are members of the Senate.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that as Principal I.S. Sandhu had talked about CAS promotion. He pointed out that the approval in the case of directly recruited Professors had not been granted till date. He had requested the office in this regard and he has been informed that a Committee has been formed to which he informed the office that the Committee has been formed for CAS and not for direct recruitment. The approval is pending for a year.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that what Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal is saying is that actually the College branch did not have the clear information. There should be no problem for the direct recruitment. The direct recruitments are being done in the Education Colleges.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if his services are required, he is ready to help without claiming the TA/DA. Whenever he would come to attend any meeting, he would help in the matter.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to get the cases of Associate Professor and Professor cleared.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested that the position of Director should also be advertised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he authorises Principal I.S. Sandhu and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal to take up the case.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that the problems are coming up because some things are not clear. As they are discussing the issue of the Principals, this issue came up for discussion in May 2014. The spirit of concept of 'once approved always approved' has been changed. The decision, that those already approved as Principals they need not take the approval again, was taken because of the shortage of Principals. But when a Principal applies in some other College or institution, in that case the API score as mandated by the UGC is required and there is no need to process the case for approval. Secondly, there is shortage of Principals as has been pointed that about 50% of the posts of Principals are vacant. If, by taking that as base, they implement this decision in the case of teachers, he pointed out that there are so many well qualified candidates and with such a decision there would be unemployment among the younger generation. This decision is right only in the case of the Principals. According to him, this decision should not only be valid for applying in the same institution but for the other institutions also.

Shri Jarnail Singh clarified that the person could apply in the other institutions up to the age of 60 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the spirit of 'once approved always approved' was for the persons below the age of 60 years and not beyond.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that but the question arises of the API score of 400.

The Vice-Chancellor requested not to mix up the things. He said that it is correct that they had approved the concept of 'once approved always approved' for the persons below the age of 60 years.

Principal I.S. Sandhu and Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it is no more prevalent now.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether they have revised the decision to which members said that it had been revised. He directed the Dean College Development Council to get the Syndicate decisions in sequence to set it right. He did not want that the term of the present members ends in December and the matters remain in a mess. He would like to have a clarity on all this before 10<sup>th</sup> December meeting so that no one is accused.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that those Principals who have already been appointed should not be disturbed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that those would not be disturbed.

Principal N.R. Sharma pointed out that an appointment was made more than a year ago but till date there is no notification from the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) whether there is a requirement according to 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> amendment or through API capping or without capping. The approval is being withheld on the plea that the API score, an old case of more than a year when there was no guideline regarding API to the Selection Committee nor any notification was



issued by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges), would be counted as per the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he needs somebody who would resolve this issue.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if a post was advertised after 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 and the last date for application was after 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2016, then the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment would be applicable and the appointment could not be made according to the 3<sup>rd</sup> amendment. The dealing person who has objected to it, has a clear understanding of the matter.

Shri Jarnail Singh and Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if any appointment is made, then there could be court cases.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal N.R. Sharma to bring a proper case.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they had taken the decision regarding the extension to the Principals, the issue was first discussed and approved in May 2014. Then the matter was placed before the Senate in its meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> May, 2014. There was brief discussion and no agreement could arrive in the Senate meeting and then the matter was deferred. After that arising out of some issue as they are today discussing so many issues, this was again discussed in the Syndicate in its meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> July, 2014. He read out some part of the discussion where Shri Ashok Goyal had said that "his simple submission is that they should be very careful about the functioning of the University. The things which needed to be stopped at the level of the Vice-Chancellor should stop there and similarly the things which needed to be stopped at the level of Syndicate should stop there and so on". When they approved it, it was a rule and as far as rules are concerned, as per Panjab University Act the body which could make the rule is the Syndicate and it should not have gone to the Senate. Therefore, this issue after being resolved in the meeting of the Syndicate in July 2014, the matter although not approved in the Senate, was never placed before the Senate. Now, they are just making amendment in that rule.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether they started practising that 2014 rule to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said, yes. Whether a notification was issued to practise that rule to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said, yes, and said that it was never placed before the Senate. If that notification is on record, a note be prepared and let they reiterate that the Syndicate is a continuity and whatever decision was taken by the Syndicate had been implemented and that had not been rescinded at any stage. They are just reiterating that practice.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he had given a note in this regard, however, he would be again submit a note in this regard.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that there is a decision of the Syndicate which has been made a practice. Besides this, in the continuity of that, today they just say that this is what the Syndicate decision is. If there is any revision in that decision by the Syndicate which could be a modification or anything like that, that should be reiterated and circulated to everyone that this is the practice as of

today. He requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to prepare this and they would not wait for the next Syndicate meeting. If they give him the authorisation, he would send to all the members an e-mail of the draft to be submitted by Professor Navdeep Goyal on which the members would send their opinion to him (Vice-Chancellor) before it is circulated to all the Colleges through DCDC because it is to be implemented by the Colleges. If there are any changes suggested by the members, he would write back to Professor Navdeep Goyal along with the original draft and the revised draft would be sent to the members on the basis of the suggestions. In this way, they arrive at what the practice is at the moment. Then they would circulate that practice to everyone. He enquired whether the members agree to it.

Some of the members said that they agree to it.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that a two-member Committee be formed to work on it and suggested the name of Professor Navdeep Goyal to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Dr. Dalip Kumar be also associated with him.

This was agreed to.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the Vice-Chancellor had requested the Dean College Development Council to prepare a note which has come as table agenda. The discussions were earlier held in the Syndicate meetings. They are discussing the case for extension for 2+2+1 years or 3+2 years, thus a total period of 5 years. There is a point no.5 (sub part (iii) in the note of Dean College Development Council, the discussion on this has never taken place in his presence. Basically, this extension is for 6 years but not for 5 years. He read out from the note "existing re-employed Principals after attaining the age of superannuation and have been granted re-employment for two years, their cases will be considered for extension of another one year without re-advertising the post and on a resolution passed by the concerned College management".

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that it is 3+2 years in place of 2+2+1 years and there is nothing wrong in it.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that now it is clear. As they were discussing that the University should not grant the approval to the teachers working on a salary of Rs.15,600/-. His submission is that similarly they should also not grant approval to the Principals who are paid a salary of Rs.37,400/- so that their pay scales are revised.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they agreed to it as a one-time measure so that the aided posts could be kept and the posts could be filled up even at Rs.21600/- as if someone is working on a low salary for three years. In this spirit, they accepted the notification of the Punjab Government. The University never expected that under the disguise of that the Punjab Government would pay the salary of Rs.37400/- to the Principals also. If they had anticipated such things, they would not accepted it for the Principals as their interest was to see that 1925 posts of the teachers could be filled up. Consciously, they could not accept that notification.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that till the time such a rider would be binding, they would not be able to find Principals.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would take up it with the Government.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that they could stop the approval of the unaided Colleges.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the newly selected PCS officers and the Doctors in Punjab Government are also paid the salary of Rs.15600/- and are on probation for 3 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it did not mean that they would agree to it. The PCS officers would get their cases cleared as they work with the politicians but the teachers would not be able to get it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that those persons who had been appointed on probation for a period of 3 years, they are just about to complete the probation period within 2 months for which a Committee is to be formed. He would request the union of teachers to pursue the cases.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the Principals who are working in the Colleges after crossing the age of 60 years, the Managements are paying the full salary to them. Since the posts are advertised three times, if it is mentioned in the advertisement that the full scale would be given, it might be that more applicants could apply. He further said that if the salary is given in the scale of Rs.37,400/-, then the Government would also contribute towards which is not being done at the moment.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that they should take up a test case of the persons who have been appointed three years ago and whether those persons would be given the full salary.

At this stage, Dr. Subhash Sharma raised an issue of general discussion as he had to leave early, which has been made part of general discussion

**RESOLVED:** That the Dean College Development Council be directed to compile in sequence all the discussions held on the issue in various meetings of Syndicate and the same be placed before the Syndicate in its next meeting.

**Enhancement in annual  
NSS fee of affiliated  
Colleges**

**15.** Considered recommendation (No.1) dated 02.02.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Advisory-cum-Review Committee that the annual NSS fee of affiliated Colleges be enhanced from Rs.5/- to Rs.10/- per student per year from the academic session 2018-19:

**NOTE:** 1. The above Committee had recommended the enhancement for the academic session 2017-18, but the Programme Coordinator, NSS, vide her letter dated 12.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**) had written the above minutes were got approved late, so the enhancement can be implemented from the academic session 2018-19.

2. The Vice-Chancellor passed orders that Professor Navdeep Goyal please to see the recommendations of the Committee dated 02.02.2017. Professor Navdeep Goyal, suggested that the Fee may be enhanced from Rs.5/- per year to Rs. 10/- per year from the session 2018-19 as only few students participates but fee is payable by all.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he has no objection on the hike in the charges but the funds for NSS activities are never released to the Colleges. The Colleges on their own organise the camps, make the payments to the teachers and the students. A lot of money is being collected by the University through this fee. He requested that the funds should be released to the Colleges then he has no objection even if the amount is increased even to Rs.15/-. If no grant is to be given to the Colleges, then this hike should not be effected.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that for the last 7 years, the expenditure on the payment of salary to the two officers of NSS and the camps is being incurred by all the Colleges on their own so that the students did not suffer. The Colleges have not received any funds for the last 7 years because the Government has not reimbursed to the University. If the fee is to be enhanced, then some money out of this fund should be released for the camps.

The Vice-Chancellor said that why this necessity had occurred, there must be some articulation of this necessity and what is the purpose.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this fee of Rs.5/- is being deposited with the University. Actually, this amount was meant to offset the expenditure being incurred on the NSS Coordinator and the staff. The duty of the Coordinator is to get the grants from the U.T. Administration and Punjab Government but the grants are not being released.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired whether efforts are not being made in this regard or the Government is not releasing the grants.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that efforts must have been made but it is a fact that the grant has not been released. The Punjab Government has not released the grant to the other universities also. Some grant is released by the U.T. Administration. The Colleges collect this fee and deposit with the University. There was a discussion on this issue. Even now it is being said that till the grant is not released, the camps would not be allowed. It has happened so in a few cases but it is wrong. It is the duty of the Coordinator to arrange for the grant but the money is not being arranged. But if it is said to the Colleges that if they did not deposit the money, they would not be allowed to hold the camps, it would create another issue. They could enhance the fee but it would be paid by the Colleges to the University only when the University arranges the grants to the Colleges from the Government.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is fair enough.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendation (No.1) dated 02.02.2017 of the Advisory-cum-Review Committee for enhancement of the annual NSS fee of affiliated Colleges from Rs.5/- to Rs.10/- per student per year from the academic session 2018-19, **as per Appendix-XXVI**, be approved and efforts be made to get the grants released from the Government.

**Item No. C-16 was taken up with Item No.C-14.**

**Representation of Professor Rajesh Gill dated 30.09.2017 regarding alleged non supply of DVDs of Senate/Syndicate meetings**

**17.** Considered the representation of Professor Rajesh Gill dated 30.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXVII**) forwarded by Under Secretary, Vice President's Secretariat, New Delhi vide letter No. VPS/15/2/R/PU/2017 dated 06.10.2017 (**Appendix-XXVII**), regarding alleged non supply of DVDs of Senate/Syndicate meetings.

**NOTE:** A copy of detail of the correspondence made by Professor Rajesh Gill, Fellow with regard to supply of DVDs and replies there given by the office from March, 2015 onwards is enclosed (**Appendix-XVII**).

The Vice-Chancellor, while providing the factual position, said that they are enjoined to release the DVDs of the Syndicate to anyone including the Senators. The Syndicate members could ask for the DVDs after the meeting because they had participated in the meeting. The procedure at the moment is that the meeting is attended by the Syndicate members and they discuss the confidential matters. Prima facie, the agenda is confidential. Unless the minutes of the Syndicate meeting are written and circulated to the members, they had not been releasing the DVDs of the Syndicate. It is because the people take the DVDs and start pressurising the staff writing the minutes how to write the discussion. The discussions in the meetings take place in Hindi, English, Punjabi. Sometimes there are heated discussions while at other times in some other way. But they write the minutes in a neutral way and they want to protect the staff writing these minutes that they do it is they deem appropriate as they know as to which thing is not be flared up. If somebody says some heated thing, they did not want to flare it up. So, the staff writes the minutes in that way and bring the draft and typically the draft is supposed to be written in about a month's time because the Syndicate meets in a month. It is tried that the minutes of the Syndicate are written before the next meeting of the Syndicate and then the DVDs are released. This is the practice and it is nowhere written as to when and how the DVDs have to be released. There is a decision of making the DVDs available to anyone on a payment of Rs.125/- but for the Senators, it is free. This decision was taken on an experimental basis. A given Syndicate some years ago even discontinued the recording and that the DVDs should not be given to anyone. Then the matter went as an information item to the Senate and the Senate reversed the Syndicate's recommendation and took a decision that the recording should be done and be made available. How soon these are to be made available, what he has found for the last some time is that whenever the meeting is over, the next day morning a request is made to provide the DVDs. Such a request is made by someone who had been a member of the Syndicate herself. He felt uncomfortable giving the DVDs even before the minutes are written because people who are writing the minutes come under the pressure immediately. Even the members could manage the DVDs as they have some links.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that after a day or two of the meeting, they get phone calls stating that such and such person had talked about such and such matter.

