

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 23<sup>rd</sup> September 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. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
12. Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu
13. Dr. Subhash Sharma
14. Dr. Vipul Kumar Narang
15. Col. (Retd.) G.S. Chadha Registrar ... (Secretary)

Professor Pam Rajput, Shri Varinder Singh, Shri Lakhmir Singh, DPI (Colleges), Punjab and Shri Rakesh Kumar Popli, Director Higher Education, U.T., Chandigarh 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 –

Highly regarded and profusely honoured, the World Renowned Nephrologist Professor Kirpal Singh Chugh of PGIMER on September 17, 2017. He was an alumnus of PU and the first qualified Indian nephrologist. He obtained MD with specialization in urinary diseases as 'Nephrology'. He has been a member of our Senate from 1996-2000.

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

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

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

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

- i) Shri Prakash Javadekar ji, Minister of Human Resource Development, released the 'SWACHHTA' Ranking 2017 of Higher Educational Institutions in New Delhi on September 11, 2017 at an Award Ceremony held in New Delhi. Post-Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector-11, bagged the 6<sup>th</sup> position and Panjab

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

University, Chandigarh stands placed at the 7<sup>th</sup> position amongst 174 Higher Education Institutions which were shortlisted for evaluation in a contest for promoting Hygiene & Cleanliness under Swachh Bharat Abhiyan. 4500 Higher Educational Institutions had participated in this national contest by providing data voluntarily for this. Our inspection happened on a day when it rained very very heavily in Chandigarh. So it is a matter of great satisfaction that the two institutions managed to get position on a day when it was very difficult to defend against heavy odds.

- ii) Dr. Kiran Bedi, Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor of Puducherry and alumnus PU, delivered Prof. J.C. Anand Memorial Oration hosted by Department of Political Science and interacted with the students who have joined the new courses on 'Leadership and Governance' and blessed them on September yesterday. She has expressed a desire that she would like to come and teach the students for few days. The new students who joined this year and would like to be continuously associated with this course as the time would go back. It would be honour for the University. If you permit me, he would get a CV from her for offering her the position of Honorary Professorship at least for the time being. This course has been implemented because she has insisted that this University is the peoples' University where everything happens by election and the students leaders aspire to be a part of the national politics, they should be sent ahead by educating them properly. The whole of India comes under the jurisdiction of national politics, therefore, they should be taught about the different political parties from different regions of India. They should be taught about the federal structure and the constitution of every party and the way they are working.
- iii) 6<sup>th</sup> Panjab University Foundation Day Lecture will be delivered by Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair Professor Shri Kailash Satyarthi, Nobel Laureate, on October 12, 2017 in the University Auditorium. He was honoured with Doctor of Law (*Honoris Causa*) during the 64<sup>th</sup> PU Annual Convocation held on March 14, 2015. He has only yesterday sent a message that he will spend full 24 hours staying in our Guest House. He will arrive on 12<sup>th</sup> morning and leave from here on 13<sup>th</sup> morning.
- iv) The Patent No.297380 for Non-Staining, Novel Lecithinised Coal Tarformulation has been granted to Professor O.P. Katare and his associates on September 14, 2017 for their innovation towards development of novel coltar nanotechnology based pharmaceutical product. TIFAC, New Delhi, Govt. agency along with Punjab State Council for Science & Technology has been instrumental in filing and processing of this Patent granted.
- v) Ms. Amanpreet Kaur, Ph.D. research scholar in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS)

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

has brought laurels to Panjab University by bagging Young Scientist Award for her research in the field of drug delivery at the 5<sup>th</sup> World Congress on Controversies, Debates and Consensus in Bone, Muscle and Joint Diseases (BMJD), held from August 31 to September 3, 2017 at Gold Coast, Australia. She got the Award along with prize money worth 300 Australian Dollars.

- vi) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Senior Lecturer in the Deptt. of Orthodontics of Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, PU, has been honoured with 'Profile of the Month' Award by Indian Dental Association (IDA) for his contributions to the dental fraternity and society as a whole.
- vii) Cluster Innovation Centre in Biotechnology, promoted by BIRAC, launched its first product developed by an Innovation Fellow and Ph.D. Scholar, Ms. Shivanshi Vashist under the mentorship of Dr. Rohit Sharma, the Coordinator, CIC. This product is jointly manufactured by Ms. Shivanshi Vashist, Managing Director of new company Microradical 360 Pvt. Ltd. and a manufacture from Mohali Fabricator GAK Equipments, S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali). This Centre started to function in less than one year ago and a student creating this, promoting a company is that on which the University should take pride.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (1) Felicitations of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - i) Ms. Amanpreet Kaur, Ph.D. research scholar in the University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS) on her having brought laurels to Panjab University by bagging Young Scientist Award for her research in the field of drug delivery;
  - ii) Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, Senior Lecturer in the Deptt. of Orthodontics, Dr. H.S. Judge Institute of Dental Sciences, PU, on his having been honoured with 'Profile of the Month' Award;
  - iii) Ms. Shivanshi Vashist, a Ph.D. Scholar, under the mentorship of Dr. Rohit Sharma, the Coordinator, CIC for developing the first product launched by Cluster Innovation Centre in Biotechnology, promoted by BIRAC.
- (2) The information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv) be noted
- (3) The Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Syndicate meeting dated 20.08.2017, as per **Appendix-I**, be noted.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**Confirmation of faculty members** of 2. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each.

**(i) University Institute of Engineering & Technology**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Krishan Kumar	Professor	29.10.1972	08.09.2016	08.09.2017

**((ii) University Institute of Applied Management Sciences**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Monika Aggarwal	Associate Professor	19.05.1975	19.07.2016	19.07.2017

**(iii) Department of Laws**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Jyoti Rattan	Associate Professor	22.01.1971	04.07.2016	04.07.2017

**NOTE:** 1. The confirmation of the above faculty members are subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, CWP No.17501 of 2011.

2. A detailed office note is enclosed **(Appendix-II)**.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the following faculty members, be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each:

**(i) University Institute of Engineering & Technology**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Krishan Kumar	Professor	29.10.1972	08.09.2016	08.09.2017

**((ii) University Institute of Applied Management Sciences**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Monika Aggarwal	Associate Professor	19.05.1975	19.07.2016	19.07.2017

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**(iii) Department of Laws**

Sr. No.	Name of the Faculty Member	Designation	Date of Birth	Date of Joining	Proposed date of Confirmation
1.	Dr. Jyoti Rattan	Associate Professor	22.01.1971	04.07.2016	04.07.2017

**NOTE:** The confirmation of the above faculty members are subject to the final outcome/decision of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh, CWP No.17501 of 2011.

**Issue of grant of non-compounded advance increments on account of Ph.D. degree to Dr. Rajnish Saryal**

**3.** Considered minutes dated 31.07.2017 (**Appendix-III**) of the Grievance Redressal Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, on the pattern of Standing Committee (in terms of authorization given by the Syndicate vide Para-49 dated 27.02.2016/14.03.2016), to examine the representation dated 24.08.2016 (**Appendix-III**) of Dr. Rajnish Saryal, Assistant Professor, P.U.R.C., Ludhiana regarding non-compounded advance increments on account of Ph.D. degree.

**NOTE:** The Vice-Chancellor has observed as under:

“The spirit of the UGC notification is that those have been permitted/were permitted to proceed to complete their Ph.D. via the M.Phil. route are not to be denied any benefit that accrues to those who do Ph.D. via course work, as course work became mandatory. There is no need to seek UGC clarification. Let the matter be sent to Syndicate and Senate.”

Principal Hadiljit Singh Gosal while discussing the issue of increments for Ph.D. degree said that in the other cases where the persons who have done Ph.D. with Course Work, they have not been given increments. Dr. Rajnish Saryal has given an affidavit in which he has stated that he will withdraw the case from the Court if the increments are granted to him. The Committee constituted to look into such cases has recommended that the University may seek clarification from the University Grants Commission with regard to applicability of University Grants Commission notification dated 5<sup>th</sup> May, 2016.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said it is a fact that there are so many similar cases.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not against this. The persons who have already done M.Phil and Ph.D., how many times they could be asked to do it again and again.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal informed that Dr. Meera Nagpal of P.U.R.C., Ludhiana had done Ph.D. with course work. Dr. Meera Nagpal and Dr. Rajnish Saryal both have filed a case for grant of Ph.D. increments. Dr. Meera Nagpal is also ready to withdraw the case if she is granted increments for Ph.D.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that these cases should be cleared and it be decided that a notice be sent by the Establishment to

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

all those who have similar cases and such cases will also be considered.

Dr. Dalip Kumar while referring to the UGC guidelines, May 2016, said that rule 7.6 is very clear which says that candidates already holding M.Phil degree and admitted to the Ph.D. programme or those who have already completed the course work in M.Phil and have been permitted to proceed to the Ph.D. in integrated courses, may be exempted by the department from the Ph.D. Course Work. All other candidates admitted to the Ph.D. programme shall be required to complete the Ph.D. Course Work prescribed by the department. He said, to his mind, such cases should be cleared by the Syndicate which was endorsed by some other members also.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that such cases are there, but the R.A.O. creates problems and the audit people do not look at the academic decisions taken by the Syndicate. The audit people just want to keep the expenditure on the lower side and also that nothing should be left open.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that as per the UGC guidelines, the persons who have done M.Phil, they are exempted from the course work.

Shri Shaminder Singh Sandhu while endorsing the view point expressed by Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the spirit of the UGC regulations is also the same.

The Vice Chancellor said that anybody who has not been given this benefit, he goes to the Court where it takes a long time for final decision.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said it is but natural, whosoever will not get his dues, he will definitely go to the Court for justice.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that these two cases should be cleared and the other cases should be examined and granted the benefit, otherwise they will also go to the Court.

The Vice Chancellor said that there are people who can stop anything anywhere. If they are not able to stop here, they will stop it at other higher level. The Vice Chancellor said that his salary was also stopped for three months.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he is surprised to see the objections raised by the R.A.O. as the audit people do not know that a Professor and a Principal, both are equal in rank.

The Vice Chancellor said that they are protected in such a complicated way that even the IAS officers do not want to do anything against them because the audit people start raising objections on their work. They do not want that any work should run smoothly, otherwise the performance evaluation would start everywhere, but at the moment, nothing is done. If something starts, then expectation would come that everybody must give some output. The deeper reason behind it is not to have higher standard of performance in the nation. If they get something done from here, the IAS officer sitting above them are not ready to do anything, because the audit

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

department will start putting objection on their work. Even if somebody has got his house renovated, they would put an objection on it.

On question by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal as to whether there is any solution to it, the Vice Chancellor said at the moment the only solution is that the Syndicate has the authority to repeat and assert it. They should repeatedly take back the issues and by doing so they will be able to break their resistance. In order to replace a person of audit department, they can put a request to the CAG. But to do this, it is better if they take a decision regarding this when the U.T. representative is present in the Syndicate meeting. If they take a decision in the absence of both the representatives of the Governments, then there could be a problem. They should put it as an agenda item in a specially convened meeting and force the government representatives to be present. Otherwise some other such person would come. He will again complain against the University that the Syndicate and Senate of Panjab University consider law into themselves and pass anything they want. They say that all the positions which have been sanctioned by the University, their sanction has not been taken by the funding agency. With great difficulty they accepted 1378 posts as the teaching positions of the University, when they (PU) brought down the number from 1510 to 1378 posts, the Centre at least once accepted that they have 1378 sanctioned positions, otherwise the senior officers in the MHRD were asking from where they have got these positions sanctioned. They questioned as to how they have taken these posts i.e., directly or indirectly. But this time when they released Rs. 208 crores, they said that everything about the posts etc. is written.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked if these posts include the self-financing posts also to which the Vice Chancellor said that these includes all the posts.

The Vice Chancellor said that IISER, Mohali is a Central Institute and they have a fixed number of sanctioned position. For every additional post they want, it has to be got sanctioned. If they have to fill a vacant position, they have to get it approved before it is advertised. The Government Financial Rules are far more stringent when it comes to such things. But their university is not practising these rules in an arbitrary way. There are reasons why the University exercise financial autonomy. He stated that since yesterday, he is re-writing the things, how their financial model has evolved, why they are different from other institutions.

At this moment, Professor Mukesh Arora requested the Vice Chancellor to spare sometime to visit P.U.R.C., Ludhiana as there are lot of problems.

Shri Dalip Kumar said that he wanted to add one thing here. He said that as stated by the Vice Chancellor himself, everything is clear in the UGC regulations. Last time there was an item and at that time they have said that the UGC regulations should be seen in the spirit for which these are made. There are cases in the UIET and the Registrar and the Controller of Examinations has given in writing for the award Ph.D. degree, but there is a note from the R.A.O. where he has said that their degrees are fake. Dr. Dalip Kumar wanted to share the other cases of UIET when there was no Entrance Test. However, the Vice Chancellor said that they will review this matter.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 31.07.2017 of the Grievance Redressal Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, on the pattern of Standing Committee (in terms of authorization given by the Syndicate vide Para-49 dated 27.02.2016/14.03.2016), to examine the representation dated 24.08.2016 (**Appendix-III**) of Dr. Rajnish Saryal, Assistant Professor, P.U.R.C., Ludhiana regarding grant of non-compounded advance increments on account of Ph.D. degree, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Items No. 4 and 5 were taken up together for consideration.

**Resignation of Dr. Charanjeev Singh**

**4.** Considered if, the resignation of Dr. Charanjeev Singh, Professor, Department of Public Administration, be accepted w.e.f. 01.08.2017, i.e., one day after the expiry of EOL without pay sanctioned to him upto 31.07.2017, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, be accepted.

**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. Dr. Charanjeev Singh was granted EOL without pay for a period of three years w.e.f. 02.08.2012 to 31.07.2015 which was extended for two years more w.e.f. 01.08.2015 to 31.07.2017 on personal reasons, under Regulation 11 (G) at pages 139-140 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007.

3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-IV**).

**Resignation of Dr. Deepti Laroia Sarkar**

**5.** Considered if, the resignation of Dr. Deepti Laroia Sarkar, from the post of Assistant Professor, University Institute of Legal Studies, be accepted, w.e.f. 09.09.2015 i.e. one day after the expiry of EOL without pay sanctioned to her up to 08.09.2015, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, be accepted.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 6, page 118, Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, which reads as under:



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

“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 29.08.2017 of Dr. Deepti Laroia is enclosed **(Appendix-IV A)**.
3. An office note enclosed **(Appendix-IV A)**.

Professor Mukesh Kumar Arora wanted to know whether there is a requirement of depositing three months salary when a person resigns who is on long leave. He said that such a practice is prevalent in the colleges. He desired to know whether it is written that they are not required to give three months salary.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they insist, one could ask for it.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that he was on leave up to 31.7.2017 and he resigned on 1.8.2017. Since his leave ended on 31.7.2017, he cannot be considered on leave.

The Vice Chancellor read out regulation 6 which envisages that if a person is on long leave and resigns his post and his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

However, Principal H.S. Gosal said that long leave of Professor Charanjeev Singh has ended on 31.7.2017 and he is resigning on 1.8.2017. In the other case, Dr. Deepti Laroia Sarkar has taken more leave than the service she has rendered. It will be a loss to the University exchequer.

The Vice Chancellor said that she is a woman, she has got married and moved away.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that it is written in the Calendar that if someone is on long leave, he/she is not required to give three months notice, but in the case of these two cases, they are not on long leave.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Mukesh Arora asked that if it is not a violation of Calendar and would like to bring this to the notice of the members. However, it is upto to them as to see what is to be done. This was also endorsed by Principal H.S. Gosal.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Syndicate can also waive off any condition if it is a violation.

Principal H.S. Gosal said that if they want to waive off the conditions, they can do it to which the Vice Chancellor said he would like to do it, but only on behalf of all of them.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if they had been condoning this in the past, then they should condone it, otherwise they should waive off the condition.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they might not be aware of the rule that they have to tender their resignation before the end of their long leave. Had they been aware of it, they could give it earlier.

Principal Gurdip Kumar was also of the view that this conditions should be waived off.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they had been accepting such resignation earlier also and secondly they have now left the job, it should be done to which Principal H.S. Gosal said that the R.A.O. may not create any problem later on.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should make these people to write a letter to the University saying that they ought to have given this notice and they sincerely regret this inadvertent lapse on their part. If they write a letter to this effect, then the Syndicate will waive of the three months salary, otherwise not.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said now with the condition as stated by the Vice Chancellor, they can waive off the salary.

The Vice Chancellor further said that take a letter from them and if they acknowledge that the Syndicate has taken a favourable decision and convey their thanks to it. While thanking the Syndicate if they express regrets for the inadvertent lapse on their part. The Vice Chancellor asked the Registrar to talk to them about it and take it up and whatever letter comes from them, that shall be presented to the Syndicate for information. He further said that nobody should take the Governing Body for granted.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the resignation of Dr. Charanjeev Singh, Professor, Department of Public Administration, w.e.f. 01.08.2017, i.e., one day after the expiry of EOL without pay sanctioned to him upto 31.07.2017, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, be accepted subject to the submission of an application expressing regrets for the inadvertent lapse on his part for not giving the notice in time and the same be placed before the Syndicate for information;

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

- (ii) the resignation of Dr. Deepti Laroia Sarkar, from the post of Assistant Professor, University Institute of Legal Studies, w.e.f. 09.09.2015 i.e. one day after the expiry of EOL without pay sanctioned to her up to 08.09.2015, under Regulation 6 at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, be accepted subject to the submission of an application expressing regrets for the inadvertent lapse on her part for not giving the notice in time and the same be placed before the Syndicate for information.

### **Schedule of Senate by-election**

6. Considered if, the draft schedule (**Appendix-V**) for Senate by-election, for one seat of Senate vacated by Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora, be approved:

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting held on 23.07.2017 (Para 5) (**Appendix-V**) has resolved that –

- (i) by-election, for a seat of Senate vacated by Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora, Principal, be conducted for the remaining term of the Senate, i.e., up to 31.10.2020, as he has been transferred from DAV College, Abohar to DAV College, Jalandhar, as Principal;
- (ii) the Registrar be appointed as the Returning Officer for the by-election, under Regulation 10.1 of Panjab University Calendar Vol.-I, 2007;
- (iii) the by-election be held at Chandigarh on a working day;
- (iv) the Returning Officer would prepare the by-election schedule and send the same by-email to the Syndicate members for information.

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

While discussion the schedule of by-elections, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that as per the schedule, the election schedule is starting from 20<sup>th</sup> October, 2017 and they have give 90 days' time for conducting the election. In this way, the election process will go till January, 2018. He suggested that the election should be held in December and with this they could save 20-25 days time.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he also wants the by-election to be held at an early date, but it might create a problem for them because in December the Syndicate election would also be held which is a very long process.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

It was informed that the winter vacations will commence from 23<sup>rd</sup> December to 4<sup>th</sup> January, 2018.

After a lot of discussion, a general consensus was emerged to hold the by-election in the month of December, 2017.

It was also informed that the Senate and Syndicate meetings could not be held together as there will be faculty meetings also.