Continuing, the Vice-Chancellor said that the members know everything but at the moment, they did not have an authorised copy. After getting the DVDs, the members prepare the transcript of the same and approach for writing the discussion in such and such way. In order to protect the staff coming under pressure, he has been following this norm that the DVDs would be released only when he has seen the draft minutes. He asked the concurrence of the members on this.

Some of the members said that they could prepare some rules in this regard.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that even the members of the Syndicate should refrain from asking the DVDs before the minutes are written.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he did not need the DVDs. He said that the madam (Professor Rajesh Gill) has sent a message to the members saying that she has not received the DVDs of the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> September and that of 7<sup>th</sup> October were delivered to her only on the night of 18<sup>th</sup> November.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has finalised the minutes of the meeting a day ago while returning from Delhi.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the meeting of 7<sup>th</sup> October was only on a single agenda point.

The Vice-Chancellor said that, that is why he has finalised the same. He has so many other minutes also with him.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is right under the circumstances pointed out by the Vice-Chancellor but it is judicious that since the meeting was held only for a single point agenda and if she (Professor Rajesh Gill) asked for some information, they should have no hesitation. As said by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, he has also received an e-mail that she received the DVDs at 7.00 p.m. yesterday.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he enquired from the Deputy Registrar (General) whether the DVDs had been released or not as he had finalised the minutes. When it was noticed that the DVDs had not been released, he directed to release the DVDs. He has finalised some of the minutes of the meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> September and some are pending with him. He is the single person and has to read everything because sometimes there are some mistakes or the language is wrong or the context becomes wrong or something could not be understood. Since he has to read every word, it is just a too much strain on him.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that they should frame a timeline for providing the DVDs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that as he has told that until the minutes are written, the DVDs could not be provided.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is right that some minutes are pending but efforts should be made and nobody should have any objection to know about a decision taking regarding him/her. At the moment, the Vice-Chancellor is having some limitation. But it would be better if the DVDs are provided in time.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has been conducting the meetings for the last more than 5 years. They could get the record and see as to when the minutes were submitted to him and when the same were finalised, released and uploaded. With the regularity the minutes of the Syndicate and Senate have been uploaded during his term, he challenged that it had not been done quicker than him in the past. Thereafter, one keeps on saying that the Vice-Chancellor is accused that he is hand in gloves with Principal B.C. Josan and the Registrar is with the XEN. While the decision was taken by the Syndicate, it was nowhere mentioned as to when the DVDs would be released. It is just a decision of the Syndicate that the DVDs are to be provided. He felt uncomfortable in releasing the DVDs before the draft minutes are written or could be released before the next meeting of the Syndicate even if the minutes are not written.

Some of the members agreed to it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it could be provided within one month of the meeting.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could not be done because sometimes two meetings are held and in such a case the DVDs could be released before holding the next meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that the DVDs could be provided when the draft minutes are written or before the next meeting, whichever is earlier.

The Vice-Chancellor said that respecting this, as still he has not been able to finalise the minutes of 23<sup>rd</sup> September, he would release the same.

Principal I.S. Sandhu suggested that the decision to provide the DVDs before the next meeting of the Syndicate should not be taken because sometimes it takes 2-3 months to prepare the minutes. Until the minutes are written, how the DVDs could be released. After preparation of the minutes, the same are also sent to the members to point out any discrepancy and some corrections also needed to be made. Therefore, until the minutes are finalised and approved by the members, the DVDs should not be provided. Sometimes the Syndicate could meet in emergency even before a month also, then it would be difficult to provide the DVDs.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that the timeline could be when the draft minutes are written.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is right. He further said that the upper limit could be two months.

Some of the members said that the limit could be till the draft minutes are approved.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he wanted to avoid the accusation that he intentionally was not approving the draft of the minutes.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma enquired about the decision regarding the DVDs of Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor replied that there is no need of giving the DVDs of the Senate.

Principal N.R. Sharma made a submission, if deemed appropriate, that since the Syndicate and the Senate have their own sanctity, it is not good if someone makes complaints daily that he/she has not received small things like the DVDs, etc. It is understood that the DVDs could not be supplied before one month. If one had gone to the grievance redressal mechanism and has not been heard, only then it could be written. It should also be added that if one has not been heard in the grievances cell, only then one could write to the Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that even the DVDs of the year 2012 are being asked.

**RESOLVED:** That the DVDs of the Syndicate meetings be provided after preparation of the draft minutes and its approval by the Chairman of the Syndicate.

#### **General Discussion**

Dr. Subhash Sharma raised an issue of general discussion when Item No.C-15 was taken up for consideration which has been made part of general discussion at the beginning.

- (1) At this point Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he would like to talk about a very small issue. In the last Syndicate also he had talked about this but at that time there was no parity in the examination. There is a candidate, who is presently getting training in IMA. His selection was made only in the first attempt. He was a student of their University, but unfortunately, he got re-appear in History paper. Due to this he came back after resigning from there. But still he has one month with him. If he submits his pass result there within one month, then he can join back there. There are two options in it which they could do. One, that he could be given one more chance for re-evaluation as he is very much hopeful for his marks to be increased. Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the candidate is very passionate to take training in the army.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Controller of Examinations if he is permitted to do this.

The Controller of Examinations said that once the re-evaluation result is out, special evaluation could be asked for.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the Controller of Examinations could allow it.



The Vice Chancellor asked if his marks did not increase, to which Dr. Subhash Sharma said it is his luck. In that case he would appear again, but they should give him a chance.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he has the authority, he would do it.

- (2) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he would like to submit that the decisions which are taken here in the Syndicate should be conveyed and implemented in the same spirit. He requested that when a Syndicate or Senate member sends emails about that, the same should at least be acknowledged. By sending an email they just want to bring to the knowledge of the concerned persons and it should not be considered that it is a press statement. Actually, the issue is that in the Syndicate meetings of 20<sup>th</sup> August, 2017 and 23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2017, a decision was taken about the work to be allotted to the XEN (Mr. Padam). It was made clear that he should be given the work relating to maintenance of Hostel and the works running at P.U.R.C., Muktsar. Now, after three months he had received a letter dated 16<sup>th</sup> November, 2017. In this letter whatever has been conveyed to him is that he has been given only the public health work of the hostels. The public health works in the hostels include the works relating to maintenance of washrooms and toilets and plumbing work. It was decided in the spirit that the hostels need attention. Though there is delay in issuing the letter, but the part relating to assigning the duties is not correct.
- (3) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the second point is that this Syndicate in its meeting held on 23.9.2017 had taken a decision that the name of Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma be added in the Enquiry Committee for Mukerian College. He is surprised that that decision was not at all observed in letter and spirit and the Committee has already visited Mukerian College, but it has not been conveyed to the Committee and nothing of this sort happened.
- (4) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma repeated his earlier appeal for installing the plaque of Shaheed Bhagat Singh. He said that he had also requested Professor Ronki Ram to write something about Shaheed Bhagat Singh. But the things are still standing there.
- (5) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further stated that a discussion took with regard to College Professors for making them ex-officio members and it was decided that some University Professors i.e. he himself, madam (Professor. Pam Rajput), Professor Navdeep Goyal and President PUTA, Professor Rajesh Gill be also included in the Committee. It was decision of the Syndicate, but, why it was not conveyed to her. All the members said that it was a decision and she should be invited. What he means to say is that all those decisions which are taken in these meeting might be implemented in that spirit. Therefore, he humbly requested that decisions should be implemented in the same spirit as these are taken in the meeting. It should not be said that in the light of such and such the competent authority has taken the decisions, which is wrong. It could be done only if someone has been authorised to do so. If no authorisation has been given, the decision taken here in the Syndicate meeting should be implemented. He said that he

wrote a letter long time back then second time he conveyed to all the Syndicate members, but nobody responded. He further humbly requested that the things should be done in the same spirit as have been decided in the meeting. He is disappointed on the point that in spite of being informed to the Syndicate members, but no one responded. Anyway, but everybody has agreed to it that the decision was that about which he had talked about. That is why he has brought this to his (Vice Chancellor) notice to examine that what decisions were taken and why these were not implemented.

The Vice-Chancellor said that because things get delayed so the Syndicate had put this into the practice to get the only resolved part issued at the earliest. But sometimes everything that they discuss could not be mentioned in the resolved part and such things remain unattended. This is the problem. For example Professors issue discussed in the meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> September has not reached to the office as the same is still lying in his bag. He has read two files out of the five. He has also read the issue relating to Professors and it is still with him. At the moment there is a lacuna in that, everything they are deciding is not getting implemented immediately after the meeting which actually should happen. As regards zero hour discussion, whatever has been agreed upon, they should put into practice. He requested the members that whatever is agreed outside the agenda items, and somebody wants to get such decisions implemented, which are not a part of the resolved agenda items, they should pass it on to him (Professor Navdeep Goyal) and Dr. Dalip Kumar. It would be their duty to see that all these decisions be added in the actionable part immediately. It is correct that these were agreed, but minutes still could not be finalised. So he would write here that the Secretary should ensure that a Committee be constituted to follow up the action on the decisions taken in Zero hour is taken.

Professor Pam Rajput said that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma is saying that Committee had been constituted but the name of PUTA President Professor Rajesh Gill has not been added in the Committee and the Committee has also conducted a visit.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is saying the file remained with him and the same could not be sent back.

Some members requested that the correction relating to case of XEN (Mr. Padam) be got done.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that necessary correction be made in the cases of Sh. Satish Kumar Padam and the inclusion of name of PUTA President Professor Rajesh Gill in the Committee looking into the issue of making College Professors as ex-officio members of Faculties.

This was agreed to.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the matter was resolved but got delayed as he had to go abroad in the month of October, 2017 and he was busy in the meeting of Syndicate of 6<sup>th</sup> October, 2017. They had to put in a paper for the 6<sup>th</sup> October's meeting and they were busy for that meeting. First they were busy in preparing the

paper to be submitted in the Court. When they reached the Court, a document was handed over to them seeking some other information. On 7<sup>th</sup> October at 8.00 p.m. when the meeting of Syndicate ended, a paper from U.T. administration was delivered at his residence in which it had been written that this matter was flashed by the U.T. Governor to Shri Rajnath Singh, Hon'ble Home Minister. From the office of Shri Rajnath Singh, Hon'ble Home Minister, a letter was sent to U.T. administration on June 1, 2017 asking for input on the issue. The U.T. Administration withheld the letter for more than three months. On 6<sup>th</sup> October, the Court meeting held and on the next day i.e. on Saturday the 7<sup>th</sup> October, 2017, when the said matter appeared in the newspapers, the related documents were delivered at his residence at 8.00 p.m. to respond on the issue. He had to go abroad on 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2017. He set aside all other works and along with the F.D.O., got prepared the reply and sent back to the Advisor, U.T. The same was to be filed by in the Court and it was filed in his absence in the Court. He came back on 29<sup>th</sup> October, 2017. When he came back on 29<sup>th</sup> October, Registrar proceeded on leave for seven days. When Registrar joined the office after leave, meeting was fixed. He had to prepare all those papers with F.D.O. and also made a presentation. That was very tense situation and so all this work was stalled. All the files and papers received till 23<sup>rd</sup> September, 2017 are lying here. The messages from Delhi started coming regarding non deliverance of DVDs etc. to Professor Rajesh Gill and other related issues. As the meeting of Syndicate for 7<sup>th</sup> October was single agenda point meeting, he first cleared the minutes of the 7<sup>th</sup> October meeting. He gave it back to the Dy. Registrar (General). The papers remained with Dy. Registrar (General) for two to three days. Once he changed the draft, incorporated the corrections and the same had to be brought into a format for circulation. Dy. Registrar (General) could not make the corrections. Until the corrections are made, the same could not be circulated. So, in spite of the fact that minutes for 7<sup>th</sup> October meeting were cleared, when he enquired about the same, Dy. Registrar (General) answered that he and his staff was busy in preparing the agenda items for the meeting of Syndicate to be held on 19<sup>th</sup> October, 2017. So too much back log of files has been piled up. After 14<sup>th</sup> October he has not been able to clear even the administrative files in the office. His room is full of files. He takes the files with him as and when he goes to Delhi or some other station so that some of those files could be cleared while on the way. After attending the meetings at Delhi, there are so many after-effects of the meeting. Due to excessive work, he gets tired. Tomorrow he has to travel to Delhi along with these files. There is no doubt that the delay has occurred, but this is the background of this delay. The Vice Chancellor informed that Professor Ronki Ram has given the photograph and Architect is working for having the plaque. The photographs of both Mulkh Raj Anand and Shaheed Bhagat Singh are lying there.