The members debated upon the issue threadbare and finally decided that the by-election be held on 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2017 and the schedule be changed accordingly.

**RESOLVED:** That the draft schedule for Senate by-election, for one seat of Senate vacated by Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora, **as per Appendix**, be approved with the modification that the election be held on 26.12.2017 and other dates be also changed accordingly.

As per the discussion, 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2017 was agreed upon for holding the election. However, on perusal of the schedule, the Registrar put up a note to the Vice Chancellor as under which was approved by the Vice Chancellor:

1. Under the provisions of Panjab University Calendar, we have to give 90 days notice before the date of elections.
2. Even if we notify today, i.e., 25<sup>th</sup> September, 2017, we can hold the elections on 24<sup>th</sup> December earliest, however, 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> December, being holidays, we may hold it on 26<sup>th</sup> December, 2017.

**Memorandum  
Understanding**

**of**

**7.**

Considered if,

- (i) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-VI**), between University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh and Semi-Conductor Laboratory, Department of Space, Government of India, Sector-72, S.A.S. Nagar, Punjab be executed.
- (ii) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-VI**), between Sophisticated Analytical Instrumentation Facility (SAIF) Panjab University, Chandigarh and Department of Science & Technology (DST), Govt. of India, New Delhi, be executed.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-VI**), between University Institute of Engineering & Technology (UIET), Panjab University, Chandigarh and Semi-Conductor Laboratory, Department of Space, Government of India, Sector-72, S.A.S. Nagar, Punjab be executed; and
- (ii) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) (**Appendix-VI**), between Sophisticated Analytical

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Instrumentation Facility (SAIF) Panjab University, Chandigarh and Department of Science & Technology (DST), Govt. of India, New Delhi, be executed.

### **Deferred item**

**8.** Considered minutes dated 09.08.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to frame suitable guidelines for future to avoid unpleasant situations with regard to vacate the office room/s positively within one month by the faculty member(s) after the completion of re-employment tenure and in case a re-employed faculty member intends to apply for a research project or undertake Ph.D. student(s), he/she should do so within first two years of his/her tenure to re-employment.

Dr. Dalip Kumar referred to point No. (iv) of the recommendation of the minutes of the meeting dated 9<sup>th</sup> August, 2017, which says "In case the office room provided to the faculty members is not vacated within the above-stipulated period, the eviction proceedings may be initiated as per the rules of the University". He said that the language used is very harsh. A teachers who has served here for 35 years, use of such a language for him is unpleasant to which the Vice Chancellor said that he has not made the language.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if they read out the consideration item, it says that to avoid unpleasant situations with regard to vacant the office room/s positively within one month by the faculty members(s) after the completion of re-employment tenure and in case a re-employed faculty members intends to apply for a research project or undertake Ph.D. students(s), he/she should do so within first two years of his/her tenure to re-employment. He said that in the guidelines they have allowed five years and to curtail three years is not understandable. He also read out clause (iii) of the recommendations of the Committee dated 9<sup>th</sup> August, 2017 which says "while keeping in view the suggestions as at (i) & (ii) above, in no case the University teachers be allowed to keep the office room allotted to them in their respective departments beyond the period of completion of two months either of their superannuation or re-employment". He said that there is no doubt that the language is harsh. Secondly some of the teachers, either superannuated or re-employed, are really contributing to different departments. When they talk about Professor Emeritus, sometimes, they cannot give such positions to the retired teachers, whereas sometimes the retired teachers are actually working within the department and for the department. If this item is passed in this format, it will mean that the item is passed irrespective of the fact whether the department functions well or not, but the eviction is to be done. Nowhere the interest of the department has been taken into consideration.

The Vice Chancellor said that the spirit is that the teacher has to take a Ph.D student for five years and if he takes the students in the last two years, who will get his Ph.D. done. He further said that after the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years, one is not permitted to have a Ph.D. student unless the co-supervisor takes the responsibility that his thesis will be completed. One cannot take independently a student after 60 years in the Government of India system because after 65 years one may not be able get the thesis completed. Liability is one thing and the spirit is another thing.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the enrolment of a Ph.D. student is done by the Joint Academic Administrative Committee of the department. Obviously, they always keep this thing in mind whether a person is to be given a Ph.D. student or not

The Vice Chancellor said that this matter cannot be left to the department given the heterogeneity in the University. Sometime there are 2-3 persons in the department who just settle their personal scores. This problem is not there in the departments where there are 30-40 faculty members. If they make such rules, there is a real difficulty. As regards the language of the proceedings of the Committee, the Vice Chancellor said that the language is harsh, but it may have been written by the office and the members might have merely signed it. The language might not have been drafted by the persons who have participated in the meeting.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since the language needs to be redrafted, he suggested that the item may be deferred.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what they are going to defer.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is not much hurry in it so it can be deferred to which the Vice Chancellor said okay.

The Vice Chancellor said that somebody should redraft the guidelines and since they have also to approve the directives of the Syndicate and let the directives of the Syndicate be written carefully which are not considered defensive. So in view of the directives of the Syndicate, the guidelines might be redrafted. Somebody should redraft it so that no harsh wording goes from the Syndicate. Professor Navdeep Goyal offered to redraft the language.

**RESOLVED:** That the consideration of the item be deferred. Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Dalip Kumar be requested to redraft the guidelines.

Items No. 9 and 26 were taken up together for consideration and accordingly the discussion took place on both the items.

**Letter of Shri Ramesh Monga regarding exploitation of guest faculty**

**9.** Considered letter dated 24.08.2017 (**Appendix-VII**) of Shri Ramesh Monga, RTI activist, House No.17, Phase-I, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi with regard to exploitation of Guest Faculty in Panjab University (i.e., Departments, Centres and Constituent Colleges).

The Vice Chancellor said this is a very strange item. It relates to a complaint by someone. He said that whatever happens in the University it is on behalf of the Governing Body of the University. The main Governing Body has given this responsibility to the Syndicate to run the University. When people write this kind of complaints, the governing body must give its reaction to such complaints, otherwise this will give the impression that the governing body does not have any regard and anybody can make any type of accusation because they normally do not react as if they are a soft entity.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in the complaint actually the allegation itself is wrong. The maximum limit of remuneration of Rs. 25000/- being paid to a Guest Faculty teachers is fixed by the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

University Grants Commission The U.G.C. has never said that they have to deliver only 25 lecture in a month. They have just said that this is a limit and Rs. 1000/- is to be paid per lecture and a maximum amount is that of Rs. 25000/- per month. They have never said that only 25 lectures have to be delivered.

The Vice Chancellor said, in principle, the person who has been offered the guest faculty position, only he can protest, but if the appointing authority or the recommending authority says that he has to take this number of lectures and if he does not agree to that, the job could be given to someone who agrees to it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar asked if something regarding the lectures is mentioned in the appointment letter to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that nothing of this sort is written in the appointment letter.

The Vice Chancellor said that is why the matter has been placed before the Syndicate because in the letter it is said that the University is exploiting them. The Vice Chancellor made it clear that they do not exploit anyone, but there is lack of understanding by the applicant as well as the civil society person. Therefore, their responsibility is that the things may be clarified to them. The purpose of bringing this item is that they should made clear about it so that the complaints might not come.

Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested that they should take an understanding to this effect at the time of appointment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when they talk about the U.T. Administration, they appoint resource persons, but he is not aware about the salary being received by them, perhaps it is 25000/- or it may be less than 25000/- p.m.

Professor Mukesh Arora wanted to know for his information that in some departments, one person gets only one lecture at the rate of Rs. 1000/- and can get a maximum of Rs. 25000/- p.m. He wanted to know whether there are persons who have been allotted even four period a day and given Rs. 25000/- to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are no such people. Therefore, it is clear that this accusation is wrong because it is as per the University Grants Commission guidelines.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the Panjab University does not rectify this, the same will be reported to the Chancellor and a PIL will be filed. On a suggestion by Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be rectified, the Vice Chancellor said that is why their Governing Body has taken cognisance of it and asserted that the University issues appointment letter to the Guest Faculty as per the University Grants Commission guidelines. So, when somebody files a PIL, they can show this as a cognisance taken by the Syndicate and the case will be dismissed straight away.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that these are norms in all the universities.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if the nomenclature of the post remains as Guest Faculty, then the letter written by Mr.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Ramesh Monga is correct because to a guest faculty they cannot give him more than 2 lectures a day.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that if a person is taking only two periods a day, and his workload is less than 25 periods, then he cannot be paid Rs. 25000/- p.m. The Vice Chancellor further said that if a person has taken only one period a day, then he cannot have 25 periods in a month because they do not work more than 20-22 days per month.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they should leave aside all the other verbal things, but whatever he is saying is by keeping the letter in mind. He said if they give four period a day, then it comes out to be 88 periods because a college opens for 22 days in a month.

The Vice Chancellor said that one should not be given four periods a day. He has already told them that against one vacant position, they can appoint two guest faculty teachers.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the Vice Chancellor has also said this in the Senate, but it could be enquired from the FDO, it would double their burden.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no question of financial burden. The grant for the constituent colleges is given by the Punjab Government and if the burden gets doubled, it is his responsibility to plead it before the Punjab Government. for getting more grant.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that for his college only 2-3 posts have been advertised. He is not having teacher for English, Political Science and Commerce. The Political Science teacher is attending Course Work and they could not get Commerce teacher. and the teacher who was appointed, he did not join. He, therefore, requested that they should be allowed, as per the other affiliated colleges or they may be allowed to appoint resource persons. He informed that he has asked from the Establishment Branch about it but they told him that there is no provision for appointment of resource persons.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that then they can appoint two guest faculty teachers

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said the advertisement for regular posts will take a lot of time. He requested that the posts which have already been advertised and where the teachers could not be available, they may be allowed to fill up those posts of their own and they will get it approved from him (Vice Chancellor) He requested that this may be allowed to them so that there is no loss of studies. He further pointed out that they have changed something in the order regarding the appointment of guest faculty and with this they hoped, the problem will be to some extent.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that he would like to say that regarding Item No. 9, the Vice Chancellor has already constituted a Committee which is already working on it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the Vice Chancellor has constituted a Committee as this problem was faced earlier also.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

He asked to the F.D.O. to read out the resolve part of that Committee so that, if needed, the change could be made.

The F.D.O. read out the following clause recommended by the Committee constituted by the Vice Chancellor as per Syndicate meeting dated 20.3.2017 (Para-2) to work out the modalities for the appointment of Guest Faculty/Part-time faculty in the P.U. Constituent Colleges, held on 16.8.2017: for inclusion in the appointment letter:

“This is to inform you that the Vice-Chancellor has appointed the following as guest faculty in P.U. Constituent College to teach the subject mentioned below against each on an honorarium of Rs. 25,000/- per month (fixed), subject to fulfilment of conditions of taking workload as prescribed by the University Grants Commission for the Assistant Professor, w.e.f. the date they will start working for the academic session till the end of ongoing academic session or till the posts are filled through proper selection/regular appointments, whichever is earlier:

In case work and conduct of Guest faculty is not found satisfactory during the academic session, the Principal can recommend his/her removal or relieving after issuing the ‘show cause notice’.”

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu pointed out that as per above clause, it has been approved that the appointment will be for the academic session till the end of ongoing academic session or till the posts are filled through proper selection/regular appointments, whichever is earlier: He desired that the words “till the posts are filled through proper selection/regular appointments, whichever is earlier:” He further said that the appointment should be made only for one session. They are facing problems due to this clause. If the clause for regular appointment is not there, they can appoint a new person, if he/she is not working properly.

The Finance & Development Officer while clarifying it said that in the above clause, it has also been written that in case work and conduct of Guest faculty is not found satisfactory during the academic session, the Principal can recommend his/her removal or relieving after issuing the ‘show cause notice’

All the members said that these lines covers everything.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can appoint two persons against one vacant post.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that when they talk of University Grants Commission workload, it is 16 hours , then they can allot 24 periods

The Vice Chancellor said that by increasing the hours, why don't they appoint two persons.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that they should change the nomenclature of guest faculty to that of resource person.

Professor Mukesh Arora asked, will a teacher get any benefit if the nomenclature of the post is changed from guest faculty to that of resource persons.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu suggested that they could replace the word guest faculty with that of Assistant Professor.

However, the Vice Chancellor said that they can appoint two guest faculty teachers in place of resource person, this is the only solution to this problem.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu asked is it not possible to appoint one temporary Assistant Professor to which the Vice Chancellor said that they cannot do so and that will create more problem because with this the exploitation would be more.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that guest faculty is appointed only if they have only one period and they cannot appoint 2-3 guest faculty for the same subject.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he (Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu) has the workload of 64 hours, he can appoint two guest faculty teachers. The Vice Chancellor asked them to advertise the posts and appoint two persons if they have adequate workload.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the teachers are not available even after the advertisement of the posts.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the permanent solution of the problem is to fill up the posts on permanent basis.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is what he has been saying. He also wants to fill these posts on permanent basis.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that they have sent a letter for approval of a panel of experts.

The Vice Chancellor asked Special Officer whether their letter has been received. It was informed that such a letter has not been received in the office of the Vice Chancellor so far. Just to send the letter is not enough, nothing would happen until these are advertised in the newspapers.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that all the four Principals of the Constituent colleges would sit together and prepare the draft and it would be done very soon. He further informed that Principal Khosla has picked up the old advertisement and they had given a corrigendum. They had reserved all the four posts in the subject of commerce, which was not possible. They cannot oust the general category persons. If they have four posts in one subject, one post could be put under reservation. He assured the Vice Chancellor that the amended advertisement would reach the office of the Vice Chancellor.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested the Vice Chancellor they should make the roaster here in the University.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they have two posts in each of the subjects, so at the moment they should be allowed to fill these posts. When the roaster would be prepared, the posts could be re-advertised keeping in view the workload. He requested that let one post in each subject be allowed to fill, only with one post in each subject, the expenditure would be reach to 16 lakhs.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should fill at least two posts in the subject of English. If they ask the private colleges to fill the posts, they should also fill their own posts.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they will fill only those posts which have already been advertised.

The Vice Chancellor said that let these posts be first filled and they will then see about the other posts later on.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they have allotted four units of Commerce and for that eight teachers are required.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they are filling two posts in each unit whereas the workload is that of three teachers in each unit. He further stated that he has 22 students in a unit and for that he has to appoint two Professors as asked as to how much expenditure would be involved in it. He further said that he will fill eight posts in the subject of Commerce. and he requested to let them do this.

**RESOLVED:** That the accusations levelled by Shri Ramesh Monga are baseless as the University is following the UGC guidelines in respect of the guest faculty.

**Modalities for the appointment of guest faculty/part-time faculty in Panjab University Constituent Colleges**

**26.** Considered minutes dated 16.08.2017 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 20.03.2017 (Para 3), to work out the modalities for the appointment of Guest Faculty/Part-time faculty in the P.U. Constituent Colleges:

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.03.2017 (Para 3) (**Appendix-VIII**) while considering the appointment of Mr. Aman Moudgil as guest faculty has also constituted a Committee comprising of Dean, College Development Council, 2-3 Principals, Finance and Development Officer to work out the modalities for the appointment of guest faculty/part-time faculty in the Constituent Colleges.

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 16.08.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 20.03.2017 (Para 3), to work out the modalities for the appointment of Guest Faculty/Part-time faculty in the P.U. Constituent Colleges, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**Addition in Panjab  
University Accounts  
Manual 2012**

**10.** Considered if the following addition as sub-clause (e) be made in Rule 8.8 (i) preparation of estimate (Original Works/Maintenance Works) and as clause (iv) in Rule 8.38 (Materials and consumption statements) at page 68 and 88 respectively of the Panjab University Accounts Manual 2012:

**Rule 8.8:**

- (e). After allotment of the work, there should not be any change in specifications of the material. Change in specifications should normally not be allowed in any case, until it is a dire necessity keeping in view the urgency of the work/interest of the work. However, in such cases, the financial implications involved should invariably be brought on record for enabling the competent authority to consider such an amendment and take appropriate decision.

**Rule 8.38:**

- (iv). Pre inspection of all material should be carried before the same is allowed to be utilized on the works. The material on receipt at site should be duly inspected by an officer next in hierarchy to the Officer-in-Charge of the work who would duly certify that the material received at site is strictly as per specifications mentioned in the DNIT/work order and there is no deviation whatsoever. The Contractor should also be a signatory to such a report and the material should be duly stamped by the Inspecting Officer and the report should mention the defined stamp so that the material could subsequently be checked at site even after its installation at a later stage.

**NOTE:** An office note along with page 68 and 88 is enclosed (**Appendix-IX**).

As desired by the members the Registrar clarified the issue contained in Item No. 10. He said that certain specifications get changed later on sometimes with the change in the budget, as has been happened in the case of Rajiv Gandhi College Bhawan. So, they wanted to incorporate certain changes in it. The C.V.O. has gone through it and she has recommended that changes be got incorporated in their accounts manual so that they might not face any problem subsequently.

The Vice Chancellor read out a rule which says after the allotment of work, there should not be any change in the specifications. Change in specification should normally be not allowed in any case until it is dire necessity keeping in view the urgency of work. However, in such cases the financial implications involved should invariably be brought on record in order to enabling the competent authority to consider this. The Vice Chancellor said that it is just to make the things a little stringent and to have less causes of frivolous complaints against the University to which the members said okay.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**RESOLVED:** That the addition of following as sub-clause (e) be made in Rule 8.8 (i) preparation of estimate (Original Works/Maintenance Works) and as clause (iv) in Rule 8.38 (Materials and consumption statements) at page 68 and 88 respectively of the Panjab University Accounts Manual 2012, be approved:

**Rule 8.8:**

- (e). After allotment of the work, there should not be any change in specifications of the material. Change in specifications should normally not be allowed in any case, until it is a dire necessity keeping in view the urgency of the work/interest of the work. However, in such cases, the financial implications involved should invariably be brought on record for enabling the competent authority to consider such an amendment and take appropriate decision.

**Rule 8.38:**

- (iv). Pre inspection of all material should be carried before the same is allowed to be utilized on the works. The material on receipt at site should be duly inspected by an officer next in hierarchy to the Officer-in-Charge of the work who would duly certify that the material received at site is strictly as per specifications mentioned in the DNIT/work order and there is no deviation whatsoever. The Contractor should also be a signatory to such a report and the material should be duly stamped by the Inspecting Officer and the report should mention the defined stamp so that the material could subsequently be checked at site even after its installation at a later stage.

**Recommendations of the Committee dated 08.08.2016**

**11.** Considered the recommendations dated 08.08.2016 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that Shri Sudhir Baweja, be designated as Lecturer/Assistant Professor w.e.f. 12.01.1993 (i.e. the date on which he was designated as Teacher under Regulation 1.1 at page 124 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 1989) subject to applicable conditions. His salary be fixed notionally in the grade of Lecturer/Assistant Professor (personal to him) w.e.f. 12.01.1993 and the actual financial benefit of revised pay as Assistant Professor shall be allowed from the date of approval of competent authority i.e. Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate. He be assessed for various career advancement schemes of UGC from 12.01.1993. However, such financial benefits, if any, accrued to him should only be given from the date of approval by the Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate.