- (6) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said he wanted to know about the news which appeared regarding re-evaluation result of MBBS students. He enquired how that controversy began that since there is no provision for re-evaluation in MBBS, how the two students got their result re-evaluated and cleared the examination.

The Controller of Examinations said that is the case of 2015. Some students complained that they are the victimised and exploited. Because there is no provision for re-evaluation, so deliberately they have been given one mark short of the passing marks. Fifty marks were required but forty nine were given. As there was no provision, so the Controller of Examinations sent it back. Again students requested to the Vice-Chancellor. Professor A.K. Bhandari was Dean of University Instruction at that time. Prof. Bhandari suggested that even if there is no provision, but the interest of the professional students could not be overlooked. Special re-evaluation should be carried out. As there is precedence already in the University, so re-evaluation was carried out and result of the two students was notified. Thereafter a committee was constituted as to why there is no provision for re-evaluation for medical students.

Some members said that the matter was discussed in the Syndicate and Senate also.

The Controller of Examinations further said that the committee was extended little more. Three more medicos i.e. Director, Govt. Medical College and Hospital, Sector 32, Dr. Amod Gupta and Dr. Ravi K. Gupta were added in the committee last year. Meeting of the committee was held in the Syndicate room. The committee made very exhaustive recommendations as to why it was not taken care of earlier by the Punjab University and had recommended many reforms about the appointment of examiners, their status and their remuneration. That file has been prepared and would come in the next meeting of Syndicate. One of the observations in the file is how to increase the remuneration of examiners for medical faculty.

The Vice-Chancellor said that remuneration to the medical faculty is very less.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that out of twelve, two students got the benefit of re-evaluation and ten students failed.

The Controller of Examinations said that they did not receive any representation from the other students.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that everybody was clear that according to university regulation, re-evaluation could not be done. Only two students approached, to whom and from which source, office might know about it. There is belief among the people if the university notifies about the re-evaluation to all the students, then they could apply and get the benefit of re-evaluation.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they had discussed the matter in detail that evaluation is not done fairly in the medical colleges. Thus the committee was constituted.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is not talking about the committee. Improvement should be made. He is talking about the incident of twelve failed students out of which two got the benefit of re-evaluation and have passed.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that thereafter, last year also special evaluation had been done for some students. The committee had asked for re-evaluation of all students result. If evaluation had been done fairly, sometimes doctors of Medical Colleges do not fail the student on academic basis, they fail the students due to some other reason. Many intelligent students are committing suicide due to this.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he is not defending whether re-evaluation should be done or not. He is talking about the twelve students out of which only two students get the benefit of re-evaluation. Why re-evaluation notice was not put on the notice board of the college and notified to the students.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he does know about the students who got the benefit of re-evaluation of result. If fair evaluation has been done, there is no harm.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if the university is violating the regulation, though it was genuine, but it should be made public so that all students could get the benefit of re-evaluation.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if student complains to the Vice-Chancellor that justice is not being done to him/her. The student represents to the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor is convinced that injustice is done to him/her, then where is the harm in it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the university revised the regulation in arbitrary manner so that the student could get the benefit. The same should be notified that as the re-evaluation is not permitted, but as a special case, they have permitted it and the other students can apply for re-evaluation.

Controller of Examinations said that there is live example in today's meeting where a student has been allowed to get the (re-evaluation 2<sup>nd</sup> time) done after his re-evaluation has been done. Could the University offer this also to the public?

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the precedent that you have made, would be set up and all other students would want to claim the same.

- (7) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that second issue is about Health Centre of the Panjab University. All of them know very well about the plight of Health Centre. He went to the Health Centre day before yesterday and came to know that there are two regular doctors (i.e., C.M.O. & Dr. Khullar) in the Health Centre and both of them were on leave. He enquired about the C.M.O. (as his signatures were needed) and he was told that C.M.O. has gone to Central University, Lucknow. The Vice-Chancellor of that University has invited C.M.O. to attend some meetings being held in Central University, Lucknow and 2<sup>nd</sup> doctor, Dr. Khullar is not well. When they allow someone to attend the outstation meetings, the office becomes headless. Nobody is able to get his work done and also the files are not cleared. The doctor who is competent to sign is not available. Both doctors are competent to sign the

documents. He enquired about the leave but it could not be confirmed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not do the microscopic of this. That is what the C.M.O. has to see. But, what the C.M.O. could do. He would say he is left alone as everybody else is entitled to leave. Now when the Central Govt. does not cooperate with them. How many years have passed they are appealing to the Central Govt. for permission for recruitment of Medical Officer, Chief of University Security and Dean College Development Council. These are the unique positions and affecting the university functioning very badly. But the politicians, I.A.S. officers/bureaucrats pay no heed to that. What they could do. They can express anguish once again that the Syndicate feels helpless that essential appointments are desired for the proper governance of the University and the Syndicate is unable to get such things implemented. For instance, it is the desire of the Syndicate that the Medical Officers should be recruited. That will help to take care of the needs and this is a critical need. DCDC and Chief of University Security should be permitted to be recruited. The retired medical officers are willing to work on pittance in the Health Centre. If they refuse to work, they could, and earn much more money by consultancy. If the university tried to enhance their payment, U.T., Finance Department and U.G.C. does not permit.

The Vice Chancellor said that everybody behaves here as if the money is going from his own pocket.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said it is but natural that if there are two teachers in a department and someone goes on leave, the work of his seat will suffer.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they can refuse the C.M.O. for going to Lucknow, but C.M.O. would put him in such a difficulty that the Vice Chancellor is not allowing him to go there and he is restraining him to go the Professor Sobti's University.

- (8) The Vice Chancellor requested the members to realize this. He said that Professor Sobti calls every Professor of this University at Lucknow. There was a crucial meeting of Institute of Eminence, yesterday, but Professor Bhandari did not come. He was given the task to do this. He knew that the deadline was 12<sup>th</sup> December. He can say 'no', but he did not say this. He (Professor Bhandari) wanted him (Vice Chancellor) to order that this cannot be done. He had already got the ticket to go to Lucknow. This is the situation. He said that he is sorry to say that this is the difficulty. Yesterday, he received a letter from Professor Sobti claiming that he has applied in 2013 for Senior Professorship, what has happened to that and why he has not been replied so far. He (Prof. Ronki) himself invited applications for Senior Professorship, did nothing till his term came to an end, did not leave any note in the file. When he (Vice Chancellor) came here, all the Senior Professors started asking him about this. The first who came to him was Professor Kohli and asked as to what has happened to his Senior Professorship. What he can do, he is not against it. He said that he was himself a Senior Professor in the HAG Grade-1. He asked Professor Bhandari to enquire from the UGC if they can do this. A

letter was written to the UGC. The UGC informed that the matter is under consideration of a Committee. Then a rumor was spread by some people that it has been done in Kurukshetra University. It was got enquired and it was found that this has not been done in any University. The Vice Chancellor informed that it was done in Central Universities, IITs, IISER, IIMs. But it was not done in any of the nearby State Universities. The Vice Chancellor asked the F.D.O. if it has been done in Delhi University, the F.D.O. informed that it has not been done in any UGC regulated Universities. So, it has not been done in any University, but Professor Sobti, who is himself a Vice Chancellor of Central University, has more connection with the University system than he had ever had, but he (Prof. R.C. Sobti) has sent him a letter. The Vice Chancellor said that he (Prof. Sobti) knew it well, his term is coming to an end, now he has to come here as a retired Professor, if he can get his promotion from the back date, it is possible that he may get elevated pension in the 7<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. Because if he retires as a Senior Professor and if he is claiming a Senior Professorship after having retired as a Vice Chancellor, from a back date, the financial implications of this is that the money will come from the internal income of the University. The Central Government is not going to give any money for pension. Does he not know the financial situation of the University? If B.O.F. or R.A.O. or L.O. put objection, anything which has a financial implication, that cannot be given from the back date. There are Professors in the University who after six years, would ask that their promotion is due since 2009 or 2008 and he submits the documents and ask to process his case. There is no institution in the world who could process a case from such a back date. The Vice Chancellor said that if the promotion is due and if they did not submit their papers within six months, then promotion would be considered from the date they have submitted the papers. He does not want to use harsh words, but since there is internal government and someone meets some members of the Syndicate, get a letter forwarded from the local M.P. and put the Vice Chancellor under pressure and says that the Vice Chancellor is snatching away their rights.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Professor Sobti would also say, see, what is being done to him, what is his plight in the institution where he was in power.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has also talked to Professor Ghuman who told him that Professor Kohli has also reminded him about this. The Vice Chancellor informed that Professor Kohli is also coming back within six months. While citing another case, the Vice Chancellor said that a post was advertised and a person assumed a higher post in the department of Microbial Technology and after six months, he resigned from that post and went to his parent department i.e. Microbiology. When he was asked about it, he said that this will affect his seniority. Then, he (Vice Chancellor) told him that he was having a person in the waiting list and he has deprived him. If he wanted, he could refuse him to come back to his parent department. But if he would do that, then he would sit on hunger strike in front of his office. He said that he will be deprived of his right. He compelled me to hold two more interviews to reach to the same level which he had got in the open category. By

compelling him to do so, he got the public money and his time wasted and the University has to lose one teacher, but he insisted to get the promotion from the due date. The promotions are given from the back date because there is liberty in this University, otherwise one should be given promotion only from the date he submits his case for promotion and not before that. The Vice Chancellor said that he challenges all of them, bring an agenda item, the person who ask for promotion from the back date in spite of the fact that he was having the opportunity to apply earlier, which he did not do, his application for promotion would not be considered from the back date. It is a separate thing if the delay is from their side, but if the delay is from the person concerned because he has not filed the application in time, then how can he claim the promotion from the back date. It is not allowed in any national institution of the country where the government financial rules are operative and they are also bound by the Central Government Financial Rules. Is there anybody who have the courage to bring this proposal that they would not grant promotion from the back date, but they would not do it because they would not get votes.

- (9) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he wanted to say a small thing which is in his mind. He said that it is the total discretion and prerogative of the Vice Chancellor, but he is of the opinion that under the services, to keep the morale of the employee high is also must. He has been constantly seeing a person who has come here as Deputy Registrar under direct recruitment. He would ready to apologize if anybody could say something against about him. He joined here as Deputy Registrar and worked on many seats. Today also he is Deputy Registrar. If he is transferred six times in six months, it is wrong. If he is not doing his work properly, then he should be charge sheeted, tell him that he is not a good worker. This was also supported by some of the members. If it is so, then it is understandable. First he was transferred from Secrecy and posted in the Estt. Branch and from Estt. Branch to the College Branch, from the College Branch to the Accounts Branch and then to the Examination Branch. Now, it is heard that he is being transferred to Secrecy Branch. He said on oath that has neither not asked him to speak about him nor he will say. He is a very simple person. Nobody could say that he has done anything wrong ever, but he is suffering only because he resists to do wrong work.

- (10) The second point which he would like to say is about Mr. Munishwer Joshi who is a Deputy Registrar. He was seated in the office, his name plate was also installed there and he was very happy on that.

The Vice Chancellor intervned to say that he has never asked him to put his name plate. He (Mr. Joshi) has misquoted him, he just took him there and no orders were issued and nothing of the sort. In his enthusiasm, he did everything on his own.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that Mr. Munishwar Joshi told him that the Vice Chancellor and Controller of Examination has seated him there. And next day he thought that if he has to sit there, he should install his name plate there. But next day, they



posted him in the Estate Branch. He requested that at least they should take some care to deal with the officials in a proper way.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that if some name plate is already installed there, then there should also some orders to remove that name plate.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that when it was told to him that it was his office, it was implied.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that it is not correct and he had not even talked to the Registrar.

- (11) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that if they talk about the students, it is his duty to talk about the employees also in the same way as he talks about the students and the teachers. He challenged that if anybody could prove that there is any complaint against him (Mr. Tewari) or has harassed any person, he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) is ready to apologise.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the person should not be transferred before one year.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further pointed that due to the attitude of Professor R.C. Sobti, the stents were implanted to this person (Mr. Tewari) and is still working. Therefore, they should think on humanitarian grounds.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the person is a very honest man.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma also supported the person.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the person is very well acquainted with the work and none of the other Deputy Registrars could be equated with him.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the transfer was on the request of the Controller of Examinations.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he has seen the person for the last about 10-12 years and is the most intelligent person amongst the Deputy Registrars. He could be assigned some important posting and should be allowed to work at least for a year or two.