**NOTE:** 1. Shri Sudhir Kumar Baweja was appointed as Tutor-cum-Curator in the Department of Philosophy, University School of Open Learning, P.U. on 28.04.1982. He was designated as Teacher w.e.f. 12.01.1993, under Regulation 1.1 at page 124 of then P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 1989 by the Vice-Chancellor as per authorization given by the Senate vide Para XXI dated 19.12.1982. This was got noted by the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Syndicate in its meeting dated 14.02.1993 (Para 2 v) and as also by the Senate on 20.03.1993 (Para III).

2. Shri Sudhir Kumar Baweja vide his representation dated 28.04.2016 duly forwarded by the President PUTA, requested for removal of anomaly and subsequent re-designation and inclusion in CAS.
3. The Vice-Chancellor vide order dated 12.05.2016 constituted a Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor A.K. Bhandari to examine his request as he was due to retire. The Committee in its meeting dated 08.08.2016 considered his representation.
4. The case was referred to the accounts branch to place the matter before the Board of Finance, but D.R. (Accounts) has observed that in another similar case the BOF in its meeting dated 15.05.2016 had discussed that such re-designation need to be reviewed and the same should be done by following the proper procedure.

The Board of Finance consider the recommendations (Item No.16) with regard to re-designation of Dr. Mahendra Prasad Sharma, Senior Technician (G-II) table) as Assistant Professor (Tabla) and after discussion it was agreed to that a post of Assistant Professor (Tabla) in the Department of Music might be got recommended and the said post be filled by following the proper procedure. This was approved by the Syndicate and Senate in its meetings dated 27.02.2016/14.03.2016 and 27.03.2016, respectively. A copy of the minutes of the Board of Finance along with the resolved part of the Senate dated 27.03.2016 is enclosed.

5. Certain laboratory/technical employees have been designated as Assistant Professor (Personal to them) w.e.f. 06.12.2009 vide order dated 03.03.2010 but there is no mention in the said orders with regard to grant of benefit under CAS.
6. Shri S.K. Baweja was retired from the University Services on 31.01.2017 after attaining the age of superannuation i.e.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

60 years and was also sanctioned the retirement benefits, however, he has been allowed to continue in service vide order No.3493/Estt. dated 10.03.2017, pursuant to CWP No.1286 of 2017 filed by him, which stands tagged with other CWP No. 11988 of 2014- Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs P.U. and LPA No. 1505 of 2016- Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while speaking on this item said that when they look at this particular case, it has been recommended that, Shri Sudhir Baweja be designated as Lecturer w.e.f. 12.1.1993. He said there had been many such cases before this, but the decision in those cases was made applicable from the date of Syndicate decision. In this regard, he mentioned about the case of Dr. Bimal Rai. Dr. Bimal Rai was earlier designation as teacher. Later on he requested to convert his designation from a teacher to Assistant Professor and the change of designation to him was given from the date of Syndicate decision. He further said that it is not possible to change the designation of any person from the date falling 20-25 years back. If they change the designation of any one, there are rules for it. The rules are very clear that on the day the designation has to be changed, the person should be eligible on that day to be appointed as Assistant Professor. Now, he has already retired and secondly, he is M.Phil only and not Ph.D. Though it is not fair, but suppose, if they do it notionally, what benefits would be given to him after retirement to which Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he will then ask for arrears also. Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as on today, he is not eligible to be appointed as Assistant Professor.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was eligible when he was appointed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that he was first appointed on a non-teaching post and after that he was designated as teacher. It has been done in the case of so many other teachers also. As an when the Syndicate took any decision regarding these persons, the decision was given effect from the date of Syndicate meeting.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if he (Shri Sudhir Baweja) was eligible on the date of his appointment, only then he was made Lecturer, but Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he was not designated as Lecturer.

The Vice Chancellor said that Shri Sudhir Baweja was appointed as Tutor-cum-Curator, but his qualifications were like that of a Lecturer. With the passage of time, he kept on doing the academic work. The Vice Chancellor further informed that a similar case was also there in the Music Department which was also placed before the Board of Finance and the same was not approved.

Principal Hardiljit Singh and Professor Navdeep Goyal along and some other members were of the opinion that this is not a fit case for approval.

The Vice Chancellor read out some a portion of the item which says, "such financial benefits, if any, accrued to him should only be

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

given from the date of approval by the Board of Finance/Syndicate/Senate.”

However, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that by doing so they will make a mockery of the system for a retired person

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations dated 08.08.2016 of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, that Shri Sudhir Baweja, be designated as Lecturer/Assistant Professor w.e.f. 12.01.1993 (i.e. the date on which he was designated as Teacher under Regulation 1.1 at page 124 of the P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 1989) subject to applicable conditions, be not approved.

**Letter dated 17.08.2017  
from Principal Secretary,  
Department of Welfare of  
SCs, BCs and Minorities,  
Punjab**

12. Considered letter dated 17.08.2017 of Principal Secretary, Welfare, Department of Welfare of SCs, BCs and Minorities (Reservation Cell), Government of Punjab, regarding increase in the percentage of Reservation of seats for the members of Backward Classes in Educational, Technical and Professional Institutions for admission.

**NOTE:** A copy of Regulation 29.1 appearing at page 168 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the Central Government had taken a decision for making reservation to OBC Category candidates, simultaneously, a decision was taken that the general category seats will not be decreased and appropriately equal number of seats for general category were increased. Therefore, it is not fair to accept the issue without taking it up for discussion.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no recommendation to accept it and they are just to consider the Punjab Government notification.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they have to see whether they can increase such number of seats or not looking at their own infrastructure. He opined that this issue should be first considered in the meeting of the Chairpersons, only then they should go ahead.

On a query by Dr. Subhash Sharma as to what is the percentage of Backward Class category, Professor Navdeep Goyal said at present it is 5% and which going to be increased to 10%.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma wanted to know if the Punjab Government would give money to Panjab University to appoint more faculty and creating infrastructure as was given by the Centre Government when they increase the number of seats for OBC.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked whether this notification has been received from the Government of Punjab or from the Department of Social Welfare to which it informed that it was received from the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare. Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said then it is not desirable to accept it.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

The Vice Chancellor read out to the members the relevant lines which says that, all University teaching departments shall follow the reservation policy of the Centre Government i.e 15% for Scheduled Caste, 7.5% for Schedule Tribes and 5% for members of Backward Classes as defined by government from time to time. Here the government means both the governments i.e. Punjab Government as well as Centre Government. Government means that they cannot completely disregard what the Punjab government says because then it will defeat the very purpose of being designated as Interstate Body Corporate as the Punjab Government has also a role. So, the Vice Chancellor said that they should recommend formation of a Committee in which the D.P.I. (Punjab) as a member of the Syndicate must participate.

All the members endorsed to it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu suggested that the Committee should also consist of 2-3 Syndicate members.

The Vice Chancellor further suggested that in order to consider the issue threadbare, a Committee consisting of both i.e. the DPI (Colleges), Punjab and Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh, 1-2 members from the Syndicate, Dean of University Instruction and one more person suggested by the D.U.I. and Professor Anil Kumar, UIPS, should be formed. This was agreed to

**RESOLVED:** That a Committee comprising of the following members be constituted to examine the issues envisaged in the letter:

1. Dean of University Instruction
2. DPI (Colleges), Punjab
3. Director, Higher Education, U.T. Chandigarh
4. Professor Navdeep Goyal
5. Dr. Subhash Sharma
6. Professor Anil Kumar, UIPS

**Waiving off the penalty of Rs.1 lac imposed upon certain Colleges**

**13.** Considered if, the penalty of Rs.1 lac imposed upon the Affiliated Colleges, who have failed to submit their request application for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2017-18, be waived off, as recommended by the affiliation Committee (for the year 2017-18) in its meeting dated 07.08.2017 and 31.08.2017 (**Appendix-X**).

**NOTE:** A copy of the circular No. Misc. 81936-82131/DRC dated 09.09.2016 enclosed (**Appendix-X**).

**RESOLVED:** That the penalty of Rs.1 lac imposed upon the Affiliated Colleges, who have failed to submit their application for grant of temporary extension of affiliation for the session 2017-18, as recommended by the affiliation Committee (for the year 2017-18) in its meeting dated 07.08.2017 and 31.08.2017, **as per Appendix**, be waived off.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**Renaming of Panjab University Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai**

**14.** To ratify the request dated 24.08.2017 (**Appendix-XI**) of Dr. N.R. Sharma, Principal, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai that P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, be named as “Saheed Udham Singh P.U. Constituent College”, Guru Har Sahai:

Professor Mukesh Arora said, Principal N.R. Sharma is perhaps willing to be shifted to Dharamkot College as his present college is far away. Secondly, Dharmkot is a new college and he would be able to run this college in a better way.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said though he would like to help his friend Principal N.R. Sharma, but he would also like to say that till an MoU is signed with the Punjab Government, he may not be shifted to Dharamkot College because they do not want their friend to suffer.

The Vice Chancellor the MoU is not possible.

Professor Mukesh Arora again said that since Principal N.R. Sharma is willing to be shifted to Dharamkot, so he should be shifted there.

However Principal N.R. Sharma said that Professor Mukesh Arora is just joking, but it is because that Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma had said that there are Court cases against Principal Kuldeep Singh, so he should not be given the charge of Dharamkot. That is why he has said in a lighter vein that then he should be given the charge of all the college situated on the Zira Road. However, Principal Sharma also said that if they want to shift him to Dharamkot, he is ready for that Professor Mukesh Arora again stressed that Principal N.R. Sharma ji has agreed and he should be shifted to Dharamkot College.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if they would like to give him additional charge, it is okay, but nobody will be ready to take charge of Guru Har Sahai College and it will create a problem for them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have appointed him through proper selection for Guru Har Sahai College and that is not to be changed.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that Principal N.R. Sharma should be given the additional charge of Dharamkot College to which the Vice Chancellor said, that is fine.

On insisting by Professor Mukesh Arora, Principal N.R. Sharma said that if there is some technical problem, then this idea should be dropped to which the Vice Chancellor said that he will talk to him (Principal N.R. Sharma) later on

**RESOLVED:** That as per the request of Principal Dr. N.R. Sharma dated 24.08.2017, P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai be named as “Saheed Udham Singh P.U. Constituent College”, Guru Har Sahai.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**Representation dated  
27.03.2017 of Punjab  
Government College  
Professors Association**

**15.** Considered minutes dated 23.08.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Syndicate dated 30.04.2017 (Para 9), to examine the representation of Punjab Government College Professors Association dated 27.03.2017 to make Professors working in the Government College of Punjab as an Ex-Officio member of the Faculties of Panjab University.

Initiating discussion on the item, the Vice Chancellor asked the members to give him five minutes time to explain that this item has generated a lot of unnecessary heat. He further said that he would like to give them the solution but before that he would like to tell them its background.

Dr. Rabinder Nath said that this is a very hasty step and it should be reversed.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he has been a teachers' representative throughout his life and even now he is teachers' representative. He stated that the name of the constituency from where the teachers' representatives are being elected is Professors, Associate Professor and Assistant Professors Constituency. Earlier, it was Professors, Readers and Lecturers constituency. Though, there are less teachers coming from that Constituency, but that constituency has been already existing. He asked, will they cast their vote on two sides. The Vice Chancellor said that they should not look at the governance of the University in terms of just getting elected and electoral politics. This is what he wants to share with them.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the demand made either Professor Mukesh Arora or Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma is wrong.

The Vice Chancellor requested the members to allow him to speak as he wants to educate them on the issue. They may discuss, whatever they desire, but allow him to first tell them about this for ten minutes to which the members said okay. Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that whatever they would like to do, it should take the University forward and resolves the conflicts which are floating around.

The Vice Chancellor stated that this matter is generating a lot of heat and is being seen as if it is a matter between teachers of affiliated colleges and teachers on the campus. This conflict, he believes, is unnecessary. This becomes a conflict, given the old history of the University. This University was established in 1882, but in 1904 when a Common Universities Act was brought in to govern the Universities of India by Lord Curzon. It happened with a lot of background to it. According to that background, the Universities should be seen as institutions where teaching and research happens concurrently. But no teachers were appointed in any University in India till then. In Panjab University, a small number of teachers were taking their salary from the University budget. Those teachers were appointed in so called Oriental College which was created as an appendix to the Government College Lahore in 1864. Only those teachers who were teaching Sanskrit, Urdu etc were paid from the University income. The (main source of) University income was the same as it is today i.e. from the examination fee. Since there was teaching department so there was no question of income from tuition

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

fee. So, in 1904 when the Universities commenced, somebody had to perform the job of faculties of the University. The question is what is the faculty of the University. In the universal sense, faculty means the people who teach, but there was no teaching faculty. But they had to kick-start the whole process. To kick-start the whole process, it was said that the Senate members of the University will perform the role of faculties of the University. The 1904 Act said that there will be 85 members of the Senate, out of which ten members would be from the Graduate Constituency. The Graduate Constituency was the same as it is today, i.e., graduates of five years standing. Some of them were the Ex-officio Members and the remaining seventy persons were nominated. They were asked to perform the duties of faculty members. Then it was said that every member would perform the duties of three faculties and it would be responsibility of the Senate as to which duty he would perform. But how the Senate would decide it. Practically, it was that every member of the Senate would choose the faculties as per his preference. Faculties were defined and preferences were asked for. It was a common Act for all the five Universities. The process of teaching and research in Calcutta University had gone ahead as there were scientists like Professors J.C. Bose and Prafulla Chandra Ray. The Indian Association of Cultivation of Science was established in 1876. So research tradition was there. All these persons were in Colleges. There was no person in the Universities. Calcutta University was having ten faculties and in Panjab University there were eleven faculties. The members were asked to choose the faculties. In Calcutta University, every faculty has the same weight and every faculty would choose one Senator and in this way ten Senators would be elected on behalf of faculties. In this way, whatever number was specified, that was the total number. But in the case of Panjab University, it was said that one Fellow each from the five (major) faculties would be elected. These five faculties were the present six faculties, except the Combined Faculty. Thus only five Fellows were to be elected from the (five major) faculties. The Combined Faculty came into being after 1947 and till 1947, they were having only five Senators from faculties. There was no teacher (paid from University funds) in any University in 1904. When Honours school was started in 1919 at PU, the University started appointing teachers. In 5-6 departments, Professors and Lecturers were appointed and there were no Readers. Even these teachers of the University were not members of the faculties. When the University departments were made, they were inter-collegiate organizations. The teachers in Lahore who used to participate in the postgraduate teaching, on behalf of the different colleges, they constituted the departments on behalf of the University. Only one or two teachers were paid salary by the University. They were designated as parts of the University departments. So, on paper they were the University faculty. They were teachers of the University departments as constituted at that time. But, out of them, no person was the member of the faculties. University started in independent India in 1947 and (almost) the same Act was adopted by issuing an ordinance. Whatever number of teachers was there at Lahore, nobody knew where they had gone after independence. In this background, they said that the work which a Fellow was doing for three faculties, now he would do for four faculties. This was the basis that the preference of faculties increased from three to four. In the twentieth Century India, Delhi University was already established 1922, Agra University came into being in 1925 and the Lucknow University in 1920. In other States, the Universities had also come up which were unitary type universities like that of Banaras Hindu University, where there were departments

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

and the city colleges were affiliated to it. Likewise, the Delhi University was also a unitary University. Till this time concepts has come that a University would have its departments and appoint teachers which would include Professors, Readers and Lecturers. It was also written that the University Professors would be the members of the faculties by default, but the added members of the faculties were continued, which was a part of the 1904 Act. If somebody is a lawyer, how he can take the responsibility of two more faculties to which he does not know anything. He has to appoint Board of Studies etc. etc. Now every person had chosen two faculties of his choice . In every faculty there are two persons who do not know about that faculty and they are 2/3 in number. Then it was said that two persons would bring an added member who knows about that faculty. When the then government was nominating 70 people, they were not nominating them arbitrarily. More than 90% of the people nominated by them were the Principals of the prominent Colleges, such as DAV College, Government College, Khalsa College Principal, DAV College Jalandhar, Government College Hoshiarpur, Government College, Kapurthala etc. Some the Principals of Technical Colleges were nominated. While nominating members, they also took into consideration the geographical distribution. Likewise they also nominated senior teachers, who participate in the postgraduate teaching, such as Shri Vishwanath, Shri Diwan Anand Kumar, Dr. S.S. Bhatnagar; but before 1947, these (eminent academics) were not members of the any faculty, but they were nominated. In 1947, they said that out of the 70 members, half would be nominated and half would be elected by the academics. In that background, the Principals Constituency and Teachers Constituencies came into being. In 1947, there were no teaching departments in the University, but now the University teachers think that more persons are elected from the colleges and there is very less number of persons from the University. So, there is lot of heart burning. The Act of 1904 when it was made applicable in the form of an Ordinance in 1947, before that there was no member from the University, unless someone is nominated. Since there were very few Professors in the University, how many could be nominated. When it started in 1947, there were no teachers from the University in the faculties. If somebody says that they had said that divide the University and College teachers in the ratio of 50:50, then there was no teacher in the campus. This is the background where the whole thing was embedded. When they had to make the added members, they would again be from the colleges. It was felt that the added members would keep on coming from the colleges until there were teachers in the University. So, gradually, the University (Campus) started developing after 1960. On a query, the Vice Chancellor said that the teachers who were teaching at Hoshiarpur, they were the inter-collegiate faculty.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that there were two colleges, one was Government College, Hoshiarpur and the other was University College.