Some of the members also said that the person is a very honest man.

The Vice-Chancellor said that no punishment has been given to the person by way of transfer.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Principal I.S. Sandhu said that if the person is so much capable, then the Vice-Chancellor should have talked to him that he is being assigned a bigger responsibility. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further said that even the Finance and Development Officer had praised the person that he has got a good Deputy Registrar for the accounts branch. The

person worked there very honestly. There is no complaint of any kind from anybody against that person.

- (12) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that a student had applied for improvement under the golden chance and appeared in the theory examination. But, by chance, the communication for the practical examination could not reach in time from the University and the student missed the practical examination. The student has taken admission in Canada in the next semester commencing in January. The student has requested either to conduct a practical examination in the month of December by giving a special chance or his result be declared after considering the marks obtained by him in the regular examination held earlier.

Principal I.S. Sandhu pointed out that there are some similar students of B.Sc. (Agriculture).

The Vice-Chancellor said that if it is within his purview, he would do it as he is not against anybody. But it could not be done that if such thing is approved for a particular case, the others could also be granted the same benefit. Then, it would be problematic.

- (13) Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that for the last 2-3 years, the payment of practical examination has not been made to the teachers. He has also come to know that some official in the E&P section did not do anything and the person has been transferred. There is a need to fix the responsibility if the payment has not been made for the last 2-3 years and an enquiry should be conducted.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would seek an update from the Finance and Development Officer in this regard.

- (14) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that B.A. LL.B. integrated course is running at Panjab University Regional Centre, Ludhiana. There is a doubt that a new proposal is being made due to which the earlier duration of 25 hours per week would get reduced to 5 hours for the teachers teaching the subject of Economics, English, Sociology. There is a condition of the UGC that 16 hours per week teaching are required for getting promotion. Therefore, the teachers have a fear in their minds that it would affect their promotion. If any new scheme is to be implemented, it would also affect their services.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal to ask the teachers to give in writing on this issue.

Professor Pam Rajput said that she has received such a representation and would hand over the same to the Vice-Chancellor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the future of someone could not be brought to an end easily.

- (15) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal pointed out that there are so many Colleges which have not contributed even a penny to the Sports Committee. The teams of such Colleges are taking part in the sports. He along with the President of the Sports Committee

had requested that the results of such Colleges should be withheld until they pay the required amount. Lacs of rupees are outstanding against such Colleges.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that some Colleges including 6 Government Colleges are not paying this fund.

The Vice-Chancellor requested the Dean College Development Council to have a meeting of all the Principals, the minutes of which would be recorded before bringing the matter to the Syndicate so that a chance is given to the Colleges.

- (16) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal pointed out that Shri Deepak Kaushik had moved a resolution which has not been considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into it.

- (17) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that due to the semester system examination and other related work has increased manifold. The sports events are going on and the youth festivals have just concluded and the examinations are going to commence. The supplementary examinations have been delayed due to it and the results are also getting delayed. There is a lot of pressure of work on the Controller of Examinations as he is handling the charge of Dean College Development Council also. He requested to distribute the work.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a Dean College Development Council could be appointed.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the work of Dean College Development Council could be given to the Principal of a College or to a Professor of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would do it.

- (18) Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang said that he is talking about the approval. Under the NCTE new rules, there is a subject of Perspective in Education in which NET in Education is required. The NET qualified candidates be considered for the subjects of Pedagogy in Hindi, Punjabi which is as per the NCTE norms. He requested that some cases of approval in such subjects pending be got cleared.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang to provide a detailed note on the issue and suggest a solution also and the same would be examined.

- (19) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as the University invites the applications for grant of affiliation by 1<sup>st</sup> of November and the data in this regard is available by 1<sup>st</sup> January with the office of the Dean College Development Council. For this work, a time of two months is sufficient and they should start the process from 1<sup>st</sup> week of January so that the whole process is completed before the start of summer vacation. He requested that instead of the earlier practice of starting the process late, it should be started from the 1<sup>st</sup> week of January. He clarified that there would be no change in the dates of receiving the applications, etc.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has no objection as all the work related to it is to be done by the Senators.

- (20) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the pensioners have a feeling that it would be better if they are provided month-wise information regarding their pension instead of annually.

It was clarified that Form-16 is provided to all the pensioners.

- (21) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the significance of the meetings of the Board of Studies is very much as they are heading towards semester system of examination. About 50% of the teachers are able to attend these meetings as the teachers do not get the meeting notice in time. He requested that the General Branch be directed to get created a WhatsApp group by the Chairman so that the meeting notice could be delivered immediately. It would help in their participation in a better way.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

- (22) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there is a lot of confusion regarding holiday on 24<sup>th</sup> November which is to be observed on 23<sup>rd</sup>. The Punjab and Haryana High Court has declared it to be observed on 23<sup>rd</sup> and the same has been notified. He requested that the change of date of a holiday should be notified in time.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that actually the holiday was on 23<sup>rd</sup> but the University staff tries to attach the holidays with Saturdays/Sundays. The holiday is on 23<sup>rd</sup> in all other universities.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the religious moments should be celebrated on the day when these actually fall.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the holiday is on 23<sup>rd</sup> in the Punjabi University and Guru Nanak Dev University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that such a practice is being followed by the British as the birthday of the Queen is either celebrated either on Friday or Monday.

- (23) Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal requested to take up the issue of the non-attending Colleges.

- (24) Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as Dr. Subhash Sharma had raised the issue of a student of MBA from USOL, he would also hand over a similar case to the Registrar.

- (25) Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in one of the earlier meetings a decision was taken. The recording of the minutes was not proper as it had been pointed out by the office that something was not clearly audible. They had taken a decision that the charge of the Campus Sports would be with the Director, Sports instead of Dean Student Welfare. But it could not be recorded in the minutes. Therefore, it needed to be corrected.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay, fine.

- (26) Professor Navdeep Goyal raised the issue of grant of increments for Ph.D. This issue has been discussed a number of times and had also been approved. It was held up somewhere. Aggrieved by this, Dr. Nitin Arora and others filed a case in the Court. The reply filed by the University in the court in this case is wrong. In the reply, it is mentioned that the replying respondents have never denied/refused to the petitioners to give the said increment but on the other hand, the petitioners have never approached the replying respondent with any representation or the certificate of compliance. According to him, such a reply should not have been given by the University.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there was no need of mentioning it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the compliance is being sought that the teachers should certify that they have done their Ph.D. in accordance with the UGC Minimum Standards and Procedures for award of Ph.D. Degree Regulation, 2009 published in the Gazette of India dated July 11, 2009. Those persons who have done their Ph.D. before 2009 and have been appointed, it could not be applicable. There is a person named Dilbag Singh in the Department of Mathematics who is UGC FRP. He read out the letter of the UGC where it is mentioned that fresh recruitment and holding Ph.D. degree at the time of appointment under UGC FRP. His pay is to be fixed at the minimum pay band of Rs.15600-39100 with AGP of Rs.6000. He is also entitled to 5 non compounded increments since holding Ph.D. degree at the time of appointment amounting to Rs.3250/- as per Regulation 9.1 of UGC Regulations of 2010. Thus the initial pay would be Rs.18850/- + AGP of Rs.6000/- and other permissible allowances. This person has done his Ph.D. under the old regulations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could look in the files where he has noted all these things. That is why he is taking the matter again to the Board of Finance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal handed over some documents to be attached with the item for the Board of Finance.

The Vice-Chancellor said that when the representative of the MHRD comes to attend the meeting of the Board of Finance, he should at least endorse his (Vice-Chancellor) opinion. That is why one of the agenda items to be discussed with the Finance Secretary, U.T. is that if the 5 increments have been granted to the U.T. Colleges, then why the same is being denied to the teachers of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said then why an officer of the same department is adopting two different standards.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked whether they should still stick to that decision which has been filed in the court or they should withdraw it.

The Vice Chancellor said he does not know who has done this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the mistake is not from anyone, but they should withdraw the reply which was supported by Shri Jarnail Singh and some other members.

It was pointed out that it was signed by a Deputy Registrar to which the Vice Chancellor asked, who is that Deputy Registrar?

The Registrar explained to the Vice Chancellor about it and said that it was verified by the Deputy Registrar to which the Vice Chancellor said that they not read properly and signed blindly.

It was agreed to withdraw the affidavit filed in the Court with regard to the issue of grant of increments for Ph.D. degree.

- (27) Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said what Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang has said is a specific case. In that case the NCTE in the year 2014 has clearly made three categories, one is Perspective in Education for which NET in Education is required, second is Pedagogy subjects where NET in languages is allowed and third category is that of Librarians and Physical Education, in which they have not written anything about NET, but their qualifications is mentioned as B.Lib. It is a question of interpretation. This is a specific case. A Special Approval Committee has already been constituted by the Vice Chancellor.

When Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu intervened to say something, the Vice Chancellor asked him not to intervene in between and let Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma complete his version.

Continuing, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the said Approval Committee has given approval in June 2016 to a candidate having NET in Punjabi subject, but now in a latest meeting of the Committee, they have refused to grant such approval. He, therefore, requested that this is a specific case which may kindly be looked into. The NCTE has very specifically written that the 2014 guidelines would be applicable.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu intervened and said that he would like to say something relating to this issue. He said that Principal S.S. Sangha is the Chairperson of that Committee of which Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma is talking about. He is also of the opinion that the candidate having NET in the subject of Punjabi and Hindi should also be there as he also belongs to language subject. But, as told by Principal. S.S. Sangha, the Chairperson of the Committee has been Dean of Education. He said that this practice was being followed earlier, but now it is not in vogue in the Pedagogy subjects. He said Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma is referring to the 2014 guidelines whereas these have been amended in 2016.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that this is what he is saying and requested that they should get it interpreted.

The Vice Chancellor, however, said that if the permission is not received so far, it means that the old guidelines will continue.

Continuing, Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is a case of approval of Ms. Gurwinder Kaur as Principal of B.Ed. College. It is an appointment which was done two years back. He informed that she is already approved as Principal thrice. A similar case of approval of Ms. Jasbir Kaur of a College at Chella was done by the Vice Chancellor when there were elections.

The Vice Chancellor said he does not do that, but the case file is put to him after checking everything. He does not have time to study these things with microscopia. He expects the senior officers of the University, who are competent to do it, who deal with these things. They put it up to him after duly checking.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma further said that the candidate wrote to NCTE for clarification. There is a letter that he will hand over to him. They have categorically said for already approved Principals, this NCTE new regulations do not apply.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it is totally wrong. Their University is an autonomous body. If there is a rule 'once approved always approved' then it would be applicable to all, and not only on Gurwinder Kaur.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is a clarification from the NCTE.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu further said that the rule of 'once approved always approved' would be applicable to all the colleges though it is a Degree College of B.Ed. College or it may be a Principal or Lecturer. When Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he is not asking him, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he is part and parcel of that Committee and it is his duty to tell all this.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is your duty to hand over the documents relating to this case and it is his duty to get it examined.

(28) Professor Pam Rajput told the Vice Chancellor that he may have received the file of Board of Studies relating to governance and leadership. She requested the Vice Chancellor to clear that file to which the Vice Chancellor said that it is not a Syndicate matter.

(29) She further said that it was decided in the Syndicate in the case of Dr. Komal that a Committee would formed to see as to where the delay occurred and who is responsible for it. But that Committee has not yet been constituted. In the same Syndicate meeting, it was decided to examine the service rules of teachers, and if necessary, keeping in view of the sexual harassment, the necessary changes should be made. So the committee needs to be constituted at the earliest.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Pam Rajput to give it to him in writing once again.

Professor Pam Rajput said that it has already been decided to constitute a Committee.

The Vice Chancellor again requested her to give in writing, otherwise the things would get late because it would take long time to finalize the zero hour discussion.

- (30) Professor Pam Rajput further said that it her request to whole of the House and the D.R. (General) office that in one case where she sent her report as Chairperson of the Committee, and the verbatim of that report was published in the Tribune. Either one of them had leaked it. Even the commas or full stops have been put as written in the report. If some media persons ask them, then they should give a limited reply to them. The House should take note of it.

On being asked by Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma as to which case she is talking to, Professor Pam Rajput replied that it was regarding the case of Dr. Neelam Paul.

The Vice Chancellor said that the case of Dr. Neelam Paul goes upto the Central Ministers. No secrecy is exercised here. When the case goes from one person to the other, someone may took a snap of the document and send it through Whatsapp. So, in this technology driven age of 21<sup>st</sup> Century, there is no secrecy.