However, the Vice Chancellor clarified that the Government College was converted into a Constituent College of Panjab University. He said that those who were earlier in the Punjab government service and then joined Panjab University, they were considered as Panjab Government employees, but those who were appointed by the Panjab University, they were Panjab University employees. So, it was a hybrid state. Somewhere, the Punjab Government rules were

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

applicable and somewhere the Panjab University Calendar rules were applicable. So, the Head of the Department could be an appointee of Punjab Government or he could be a person appointed by the Panjab University. It was a mixed hybrid state and Diwan Anand Kumar had chosen Government College, Hoshiarpur because Shri Vishwanath was Principal of Government College, Hoshiarpur, Shri Vishwanath was a Zoology Professor and Diwan Anand Kumar was also a Zoology Professor and thus they had good understanding. Hoshiarpur was called the Kashi of East. When the University came to Chandigarh, there were few Professors in the faculties. At that time everyone could not become a Professor. This set up would have remained the same, but the added members were must, number of colleges was expanding till 1960. When the University started growing and Career Advancement Scheme was introduced, everybody could aspire to become Professor, Headship was changed and started by rotation which could go down even to Assistant Professor with eight years' of service. In that system it was there that the Professors and Heads of the Departments would be members of the faculty. So, if the Head of the Department was Reader or a Lecturer, he could be a member of the faculty. In this way, a dynamic change was witnessed in the number of faculty members, Continuing, he said that the document which he has submitted in the Court, tables have been given where it has been mentioned about the distribution of faculties. In the year 1904, when the University was in Lahore, in the Oriental Faculty, 36 Senators had given their option and the number of added members was 20. In Arts faculty the number of Senators and added member were 48 and 24, in Law Faculty it was 9 and 1, in Medical Faculty the number was 8 and 4, in Science Faculty it was 27 and 13, in Agriculture Faculty the number was 11 and 7, in Commerce it was 12 and 6, in Engineering, it was 7 and 4, in Dentistry the number was 6 and 4, in Veterinary it was 6 and 4 and in Education the number was 8 and 0. In minor faculties, since the strength was less, one person each from the faculties of Oriental, Arts, Law, Medical and Science would be elected as Fellow. The present structure of the Syndicate is a part of the Act of 1904 as it mentioned how many Fellows would come from the Science Faculty, Law Faculty etc. etc. In 1947, they had just made a small tinkering and nothing else. They had just added in it that one Fellow from Combined Faculty would come and similarly it is also added that three Fellows would come in the Syndicate from the Combined Faculty. So, this is all they have evolved. The Vice Chancellor said that he has given in the table, what was the situation in 1944-45 and what was the situation when the University came to this Campus. A table had been attached showing the situation in 1961. It has also been mentioned what was the situation in 1983, 1993 and 1999. The situation kept on changing with the passage of time. There was no Engineering Institute earlier. There was only one Engineering College, but their Professors were not the employees of Panjab University. Only the employees of UIET and UICET were the employees of Panjab University. Even a learned Professor of Mechanical Engineering in PEC could not be a faculty member of Panjab University. Similarly, a learned Professor of Medical College could not be their faculty member. Their faculty member could be a person who is the Professor of the Dental Institute. So, this is the background in which the whole thing has evolved. Now the question is that the University faculty has got representation in the faculties, but even today, there is large number of Senators who are nominated or Ex-officio members, they do not teach the classes. Every Senator could be a member of four faculties and they take part in electoral politics and because of this so much

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

heat is generated as to who has taken which faculty. The electoral politics has a separate dynamics to that of academic responsibility. Owing to the electoral politics, there has been an unnecessary conflict between College Professors versus University Professors. Somebody has said that as the University Professors are members of the faculties, in the same way the College Professors should also be members of faculties. There is no way in the Calendar to do it unless some changes are brought in or some modifications are done. This is the background of the conflict. At the moment nothing seems possible to it. He said without making much tinkering, one way to do it is that the government has made Professors in the government colleges and all the grant-in-aid colleges are left. So among the teachers of the colleges also, there is heart burning. The question is, how to address this situation. One solution to this problem is that the added members, even today, are coming from the colleges. It has become a part of the University politics as to who two Senators would make whom an added members. Added members could be half the number of Senate members. If they take a choice from the Senators that all the approved Associate Professors in the entire University system, Colleges, Associate Professors of three years standing and above and also those who have already become Professors, out of these an Added Members Faculty could be formed. The term of the Senate is four years. The added member would have a term of two years. They could be taken by seniority and subject-wise. Since all could not accommodated, so the persons next in the seniority could be added and so on. This is the one way of reducing the heart burning. This would not have any effect on the University teachers. The University Associate Professor with three years standing could ask for to make them members. They can also be put in the same bunch of seniority list as if there is a seniority list of Associate Professor in the entire Panjab University system i.e. Colleges and University teachers put together. Added members could be made out of that list as per the seniority. Those who could not be accommodated they should be put in the next list and so on.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that in this background they can discuss this item as they deem appropriate.

The members said that the suggestions are very good.

The Vice Chancellor said that he was termed as an outsider, but he informed that he has been visiting this University twice in a year from the year 1972 and had delivered many lectures in the Physics department. Such number of lectures might not have been delivered by any other alumnus of Physics Department.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu while appreciating the proposal of the Vice Chancellor said that this would reduce the problem of their colleagues because if there is a condition of three years for the Associate Professor to become an added members, then only they will approach and thus this will reduce the burden on the teachers' representatives.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have suggested to make all Professors the members of the faculty, but he felt that all those who are eligible for Professorship, they could be the members of the faculties. The Vice Chancellor suggested the members to discuss on this issue among themselves and they could then discuss.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Committee constituted for the purpose should consist of one or two University teachers also because at present there are only college teachers. They should consider about this proposal in a proper way and only then some solution of the problem could be found.

Professor Mukesh Arora and some other members said that there were teachers from the University in the Committee, but they did not attend the meeting. Continuing Professor Arora said that the University teacher say that there was no provision in the University Calendar, but the exact position is that there was no Professor in the Colleges. Secondly, the University Professors say that they are superior to the College Professors which is not true.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had been holding the interviews for appointment of teachers in the University. He could say that there are very good teachers in the Colleges who have got very marks in the interview. He further stated that in the University, there are teachers who got only 51 marks out of 100 when they were promoted under Career Advancement Scheme.

Professor Mukesh Arora further said that they could see that most of the Professors in the University have come from the Colleges, so they should not do any discrimination as all of them are equal to each other.

The Vice Chancellor said that is why he has said that this talk is not proper because as per the UGC regulations, the College Professor as well the University Professor are appointed with the same criteria. If there is difference, that is only in the science departments. There is no difference in teachers of Hindi, Sanskrit, Public Administration and such like other departments. He further said that the subjects where M.A. classes are running since long, there is no difference among the College and University teachers. He said that he has talked as far as CAS promotions are concerned and not the direct appointments. The College teachers are becoming Professors or Associate Professors under CAS because direct appointments are not being done there.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he would like to talk which might be on the sideline of the issue. He stated that the affiliated colleges are suffering since May. They have held a meeting in May last but no approval of panel of subject experts and Vice Chancellor's Nominee is given to them. No meeting of the Committee which was formed for the purpose could be held. The teachers are waiting for their promotion since the last year. He further informed that in the Committee there is no teacher from the Colleges except Principal B.S. Josen.

The Vice Chancellor asked them to show him the list of members of that Committee and he would make necessary changes in it.

However, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that virtually there is no need of that Committee. Deputy Registrar Colleges should know the process as to how they have to be promoted. They suggested that they should follow the UGC



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

rules in this regard. If the subject experts as required are sent after approval, then they can hold the interviews.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that for the unaided colleges, the UGC rules are applicable, but for the aided college, a nominee of the D.P.I. and a University nominee are required.

The Vice Chancellor asked the S.O. to Vice Chancellor if any file is pending in his office to which he said that there is no file pending. The Vice Chancellor asked the S.O. to contact the D.P.I. Colleges, Punjab and D.H.E. U.T., Chandigarh and enquire as to how many case of promotion of Associate Professors are pending and the reason thereof. These should not remain pending because of their fault.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the issue is that of unaided colleges. If they start asking for panel from them, it would take another six months more. The teachers who have started from the year 2000, now they have become eligible for promotion to the post of Associate Professors. On the one hand they say that they do not find candidates for the post of Principals and on the other hand they do promote them. How they could get candidates for Principals.

The Vice Chancellor further said that they should not become a choke point and no file relating to this should remain pending in his office.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma and Principal Iqbal Sandhu said that the requests are lying pending in the University office and requested that these should be got cleared at the earliest to which the Vice Chancellor said asked to send these requests to him and he will clear them.

Principal Sandhu further requested that there is no need to constitute any Committee as it will again take a long time.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not in his knowledge. He asked to give him time and he will look into it during lunch.

Shri Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the Punjab Government had issued a letter that the University will constitute a Screening Committee to scrutinize the applications. This Committee will issue a certificate to the effect that whether the person is eligible or not.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that then they have to constitute a Committee.

The Vice Chancellor asked, how much burden they would put on the University.

Professor Mukesh Arora requested that in case they have to form Committee, some teachers from the colleges might be made members of the Committee. However, he endorsed the view point of Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu that there is no need of a Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said, let him look into it as at the moment this is not in his mind.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Shri Shaminder Singh Sandhu while reminding the Vice Chancellor said that first a Committee was constituted under the Chairmanship of Professor B.S. Ghuman, but after that Professor Ronki Ram was replaced as Chairman of the Committee. He further informed that the Committee did not hold any meeting.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will look into it and further stated that they should not keep on proposing the things. They cannot raise any thing and ask for its answer immediately. He cannot not answer any question until he has relevant paper with him. How he can react to their queries. How he can say 'yes' or 'no'.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) should know everything about it. If some new guidelines have come, if they have to know about UGC rules etc., they know it, but why the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) does not know about it.

A pandemonium prevailed at this moment and the Vice Chancellor had to adjourn the meeting.

When the meeting resumed, the Vice Chancellor said that they will come back to this item later.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma suggested that it would be better if the Committee constituted to consider the issue is expanded and some more teachers of the University be added to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that this matter is before the Syndicate and asked what will the University teachers add to it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that they there are some apprehensions as all of them have read it in the newspapers.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that he has explained the background of it. The matter is before the Governing Body of the University and they can make a small sub-Committee from themselves and invite whosoever they deem appropriate and they have to give suggestions to him as to how this has to be taken to the next meeting. The Vice Chancellor told them the names of some person i.e. Professor Pam Rajput, Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Professor Navdeep Goyal or any other person they deem fit. Two proposers of the resolution i.e. Professor Mukesh Arora and Dr. Dalip Kumar.

It was made clear this Committee has been proposed for considering the issue as laid down in item No. 15.

The Vice Chancellor said that arising out of this issue, it is brought to the notice of the Syndicate that the promotions of the College Associate Professors in the non-grant-in-aid Colleges are getting delayed and this needs an attention. He said that he will check up where these are chocked up. If these are chocked up because of some action on his part, he requested to allow him to check up as it is not in his knowledge. Before the end of this meeting, they will see how they could resolve it and expedite the matter. The Vice Chancellor further said that when they are talking about Associate Professors, they are not making any distinction between Campus, Regional Centres of the University and all the affiliated

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

colleges i.e. aided or non-aided. Every Associate Professor has a date of eligibility. He would must fall in some faculty. The lists would be prepared faculty-wise. In the time-ordering, it will be seen how much scope is there in every faculty of having the added members. They cannot touch the term of current added members. Whatever process they have to commence, it will be commenced after the end of the present term. Whatever they would propose, it would require the approval of the government. They cannot execute it till the approval is received from the government. So, this process is going to take a little time, but it can be commenced so that the tussle between College versus University could be put to an end. Once the University was an amalgamation of colleges, but even after 1947, they did not have the time to amend the Act in the background of Indian independence. They just picked up the Act of 1904 and made some tinkering in it and they started. After that no one could find time to see to it because in 1966, the re-organization Act came and Haryana and Himachal Pradesh came into being. They started looking to their own universities. The Panjab University became abandoned as far as the government of the day looking into its affairs. So the Panjab rules were made applicable to it. Now they have to look at with a holistic view. The confrontation cannot take them ahead and they would keep on fighting with each other. He further stated that they are a Governing Body for the entire University. Now a new dimension has got added. There are about 60 M.Ed./B.Ed. Colleges which are governed by NCTE rules. If they have to run post-graduate classes, they are required to appoint Professors there. In this way, they have their own problems. There would be a good number of Professors by default. So, it is their responsibility and it has fallen on them as a Body. If they resolve it, the credit will go to them.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said what they have been seeing politically is that every Fellow has to get nominated his two Special persons as added members. They had already made this commitment at the time of their election

The Vice Chancellor said that there is need to change the thinking. That is why they have to take a holistic view of the whole thing. The purpose of the University is not perpetuity in the Senate member continuing in the Senate. Once a person has become a member of the Senate, then all his actions are diverted as to how he could become a member of the Senate next time. One has to come out of this. The members felt that it needs to change their mindset to which the Vice Chancellor said that it will definitely change.

Addressing to Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu, the Vice Chancellor said at a time, he was a Lecturer, but now he is Principal. and with this he has got a bigger responsibility.

Professor Mukesh Arora said the idea of becoming a members of Senate again is always there in the mind of everyone. He quoted the example of the Vice Chancellor that he might be aspiring for further extension. It is what natural that a person thinks about that post where he has been working. Even the M.L.A. and M.P. think how to get a ticket next time. Everybody tries for getting the seat next time.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not made any lobby for Vice Chancellorship.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Mukesh Arora said while addressing the Vice-Chancellor that he may not think like that, but everybody does try for it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is true what the Vice Chancellor has said. When in the Guest House people were saying that Professor Arun Kumar Grover has become the Vice Chancellor, he had asked them who is this person. Though the names of other persons were there, but he has listened about him for the first time.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to come out of it. He informed that they have solved the problem of rotation of headship. They have also solved the seniority issue and roster issue also.

**RESOLVED:** That the following sub-Committee be constituted to re-examine the issue threadbare:

1. Professor Pam Rajput
2. Professor Navdeep Goyal
3. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma
4. Professor Mukesh Arora
5. Dr. Dalip Kumar

**Amendment in clause (ii) of Syndicate decision dated 1/15/28 & 29/05/2016 Para 81**

**16.** Considered if the following amendment be made in the clause (ii) of the decision of the Syndicate dated 1/15/28&29/05/2016 Para 81 (**Appendix-XII**), as per recommendation of the committee dated 01.07.2016 (**Appendix-XII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for Selection of the Oration speaker for the year 2016 in the area of Arts, History and Appreciation for the 1<sup>st</sup> Dr. Urmi Kessar Lecture/Oration:

**Clause (ii)**

<b>Existing provision</b>	<b>Proposed amendment</b>
Contribution towards his/her travel expenses, normally upto Rs.30000/- local hospitality to be provided by the University.	Contribution towards his/her travel expenses, local hospitality to be provided out of interest earned on the Endowment fund.

**RESOLVED:** That the following amendment be made in the clause (ii) of the decision of the Syndicate dated 1/15/28 & 29/05/2016 Para 81 (**Appendix-XII**), as per recommendation of the committee dated 01.07.2016 (**Appendix-XII**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor for Selection of the Oration speaker for the year 2016 in the area of Arts, History and Appreciation for the 1<sup>st</sup> Dr. Urmi Kessar Lecture/Oration:

**Clause (ii)**

<b>Existing provision</b>	<b>Proposed amendment</b>
Contribution towards his/her travel expenses, normally upto Rs.30000/- local hospitality to be provided by the University.	Contribution towards his/her travel expenses, local hospitality to be provided out of interest earned on the Endowment fund.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**Writing off item of  
Department of  
Physics**

**17.** Considered recommendations of the Committee dated 01.09.2017 (**Appendix-XIII**) that the following item in the Department of Physics, be written off as the same is beyond economical repair.

Particulars	PHS No.	Date of Purchase	Purchase Value
63 KVA Genset (Kirloskar make)	PHS/5	06.03.2008	Rs.5,42,000/- + Rs.63,000/- installation charges

**NOTE:** As per P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009 appearing at pages 450-51, the competent authority to write off losses is as under:

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

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that the following item in the Department of Physics, be written off as the same is beyond economical repair.

Particulars	PHS No.	Date of Purchase	Purchase Value
63 KVA Genset (Kirloskar make)	PHS/5	06.03.2008	Rs.5,42,000/- + Rs.63,000/- installation charges

**Request of Shri  
Ashutosh, Sr.  
Assistant, PUSGRC,  
Hoshiarpur**

**18.** Considered the reply dated 10.08.2017 of Shri Ashutosh, Sr. Assistant, PUSGRC, Hoshiarpur, in respect of the memorandum issued vide No.11428-29/Estt. dated 01.08.2017 pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 (Para 33:-

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 33) has considered the enquiry report dated 23.11.2015 submitted by Professor R.K. Gupta, Enquiry Officer and resolved that:

- (i) enquiry report dated 23.11.2015, submitted by Professor R.K. Gupta, Enquiry Officer, USOL, P.U. in respect of circumstances in which a sum of Rs.3,31,937/- payable to Ms. Aruna Sud, Deputy Librarian (Retd.), Hoshiarpur was credited in the account of Shri Ashutosh Sharma, Sr. Assistant, Regional Centre Hoshiarpur, as per Appendix, be accepted.
- (ii) major penalty of "removal from service of the University which does

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

not disqualify from future employment” be imposed upon the delinquent official Shri Ashutosh Sharma, Sr. Assistant, Regional Centre, Hoshiarpur.

2. The case of Shri Ashutosh Sharma was discussed by certain Syndics during general discussion in the Syndicate meeting dated 23.07.2017 and the Vice-Chancellor said that he would look into it.
3. An office note is enclosed.

Initiating the discussion, the Vice Chancellor said he hoped, they might have read this item.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that this item has already been decided by the Syndicate and the punishment has also been decided, therefore, this item should not have come to the Syndicate. This was endorsed by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal

The Vice Chancellor said that there is a letter from Mr. Ashutosh in response to the reply of the show-cause notice issued to him vide letter No.11428-29/Estt. dated 01.08.2017. In this letter Mr. Ashutosh has written that this is not a fair enquiry and show-cause notice issued to him be withdrawn. The Vice Chancellor said that he is not convinced that they should withdraw the show-cause notice.

However, some of the members also expressed the view to convert the major penalty imposed on him to that of minor penalty.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that when the case of Mr. Padam had come for consideration, in that resolution, it was passed that until the decision of the case, he will be reinstated. There were 4-5 cases. When the note was prepared, it was not prepared in consonance with the Syndicate resolution. In this case, they must have seen the enquiry report in which he (Mr. Ashutosh) was not at the helm of affairs at that time. The other two persons who were working on temporary basis, who had transferred the money to his account, they have been terminated. He further informed that Mr. Ashutosh Sharma has returned the whole amount as and when he had been asked to do so. Once he returned Rs. 2 81 lacs and after that Rs. 50 thousands. He requested that Mr. Ashutosh Sharma be given minor punishment and or wait till the decision of the Court as is being done in other cases.

The Vice Chancellor said that the disturbing point is that after admitting all the mistakes, he says that it is not a fair enquiry. How he can make this statement. Why they should be lenient to someone, and what message they are sending as a Governing Body, that people go on embezzling the public money. The Vice Chancellor further said that whatever he has done, he did it on behalf of the Syndicate.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this case should not have been brought to the Syndicate again.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that if he does not do it, then they would say that the matter has not been placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they had reinstated the suspended persons on the ground that they are paid 75% of the salary, so they should get some work from them. The spirit behind this was that nobody should take salary without doing any work. In the last Syndicate meeting, the penalty was imposed on him and there was no reason to reopen this case.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the case is in the Court and whatever decision comes from the Court that will be acceptable and the Court verdict would come within six months.

Principal N.R. Sharma also requested to reduce his punishment from major to minor to which the Vice Chancellor said, why they should do it. Continuing, Principal N.R. Sharma further said that the punishment could be reduced because the case is subjudice to which the Vice Chancellor said it does not mean that if the matter is subjudice then they should reduce the punishment.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they want to defer the case, it is upto them. The Vice Chancellor read out the final prayer made in the letter which states, "it is prayed that the show cause notice given to the undersigned be withdrawn against the undersigned". The Vice Chancellor asked them do they recommend that the show-cause notice be withdrawn, do they want to revise that decision. He said that he just asking them a straight blunt question. They have to take a decision and he (Mr. Ashutosh) has not prayed anything like to collate it with Court. Even the Syndicate cannot take a call on this that his case is pending in the Court.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that the Syndicate decision was also the same and he (Vice Chancellor) may read it. He informed that the enquiry was done in December 2015, then why this case was brought now. It has been brought as a specific case. He said that he could tell the reason as to why this case was brought now, but the Registrar said that would tell the reason for it.

It was informed by the Registrar that the file had been recovered in his office. It was hidden and inadvertently stuffed somewhere else.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked as to why the note has been changed to which the Registrar said that he has not changed the note. Principal Sharma asked him to read the decision of the Syndicate when decision on the case of Mr. Padam was taken. Principal Sharma said the case has been brought under pick and choose.

Shri Jarnail Singh asked the reason as to why this case was brought again to the Syndicate.

The Registrar read out the resolved part of Syndicate proceedings of 12<sup>th</sup> July 2014 (Para 9), which reads as under:-

"That all those employees, who have been placed under suspension for more than two years and are getting

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

75% or more of the salary as subsistence allowance, be reinstated pending the outcome of their respective cases and the Vice Chancellor be authorised to assign appropriate duties to these employees”.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that an internal Enquiry Committee was constituted in this case and its report was received on 23<sup>rd</sup> November, 2015. Obviously, its report should come to the Governing Body.

The Registrar stated that it was ordered in 12.4.2013 to institute an enquiry into this matter. Professor R.K. Gupta had submitted the report on 23.11.2015. It took more than two years. Then it has to come to the Governing Body. Both the cases are independent. Even if it is subjudice, that is being taken by the Court, but subsequently they are convinced that they have examined everything, they can give their statement in the Court. They can say that it is an established fact and that they have got an independent enquiry done and they have found him guilty and the guilty is being brought to the Governing Body.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma asked to read out the ‘resolved further’ part to which the Vice Chancellor said that it was a decision of 2014 whereas the report in this case came in 2015.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma read out a portion from the discussion which stated that “Principal Gurdip Sharma said that similar is the case of Ashutosh who is working at Hoshiarpur, the same should be taken care of”.

The Vice Chancellor said that his this statement recorded here does not imply here.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they have done it on the basis of this. This should not apply on one person. It should be applied on all the other persons as well.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that a person is reinstated so that work could be done from him.

The Registrar further clarified that in the enquiry, it has been established and there is also documentary evidence that the amount has been transferred to his account.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said whether they should do something or not to do, it should be based on the enquiry report.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the enquiry report was placed before the Syndicate and it had taken a decision on it. After that he has made a representation. Actually, this item should not have come to the Syndicate because the Syndicate has already taken a decision.

The Registrar said that for condoning the penalty, Syndicate is the only authority and nobody else.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that Mr. Ashutosh has stated that this is not an impartial and fair enquiry, then who will come to conduct



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

such type of enquiry. He has withdrawn the money and later deposited it.

The Vice Chancellor said that if they are disputing the enquiry report, then they should form a sub-committee of the Syndicate which would look into all these things. He asked the members if they want to have an enquiry committee over the enquiry committee.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that they should wait for the Court decision which is likely to come within six months.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there was no need to give any show-cause notice when it was decided by the Syndicate. They have accepted the enquiry report and a major penalty has been imposed on by the Syndicate.

However, the Registrar said it is a requirement to give him show-cause notice. Since enquiry has indicted him, thus they have to give him show-cause notice. If penalty has to be condoned that is the authority of the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said if the show-cause notice is withdrawn, it would give the impression that the enquiry is wrong which is not appropriate. This was also endorsed by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked if he has deposited the money, does it mean that he is not guilty to which the Vice Chancellor said that he will remain guilty because he has been indicted.

The Vice Chancellor said that on the basis of this letter they cannot condone the penalty.

Principal B.S. Josan said if they have to wait for the decision of the Court then the consideration on this item could be deferred.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said if there had been mercy appeal, then it could be considered.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that they can say that they cannot do anything on this letter, however, if a mercy petition comes to it, then it could look into it.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that since they have already accepted the enquiry report, how they could defer the item.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that no decision be got done from this Syndicate as it would give a very wrong signal as they have already decided the matter.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said the situation would have been different, had there would be a mercy petition, but the present letter cannot be considered a mercy petition as it is not properly worded.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested to consider it sympathetically.

The Registrar said that he is challenging the enquiry.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he might have got this application made from a lawyer.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have a responsibility. Tomorrow Pooja Bagga and Mr. Naresh Sabharwal would also come. People ask for mercy and pressurise them.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it was not in his (Mr. Ashutosh) knowledge about the transfer of money to his account. He was involved in this. There were other persons who had done it.

The Vice Chancellor asked Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma not to plead this case like this as he is a part of the decision making body. Why should a Syndicate members plead. It is not fair. The things which he (Mr. Ashutosh) himself is not saying, how they can say it.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he is fully convinced and the persons who have got transferred the money, they have already been dismissed. The amount which was deposited in his account has been returned by him. He further said that he is just requesting them to consider this case sympathetically.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that he (Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma) should say this when they took the decision in the earlier meeting to which Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he was not present in that meeting.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it was decision taken by all of them.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma again requested to defer it and he would ask Mr. Ashutosh to submit a mercy petition or they can stop his three increments.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu suggested that he should be asked to submit a mercy requesting therein to reduce the penalty imposed on him as he has committed a mistake unknowingly and that he has served for a very long time in the University with a blemish-free record.

Most of the members requested to defer the consideration of this item.

When the meeting resumed after the lunch break, the members again commenced discussion on this item.

On being asked by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal about the decision taken on Item No. 18, the Vice Chancellor said that they have taken the decision that in order to enable him to file a mercy petition, let the current appeal submitted by him, be rejected.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked, would they ask him to file mercy petition to which the Vice Chancellor said, no, they will not ask him, but they just reject it. It is for him to take some next step. If he files a mercy petition, it will again come back to them in the next meeting. As of today, they are not having any mercy petition. As of now, they have to decide whether he is to be awarded major

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

punishment or minor punishment. So they are just deferring that today.

However, Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said if the major punishment is not to be given, then by giving minor punishment, the matter should be closed.

The Vice Chancellor said that for minor punishment also, a mercy petition should be there. So this is rejected and the decision with regard to imposing major or minor punishment is deferred.

**RESOLVED:** That the representation of Mr. Ashutosh be not accepted.

**Appointment on  
compassionate grounds**

**19.** Considered minutes dated 26.07.2017 (**Appendix-XIV**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds.

The Vice Chancellor said that Item 19 has the cases for appointment on compassionate ground. He said that he was a little concerned that they are taking too long to decide these cases. The office has to be concerned about it these compassionate cases as they are wards of University employees. They want to give them relief, but the office is delaying the cases. The system has the intent to give them relief and if they delay the cases like thing, it spreads ill-will that the University is not compassionate enough. The system is wants to be compassionate, but the lethargy in the system is such that they end up inviting trouble for us. He said that he just got the information from the F.D.O. that the money of Mr. Gupta which was to be transferred from the P.G.I., with a lot of efforts, it came just in the last week. They do not know how much time still it will take. They can just see that an employee has passed away, there is so much goodwill, the employees has, so many people are pleading, still neither those benefits are paid nor his son has been given job. His son was promised a job, at that time he was in the last year of degree. Four months ago he has completed the degree has been completed, but still he has not been given the job.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that it is true that everything is now okay and after that it was decided in a Committee meeting that the appointment has to be made. It has been written that after the approval of the Vice Chancellor, appointed on Technical cadre, on completion of the Degree, after obtaining comments from the Chairperson of the Department of Physics. They have to ask for comments from the Chairperson, Department of Physics on which post he is to be appointed, but they (University office) has not sent that letter so far.

Dr. Dalip Kumar read out some lines from the recommendations of the committee which state "after detailed discussion, the Committee recommended that Mr. Bhuvnesh Gupta may be appointed". This is for consideration. He suggested that they should resolve that in order to speed up the process, they authorise the Vice Chancellor for making this appointment on the recommendations of the Department of Physics. He said with this recommendation would help to speed up the case. Professor Navdeep Goyal also endorsed his view point.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

The Vice said that one of the faculty member (Mrs. Archana of DES) who was a single parent, she passed away. Her son has also put in an application for a compassionate appointment. That case is also pending. He said that he would also like to bring it to their attention and put it in the process, because when they have to do it, it is better to do in time.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it could be done only after the confirmation of the minutes to which Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would get it done only tomorrow.

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 26.07.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the cases for appointment on compassionate grounds, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the other pending cases of appointment on compassionate grounds be processed on priority basis. It is also resolved that Vice-Chancellor be authorised to accord approval for appointment of Mr. Bhuvnesh Gupta on recommendation of Chairperson, Department of Physics.

**Issue of award of 13 marks to Ms. Gurdeep Kaur**

20. Considered recommendations (**Appendix-XV**) of the Vice-Chancellor that Ms. Gurdeep Kaur (former student of Human Genomics) to be awarded 13 marks to reach the aggregate of 50% in the third semester of M.Sc. Human Genomics. Let this be not cited as precedent for the future in any other case, in pursuant to order dated 17.05.2017 in CWP No. 11623 of 2009, Gurdeep Kaur v/s Panjab University & Others.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 28.2 of PU Calendar Volume-II, 2007 at page 22 is reads as under:

“Grace marks up to one percent of the total marks of an examination including its part/s if any, shall be added to the total marks secured by a candidate for the award of higher class (and not for earning distinction/honours); provided that no grace marks have already been availed of for passing the examination”.

2. The petitioner got admission in 2005 and cleared the 1<sup>st</sup> semester in December 2006. The result of the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester was fail and her result after re-evaluation in 2<sup>nd</sup> semester, May 2008 got declared as Pass with increased marks i.e. 305/600 marks and the candidate's result of 3<sup>rd</sup> semester got declared FAIL in aggregate after re-evaluation awarding her better increased marks in 3<sup>rd</sup> semester re-evaluated Paper-303 (December 2007). The candidate requires 13 marks for 50%

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

aggregate in the third semester to pass as she has secured 287/600 marks. Whereas the candidate is entitled for only 2 marks, as she appeared in December 2007 under Roll No. 5167 as re-appear candidate only in two papers in an examination comprises of 200 marks.

3. Representation of Gurdeep Kaur, Ex-student of M.Sc. Human Genomics dated 22.06.2017 is enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).
4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XV**).

The Vice Chancellor while briefing about the Item No.20 said that this item relates to a student who has been requesting for grant of 13 marks for the last so many years. She has not been properly advised. Had she would been advised properly, she would have passed the examination by now by again appearing in the examination. But now it has got so late that now no examination could be held again. Even if she takes the examination, it is not sure whether she would pass the examination or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he has brought this case to the notice of the Controller of examinations. The candidate needs on .04% marks.

The Vice Chancellor asked if the he has some authorisation to recommend it to the Syndicate for condoning, they should do it. Why they drag the cases for such a long time.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that perhaps the power to grant grace marks is not with the Vice Chancellor.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the talk about the section relating to grace marks, it is an academic regulation given in Volume-II. Obviously, it has to be approved by Syndicate and Senate and hence one can make an objection.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that in his DAV College, Abohar, one Mr. Sandeep Agarwal is a Lecturer in Computer. He was having a bit higher than 49% marks. But he could not be made eligible by the Screening Committees because he could not qualify the academic criteria of 50% marks and thus his case was not approved. Then he has to again appeared in the examination for improving his academic score. But here they are doing here at will. The Vice Chancellor asked him to refrain from using such a language. Continuing, Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said, had there been power with the Syndicate, thousands of teacher who are working in the colleges, there approval would have been done. He can give many example of such candidates. Whatever is being done, it is wrong. He further said that if there is any complaint in the papers, then it goes to the Board of Studies and if it finds something wrong, they can recommend it and then it is sent to the Vice Chancellor for approval.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the grace marks are given only if there is very low pass percentage and just to raise the pass percentage, the Vice Chancellor can grant some marks to every candidate. But this could not be done in the present case.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if there is a question paper complaint, that is a separate issue, but in these cases there are different measures. In this case, she is short of 13 marks and there are two compartments. For those two compartment papers, she could be given only 1% mark in each paper. Now in this case, their plea in the Court could be that she is could claim 1% grace marks in her Semester-1 & II examination, if she has not availed it earlier. Continuing, he said in M.A. final examination, if a candidate appears in four papers, he can avail four marks, but to improve or to pass the examination or if he is to placed in first division, he could be awarded 1% of the total marks.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said if a candidate in the graduation examination gets 27 marks in one paper, he could be given 8 marks to make it 35 to pass the examination i.e. one percent of the total marks. But if he appears in the compartment paper, then he will be given only one mark i.e one percent of the total marks of that paper.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the people have been doing it. They fill the form for eight papers for improvement and they will just get zero marks in those papers, they improve in one paper only and in this way they are awarded eight marks.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that what Shri Jarnail Singh has said, it is okay. If a candidate fills up fee for eight papers he will get grace for all papers, but he has to appear in all the eight papers, that also only if the result or his degree gets changed.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested to give her last chance. Professor Mukesh Arora, Principal Hardiljit Singh and Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu also endorsed it.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there are so many such cases where the candidates need only 1-2 marks and such candidates should be given a chance.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they could be given a chance and they have done it earlier also.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there are cases where the candidates need only 3-4 marks in a paper.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said when they determine the eligibility, if there is only half mark less, such candidates are not considered eligible. However, he opined that a special chance could be given to such candidates to pass the examination.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this case is different from the others. In this case there is requirement of 40% pass marks in individual paper and 50% in the aggregate. The problem in this case is that she got 40% in the individual papers, but she could not get 50% in the aggregate which is also a requirement to pass the examination. She has requested in the Court that she need 50% marks to pass the examination and she should be given grace marks at the rate of 1% of the total marks of all the four semesters.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that the total marks of her examinations are 2400 and she has requested to give 1% of total marks.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that in M.A. degree there is requirement of 40% marks in aggregate to pass the examination. Suppose one has got 50 or 52 marks in three papers and got 32 marks in the fourth paper. In this case he could be given 8 marks to pass the examination. He further stated that there may be cases where the candidates have got the pass marks in the individual subjects, but they may not have got 40% marks in the aggregate.

Professor Mukesh Arora that he feels that the candidate is pass in the individual paper, but she has not got 50% marks in the aggregate to pass the examination.

The Vice Chancellor stated that this candidates has got 50% or a bit more than 50% in three semesters, but she is short of 13 marks in the fourth semester. Her plea to the Court is that she should be given 1% of the total marks i.e. 1% of 2400. On being suggested by the members that let the Court decide in the matter, the Vice Chancellor said that the Court has referred this matter to the University.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said what they can do at the maximum is that they can give her a chance to appear in the examination.

On a query by a member that there could be hundred of petition in such cases, the Vice Chancellor said that he is not afraid of hundred of petitions, but they should be justified. They should not afraid if the work has increased.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that if they have to do it, then it should be done for all such cases. He further stated that there are many students who cannot go to the Court, so it should be done for them also. Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal also supported this.

The Vice Chancellor said that the students has done all this. If they have to advise her like this to appear again in the examination, this could have been done five years ago. They have granted golden chance so many times to the students, someone could advise her to avail those chances.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said why they should advise her, it was for her to decide. If she desires, she could appear.

Dr. Dalip Kumar read out Para 28.2 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-II, 2007, which states that "Grace marks upto one percent of the total marks of an examination including its part/s, if any, shall be added to the total marks secured by a candidate for the award of higher class (and not for earning distinction/honours); provided that no grace marks have already been availed of for passing the examination. In view of this, he said that the candidate is not earning distinction.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is her plea in the Court. She is pass in all the papers and if she gets 50% marks, then she

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

would pass in 2<sup>nd</sup> division. To enable her to pass the examination on the basis of overall examination. She is already pass in every subject individually. Now they are enabling her to be declared pass. There is no improvement and distinction. This is the pleas with which she has gone to the Court. The Court has not taken a decision and passed it on to them. So it is before them to take a decision.

Principal Hardiljit Singh and Dr. N.R. Sharma requested to reject this item.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the people will ask only question as to why the grace marks have been given to only one person. There could be so many other such cases. Those who have not approach and those who cannot approach the Court, why they should not be given the marks. He further said that he is have 3-4 such cases. He suggested that she could be given a chance. This was also endorsed by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal and Dr. Subhash Sharma.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal enquired about the decision taken on 20.9.2017 which was the next date of hearing to which the Registrar said that she may not have gone there.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma that it has become a matter of discussion among the people whether they have started passing the candidates by granting grace marks to the extent of 13 marks and they should abstain from it.

This is where, they have to withstand. They should not afraid of if this has become a matter of discussion.

Principal Hardiljit Singh said that they do not afraid of such talks, but at the same time they do not want to break the rules.

The Vice Chancellor stated that he has recommended that 13 marks be given to her because he felt convinced that 1% of 2400, if it can enable her, after a gap of 8 or 10 years to just have a pass degree of this University. He further stated that in Honours School a candidate who does not get 90% marks, he is given Hons. School degree, but he is given the Pass degree.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the regulations should be amended and it should be mentioned in the regulations that if the grace is to be given, it would be given on the total marks.

The Vice Chancellor suggested that they form a Sub-Committee whether some solution could be explored.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu while objecting to said that it would mean that if a person has just scored 11 marks, he could be declared pass by giving 24 i.e 1% of total marks to make it 35.

The Vice Chancellor clarified that it is must for the candidate to pass in individual subjects.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this provision is only for those who would pass in the individual papers. A person getting 11



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

marks cannot be declared pass because he would be required to pass in that paper also.

The Vice Chancellor said it is very simple to change the regulation, where the word "improvement" is written, what they have to do is that if 1% grace marks can enable someone who is pass in all the individual subjects could be granted to cross the 50%.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the regulation would also required to be changed where there is a condition of getting 40% in aggregate to pass the examination.

The Vice Chancellor further said that the student should be pass in all the papers individually, he has not taken grace anywhere, then he could be given 1% of the total marks if a person can be enabled to cross specified percentage of marks.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said suppose, a candidate of B.A. class passes the 1st Semester examination by getting 36, 37, 40, or 41 marks in four papers, respectively. In 1st Semester he is required 160 marks i.e. 40% marks in aggregate. What they will do in such a situation.

The Vice Chancellor said that no decision is being taken at the moment. The Para 28.2 which she has quoted in the Court, it has been written in that para "for earning distinction and honours" they are required to add "if a person is pass in the individual subjects, he can be given 1% of the aggregate marks for enabling him to pass the examination.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said whatever they could say, but a candidate could be considered pass only if he fulfils the conditions of aggregate marks also. In the instant case the plea of the candidate is wrong.

The Vice Chancellor said that this has to be brought in as resolution as an amendment or addition to what is already existing. He further stated that when they face a difficulty, only then they address it. Constitution was written, somebody as tall as Ambedkar, have they not amended it so many times.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that there is no need to change the regulations as their examination system is already contradictory. Every time they ask for golden chance to which the Vice Chancellor said that they are the persons who always demand for golden chance.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said though they ask for golden chance, but the candidate is declared pass as per the conditions laid down in the regulations.