Professor Pam Rajput said then there is no need to send the document in a sealed cover.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is his duty to send it in a sealed cover, but these things will continuously happen.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the concern of Professor Pam Rajput is that it should not publish without discussion.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as several members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor requested not to blame the Deputy Registrar as the Deputy Registrar has no role in it.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that one of them may have done it because they move from one office to the other from 9.00 to 5.00.

Professor Pam Rajput said then they are taking this blame on themselves.

The Vice Chancellor said that when he goes to the Chancellor's Office, they say that the Panjab University office is also so as perforated as that of theirs.

**Condonation of delay in submission of Ph.D. thesis by Adish Kumar Verma**

**18.** Considered if, delay of 2 years, 8 month and 10 days as on 28.10.2017 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Adish Kumar Verma, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Design & Fine Arts, Department of Indian Theatre, be condoned w.e.f. 18.02.2015 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in his request dated 11.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXVIII**):-



- NOTE:**
1. Mr. Adish Kumar Verma was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Design & Fine Arts on 19.02.2009. He was granted three years extension upto 18.02.2015 by the DUI of submission of his thesis.
  2. The extract from the clause 17 of Revised Ph.D. Guidelines, duly approved by the Syndicate/Senate is reproduced below:

“The maximum time limit for submission of Ph.D. thesis be fixed as eight years from the date of registration, i.e. normal period: three years, extension period: three years (with usual fee prescribed by the Syndicate from time to time) and condonation period two years, after which Registration and Approval of Candidacy shall be treated as automatically cancelled.

**However, under exceptional circumstances condonation beyond eight years may be considered by the Syndicate on the recommendation of the Supervisor and Chairperson, with reasons to be recorded”.**

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

Shri Jarnail Singh requested to consider another similar case of condonation.

The Vice-Chancellor asked Shri Jarnail Singh to provide the details in writing which would be taken care of.

**RESOLVED:** That delay of 2 years, 8 month and 10 days as on 28.10.2017 beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Adish Kumar Verma, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Design & Fine Arts, Department of Indian Theatre, be condoned w.e.f. 18.02.2015 and he be allowed to submit his thesis within 15 days from the communication of the decision of the Syndicate, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in his request dated 11.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

### **Deferred item**

**19.** Considered the request of certain students of 5<sup>th</sup> semester, UIPS, Panjab University, duly forwarded by the Chairperson, UIPS with regard to conduct of the exam in December, 2017 for both the semesters i.e. 2<sup>nd</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> semester of Bachelor of Pharmacy (B.Pharma.)

**NOTE:** The Board of Control in its meeting dated 25.10.2017 has recommended that the request of the candidates is not admissible under the existing Rules & Regulations for

the Bachelor of Pharmacy (B.Pharm.) Course 2010-2011 quoted below:

The candidate will be admitted to semester 5 only if he/she has earned all the credits allocated to Semester 1 and 2.

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

### Deferred item

**20.** Considered minutes dated 24.10.2017 of the committee, to finalise the contents of the format of Ph.D. Certificate issued to the students for Ph.D. Programme after July, 2009.

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

**Minutes dated 06.09.2017 of the Committee to look into Rules of promotion of Laboratory & Technical Staff of Panjab University and to consider the promotion case of Shri Varinder Kumar, and Shri Sanjeev Verma**

**21.** Considered the deferred Item No. 36 of the Syndicate meeting dated 23.09.2017 relating to minutes dated 06.09.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to look into Rules of promotion of Laboratory & Technical Staff of Panjab University and to consider the promotion case of Shri Varinder Kumar, Sr. Technician (G-II)/A.T.O. of UICET and case of Shri Sanjeev Verma, Junior Technician (G-IV) working in UICET.

**NOTE:** 1. A copy of the circular dated 22.07.1994, 24.02.1998, 05.02.1997, 10.07.2013 and 10.05.2017 with regard to the promotion policy for laboratory/technical staff and amendments made from time to time in that existing policy are enclosed.

2. The minutes dated 06.09.2017 were before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Item 36) and it was resolved that consideration of the Item be deferred.

Professor Navdeep Goyal pointed out that certain issues needed to be looked into and, therefore, suggested that the matter be referred back to the Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That the matter be referred back to the Committee to have a re-look.

**Patent License Agreements between Panjab University and Hitech Formulations Pvt. Ltd., Chandigarh**

**22.** Considered if, the following Patent License Agreements (**Appendix-XXIX**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Hitech Formulations Pvt. Ltd., Principal Offices at 213, Industrial Area, Phase-I, Chandigarh, be executed:

a) Indian Patent Application No. 2074/DEL/2014, titled, 'Nanostructured Lipidic-Polymeric Pharmaceutical Composition encapsulating Drugs';

- b) US Patent Application No. US 14/371,338, titled, 'A Process for Preparing Solid Lipid Sustained Release Nanoparticles for Delivery of Vitamins' and
- c) Indian Patent Application No. 79/DEL/2012, titled, 'Solid Nanolipidic Particulates of Vitamin D3 and Retinoic Acid (RA)'

**RESOLVED:** That the following Patent License Agreements (**Appendix-XXIX**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh and Hitech Formulations Pvt. Ltd., Principal Offices at 213, Industrial Area, Phase-I, Chandigarh, be executed:

- a) Indian Patent Application No. 2074/DEL/2014, titled, 'Nanostructured Lipidic-Polymeric Pharmaceutical Composition encapsulating Drugs';
- b) US Patent Application No. US 14/371,338, titled, 'A Process for Preparing Solid Lipid Sustained Release Nanoparticles for Delivery of Vitamins' and
- c) Indian Patent Application No. 79/DEL/2012, titled, 'Solid Nanolipidic Particulates of Vitamin D3 and Retinoic Acid (RA).

**Recognition of  
Defence Institute of  
High Altitude  
Research as Research  
Centre**

**23.** Considered recommendation (No.4) dated 13.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXX**) of the Committee that Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh, be recognised as Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh in the following subjects.

1. Pharmaceutical Sciences under the Faculty of UIPS
2. Zoology under the Department of Zoology

**NOTE:** A copy of letter No.480/RDC dated 17.10.2017 enclosed (**Appendix-XXX**)

**RESOLVED:** That recommendation (No.4) dated 13.09.2017 of the Committee for recognition of Defence Institute of High Altitude Research (DIHAR), DRDO, c/o APO Leh, DIHAR Base Lab, Chandigarh, as Research Centre of Panjab University for pursuing research work leading to Ph.D. Degree of Panjab University, Chandigarh in the following subjects, **as per Appendix**, be approved:

1. Pharmaceutical Sciences under the Faculty of UIPS
2. Zoology under the Department of Zoology

**Minutes dated  
07.09.2017 of the  
Committees of  
Publication Bureau**

**24.** Considered:

- (i) minutes dated 07.09.2017 (Item No. 1 to 7) (**Appendix-XXXI**) of the Advisory Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, regarding the enhancement of the quality of the books etc. published by the Publication Bureau of the University.
- (ii) minutes dated 07.09.2017 (Item No. 1 to 2) (**Appendix-XXXI**) of the Committee constituted by

the Vice-Chancellor, to enhance the income of the Publication Bureau through direct sale of the prescribed textbooks and regarding change in designation of the Manager, Publication Bureau.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 07.09.2017 of the Committees, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Letter No.PFC/JAC/2017/361 dated 27.10.2017 received from Punjab Financial Corporation, Jalandhar, regarding Loan account: M/s Chopra Industrial Corporation, Jalandhar**

**25.** Considered letter No.PFC/JAC/2017/361 dated 27.10.2017 received from Punjab Financial Corporation, Jalandhar, regarding Loan account: M/s Chopra Industrial Corporation, Jalandhar, a partnership concern of Shri Vijay Kumar Chopra S/o Shri Prem Nath Chopra.

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.6.2017 (Para 9) considered the letter dated 31.05.2017 from Chairperson, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC in respect of Professor Vijay K. Chopra and resolved that a Committee including Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi and Dr. Mohammad Khalid be constituted to follow up the cases of misappropriation of funds of Punjab Financial Corporation by Professor Vijay K. Chopra.

The report of the above said Committee was considered by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.09.2017 (Para 23) and resolved that legal opinion be sought as to what kind of action could be initiated against Professor V.K. Chopra.

2. Legal opinion is awaited.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a letter has since been received from the Punjab Financial Corporation, Jalandhar stating that a loan was taken and the pending case was settled in 2016 under a special scheme. The said loan was indeed taken by Professor V.K. Chopra on behalf of that company.

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

**Recommendation dated 30.10.2017 of the Administrative and Academic Committee of PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib regarding re-appointment of Assistant Professors**

**26.** Considered recommendation dated 30.10.2017 (**Appendix-XXXII**) of the Administrative and Academic Committee, of PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib that the following three Assistant Professors, be reappointed as such (without NET qualification) in the subject of Computer Science and Applications at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for the remaining period of odd semester of session 2017-2018, i.e. from 31.10.2017 to 10.12.2017 and for even semester of session 2017-18 i.e. from 08.01.2018 to 18.05.2018:

1. Mr. Ranveer S/o Shri Amarnath
2. Mr. Gagan Madaan S/o Shri Darshan Lal

## 3. Ms. Prinka Rani D/o Shri Suresh Kumar

**RESOLVED:** That recommendation dated 30.10.2017 of the Administrative and Academic Committee, of PURC, Sri Muktsar Sahib that the following three Assistant Professors, be reappointed as such (without NET qualification) in the subject of Computer Science and Applications at Panjab University Regional Centre, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for the remaining period of odd semester of session 2017-2018, i.e. from 31.10.2017 to 10.12.2017 and for even semester of session 2017-18 i.e. from 08.01.2018 to 18.05.2018 on the recommendation as per the decision of Board of Finance in such cases, **as per Appendix**, be approved:

1. Mr. Ranveer S/o Shri Amarnath
2. Mr. Gagan Madaan S/o Shri Darshan Lal
3. Ms. Prinka Rani D/o Shri Suresh Kumar

**Deferred item**

**27.** Considered request dated 27.06.2017 of Shri Ram Nath, Father in Law of Ms. Yogita Sarohi, Assistant Professor, P.U. Regional Centre Kauni, for her transfer to Panjab University, Chandigarh as a special case duly forwarded by Education Officer vide letter No. 1-1/2016 (VIP Ref/SU-I) dated 19.09.2017 University Grant Commission, New Delhi along with letter No. F.17-1/2017-U.II dated 25.07.2017 of Under Secretary, MHRD, Department of Higher Education, Government of India.

**NOTE:** The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate dated 01/15/28 & 29.05.2016 (Para 76), has approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 21.07.2016 regarding framing a policy for transfer of faculty within the Panjab University System. Accordingly, circular has been issued to the concerned quarters vide No.8236-8936/Estt. I dated 26.08.2016 (Appendix-XXV).

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

**Assignment of Fellow to the Faculties**

**28.** Considered that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name:

Professor (Dr.) J.K. Goswamy Secretary, PUTA University Institute of Engineering & Technology Panjab University Chandigarh	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Medical Sciences</li> <li>2. Languages</li> <li>3. Engineering &amp; Technology</li> <li>4. Business Management and Commerce</li> </ol>
---	---

**NOTE:** Letter dated 07.11.2017 along with proforma for assignment of faculties received from Dr. J.K. Goswamy, Secretary, PUTA is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIII**).

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the following Fellow be assigned to the Faculties mentioned against his name:

Professor (Dr.) J.K. Goswamy Secretary, PUTA University Institute of Engineering & Technology Panjab University Chandigarh	1. Medical Sciences 2. Languages 3. Engineering & Technology 4. Business Management and Commerce
---	---

**Outcome submitted by  
Professor Pam Rajput  
in the case of Dr.  
Neelam Paul**

**29.** Considered the outcome (**Appendix-XXXIV**) submitted by Professor Pam Rajput in the case of Dr. Neelam Paul, Associate Professor, Department of Music, pursuant to decision of the Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 (Para 15) (**Appendix-XXXIV**).

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

Professor Navdeep Goyal said simply this item has to go the Senate Meeting. She (Dr. Neelam Paul) did not act upon the advice of Senate. A Committee of Syndicate was constituted and it tried and gave its report. The report is to be discussed by the Senate only.