A pandemonium prevailed at this moment.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Calendar as it stands does not permit to give 1% to enable somebody to pass. If she has to be enabled to pass via 1% of the total, then it needs amendment. A Subcommittee of the Syndicate will consider whether that amendment is necessary or not. If they consider it necessary, they will bring the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

proposal. In the meanwhile she is permitted to avail of the special chance with normal fee. The rule, as it is quoted is not applicable.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu requested to record his dissent.

A pandemonium prevailed at this moment.

The Vice Chancellor said, whatever is stated in the Calendar, strict applying of this does not permit 13 marks to this candidate as recommended by him, hence the recommendation that she should be given 13 marks is rejected. The Syndicate's recommendation is that she should be given a special chance and if this matter has to be changed in the light of the fact that if a person is pass in each paper, this applies to earning distinction or honours. This is a case where a person is pass in individual subjects, but overall she is not pass because she is falling short by 13 marks which is less than 1% of the total marks. If she has taken 1% or the marks in 24 papers, she would have would have earned 24 grace marks. If the problem has been distributed, her aggregate could have increased. This is the plea she has taken in the Court. If it is necessary to change, the Syndicate Sub-Committee will ponder over it. If they think, it should be changed, they would come out with this. If they think, nothing is to be changed, the matter will remain as it is.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that the proposal he has made is rejected because it is violative of whatever is stated here. Is there is any dissent on it that a special chance will be given, he asked.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is correct to give the special chance, but they should not form the Committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it will send a signal that this candidate has the genuine right, but the regulations was coming in the way and that is why the regulation is being amended, though they have rejected the case. This regulation has been there for the 30-40 years. The Committee may not be made by linking it with this case.

The Vice Chancellor said that it okay, if somebody wants to form a Committee independently, they can do so.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that if somebody wants, he can give the resolution.

The Vice Chancellor said it is okay, the Committee will not be made arising out of it.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said they can change the regulations by making a Committee from today, but they cannot make applicable from the back date.

The Vice Chancellor said now they are resolving only what is there in the Calendar. One percent is allowed for award of higher class.

Shri Jarnail Singh said where it is applicable, it is also a problem. It is one percent of the total marks. What they exclude the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

internal assessment. When they include practical and theory marks for granting one percent, then why not internal assessment marks.

Principal Iqbal Sandhu said in the Semester System if the total system is viewed properly, the candidate not passing in third semester has to be reversed and he has to appear in the fourth semester which he has already passed, if they go by the old rules of annual system. If they want to help the candidate, they should give her a chance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the regulations are course-wise. They can make a regulation for this course only, it cannot be an overall regulation.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that these are very old regulations. Nowhere in the world, the candidate is allowed to sit again for the paper which he has already passed. Now if a person is failing in all the subjects of Ist Semester, he could appear in the 4<sup>th</sup> Semester examination, it is because that these regulations suits them. He, therefore, requested that the old regulations, wherever it necessary, may be got amended as the annual system is not there now.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that still their mindset is as per rules of annual system. In that system it was said that a chance could be given to B.A. 2<sup>nd</sup> Years students only. Even at that time he has said that if a chance is to be given, it should be given to B.A. Ist year students also. If they want to bring some change, then it should be taken to that Committee where they feel something could be done in this regard.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor, in pursuant to order dated 17.05.2017 in CWP No. 11623 of 2009, Gurdeep Kaur v/s Panjab University & Others, that Ms. Gurdeep Kaur (former student of Human Genomics) to be awarded 13 marks to reach the aggregate of 50% in the third semester of M.Sc. Human Genomics, **as per Appendix**, be not accepted and a special chance be given to her at normal fee.

**Resolution of  
Professor Navdeep  
Goyal regarding status  
of Panjab University**

**21.** Considered the following resolution dated 28.08.2017 proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, Syndic (through e-mail), regarding status of Panjab University, pursuant to the Syndicate decision 20.08.2017 (Para 23):

“Panjab University be declared an Institution of National Importance without any change in Governing and Academic structure of the University” (Funded by Central Govt.)”

- All the affiliated College situated in the State of Panjab and Chandigarh will remain with the University.
- The service conditions of non-teaching staff and other benefits being provided to them at present will be not be changed and these will be given as per Punjab Government rules.
- The service conditions of the teaching faculty will be as per UGC/Central Govt.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

- NOTE:**
1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 20.08.2017 (Para 23) considered the resolution proposed by Dr. Gurmeet Singh, Fellow for grant of Central University Status and decided that Professor Navdeep Goyal and Shri Jarnail Singh be requested to prepare a fresh draft resolution on the issue of grant of status of National Importance/Centrally funded institution to Panjab University.
  2. Accordingly, the resolution proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal was circulated through e-mail on 28.08.2017 to the members of the Syndicate for perusal and consideration.
  3. The above resolution was placed before the Senate in its meeting dated 10.09.2017 for consideration and after discussion, the members were of the view that the item should be placed before the Syndicate.
  4. As decided by the Syndicate at its meeting dated 23.07.2017(Para 12), the data of other Universities which have been converted to the Central Universities was not received upto 20.08.2017 had now been received and was also placed before the Senate.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that he has come to know that when Allahabad University became a Central University, all the affiliated Colleges were disaffiliated from the University and it the State had to make a separate State University. He requested that it should be enquired into properly because if their University is made a Central University, it might meet the same fate.

The Vice Chancellor said, let him give a little bit of more background. There is this issue and right now the Court has taken cognisance of it. The hearing was held two days ago and Justice A.K. Mittal who has started to hear the case now said that he would also look into the status of the University. In that context, he made him (Justice A.K. Mittal) aware that, to some extent, this dispute about the status of the University is out of the ignorance of the history of the University. He said, he does not know how many of them would have studied the first Chapter of this book (showing the Yellow Book, 'A History of Panjab University'). He suggested that all of them should once read this book once. He stated that he has distributed a number of copies of this book to various people. A DVD of this book has also been prepared. However, he would again send a copy of this book to each of them. This has also been uploaded on the website of the University. The Vice Chancellor said that they need not to read the whole book, it is sufficient if they read only first 34 pages. Continuing, he said they have to read about, what their University, who created it is and how it has evolved.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor read out the first page of Introductory Chapter of the Book "A History of The Panjab University, Chandigarh (1947-67) by R.R. Sethi and J.L. Mehta which

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

states that “the genesis of the modern system of education in the Panjab may be traced back to 1849 when the Province was annexed to British India.” During the very first year of the British rule the State Government opened an English School at Amritsar in which English, Hindi, Urdu, Persian, Arabic and Sanskrit were taught. Soon afterwards, a scheme for establishing ‘4 normal schools, 60 elementary schools and a Central College at Lahore’ was also contemplated. But the real foundation of modern education in the Province was laid by Sir Charles Wood’s Despatch of 1854\*\*. At this point of time the Vice Chancellor read out the explanation given for the two stars which states that “At the time of the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company in 1853”. After that the Vice Chancellor explained about the East India Company whose shareholders were the Royalty of England and M.Ps of England, Members of Parliament and many rich persons. The ruling class of England was the owner of the East India Company. This company was given the charter and this Company was being looked after by the England Government.

The Vice Chancellor again read out explanation given in the book at two stars(\*\*) which states, “At the time of the renewal of the Charter of the East India Company in 1853, the British Parliament made an enquiry into educational developments in India through the appointment of a Select Committee consisting of some members of the House of Commons. On the basis of the report submitted by this Committee, the Court of Directors sent this famous despatch to Lord Dalhousie, the Governor-General of India, on July 19, 1854”.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that the mutiny of Delhi was controlled by Lord Dalhousie.

The Vice Chancellor again started reading the explanation given for two stars (\*\*) which further states, “This despatch was described as Wood’s Despatch after the name of Sir Charles Wood (afterwards Lord Halifax), he was also the Secretary of State for India in England, who was then the President of the Board of Control. It is a very lengthy document and deals with many questions of educational importance”.

The Vice Chancellor further said that in the Wood’s Despatch, it was suggested that there should be a D.P.I. and for the implementation of the Wood’s Despatch, one percent of the land tax of Punjab will be used for education and a holistic plan be prepared which will envisage to take care of the education from primary level to the University level. Till that time, there was no University in India. In 1856, the East India Company decided to make three Universities i.e. Bombay, Calcutta and Madras. The decision to open Universities in India was a consequence of Wood’s Despatch. Consequence of Wood’s Despatch was regulating school education in Punjab and that one percent of land tax of Punjab will go to open schools. After the mutiny of Delhi and formation of three Universities, India’s control shifted from the East India Company to the Parliament in the year 1857 and no University was made for 25 years.

In order to make more clear the start of education system in India, the Vice Chancellor read out the following paragraphs at page 2 of the Book ‘A history of the Panjab University’ :

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

“In accordance with the recommendations of the Wood’s Despatch, the Department of Public Instruction in the Panjab was established in January, 1856. “A cess amounting to one per cent of the Land Tax was attached to education, and within two years 456 village schools were opened from this source while grants-in-aid were contributed to the support of various Mission Schools in the Province.”

After the Great Revolt of 1857, the rule of East India Company came to an end and the British Crown took the reins of Indian empire in its own hands. Lord Stanley, the first Secretary of State for India, re-affirmed the policy of 1854 by a despatch in 1859. A Medical College at Lahore was opened in October, 1860 and in April 1861, Sir Charles Wood, now the Secretary of State for India approved “the formation of a school of a superior order at Lahore which would serve as the nucleus of a Central College”. This school was a rather curious combination of a Government High School and a Chiefs’ College, containing separate classes “for the sons of nobles and other persons of distinction.” About this time, a similar institution was opened at Delhi which had been attached to the Panjab after the Great Revolt of 1857. These institutions fell within the jurisdiction of the Calcutta University and prepared students for the Matriculation and the Intermediate course each of two years’ duration of that University.” The Panjab Administrative Report for the year 1860-61 records with satisfaction that “four candidates educated in the Panjab (including Delhi) were successful in passing the Entrance Examination for the Calcutta University.”

The Vice Chancellor said that till this time the matriculation examination did not start and as mentioned above, it was Entrance Examination of Calcutta University. The first College was opened in Lahore in 1864. As regards whether they are Centre University or a State University, he said that the first College was opened by the English people who had started the regulation of education in India. The person who had opened it, he was the Secretary to State for India. The office of the Secretary to State for India was created after the Queen had taken over reigns. Whatever happened in Punjab, it happened in Lahore. It was the direct creation of the so called Central Government of India. They have done that very thing in Lahore and Delhi was attached to Lahore. The Panjab University which was established in 1882, was not named after any city. It was a University named after Punjab including Delhi. In 1904, Lord Curzon brought and the Act of Indian Universities which has also a background which has been described in this book and he then read out the following paragraph (page3) from the book:

“In 1863 the Panjab Government obtained necessary sanction for the opening of degree colleges in the State and in the following year two Government Colleges were established, one at Lahore and the other at Delhi. They prepared the students for F.A. and B.A. examinations of the Calcutta University. Dr. G.W. Leitner, formerly Professor of Arabic and Muhammadan Law at King’s College, London was appointed the first Principal of the Government College, Lahore”. A Mission (Degree) College was set up at Lahore in 1866 and was affiliated to the University of Calcutta. For want of public interest, however, it was closed in 1869.”

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. G.W. Leitner was born in 1940 and was only 24 years old when he was appointed as the first Principal. The University was opened on 14<sup>th</sup> October, 1882, he said, it was because that 14<sup>th</sup> October was Leitner's birth day. The Mission (Degree) college which was closed in 1869 resurfaced as F.C. College, Lahore after the University came up in 1882.

Continuing the Vice Chancellor said, in nutshell, it is the first University created in 1882 by the then Central Government of India in India. The first three Universities were made by the East India Company. As a consequence of Wood's Despatch, the Central Government brought an Act in 1904 which applied to the then five Universities i.e. Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Lahore and Allahabad University. Allahabad University came into being after five years of Panjab University. Not only Delhi University, H.P. University and M.D.U. were carved out from Punjab, but everything was carved out from this Punjab State. So, this is the original University of National importance of India. Let us not have any doubt about their status. Nothing has changed from 1904 to 1947. In 1938, when Provincial Assemblies were made, Sikandar Hayat Khan was the President of Unionist Party and Mr. Baldev Singh was also a Minister. In 1938 a full time Vice Chancellor was appointed in the University. Then a line was written which was recorded in a document that he has distributed to all of them. It states that, 'Provincial Government shall not pass orders, save with the concurrence of the Government of the Province wherein the College concerned is situated'. The Punjab Government was temporarily given the responsibility that they should see the daily administration of the University as a full time Vice Chancellor has been appointed and more Universities would come with the passage of time and there is any dispute, they should come to the Central Government. So the masters of this University remained the Central Government of India. Then India became independent and the University was divided in two parts. The Colleges situated in India were with this University and they had to take their examinations. The University had to be restarted and for that an Ordinance was promulgated. By making only minor changes in the old Act, the Ordinance was issued. That was called East Punjab University Act because that part was in East Punjab. But on 26<sup>th</sup> January, they became to Punjab and this was made a Panjab University Act. Panjab University Act was applying to all the territories which were in India. There was a time when Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Burma, NEFA etc. were also with the Panjab University because they were a National Institute created by Central Government, but the then Central Government did not give them any money. The Punjab State was reorganised on linguistic basis in 1966 under the Punjab Reorganisation Act. In Punjab Reorganisation Act, these words were replaced with Central Government. Because the Chandigarh became a disputed territory, owing to the capital of two States. There were two Chief Ministers, two Education Ministers, one for Punjab and the other for Haryana. Similarly, two D.P.I. were there i.e. one for each State. In this way some minor changes were made and the Body Corporate became Interstate Body Corporate. Where from the word Corporate came? The Universities were supposed to be corporate, but no one in India was cautious that University is a corporate. This whole concept came from Lord Curzon and is beautifully recorded. That is why, he is saying that they should read all this. It is a wonderful piece of work. It has been compiled by R.R. Sethi who was a Research Associate of Mr. J.S. Bruce who had written

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

this book was a British. That is why there is continuity in both the books. So, they could know about the finances only from these books. The British Government did not give them any money. The whole amount required for running the University was either to be generated or to be donated by the people. This book says that it is a peoples' university, earlier he was also not aware of it.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma asked the Vice Chancellor if he has a list of the persons who have donated money to the Panjab University to which the Vice Chancellor said that he does not have any such list.

The Vice Chancellor further said that anybody may or may not agree to it, they are a Central Institute and they are an Interstate Body Corporate. As per the Act of 1904, they were not a University which was belonging to a State. British India was one thing. Patiala, Kapurthala, Kashmir, Rajasthan, Delhi etc. were separate States. So they were Interstate Body Corporate right since the inception. Only in 1947, they have become a State University when the University was a Body Corporate, actually an Interstate Body Corporate, but the 'Interstate Body Corporate' word came into writing for the first time in 1966. Prior to it, they were already an Interstate Body Corporate. It is just writing now because two Chief Ministers have come. Every Maharaja of Kashmir was a member of their Senate. All the Nawabs were the members of their Senate. All the Heads of the States who were giving money to the University, were the members of the Senate. So they should not have any confusion. They are a National Institution. To whose degrees the Cambridge University and Oxford University had given equivalence, he asked. If the Oxford University has started giving scholarships in the name of Dr. Manmohan Singh and by doing so they acknowledged their connect with this University from the time immemorial. If the British Government had made education a nucleus, it was in Punjab. The first college in Calcutta was made by Raja Ram Mohan Roy and the Hindu College was later on known as Presidency College. The British took hold of India with the strength of Punjab. Since they wanted to rule over India, they made education a tool for this and started to expand school education. They needed Clerks only, but by 1904, they got good number of Clerks. Then they thought that there should be research in the Universities. So Indian Universities Act was the first Act when they said that teaching and research should run simultaneously. They started bringing Professors from England for teaching and research in the Universities. The first instalment of grant for GIAN Scheme was given by the British Government and the names of British Professor who have first come here have been mentioned the first Chapter of the book. So they are original Central Institution and present resolution for National Importance etc. it is just reiterating the old one. They are not doing anything new. Why they are reiterating?

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that, in nutshell, they can say that their University is the mother of all Universities. Why they should follow the other people, rather they should follow them. This University established before the other Universities. Recognition to the degrees of Panjab University was given by Oxford University. So they have a very rich heritage. Why they are running after the others?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not his resolution. He was asked by the Syndicate, so he brought this resolution.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Shri Jarnail Singh said that it is not a resolution of Professor Navdeep Goyal, either it should go to the proposer or they should reject it.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that after knowing the history of the Panjab University, they reject this resolution.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the resolution was first mooted by Dr. Gurmeet Singh and it was discussed in the Senate that the Proposer of the resolution has to autonomy to amend it or not to amend it. Therefore, it should be sent back to the Proposer as it cannot be accepted in this form.

The Vice Chancellor said they do not intend to disown it, but the book 'A History of the Panjab University' in its first chapter says that they are an institution created by the first in British India after the British Parliament took the reign of India, they are a Central Institution since then.

Most of the members desired that the Vice Chancellor should read this book in the Senate.

The Vice Chancellor asked the Special Officer to Vice Chancellor to send through email the first 34 pages of the book to all the members of the Syndicate. The Vice Chancellor said that he has read in this book that they save 20% of the fee to put it in the University reserve. Till 1904, the University had a reserve equal to the examination fee which they used to collect. Today's they are collecting Rs. 150 crores from the examination fee. If they want to have some reserve, then they should pass a resolution that they would put 5% of the examination fee in the University reserve in the year 2017-18, so that they may not face the situation again which they faced in August, 2016. They should have that much of reserve with them that if they come across with the shortage of money, they should be able to run the affairs of the University. This is the legacy which they have forgotten.

Dr. Rabinder Nath stated that Professor T.N. Kapoor (former Vice Chancellor) has left a quite good amount of money in the University reserve, but the other Vice Chancellor said that money is not to keep in reserve, it should be spent.

The Vice Chancellor said that right now they have to compete with the other institutions. If Pune University could have a reserve of Rs. 500 Crore, why they cannot do so. If they want to compete with the Pune University, then they are required to have a reserve equivalent to that of their one year's budget. They should make a beginning for it as has been written in their yellow book. They should put some amount of money from the University income in their reserve fund. He said, let it not be decided in a hurry, but, conceptually, it is their heritage. This is the job of the Think Tank and to save the University, there should be holistic thinking. There is no need of new ideas as much can be had from the old ones

**RESOLVED:** That resolution dated 28.08.2017, **as per Appendix**, proposed by Professor Navdeep Goyal, Syndic (through e-mail), regarding status of Panjab University, pursuant to the Syndicate decision 20.08.2017 (Para 23), be not accepted.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**Deferred item**

**22.** Considered minutes of the committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor regarding University Examinations 2017.

Dr. Dalip Kumar stated that they have not received the papers concerning this item and hence it should be withdrawn and brought in the next meeting of the Committee. However, it was informed that the papers relating to this item have been placed on the tables of the members. When the Vice Chancellor said that this Item be deferred, Dr. Dalip Kumar said this item should not have come here.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that 2-3 meetings of the Committee already constituted have been held. They have been asking for some documents from the Secrecy Branch and from other quarters. They are not getting cooperation and the required documents have not been supplied due to which the matter is being delayed. However, as soon as they get the required documents, they will do it. So, this item could be deferred.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he is also saying the same thing that when they do not have the necessary papers, how they could discuss it, so they should defer it.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know whether they call the Controller of Examination or the concerned person from the Examination Branch so that they can answer the questions to be raised by the Committee.

Principal B.C. Josan that they call them in the next meeting. They would first call the complainants and after that they will call the Controller of Examinations.

On being asked by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal as to how much work they have completed, the Vice Chancellor said the papers submitted are the status report.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the Controller of Examinations has himself expressed his desire to participate in the meeting.

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

**Report of Committee regarding cases of misappropriation of the funds of Punjab Financial Corporation by Professor V.K. Chopra**

**23.** Considered report of the committee constituted by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 25.06.2017 (Para 9) with regard to follow up the cases of misappropriation of the funds of Punjab Financial Corporation by Professor V.K. Chopra.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said if they look at the papers, the issue which is worth legally examined, it has been written that nothing has come from the Punjab Financial Corporation. When they look at the report, the report talks about "all misdeeds of Professor Vijay Chopra". Now, he is already retired and is a pensioner. He asked, legally, what action they can take against him, this needs to be examined.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is for them to think, what they can do. He said that Mr. Chopra is a challenge to the Governance of the University. The Vice Chancellor asked the members, is he not challenge to the Governing Body to which the members said, yes. They face this menace. Do they not have this much strength that they could counter someone.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal said, what the Vice Chancellor has said is right, but they have to see as to what they can do. They have to discuss it. Whatever has come to their notice is that he (Dr. Chopra) was not taking classes, he used to level false allegations on the people. On the basis of that it was discussed in the Syndicate and Senate and on that basis a red entry in his service book was also done. After that he was also made Chairperson of a department.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was all done with the approval of the Governing Bodies. It was in their knowledge.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Professor Chopra) kept his service book hidden in his custody till all the pensionary benefits were granted to him.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one issue is that he kept his service book in his custody due to which his misdeeds and the red entry made therein had remained unchecked.

The Vice Chancellor said that given this type of track record, he (Dr. Chopra) should not have been given the reemployment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that due to all these things coming not to the fore, he (Dr. Chopra) was able to get reemployment, gratuity and all other things. He was also taking pension. A computer also remained in his custody.

Dr. Subhash Sharma asked if they could stop the pension and if some punishment is to be given, what could be that punishment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal asked if they can file a complaint against him.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Dr. Chopra) put all papers to Prime Minister's Office and from there these papers travelled to UT Police and then they forwarded these papers to them. He gave the proceedings of Syndicate to U.T. Police. They asked us as what action the University wants from them and what case could be put on him. So, even the UT Administration has asked them as to what has to be done. So, is he not a menace to the society? First he commits mistakes, then serves legal notice and also insults people. He also manipulated the things in the University and gave his rejoining. With whose connivance, all this is being done, is he (the person supporting him) not a member of the Senate? Had he not been a member of the University Syndicate? Why they (Syndicate members) are afraid (of doing anything).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said there is nothing to be afraid, but they have to think as to what they can do. Should they do a police complaint?

The Vice Chancellor said that when he (Dr. Chopra) gave his joining report, was it not sent through the serving Professor of the University. On what basis, the joining report was sent to him (VC)? Why his joining was taken? What authority he (Chairperson) had to take his joining report.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked if they can stop his (Dr. Chopra) pension. He further said that he had been doing business at Jalandhar without permission. He also remained absent from duty, he was not taking classes, he did not perform examination duty, he had taken a loan which he did not return.

The Vice Chancellor said even there was a sexual harassment case against him (Dr. Chopra), but by intimidating the students, he got the complaint withdrawn from the students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said an order was passed in which he (Dr. Chopra) was asked not to take the classes, but he could not be stopped from taking classes. This was the reason that he was able to intimidate the students and the students withdrew their complaint because they feared that he will spoil their career(s).

The Vice Chancellor said it means they (the members of Governing Body) are tolerant. What type of Governing Body is this, if they are so tolerant? The persons who are supporting him, are they not the members of their Governing Body? Are they afraid of punishing each other?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one thing is that he has concealed the facts. It is sufficient to file a case of under section 420. However, it will be decided by the police.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they should take a legal opinion on the report as to whether they can take any action against Dr. Chopra as he is a retired person. Can any disciplinary proceeding could be initiated against him on the basis of the report of the Committee. The loan case of Punjab Financial Corporation could also be mentioned and information must be collected about this. He had not informed the office of PFC that he had been doing job in the Panjab University. After having the legal opinion, the item be brought to the next meeting.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that proposal for punishment be brought and decision be taken in the next meeting of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Chopra has been manipulating the whole system. He has been in the habit of sending legal notices to everyone. Every day he sends letters to the Senators and sends complaints to persons all over India. Is there any governance in the University?

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that since they did not take any action, that is why he is doing so.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that when it was established that Dr. Chopra is a culprit, unfortunately from 2006 to 2012, he was kept in a commanding position. He was made Chairperson of a department, he was also made expert at various places and so on. So he got very much respectability otherwise everything was established against him, all the Committees had indicted him. He said that he has received a document dated 14.6.2013. According to this document, Mr. Chopra went to R.S.D. College, Ferozepur with a Committee, of which he was not a member. He told them that since he

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

was not a member of the Committee, he will not claim TA/DA. But after that he thought if all the persons are taking TA/DA, he should also take it. For this, through the (then) Dean College Development Council they got the college to agree to make payment of TA/DA to him (as well). The fraud in this is that he got the payment of TA/DA from the College as nominee of the D.P.I., whereas the nominee of the D.P.I. has always been a Principal of the Government College, which could be a bigger fraud than this. He further said that they can enquire it from the Principal of R.S.D. College, Ferozepur.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to show teeth as Dr. Chopra has made a mockery of them. Besides getting information from the RSD College, the University record should be got checked. The Vice Chancellor further said that the officials who are in connivance with him, they should also be booked.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that there are very big guns in his support, what they could do to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that whosoever has supported him, they are all here, (i.e., in Senate). The Vice-Chancellor added that the pension to all University teachers is to be given from the fee to be collected from the students, because the Central Government is not going to give money for pension. The amount of Rs. 208 crores committed by the Central Government this year is only for the salaries of serving teachers and 1:1.1 of non-teaching employees and the rest of the amount will have to be collected from the fee of the students, year after year.

Dr. Subhash Sharma opined that if somebody commits a mistake with the office, he is liable to be punished. The scams which are being detected today, the persons who have committed those frauds are being booked, because they have signed the documents. FIRs are filed against them and sentences are awarded to them.

The Vice Chancellor said that if he has claimed payment of TA/DA as nominee of the D.P.I., it becomes a case under section 420.

**RESOLVED:** That legal opinion be sought as to what kind of action could be initiated against Professor V.K. Chopra.

**Report of Inspection Committee dated 12.08.2017 in respect of C.G.M. College, Mohlan**

**24.** Considered report dated 12.08.2017 Of the inspection Committee constituted by the affiliation Committee, pursuant to General discussion of the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 in respect of surprise visit at C.G.M. College, Mohlan, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib, with regard to infrastructure and grant of temporary extension of affiliation in the various courses/subject.

**NOTE:** The Inspection Reports of following sessions are enclosed for information:

Sr. No.	Session	Documents	Page No.
1.	2012-13	Members of Inspection committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.	<b>1-A-3-A</b>
		Inspection Report.	<b>4 - 19</b>

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

		Letter regarding granting affiliation to the College.	<b>20 - 27</b>
2.	2013-14	Members of Inspection committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.	<b>28-33</b>
		Inspection Report.	<b>34-57</b>
		Letter regarding granting affiliation to the College.	<b>58</b>
3.	2014-15	Members of Inspection committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.	<b>59-62</b>
		Inspection Report.	<b>63-87</b>
		Letter regarding granting affiliation to the College.	<b>88</b>
4.	2015-16	Members of Inspection committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.	<b>89-92</b>
		Inspection Report.	<b>93-119</b>
		Letter regarding granting affiliation to the College.	<b>120-121</b>
5.	2016-17	Members of Inspection committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.	<b>122-124</b>
		Inspection Report.	<b>125-161</b>
		Letter regarding granting affiliation to the College.	<b>162-162/A</b>
6.	2017-18	Members of Inspection committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor.	<b>163-170</b>
		Inspection Report.	<b>171-192</b>
		Letter regarding <b>Not</b> granting affiliation to the College.	<b>193</b>

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they were discussing a case in the Affiliation Committee meeting where they have decided permission for 1<sup>st</sup> year be not granted because there were many things which were reported by the Committee which had gone there for inspection. He informed that an interview was going on in a Constituent College where one girl appeared. It was her claim that she has been teaching in C.G.M. College, Mohlan, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib. Then one of them asked, are the classes held there? She told that after the interview, she did not go there, but after her selection, her salary is put in her account and the same day it was withdrawn by getting a cheque signed from her. Continuing, he said that after formally talking, they felt that this is not the only college which is indulged in such practices, but there are other colleges doing so. It was also decided in the Syndicate that there is a large number of non-attending colleges where the students do not come. Only their admission is done and their examinations are conducted. It was decided that they should check at least some of the colleges. They have to conduct inspection at Guru Nanak College, Muktsar. The other two members were Dr. Vipul Narang and Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu. It was decided that they should just give a surprise visit C.G.M. College, Mohlan, Distt. Sri Muktsar Sahib which is only 40 Kms from there. What they saw there was very surprising. A large number of School children were coming out of the College gate. When they asked the College people about this, they said that some renovation/repair work was going on in the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

school building. Then they asked them to show where the Colleges students are sitting. They inspected all the classes. There were 4-5 classes running at that time. They were allotted nine sections of B.A. If they look at the strength of graduation classes, as per the sections which were allotted to them, it should have 27, plus B.Sc. Agriculture classes. In this way, the number of classes should have been at least 30. Only four or five classes were there and total number of students was 30-35. Then they started to check to record of previous years. Last year about 1600 students were admitted. For this year also, the admission as around 500 students, but the number of students was that which were sitting there. No record was maintained as other attendances were concerned. Based upon all these things, they thought that if the college is running like this it is not fair. They also checked the last years' Inspection Committee which visited this college and found that most of the members were from the Department of Evening Studies. They had recommended that all the inspection reports of this college be seen and all the other things may also be enquired into thoroughly. If vigilance inquiry is required that should also be done. The documents which the college has supplied, there are so many other glaring things. One is about the inspection committee where the name of Dr. S.S.Gill and Dr. Manju Jaidka have been deleted and the name of Prof. V.K. Chopra has been put there. Who has written this, he does not know, but it is there. Similarly, Dr. Bhupinder Kaur and some other names are there. It has happened on 26<sup>th</sup> of June, 2011. This is the period, when the present Vice Chancellor was to join. Then a Committee was constituted. The Committee went there and also approved. Referring page 20 of the agenda papers, he read out the last line of the para which says "furthermore the College shall submit building plan duly approved by the District Town Planner within one month of the date of despatch of this letter. He does not know how they can give affiliation to a college without the approval of the building plan. Generally this is the function of Survey Committee and generally, till the date a college does not complete this requirement, the affiliation is not granted. So this is the first glaring mistake that even without approval of the building plan, affiliation was given to which the Vice Chancellor said that the papers were signed by the Deputy Registrar (Colleges) Mr. Dhiman. Professor Navdeep Goayl said whatever, it may be, but it has to be seen, why and how it happened.

Dr. Vipul Narang pointed out that his College had opened, the XEN had put many objections and all the maps were got approved from Chandigarh.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said this is very serious mistake and whosoever is involved he should be asked about it. While referring to page 31 he said that the College has applied for B.A. for 160 seats which is equivalent to two units. Referring to page 47, he said, what is really interesting and glaring is that there are clearly two handwritings, one is dark and the other is light. In the Column "Is infrastructure is available in terms of class rooms, laboratories and equipments". In this column they say, Inadequate, has been detailed in Inspection Report by the respective experts and then at the end the recommendation has been made at two places, whereas normally it at one place. Either it is said granted or that the proposed extension be granted for under some conditions. He also pointed out that two different inks have been used. In the third column, 160 seats for B.A.- I & II class have been recommended. This is in different ink. But in the first column it is recommended for grant of two previous units

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

plus two additional units. It is a clear fudging by someone and it has been written by someone afterwards. The College has applied only for two units but finally the Committee is recommending four units instead of two units and also they are talking about to give grant for two more units on conditions. Forensic check could be got done for the different handwritings. He said that they can match the handwritings at page 53. There seems to be fudging in the dark handwriting. He also informed that in the year 2013-14 also the affiliation of many colleges was cancelled including their Ayurvedic College. But in the case of this College, they granted four units when the college has just asked for two units. While referring to page 62, he said that in 2014-15, the College also applied for B.Sc. Agriculture and if they see the inspection report regarding this, it is recommended by the Inspection Committee that proposed extension of affiliation be not granted. On the basis of this reports of 10<sup>th</sup> of May, the extension has been granted which is mentioned at page 88. Similarly, when they look at some of the reports, particularly at page 88, it has been mentioned that "salary is being paid in the UGC scales of 15600-39100+AGP and DA of 72%. This cannot not be found in the record. He does not understand, how it has been written. So, that is why he is saying is that whatever has not been granted, that has been granted after the inspection report. Whatever should not have been granted to the College without inspection, that has also been granted. This clearly shows that there is some big fraud. Secondly, the lapse would also be put on them because the lot of people are talking about it. He said that they keep a proper attention that the Inspection Committee should be different for different colleges.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the lapses which have been pointed out, the case should be referred to the C.V.O. and the examination centre of the candidates of this College be made at P.U.R.C., Muktsar.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that after calculating, he felt there should be a total of 38 teachers. Once he was on a visit to Abohar. He wanted to visit this College also but someone told me that the way is not good and he dropped the idea of going to this college. Next day Shri Munish ji met me and asked that if he had to go to his college yesterday. He (Shri Munish) further said that one of his men had played a trick with him so that he may not reach the college. He said that they should compare the report of April 2017 of Principal Kuldeep Singh and the other reports, then they can see that there is difference of zero and hundred. Whatever Committee has gone there, they have written two common things, one that they point out is the less number of teachers in each course, but at the end they tick for grant of what is required by the college. Every Committee has written that there is no window in any room. The students strength has come down from 1600 to 496. He said that he is talking about the report of August, 2016. The other report of Principal Kuldeep Singh is of April 2017. Perhaps college may have got some message and improved their infrastructure, but he could not find anywhere whether any compliance has been done by the College. They should not have given extension till the compliance report had been received. The College has not submitted the compliance report and the (University) office has issued letters for affiliation. This is a very serious issue under whose pressure all this was done. Except the year 2015, there are almost similar names in the inspection committee.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal said if the Vice Chancellor has removed his name from the list, it again came in the list.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that last time 18 people Committee visited this college in April, 2017, but there was no nominee of the D.P.I. This is a very serious issue. When there were no doors and windows, how they were allowing them to continue. This college has not done any compliances pointed out by the Committees. So the compliance report is also required to give final nod.

Shri Shaminder Singh pointed out that it has been mentioned about a teacher that her salary was being taken back from her. He said that such issues are there in many other colleges. He requested that they should also do something where this type of exploitation is being done to which the Vice Chancellor asked him to give a list of such colleges.

The Vice Chancellor said that he will use teachers from colleges as well as from the University for forming the Committees.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that he had been member of the Syndicate for last 3-4 years. He informed that in every meeting of Syndicate he had raised this issue that affiliation for B.Sc. Agriculture may not be granted where there are no teachers. One of the Fellows has told the managements of such colleges that Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu speaks against your colleges. But he had tried to say the right thing. While appreciating Principal Kuldeep Singh, he said there are 3-4 such colleges where the issue of non-attendance exists. This time, he visited two colleges and gave my general observations. In the three colleges of that area, there has been no non-attendance admission. It is their achievement. Though their admissions have fallen down, but there is no non-attendance admission. He said that he would like to inform them there was festival meeting and he has gone there. The managements of 4-5 colleges were also there to press upon their issues. It has been given to understand that some Fellow is telling the managements that a complaint be given to the Vice Chancellor against him (Principal Iqbal Sandhu) that he is pressuring them and asking money from them. Such things also took place there. They (Managements) do such things with the intension that the names of such people may not be put on the Committees. He further said that this Committee has tried to improve the things as much as they can. He again informed that a management has opened two colleges, one college is five years old and other was opened in 2001. There is a condition to have 18 teachers, but there is only one teacher. So he requested the House that before bringing the issue to this house, everything should be checked because it would be a question mark on them also. Ultimately, these managements would go to the Courts because the admissions have already been done. 29<sup>th</sup> was the last date for affiliation applications. The general admission date was 15<sup>th</sup>. The permission for affiliation was given on 16<sup>th</sup> or 29<sup>th</sup>. Thus their admission should be with the permission of the Vice Chancellor. Our duty is to get the salary of the teachers paid by the managements and if they return it back to the management, there is no way to set it right. He also said that three managements of DAV college had come to him and asked him why he checks their colleges only. He mentioned about the DAV College, Abohar where there is one teacher and the number of students is about one thousand. The condition of some other colleges is also the same. So

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

at some place, there are also lapses on their part. He assured that as and when he would come in a selection committee meeting, he would check all these things. He told the managements that he does not oppose them, which they can check from the Syndicate proceedings, but they are not doing something good. He suggested, if they have to close down such colleges, then they have close at least 30-35 colleges. If they want to improve these colleges, they should not given any new course. If the decision is to be implemented, then those colleges to whom the affiliation has been granted, the decision would be applicable to them also.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that whatever decision has to be taken, that should be implemented to all such colleges who do not comply with the lapses pointed out by the affiliation committees. Committees should be formed. The members of these committees should those who do not have their own interests.

Shri Jarnail Singh said they should not affiliate any college because if they got a stay from the Court, then it would continue for a long time. Rather they should use their own power, they may not be granted new courses, the units could also be reduced. The University should not make examination centre there. The problem could faced in the girls colleges, but there the University can appoint some strict persons so that there may not be any copying or the students may not get any help. The non-attending candidates would take admission only for one year. Thus, they will automatically leave the college and get admission somewhere else.

The Vice Chancellor also said that to disaffiliate them would not solve the problem because they would hire a good advocate and get a stay.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that at the moment they should not disaffiliate them, rather they should not grant any new courses and units should also be reduced.