The Vice-Chancellor said that PUTA is saying that excess is being committed to the teacher and these matters might be settled at the university level and not sent to the Syndicate. Now, Dr. Neelam Paul's case is handled by the then President, PUTA and all the ex-Presidents of PUTA. The Committee comprised of the Dean University Instruction, the then present PUTA, President and all the ex-Presidents of PUTA. The only person who has not dealt with her, is the present President of PUTA. Otherwise the matter has been dealt with by what they are desiring it to do. He (Vice Chancellor) thinks that it is not an appropriate demand by PUTA that cases of teachers would not be sent to the Governing Body because the Governing Body is the appointing body. It has no sense of doing that. In any case whatever the recommendations were regarding Dr. Neelam Paul, they were handled by committees comprising PUTA President and ex-Presidents of PUTA. When everything had been decided by Dr. Neelam Paul in February 2016, she lodged the second complaint. On her second complaint, the recommendation of the committee at that time was that she has defamed the Vice-Chancellor, she has defamed her colleagues, so disciplinary action must be taken against her. They did not initiate any disciplinary action against her because she took the matter so ahead that she gave a legal notice to the Chancellor. As she gave the legal notice to the Chancellor, so Justice Anand Committee was formed. Whatsoever issues were referred to the Justice Anand Committee, all those issues got proved against her. Later on, it is being propagated by her as if Syndicate is trying to victimise her. It is a very strange thing. Again in her case, she is seeking promotion from 2009. Whatever she has submitted, she was not having that. She was offered to submit her data after 2009 and she would be given promotion form the date when it would be due to her. She did not want to do that. This case was inherited by him from Professor Sobti. Now, it is 2017, but she has not submitted her updated CV.

When he would go after completing his term, she would submit her case and hope that with the assistance of PUTA and with the help of sympathetic electorally conscious members of the Senate, the same would be passed. If not granted from 2009, it would be granted from

2010 and she would get all the back wages accordingly. That person does not deserve to be even considered for next promotion, considering what she has done. Some exemplary message has to be sent, so the Syndicate might take a conscious call whether to debar such a person for being considered for promotion in view of what she has done and the disgrace she has brought to the university. To give a legal notice to the Chancellor of the University for no reason at all, is not a small thing. It is not a small thing that she engaged in fraud as she did not go to the conference, but everybody wants to protect her. What the Governing Body of the University is doing? They are protecting those people who are violating everything.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that she (Dr. Neelam Paul) did not go to the Allahabad to attend the Conference.

The Vice-Chancellor said that neither she did not go to Allahabad to attend the Conference nor did she go anywhere else. It is a challenge to the academic governance of this University. Do they waste taxpayer's money like this? Though much money is not involved and only one increment would be granted for promoting somebody. But, what they are governing. He said, let it go to the Senate.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired if it would directly go to the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that she has disobeyed the Senate and Syndicate has tried to implement the decision of the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they would mention that she has disobeyed the Senate.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they have to write something and then forward it to the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Syndicate had expressed concern on this. Simply, she should express apology or regret and nothing else.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in case she expresses her apology, the Vice Chancellor would have forgiven her.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what he could do, to which Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that to forgive someone is also an act of greatness.

**RESOLVED:** That the Syndicate expressed its anguish over the disobedience of the directions of the Senate by Dr. Neelam Paul, the matter be reported to the Senate.

**Extension in term of appointment of Professor Deepti Gupta, as Dean of International Students**

**30.** Considered if, the term of appointment of Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies, as Dean of International Students, be extended for one more year w.e.f. 20.11.2017.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 1, page 108 of P.U. Calendar, Volume I, 2007, reads as under:

“The Senate on the recommendations of the Syndicate, may, from time to time, appoint one of the University Professors to hold the office of Dean of Foreign Students. The term of appointment shall be for one year, renewable from year to year, but the maximum period shall not exceed three years (consecutively). The amount and nature of the allowance to be granted to the Dean of Foreign Students for performing the duties attached to the Office shall be determined by the Syndicate at the time of his/her appointment.”

2. Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies was appointed as Dean of International Students w.e.f. 12.11.2015 till further orders. However, after completion of one year, her term of appointment as such was extended for one more year w.e.f. 13.11.2016 on the same terms and conditions.
3. The term of Professor Deepti Gupta, as Dean of International Students has been extended upto the date of Syndicate meeting i.e. 19.11.2017 by the Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate.
4. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXV**).

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the term of appointment of Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies, as Dean of International Students, be extended for one more year w.e.f. 20.11.2017.

**Enquiry report submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba in the case of Shri Charanjit Singh**

**31.** Considered

- (i) the enquiry report dated 12.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXXV-A**) submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Enquiry Officer with regard to charges levelled against Shri Charanjit Singh, Junior Mechanical Engineer, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U.
- (ii) if, the enquiry report is accepted, the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent official-Shri Charanjit Singh, Junior Mechanical Engineer, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., be decided.

**NOTE:** 1. As per rule 1.1 (II) appearing at page 74 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the post of Junior Mechanical



Engineer held by Shri Charanjit Singh is a Class 'B' post; and

2. As per Regulation 3.1 appearing at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Syndicate is the appointing authority of Class 'B' employees and Regulation 3.3 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 speaks that the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.
3. The minor and major penalties stand defined under rule 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
4. A detailed office note enclosed **(Appendix-XXXV-A)**.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while explaining about the case said that Shri Charanjit Singh went abroad. He was helpless as his daughter was very small. He applied for leave but leave was not sanctioned. His small daughter was in Canada. He was under the impression that his brother-in-law would take care of his daughter but he could not manage. He was back in India well in time. It is right that he did the mistake for which he should be given warning or minor punishment. He was not allowed to join the office and he was not being paid salary.

Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he was not allowed to join his duty in the Dental College by the Director Dr. Ashish Jain. He said that should be allowed to join the duty.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that he was reporting daily and sits in the Establishment Branch.

Professor Pam Rajput said that keeping in view his small daughter, he might be allowed to join the office and warning be given to him.

Members were of the opinion that he may be allowed to join his duty after giving him warning or minor punishment. The period on which he remained absent without sanction of leave, may be treated as leave without pay.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should sanction him the leave after censure and also if he tenders apology for his unauthorised absence.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. the enquiry report dated 12.09.2017 submitted by Shri S.S. Lamba, Enquiry Officer with regard to charges levelled against Shri Charanjit Singh, Junior Mechanical Engineer, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., **as per Appendix**, be accepted;

2. the minor penalty of 'censure' be imposed on Shri Charanjit Singh;
3. he be allowed to join duty after he tenders apology for his unauthorised absence;
4. he be treated on duty except for the period he remained absent without sanction of leave and he be granted leave without pay for the period he remained absent.

**Reply dated  
14.10.2017 submitted  
by Shri Komal Singh**

**32.** Considered reply dated 14.10.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVI**) of Shri Komal Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, duly forwarded by Chairperson, Department of Public Administration, Panjab University, in response to the show cause notice No.6821/Estt. dated 03.10.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVI**), served to him, pursuant to the decision of the Senate meeting dated 10.09/24.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

**NOTE:** The Senate in its meeting dated 10.09/24.09.2017 has considered and accepted the PUCASH report and has also decided to place Dr. Komal Singh, Department of Public Administration under suspension. Accordingly, Dr. Komal Singh has been placed under suspension with immediate effect under chapter IV (vii) Part VI, Rule 1.1 page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, vide order No.6806-20/Estt.I dated 03.10.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVI**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that PUCASH report has been submitted. Clarifying his position, Dr. Komal Singh has written that he has not done anything. Syndicate has no authority on that. Senate has already taken decision. The reply of show cause notice submitted by Dr. Komal Singh might be referred to the Senate for further action.

The Vice-Chancellor said that okay, the matter be referred to the Senate

**RESOLVED:** That the matter be referred to the Senate.

**Deferred item**

**33.** Considered e-mail dated 05.11.2017 received from Professor Rajesh Gill, with regard to non supply of information as sought by her vide letters dated 24.07.2017, 19.09.2017 and 09.10.2017, respectively.

**NOTE:** An office note is enclosed.

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

**Request dated  
19.09.2017 of Shri  
Shashank Anand, IPS**

**34.** Considered request dated 19.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVII**) of Shri Shashank Anand, IPS, with regard to migration from M.D. University, Rohtak to Panjab University, Chandigarh, for continuing 3 year LL.B. (Hons.) Evening Programme 5<sup>th</sup> semester.

- NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor has referred the matter to Syndicate to evaluate this request for migration, Evening Classes in 3 year Law shall continue upto the next academic year i.e. 2018-19. If, allowed to migrate, the applicant can, in principle, complete V & VI semester upto the end of 2018-19.
2. A copy of the minutes of the joint meeting of Academic and Administrative Committee dated 29.09.2017 (item No. 3) along with minutes of the joint meeting of the Board of control and Academic Committee dated 24.10.2017 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVII**).
3. A copy of Rules relating to migration of students from a law college affiliated to another University to the Department of Laws of the Panjab University, available at pages 296-97 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016 is enclosed (**Appendix-XXXVII**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for this year, it is not possible to allow the migration to which the Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

The Vice-Chancellor said in next year it would be rarest of the rare cases because Evening Law Course would be closed. It would be last chance for him. But if he (Shri Shashank Anand) is transferred out of Chandigarh then he will not do it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma asked if they have deferred the item.

Sh. Jarnail Singh said that if Sh. Shashank Anand applies next year, then would be considered.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said if Shri Shashank Anand applies next year, then it would be seen.

Sh. Jarnail Singh said that if Sh. Shashank Anand transferred to some other place, then would not be considered.

The Vice-Chancellor said if he is transferred to some other place, his request will not be accepted

**RESOLVED:** That the request dated 19.09.2017 of Shri Shashank Anand, IPS, with regard to migration from M.D. University, Rohtak to Panjab University, Chandigarh, for continuing 3 year LL.B. (Hons.) Evening Programme 5<sup>th</sup> semester be accepted for the session 2018-19, provided he continues to be posted at Chandigarh.

At this point of time, the Vice-Chancellor apprised the members that he received 5-6 letters from Professor Rajesh Gill regarding misappropriation of books and intended waiver by Professor Pam Rajput, a sitting Fellow. The Vice Chancellor said that he will send these letters to them.

Professor Pam Rajput asked the Vice Chancellor as to how many books have been waived off by him.

The Vice Chancellor said that Xerox copies of letters be got done and distributed to all the member. Since the Xerox copies were available, the same were distributed to the members. The Vice Chancellor said that these letters would be discussed in the next meeting

**Proposal dated  
07.11.2017 for  
providing facilities to  
transgender students**

**35.** Considered proposal dated 07.11.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) with regard to the facilities to be provided to the transgender student's community in the Panjab University, pursuant to the minutes of the Committee dated 07.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) met under the Chairmanship of Additional Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh Administration.

**RESOLVED:** That the facilities to the transgender students community in the Panjab University, as contained in the proposal dated 07.11.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) pursuant to the minutes of the Committee dated 07.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXXVIII**) met under the Chairmanship of Additional Deputy Commissioner, Chandigarh Administration, be accepted.

**Deferred item**

**36.** Considered minutes dated 04.10.2017 regarding eligibility criteria/admission process for admission to M.Phil./Ph.D. programme.

**NOTE:** A copy of the circular No. 7959-8058/DUI/DS dated 10.10.2017 enclosed.

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

**Deferred item**

**37.** Considered status Report of the committee, constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.02.2017 (Para 12), to enquire into Quality of Construction over the last 16 years of the expansion of the Panjab University.

**NOTE:** 1. On the report of the Committee dated 8.9.2017, the Vice-Chancellor passed orders that obtain the PDF file alongwith annexure for making them available to the Senate members. Accordingly, the said file has been got prepared but yet to be sent to the Senate members.

As per orders of the Vice-Chancellor, the Chairperson of the committee was requested to provide a follow up report for meeting of the Syndicate so as to include this as an agenda item in Senate meeting of December 2017.

2. The main committee in its meeting dated 7.09.2017 constituted a sub-

committee to inspect the completed projects of the University. The meeting of the said committee was held on 8.11.2017. The SVC has requested the Committee to send the minutes and the photos at the earliest, vide letter dated 14.11.2017.

3. The meeting of the sub-committee to inspect the three ongoing project of the University was fixed for 13.11.2017, but the same could not be held due to lack of quorum. The same will now be held on 21.11.2017 as informed by the SVC vide letter dated 6.11.2017 and 13.11.2017.

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

**Condonation of delay  
in submission of Ph.D.  
thesis by Mr. Suresh  
Kumar**

**38.** Considered if, delay of 6 years, 1 month and 11 days beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Suresh Kumar, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, be condoned w.e.f. 20.02.2012 and he be allowed to submit his thesis by 31.03.2018, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in his request dated 26.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXXIX**).

- NOTE:**
1. Mr. Suresh Kumar was enrolled for Ph.D. in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology on 05.05.2003 and registered by Research Board in Engineering at its meeting held on 21.02.2006. He was granted extension for submission of his thesis upto 20.02.2012 by Research Board. He was required to submit his Ph.D. thesis upto 20.02.2012.
  2. During the meeting of the Syndicate dated 23.07.2017, Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang submitted the application of Mr. Suresh Kumar (**Appendix-XXXIX**).
  3. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XXXIX**).

**RESOLVED:** That the delay of 6 years, 1 month and 11 days beyond the period of six years (i.e. normal period of 3 years and extension period 3 years), for submission of Ph.D. thesis by Mr. Suresh Kumar, research scholar, enrolled in the Faculty of Engineering & Technology, be condoned w.e.f. 20.02.2012 and he be allowed to submit his thesis by 31.03.2018, as he could not submit his Ph.D. thesis due to the reasons as mentioned in his request dated 26.07.2017 (**Appendix-XXXIX**).

**Appointment of  
Director, Associate  
Director, Research  
Promotion Cell**

**39.** Considered minutes dated 16.11.2017 (**Appendix-XL**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for the appointment of Director, Research Promotion Cell (RPC) and Associate Director (RPC).

The Vice-Chancellor said that Research Promotion Cell has to be re-constituted. Procedure for re-constitution of the RPC is that three Senior-most Professors of the University would recommend the names for the post of Director, Research Promotion Cell and Associate Director, Research Promotion Cell. It is also there in the procedure that at one time, if there is Director from the Science subjects, then next time the Director would be from the non-science subjects.

Professor Navdeep Goyal wanted to know if this has been written somewhere to which the Vice Chancellor said, 'yes' it is written.

The Vice-Chancellor said that later on a Committee was appointed in which there were three senior Professors in addition to the Vice-Chancellor and Dean of University Instruction. So, he made a Committee comprising of Vice-Chancellor, Dean of University Instruction, three senior Professors, below the age of 60, namely, Professor Dinesh Gupta, Professor Shankarji Jha and Professor Nishtha Jaiswal. These three Professors are in order of seniority and on top list. The Committee of these five members considered the names of the those teachers which were received for this post. From Humanities Faculty only two names i.e. of Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal and Professor Sanjeev Sharma were received. The Committee selected the name of Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal, who was Associate Director last time, recommended her for the post of Director. Several names were received from Science Faculty and senior most of them was Professor V.R. Sinha. The Committee recommended Professor V.R. Sinha, senior-most Professor for the post of Associate Director. Now, names of four members were required i.e., two from Professors and two from Associate Professors. From Professors, the Committee selected the names of Professor Sanjeev Sharma and Professor C.N. Kumar who was a member last time also was selected for continuity. From Associate Professors, Dr. Navneet Kaur, Deptt. of Chemistry from Science Faculty. Day before yesterday, she was selected, for a prize on the basis of Best Performance. Dr. Purva Kansal, UBS was selected from Humanities Faculty.

Dr. Dalip Kumar asked as to who is senior among Professor V.R. Sinha and Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that there is no issue of seniority. Professor V.R. Sinha is senior in Science Faculty. But, this time, the turn is that of a person from Humanities. If Professor Sinha does not accept to serve. then he would come back to them.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said if it is written then they cannot do anything. Otherwise seniority-wise Professor Sinha is senior.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if Prof. Sinha accepts it, then he would serve as Associate Director for two . Since he would retire in the year 2022, so he can be a Director also later.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the following appointments be made to the Research Promotion Cell:

- |  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. Professor Ramanjit Kaur Johal<br>Dept. of Public Administration | Director           |
| 2. Professor V.R. Sinha<br>UIPS                                    | Associate Director |
| 3. Professor Sanjeev Sharma<br>Director, UIAMS                     | Member             |
| 4. Professor C.N. Kumar<br>Dept. of Physics                        | Member             |
| 5. Dr. Navneet Kaur<br>Dept. of Chemistry                          | Member             |
| 6. Dr. Purva Kansal<br>UBS   | Member             |

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the appointment letter to these persons be issued, in anticipation of approval of the Senate.

**Letter dated  
06.11.2017 received  
from Professor R.C.  
Sobti for grant of HAG  
Grade of Professor**

**40.** Considered letter dated 06.11.2017 (**Appendix-XLI**) received from Professor Ranbir Chander Sobti, Vice Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow with regard to HAG Grade of Professor, as he had completed 10 years of Professorship in 2004

The Vice-Chancellor said that he did not know as to what reply should be given to Professor Sobti.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, Dr. Hardiljit Singh Gosal and the Vice Chancellor were of the opinion that at present nothing could be done in this case.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment senior professorship could not be implemented.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that Mrs. Smirit Irani had come to attend a meeting in Hotel Mountview, Chandigarh. She had given a statement that in future whosoever would be the Vice-Chancellor, particularly for Central Universities, he would be from the Senior Professors cadre.

The Vice-Chancellor said that UGC did not permit the Senior Professor Cadre.

Continuing, Dr. Dalip Kumar said in that system a person should have ten years Professorship and Senior Professorship would be given to 10% of the Professors. This provision is there in the UGC regulations to which the Vice Chancellor said that they did not allow it. Dr. Dalip Kumar wanted to know whether the regulations are required to be got allowed.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that financial implications are involved in it, so the permission OF mhrd could also be required to implement it.

**RESOLVED:** That request dated 06.11.2017 received from Professor Ranbir Chander Sobti, Vice Chancellor, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow for grant of HAG Grade of Professor, on completion of 10 years of Professorship in 2004 cannot be acceded as UGC did not respond to the plea of the University to let them introduce this grade for Panjab University faculty.

**Routine and formal matters**

**41.** The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(xvi)** on the agenda was read out, i.e.

**(i)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Rabia Narang, Assistant Professor (Temporary), at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, w.e.f. 17.07.2017 (F.N.) under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.

**NOTE:** 1. Rule 16.2 at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, reads as under:

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

2. Request dated 17.07.2017 of Ms. Rabia Narang duly forwarded by Director, PURC, Kauni is enclosed (**Appendix-XLII**). She was relieved from the PURC, Kauni w.e.f. 17.07.2017 (F.N.).
3. Ms. Rabia Narang was required to fulfill the condition of one month notice as mentioned in the above Rule. But she did not give the notice of one month. She has worked in the Centre upto 16.07.2017, thus, she was advised to deposit the salary of 14 days to meet with the requirement of one month salary in lieu one month notice. Accordingly, she has deposited the salary of 14 days vide receipt No.9-2017/1482 dated 08.09.2017.
4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XLII**).

**(ii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Sonia Kapoor, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), w.e.f. 30.10.2017 (A.N.) instead of 30.09.2017 i.e. the date of resignation as already approved by the Vice-Chancellor vide order dated 30.08.2017 (**Appendix-XLIII**) or so that her salary of one month may not be deducted, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.



**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 6, page 118, Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

2. Request dated 03.08.2017 and 01.09.2017 of Dr. Sonia Kapoor duly forwarded by the Director, UIET, to serve one additional month to complete the notice period of resignation is enclosed (**Appendix-XLIII**).
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XLIII**).

**(iii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and Senate, has accepted the resignation of Ms. Nidhi, Assistant Professor, University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), w.e.f. 29.12.2017, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 6, page 118, Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the

stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

2. Request dated 29.09.2017 Ms. Nidhi, duly forwarded by the Coordinator, UIET, vide which she was written that her request be consider as 3 months notice, is enclosed **(Appendix-XLIV)**.

3. An office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XLIV)**.

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Leave Case Committee dated 18.09.2017 (Item I & II) **(Appendix-XLV)** and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has granted:

(i) extension in Extra Ordinary Leave without pay to Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics, P.U., w.e.f. 17.08.2017 to 26.09.2017 only, i.e., within the stipulation of five years as laid down under Regulation 11 (G) at page 139-140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to enable him to continue to work as Associate Professor at South Asian University, New Delhi.

**NOTE:** 1. Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma, Associate Professor, Department of Mathematics was granted EOL without pay w.e.f. 31.05.2016 to 16.08.2017 by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 31.07.2016 (Para 48 R-vi).

2. Request dated 16.08.2017 of Dr. Kapil Kumar Sharma for extension in EOL upto 16.10.2017 enclosed **(Appendix-XLV)**.

(ii) study Leave with pay to Dr. Pradip Singh, Assistant Professor, Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, for two years w.e.f. 05.05.2017, under Regulation 11 (I) at page 140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, to pursue M.D.S. course in branch of Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital.

**NOTE:** 1. Dr. Pradip Singh is required to execute an Indemnity Bond on a non-judicial stamped paper of Rs.15/- before proceeding on leave.

2. He is also required to send six monthly report of progress in his studies. These reports shall reach the Registrar within one month of the expiry of six month of the Study leave failing which the payment of salary may be deferred till the receipt of such report/s. The other terms and conditions will be applicable under the above said regulation.
3. Request dated 29.09.2017 of Dr. Pradip Singh regarding his joining in MDS course is enclosed (**Appendix-XLV**).

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Academic and Administrative Committee dated 29.09.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the following criteria for admission to Ph.D. in Law:

1. Academic Record: 60%
  - (i) LL.B./B.A. LL.B. (Hons.)/  
B.Com. LL.B. or equivalent 20%
  - (ii) LL.M. Degree 40%
2. Scholarship/Fellowship
 

Award of any National Scholarship/ Fellowship including JRF, Inspire Fellowship or any other National Scholarship/Fellowship	10%
---	-----
3. Interaction with the candidate: 30%
  - (i) Marks for the Research Proposal (Written):10%
  - (ii) Interaction with the Committee : 20%

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes dated 01.11.2017 (**Appendix-XLVI**) of the committee, with regard to update the information regarding reserved categories (SC/ST, BC, PwD, Defence Category, Freedom Fighter, Riot Victim, Rural Area, Border Area, Kashmiri Displaced Persons, Single Girl Child, NCC/NSS/Skill in teaching Youth Welfare etc.) to be incorporated in the Hand Book of Information 2018.

(vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the admission guidelines (**Appendix-XLVII**) for NRI/Foreign National students seeking admission to UG/PG course at Panjab University for the session 2018-19 onwards.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 23.07.2017 (Para 34) (**Appendix-XLVII**) has approved the proposal of Professor Navdeep Goyal, regarding fee structure, that the guidelines for Foreign Nationals/NRI students seeking admission to Post Graduate/Undergraduate Courses for 2017-18, as that of the year 2016-17.

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes dated 01.11.2017 (**Appendix-XLVIII**) of the committee, with regard to finalization of the guidelines for the admission under 5% reserved category of sports for the session 2018-19.

**(ix)** The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the Committee dated 10.10.2017 duly forwarded by the Director, Research Promotion Cell vide letter dated 16.10.2017 and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the pre Ph.D. requirements in order to qualify for enrolment that:

1. In the areas of inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary research wherein more than one disciplines are involved, there is a requirement of equivalence of the syllabi. It is desired that the Academic Committee of the Centre or Department along with concerned Supervisor, it is desired whether the candidate with a particular background/degree has sufficient knowledge to pursue Ph.D. in the field in which he/she is seeking enrolment. The candidate can always make up the deficiencies with his personal efforts, Supervisor's support and the Pre-Ph.D. course work with additional assignments for further grooming the candidate. Relatively new inter-disciplinary Centres/Departments have Faculty with background from traditional subjects, and enrolment of students with different background will help in the growth of these interdisciplinary subjects as well as that of the Faculty.
2. For inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary research, equivalence of PG course content is not of much relevance and rather incongruous to the spirit of research in the modern era of science. Therefore, as such equivalence of candidate's PG course syllabus with that of highly specialized PG course being run by a Centre should not be considered as prerequisite for doing Ph.D.

**NOTE:** A copy of the minutes dated 10.10.2017 of the Committee is enclosed.

**(x)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the proposed schedule (**Appendix-XLIX**) for the By-Election of one ordinary Fellow by the Heads of Affiliated Arts Colleges for the remaining period of

the term 01.11.2016 to 31.10.2020, pursuant to the date of the By-Election i.e. 09.02.2018, approved by the Chancellor (**Appendix-XLIX**).

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

- (xi) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has extended the term of appointment of Professor Deepti Gupta, Department of English and Cultural Studies, as Dean of International Students upto the date of Syndicate meeting i.e. 19.11.2017.
- (xii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has re-appointed Ms. Shaffy Girdhar, Assistant Professor in Computer Science, on Contract basis, P.U. Constituent College, Sikhwala, Sri Muktsar Sahib w.e.f. the date she starts/started work for the session 2017-18, against the vacant posts or till the posts are filled in on regular basis whichever is earlier, at a fixed salary of Rs.30400/-on the same term and condition on which she was working earlier for the session 2016-17.
- (xiii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the promotion of Shri Varinder Kumar Sharma, Senior Technician/A.T.O. (G-II) as Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) at Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar University Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, P.U., in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100+GP Rs.5400/- with initial pay of Rs.21000/- plus allowances as per University rules, w.e.f. the date he reports for duty, against the vacant posts in said institute.
- (xiv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate and partial modification to the office orders No.7163-70/Estt.-I dated 23.10.2017 (**Appendix-L**) has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Mr. Sushen (Son) of Late Dr. (Ms.) Archana, Associate Professor of History, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC (who expired on 26.08.2017):
- (i) Gratuity (in the event of death while in service) as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183 & 186 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.
  - (ii) Ex-Gratia Grant under Rule 1.1 at page 141 of Panjab University Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
  - (iii) In terms of decision of the Syndicate dated 08.10.2013, the payment of leave encashment will be made only for the number of days Earned leave as due to her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.
- (xv) To ratify the orders of the Vice-Chancellor with regard to appointment made as a special case of the following retired

employees, for scrutiny work for the various examinations, to avoid the audit objection:

1. Shri Kamlesh Kumar Sagar, A.R. (Retd.)
2. Shri J.S. Baweja, Reader (Retd.)

**NOTE:** 1. A copy of the order issued vide No.4828-33/DRE dated 31.08.2017 is enclosed **(Appendix-LI)**.

2. A copy of the decision of the Syndicate dated 26.09.2010 (Para 5) enclosed **(Appendix-LI)**.

**(xvi)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Class 'B' employees for further period i.e. upto 31.12.2017, on the previous terms & conditions:

No.	Sr.	Name of the employee/ designation	Department
1.		Shri Birender Singh, Driver	D.U.I.'s Office
2.		Shri Surmukh Singh, Work-Inspector	Construction Office
3.		Shri Bikram Singh, Driver	Vice-Chancellor's Office

**While referring to sub-item R-(ix),** Professor Navdeep Goyal said that pre Ph.D. requirements are not clear/proper. For example, where the candidates would do pre Ph.D. course, where they would give the presentation every time, etc.? It is a matter which needed deliberations.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this item be deferred and would be brought in the meeting of Syndicate to be held on December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017.

**While referring to sub-item R-(xii),** Professor Navdeep Goyal said that so far as he knows, there are no students in the subject of Computer Science at Sikhwala College. Would the College appoint the teacher?

The Vice-Chancellor said that Computer Science is such a subject which is needed at any time as e-literacy is to be provided to everyone. So, at least a teacher in the subject of computer science is required everywhere to provide the e-literacy and e-skills.

Principal I.S. Sandhu pointed out that during the last 5 years there is not even a single student of PGDCA and BCA.

The Vice-Chancellor suggested that skill development lectures should be delivered by the teachers of computer science to the all the persons.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that in the subject of Mathematics and Public Administration, there is no teacher in his College and he had asked the students to study the same on their own.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to ask the Computer teacher to teach the subject of computer under the choice-based credit system to every student. No fee be charged from the students learning the e-skills. Let the teacher teach for a bit literacy. If the person is having the mathematics background, he/she could teach the subject of Mathematics.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the teacher has just been transferred from the College where BCA and PGDCA courses are running. He said that the teacher has been transferred on the recommendation of some person and she had even drawn the salary for the maternity period even being appointed on contractual basis. However, he is not against the person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the teacher should show her worth by taking the classes in the next semester otherwise her services could be discontinued. She should take the classes on skill developments and motivate the people to attend those classes. She would devise a course related with computer science and deliver at least two lectures a day which could be attended by anybody suitable to them to enhance their ability.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the information contained in **Items R-(i) to R-(iv), R-(vi) to R-(viii), R-(x) to R-(xvi)** be ratified;
- (ii) the information contained in **Item R-(v)** be treated as withdrawn; and
- (iii) the information contained in **Item R-(ix)** be deferred.

At this stage, some members raised the following general issues:

- (1) Principal I.S. Sandhu said that Principal N.R. Sharma would submit a document to the Vice-Chancellor. However, he would like to point out a problem being faced by the Colleges. They need to provide education to the SC/ST students. About 10-12% students by just paying a fee of Rs.230/- get prepared the identity card of the College which gives them a right to entry and roam about in the College. In the College at Sikhwala, there are about 58 students who have not filled the admission form. Such number of students is more than that of the College he is heading. He suggested that to avoid such things as the Government Colleges charge PTA fee, they could charge the fee from SC/ST which could be later on reimbursed by the Government to the students. They have a claim of Rs.32 lacs at the College at Mohkam Khan towards the Government under this scheme whereas they have received

only Rs.16 lacs as fee from the students. For the last 2-3 years, the Government is not giving any claim due to which the Colleges are facing problems. If they charge the fee, it would amount to a total of Rs.48 lacs and the Colleges would survive. The Government could reimburse the same to the account as is being done for the private Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to submit a proposal in this regard.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that as per the Panjab University Calendar, the Principals have a power to appoint teachers for a period of 6 months. He suggested that they should start charging a PTA fund of Rs.1000/-. With this proposed fee of Rs.1000/- towards PTA funds and payment of Rs.230/- which at present the students are paying, the non-serious students would not take the admission. From the fund so collected, the Colleges would be able to hire the staff from PTA funds.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to submit a proposal in this regard which could be looked into.

- (2) The Vice-Chancellor further said that he had invited the Deputy Registrar (Establishment) as the advertisement has not yet been released. He requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to work on it to which he said that he would meet the D.R. (Estt). He requested Principal I.S. Sandhu to get the recruitment done during his term otherwise there would not be teachers in the Constituent Colleges. At least 4-5 regular teachers be appointed in these Colleges who could share the burden of the Colleges. He is having about 6 months balance of his term.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that the recruitment could be done during the term of the Vice-Chancellor otherwise the posts would not be allowed to be filled up.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would take some time and he would be able to recruit the teachers for which Principal I.S. Sandhu would have to help him.

- (3) Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that there was a teacher of Punjabi who had a very good merit and qualification but he had not been appointed. He requested that since there are some vacant posts in the Colleges, the candidate be appointed there to avoid the court case.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that they have not appointed a teacher yet, if it is allowed the candidate could be appointed at the College at Balachaur.



The Vice-Chancellor requested Principal I.S. Sandhu and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma to send a proposal and if it is within his powers, he would do it.

## **Routine and formal matters**

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

**(i)** To note:

(i) the acknowledgement received from Shri N. Yuvaraj, IAS, Private Secretary to the Vice President of India, New Delhi, vide letter dated 27.09.2017 (**Appendix-LII**), with regard to felicitation conveyed to the Vice President of India & Chancellor, P.U., pursuant the Senate decision dated 10.09.2017.

(ii) the thanks letter dated 09.10.2017 (**Appendix-LII**) received from M. Hamid Ansari, Former Vice President of India & Chancellor of Panjab University, with regard to the felicitation conveyed pursuant to the Senate decision dated 10.09.2017.

**(ii)** The Vice-Chancellor has appointed Dr. Devinder Preet Singh as Associate Professor in Orthodontics & Dentofacial Orthopaedics at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, P.U., purely on temporary basis, against the vacant post, for the period of one year in the pay scale of Rs.37400-67000 + GP of Rs.8600/- + NPA and allowances as admissible as per University rules, under Regulation 5 (a) (i) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and has also been permitted to retain the lien for a period of one year, against his substantive post of Senior Lecturer in Dr. H.S.J. Institute at Dental Sciences & Hospital.

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

**(iii)** To note the action taken by the office (**Appendix-LIII**) in respect of the decision of the Syndicate dated 23.07.2017 (Para 17) regarding sanction of prosecution against Professor Om Prakash Katare, UIPS, P.U.

**(iv)** The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee dated 04.09.2017 (**Appendix-LIV**), has approved corrigendum fee-fund structure (**Appendix-LIV**) to be followed by the Degree Colleges affiliated to Panjab University for the session 2017-18 along with the mandatory conditions as

Syndicate Proceedings dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2017

intimated earlier vide letter No. 85015-85185 dated 22.05.2017.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 28.05.2017 (Para 36 R(xii)) (**Appendix-LIV**) has ratified the fee fund structure, to be followed by the degree Colleges affiliated to the Panjab University for the session 2017-18, would remain the same as that prevailed in the year 2016-17 with the condition that this decision would be applicable to constituent Colleges also.

(v) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits in respect of Late Shri Rajinder Kumar, Senior Assistant, Establishment Branch-I, P.U. who expired on 21.10.2017 while in service to Mrs. Sita Devi (Wife), who is the nominee of the deceased employee:-

Sr. No.	Benefit	Under Rule
1.	Gratuity (In the event of the death while in service)	Regulation 15.1 at page 131 of P.U., Calendar, Volume-I, 2007
2.	Ex-gratia Grant	Rule 1.1 at page 136 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009
3.	Earned leave encashment upto the prescribed limit	Rule 17.4 at page 96 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Dr. (Mrs.) Gauri Sharma Nee Pandit Professor Department of Evening Studies	24.11.1987	31.10.2017	(i) Gratuity as admissible under Regulation 3.6 and 4.4 at pages 183-186 of P.U. Calendar Volume-I, 2007; and  (ii) In terms of decision of Syndicate dated 8.10.2013, the payment of Leave encashment will be made only for the number of days of Earned Leave as due to her but not exceeding 180 days, pending final clearance for accumulation and encashment of Earned Leave of 300 days by the Government of India.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 2017

--	--	--	--	--

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Ms. Usha Rani Deputy Registrar Secrecy Branch	03.08.1978	31.10.2017	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Avtar Singh Bhandari Sub Divisional Engineer (Civil) Construction Office, P.U.	05.10.1982	30.09.2017	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
3.	Shri Samil Masih Superintendent Examination-II	09.05.1980	31.10.2017	
4.	Ms. Indu Prabha Madaan Senior Assistant Accounts Branch	13.02.1984	31.10.2017	
5.	Shri Ram Nath Carpenter (Technician G-I) Construction Office, P.U.	02.04.1993	30.09.2017	
6.	Shri Kanahaya Lal Mason (Technician G-I) Construction Office, P.U.	02.04.1993	31.10.2017	
7.	Shri Mohan Singh Daftri Accounts Branch (Fee-Checking)	23.05.1973	31.10.2017	

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

**(viii)** To note the message dated 09.11.2017 (**Appendix-LV**) received from Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu, Vice President of India & Chancellor, P.U. regarding greetings to the Vice-Chancellor, faculty, staff and students for the New Year.

**(ix)** The Vice-Chancellor has approved the appointment of Dr. Kamlesh Narwana as Assistant Professor in History, purely on temporary basis, at P.U. Rural Centre, Kauni, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for one year w.e.f. the date she joins, against the vacant sanctioned post or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP of Rs.6000/- plus allowances as admissible, as per University rules, under Regulation 5 (a) (i) at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

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

**(x)** In pursuance of orders dated 30.10.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 22726 of 2017 (Dr. Gauri Sharma Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) in the same terms as LPA 1505-2016 and posted the matter for hearing along with said LPA on 09.11.2017. The LPA No.1505 of 2016 (Dr. Amrik Singh Ahluwalia & Anr. Vs. Panjab University & Others) entire connected bunch of matters relating to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is now fixed for hearing on 29.11.2017.

(i) the Vice-Chancellor, has ordered that Dr. Gauri Sharma, Professor of History, Department of Evening Studies-MDRC, be considered to continue in service w.e.f. 01.11.2017 as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of LPA No.1505 of 2016 & others similar cases and salary be paid which she was drawing as on 31.10.2017 without any break in the service, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone), as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of this case filed by her. The payment to her will be adjustable against the final dues to her for which she should submit the undertaking.

(ii) all those teachers residing in the University Campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to her by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble High Court on the next date of hearing.

- (xi)** As per authorization given by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 7, 8 & 9), the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Affiliation Committee dated 23.10.2017 (**Appendix-LVI**) has not granted the temporary extension of affiliation for BHMS course-1<sup>st</sup> year (50 seats) for the session 2017-18, running at Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital, Sector-26, Chandigarh, which supersedes the earlier letter No. 6681-6700 dated 29.06.2017 vide which the College was granted the temporary extension of affiliation for the said course, pursuant to the order of CCH letter No. F.No. 17014/26/2013/EP (H) dated 31.08.2017 (**Appendix-LVI**) and no admission of the students will be allowed to be made by the College for the session 2017-18.

**NOTE:** A copy of office order No. Misc./A-6/13197-13216 dated 03.11.2017 issued in supersession of the office letter No. A-6/6681-6700 dated 29.06.2017 is enclosed (**Appendix-LVI**).

( G.S. Chadha )  
Registrar

Confirmed

( Arun Kumar Grover )  
VICE-CHANCELLOR