Professor Iqbal Singh Sandhu said instead of putting a check on the units granted them, they should rather they should check the colleges it will solve many problems.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he would like to add something to what Principal Iqbal Singh has said. There are some new colleges where there is no permanent affiliation and such colleges are inspected every year and check all the courses and accordingly put conditions, if any. On the other hand there are large number of colleges which have permanent affiliation. With the passage of time in such colleges, if a teacher retires, the vacancy is not filled. Since the inspection of such college is not to be done, they do not appoint regular teachers. Now the situation in those college has become such that somewhere there is only one or two regular teachers. In large number. For this problem, there is provision in their calendar, but somehow they are not able to do that, it may be because of shortage of time. There is provision of periodic inspection. Normally what happens, when the inspection team goes there, they say they are working on the subjects for which they have requested for affiliation or extension of affiliation. They are primarily concerned with the number of regular teachers required for that subject only whereas there are many other subjects where the number of teachers is very

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

small. They should change the procedure that when an inspection committee visits a college, it should check all the subjects and their other requirements.

Principal B.C. Josan said that Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu has talked about Abohar College. Permission to fill up all the grant in aid posts was not given by the Punjab Government and that is why the posts were not filled. But now the DAV Management Committee has advertised the posts. Principal Josan informed that in order to run the work, they appoint temporary teachers and pay them full salary.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that the B.Ed. and M.Ed. colleges which are considered good colleges, their seats could not be filled, but those colleges who are doing well, their seats were filled because they admitted the students before the start of the admission, perhaps the Dean College Development is also in the know-how of all this.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the suggestion given by Professor Navdeep Goyal are very good, but there is need to make improvements in their office. The inspection committee has said that the affiliation is not granted, but their Deputy Registrar is giving a letter for affiliation. Who is that Deputy Registrar and what action could be taken against him. They have to start from here and what has actually happened.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that as they are doing all this in the case of private colleges, this should be done in the case of government colleges. A team should be sent to government colleges also and check how many teachers are there because in some of the colleges there is one teacher. Secondly, he said that they should catch the big fish instead of the small. He said in Dev Samaj College, Ferozepur, which is called a five star college, the subject of Hindi is taught there, but there is not even a single Hindi teacher. Same is the situation of Economics and Commerce teachers. In these colleges also, there are no proper teaching staff. He suggested that if they catch hold of the big fish, the small will automatically improve themselves. Thirdly, he requested that their college people have also requested that as there is a Think Tank in the University, there should also be a Think Tank for the Colleges. Earlier, there had been 3-4 sections in B.A. class, but now there is only one. They say that the University should see which courses should be given to the colleges so that the college could adequate number of students.

The Vice Chancellor this is a point well taken, for the survival and sustenance of the University, let a Think Tank be constituted for the colleges like they have made a Think Tank for the finance of the University. It is necessary to constitute a Think Tank for the survival of the colleges. The Vice Chancellor asked them to send him few names for this.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that it is a good thing that they are basically taking it as a reform. He suggested that they should also hold an event which would be motivational and for the management. If through the Dean of College Development Office, they may hold an event where some discussion about quality education and non-attendance of students etc. The college which in discussion today,

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

they were not aware where their money is going. They were not aware how much fee is coming to them, where it is going and for what purpose it is being used. The management of the college says that Mr. Munish was doing all this himself. He also gave an example of Patel College which is at Rajpura. The UGC has granted it Rs. 2 Crores to that College. They opened an account and the whole money used to come in that account. By chance, a letter reached at the hands of management. Actually they were not aware how much has to come to them. When the UGC asked them about the utilization certificate, the management said they did not receive Rs. 2 crores. Ultimately that person was caught after two months. So, the managements must be aware about all these things.

While giving the example of a college which was open by some of his know persons, he said that he advised them if they work honestly they would be able to run their college for long otherwise it will close down within 2-3 years. The college is still running. So he said that the managements also need to be advised on such issues.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is the duty of the affiliation committee to see what conditions were imposed on the college and ensure whether those conditions have been fulfilled or not. If the college is sincere, they can appoint good persons. It is not there if they could not get regular teachers, they were not closed on that account. The colleges have been allowed to run their work with temporary teachers, but at the same time they are asked to advertise the posts to fill them on regular basis.

Principal N.R. Sharma said that he fails to understand that they are the people who are in the affiliation committees, they are the persons who grant them affiliation, but how this much gap is there. Further he wanted to know how the managements come to know of it that agenda item relating to them is going to be discussed in the Syndicate. He said that there are loopholes in the system.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that these things are not confidential.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said whatever they may say, what it has been got done by one of their Senate member.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that the Inspection Committees or affiliation committee which are going to inspect the colleges, they do not have any guidelines. The affiliation committee must know how many teachers are required for M.Sc. or M.A. Course or any other course. This was also endorsed by Dr. Dalip Kumar.

The Vice Chancellor said that now they should wind up this and the operative part of this discussion that they should refer the agenda papers to the CVO. To refer the matter to the CVO, obviously, all papers have to be a source and put it properly. To CVO all those papers will be sourced and the matter will be given to the CVO. The summary of the discussion have to be given to the CVO otherwise CVO will not be able to do the job. The other point is that there is a consensus that they should quickly reach to disciplinary action. The idea is that those colleges who have been granted affiliation, they should regulate it to ensure that there will be compliance. In order to facilitate that compliance, probably, it is necessary to hold 2-3

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

meetings with the different region managements. If not three, they should hold at least two meetings, region-wise. They should make sure what is the status of the position of 1925 and their time scale. They have to take up the case with Punjab Government. They should a paper which should pertain to the guidelines on which undergraduate courses and postgraduate courses are to be approved. Since the postgraduate courses are assumed that the undergraduate courses are running well, so that the postgraduate courses approval should not be given unless the compliance for undergraduate courses are done. This should be checked specifically. In this particular case, they should have a meeting with this management and ask them to give status report as to how many students have been admitted, list of staff members ever since the courses were given to them, i.e., who are the staff members i.e. teaching and non-teaching etc in the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> year. This will put pressure on them. The Vice Chancellor said that he will take initiative to talk to the University colleagues whose names are there in the Inspection Committees of this college. He will also take the help of D.U.I. and speak to these colleagues. He will share this information with the D.U.I. who is also ex-officio member of the Senate and along with her will have a meeting with the management. This will become an input to the C.V.O. A Think Tank will be constituted and the Syndicate members will help him and give him the names. There are many Senate members who have become members for the first time. They should also take help from these new members. They are fresh and they do not have a past. Let this job be assigned to them and take their help. This is one way of sharing this huge work as the number of colleges which they have to visit is very large. This job has to be distributed.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu suggested that the office may be instructed that no new course should be allowed to be started unless the compliance is met with.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the matter related to C.G.M. College, Mohlan be referred to the Chief Vigilance Officer, Panjab University along with the relevant papers;
- (ii) the College be asked to submit status report in respect of teachers, staff and students since its opening;
- (iii) examination centre from the College be shifted to a suitable place;
- (iv) no new course be allotted to the College till a final decision in the matter;
- (v) to regulate the working of the Colleges, meetings with the Managements of the Colleges be held region wise;
- (vi) proper guidelines of the requirements for grant of affiliation be framed and provided to the Affiliation Committees; and

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

- (vii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Think Tank to suggest ways and means for the smooth functioning of the Colleges.

**Recommendations dated 13.09.2017 of Executive Committee of PUSC**

**25.** Considered recommendations (Item No.7, 15, 20, 21 & 27) dated 13.09.2017 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendations (Item No.7, 15, 20, 21 & 27) dated 13.09.2017 of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C., **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Item No. 26 was taken up for consideration along with Item No.9.

**Recommendation of the Committee dated 05.08.2017**

**27.** Considered recommendation at Sr. 8 dated 05.08.2017 (**Appendix-XVII**) of the Committee met under the Chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendation at Sr. 8 dated 05.08.2017 of the Committee under the Chairmanship of the Vice-Chancellor, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Honorarium to the members of Fact Finding Committee of fire incident**

**28.** To decide the commensurate honorarium to be paid to the members of the fact finding Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to look into the cause of the fire incident which took place on 13/14.05.2017 in the Accounts Section of the Administrative Building pursuant to proposal dated 31.08.2017 and 08.09.2017.

**RESOLVED:** That the Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the Syndicate, be authorised to decide the appropriate honorarium to be paid to the members of the fact finding Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to look into the cause of the fire incident which took place on 13/14.05.2017 in the Accounts Section of the Administrative Building pursuant to proposal dated 31.08.2017 and 08.09.2017.

**Minutes dated 15.09.2017 of Committee regarding admission of Mr. Tajender Singh Luthra, in LL.B. 5<sup>th</sup> Semester**

**29.** Considered minutes dated 15.09.2017 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the special request of Mr. Tajender Singh Luthra, DGP, an LL.B. student of Chaudhry Charan Singh University, seeking admission to 5<sup>th</sup> Semester of LL.B. at Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh due to professional commitments.

**NOTE:** The Vice-Chancellor has observed that:

“Recommended for admission as a very rare case.”

Professor Mukesh Arora asked whether Mr. Tejinder Singh Luthra is doing LL.B. from Chaudhary Charan Singh University on a regular basis to which the Vice Chancellor said, ‘yes’.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

The Vice Chancellor clarified that the jurisdiction of Chaudhary Charan Singh University is extended up to Ghaziabad and the persons living at Delhi also take admission there. Even the Noida Colleges are also with this University.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is written as “Chaudhary Charan Singh University, Meerut” to which the Vice Chancellor said what is the range of Panjab University, Chandigarh and further added that the range of Chaudhary Charan Singh University is up to Baghpat and Sonapat. Professor Mukesh Arora further asked that the College from where Mr. Luthra is doing LL.B. falls in U.P., so he asked whether he used to go to from Haryana to U.P.

The Vice Chancellor said he did this when he was posted at Delhi.

Professor Mukesh Arora said, okay, but asked what was the distance of his College from Delhi. He further said if a ward of their teacher or Principal is studying in a local DAV college in M.A. English, then if he wants to shift himself to the English Department of the University in third semester, he is not allowed. The reply was that the admission here is through entrance test. He, thus wanted to know if there is admission through entrance test, can they bring the candidate from outside. As per the rules, the students who comes from other University, all his papers should be clear. But in this his 4<sup>th</sup> semester is not clear and their calendar does not permit this.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Mr. Luthra) is already an alumnus of Panjab University who did his M.Phil from here.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that those who ask for such a favour, they send a request, but this has not been done in this case.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this case has come through a Committee and he has requested for that, though the paper could not be attached here.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal asked how this paper could not be attached to it.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is done to oblige a big person. He further said that the last date for admission was 15<sup>th</sup>, will they extend the date.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in migration cases it would be done.

Principal Iqbal Sandhu said that the Vice Chancellor has the power to do it.

Professor Mukesh Arora wanted to know the rules which permit migration in such cases.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that what Professor Mukesh Arora has said is right, but it is up to them what to do.

The Vice Chancellor said that the application of Mr. Luthra arrived on 6<sup>th</sup> September, in their process has taken time.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that migration has a procedure. When they talk about migration, it has been allowed by a very few departments which include Law and UBS. They do migration in September because they feel that in September the results are declared.

However, Professor Mukesh Arora said that they have not used the word 'migration' they have said those who want to take admission.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that those who would like to take admission, they would be obviously seek migration. He said that all the other things are already with the case.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that it is a common sense that the person who has not given the examination of 4<sup>th</sup> Semester, how they could consider him as a reappear candidate. Public is watching them. They should treat him as they treat a student. If they allow by giving him a special treatment, it would be very bad thing. He requested that it should not be done in this way. They should just follow the rules in this case. It would quoted by the coming generations that such a thing has happened in 2017. At that time they cannot deny such a chance to anyone. A case does not become rare by just saying it rare. Everybody will take benefit out of it. If he is not eligible, they should not do it as a special case. He again requested that they should refrain from it.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when one talks about migration, eligibility is seen. If they talk about law regulations, it is there that anybody who has cleared 50 percent of the papers can get admission. If they talk about eligibility, there is no issue of eligibility. He said, to his mind, if he has attended 4<sup>th</sup> Semester classes there, then he should appear in 4<sup>th</sup> Semester examination of that University.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal wanted to know whether they have a vacant seat.

Professor Mukesh Arora read out the rules for migration where it has been written that a student has cleared all the papers of previous semesters/years.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu wanted to know from the Controller of Examinations the migration rules as to when a student could migrate from other University in three years graduate courses. He further said that if there is annual system, the candidate can come in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Year and if there is semester system, then he can be admitted in 3<sup>rd</sup> semester only. According to his knowledge, the candidate cannot be admitted in the last year or in the 5<sup>th</sup> Semester.

However, Professor Navdeep Goyal said it could done in law course as there is provision for this.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that they allow inter college migration even if the candidate has a reappear. They allow it for the candidates to migrate from Hoshiarpur or from Ludhiana. For inter-university migration there is only one problem that the candidates who have reappears, how could he appear in those papers at this University. He suggested that Mr. Luthra should appear in the 4<sup>th</sup> Semester papers at Meerut University examination and then he could be admitted in



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

the 5<sup>th</sup> Semester which is permitted in LL.B. course. The item should not have come in the way it has come now. It should be mentioned that that the students should be allowed to migrate from that University to this University in view of his service exigencies.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu wanted to know whether the marks in all the University for LL.B are the same.

Principal B.C. Josan suggested that the Vice Chancellor be authorised to take a decision in the matter, however, the Vice Chancellor said they should take a decision whatever they want.

Professor Mukesh Arora said in case they take a decision to allow him, his dissent be recorded because this is not permitted.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he has attended 75% attendance and is eligible to appear in the examination. So he should give the 4<sup>th</sup> Semesters examination there and join here in the 5<sup>th</sup> Semester.

However, the Vice Chancellor said that owing to his service exigencies, he cannot give his examination there. They should understand his service exigency as he is heading a very sensitive position and he cannot be spare himself. It would be difficult for him disappear. When he did this, he was posted in Prime-Minister's security at Delhi. He has enrolled for evening classes and not in morning classes. Evening College of law is going to close. If he has a chance to complete his LL.B. degree, it is either here or at Delhi.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that what Professor Mukesh has said it is correct that there is a rule. Since it was not in the rules, the rules are made by the Syndicate, that is why this case is here. Otherwise there was no need to bring it to the Syndicate, the Vice Chancellor could do it himself.

Professor Mukesh Arora talked about an officer named C.S. Talwar who was doing law from this University. He was then transferred to Mansa as Deputy Commissioner. He had cleared all the papers, it was argued that he may be Deputy Commissioner, but migration was not allowed in his case. He was also a member of the Syndicate at that time, but even then he was not given the chance. When an IAS office could be refused, why not an IPS.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he has to give the 4<sup>th</sup> Semester paper at his college.

Professor Mukesh Arora said the rule should applicable equally to all and there should not be variations from person to person. He further said that it should not be there that a less important person may not be given a chance.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu asked how they would award the degree when the total marks in different Universities like Delhi University, Punjabi University are different. He further said that if they add proportionate marks, it means they will add now two years' proportionate marks to award the degree.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said if there is a rule and the rules have sanctity to which the Vice Chancellor said that rules are made by the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said if they do not want, do not do it.

Professor Mukesh Arora said if they change the rule today, then it can be done.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are doing it as a special case.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that after sometime, another case of an IAS is coming where they are going to reduce the entrance examination pass marks. He is also a senior officer. They are going to reduce the Ph.D. pass marks from 50 to 40. If they go on doing this, then everybody would get it done, which is wrong.

The Vice Chancellor said that anybody is not rarest of the rare case. When they have somebody like this posted in a sensitive upper position belonging to a UT Cadre, whose next posting will in some other Union Territory and the Evening Course in Law is being closed. If he does not complete this LL.B., it will remain incomplete.

On a query by the members as to who will take his 4<sup>th</sup> Semester examination, the Vice Chancellor said that their University would take his examination of 4<sup>th</sup> Semester as he has completed his attendance at that University. On another query that he should give the 4<sup>th</sup> Semester examination at Meerut University, the Vice Chancellor said that one cannot register him in two universities.

Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said that the Committee is very clear that Mr. Tejinder Singh Luthra would be required to clear the deficiencies, if any, along with the papers of 4<sup>th</sup> Semester as re-appear candidate of Panjab University. The Vice Chancellor further said that he cannot go and give the examination of that University once he becomes a student of this University.

Professor Mukesh Arora asked though it has been done by the Committee, but is this a binding on them. He said the Committee may be clear, but to his mind, it is wrong.

The Vice Chancellor said, if it is wrong to his mind, what he can do.

A pandemonium prevailed at this time.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Professor Mukesh Arora requested to record their dissent. He further said that every person has some works to do for which he takes leave from the office. He should also take leave for 4-5 days and appear in the examination. This was also endorsed by Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal.

However, the Vice Chancellor said that it is not possible for him and that University will not permit. He has already cleared three semesters. He has talked to Professor Bhandari who has said that it could be done only under deficient subjects.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Mukesh Arora said that they may do it, but it has not happened earlier. He stated that it may not become a mockery of the system. He asked Shri Jarnail Singh if a candidate can appear in the papers of 4<sup>th</sup> semester in this University if he has cleared only three semesters from another University to which he said that he could appear as deficient subject.

Though almost all the members agreed to approve, but Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma insisted to record his dissent.

Mr. Mukesh Arora also said that if Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma would record his dissent, he would also record his dissent.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma requested to defer the item to which the Vice Chancellor said that the item would not be deferred, it may either be approved or rejected.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said if they want to approve it, let it be approved and close the issue.

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 15.09.2017 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the special request of Mr. Tajender Singh Luthra, DGP, an LL.B. student of Chaudhry Charan Singh University, seeking admission to 5<sup>th</sup> Semester of LL.B. at Department of Laws, P.U., Chandigarh due to professional commitments, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

Professor Mukesh Arora and Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma recorded their dissent on the issue.

### **Options for sending the agenda of Syndicate and Senate**

**30.** Considered the following draft proposal (**Appendix-XIX**) with regard to send agenda of the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate.

- (i) the agenda for the meeting of the Syndicate/Senate be sent in digital form and an appropriate device be made available to all members of the house for access of the agenda. This would save recurring expenses of printing, binding, transportation and time.

**OR**

- (ii) the agenda for the meetings of the Syndicate and Senate is to be sent in the form of soft copy (either in Pen drive or through email) and the said agenda may also be uploaded on the P.U. Website as has been done in the case of Senate meeting dated 10.9.2017, if so, few hard copies of the same will be made available to the members on the floor of the house;

**OR**

- (iii) the agenda for the meeting of the Senate be sent in the form of hard copy without the decisions of the Syndicate as well as annexure. However, the agenda for the Senate meeting along with decisions and annexure of the Syndicate meetings may be uploaded on the University website and sent to the members

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

through email. Few hard copies of the agenda containing decisions as well as annexure be made available to the members during the meeting of the Senate. In addition to this, if any member demands for hard copy of any item, the same be made available to him/her on the spot.

**OR**

- (iv) Continue with present practice of sending the hard copies of agenda and annexures, However, if the agenda is large then three or more number of volumes can may made.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to find some solution in the background of the sentiments of the members that such a big agenda be not sent. The Vice Chancellor further said that such a big agenda is being sent from the time immemorial. What was happening earlier was that the agenda and Syndicate minutes were sent separately. When the Syndicate minutes and agenda papers are put together, it, very often, becomes a very huge document, particularly, if the Senate meeting is happening after a long gap of six months. In the present case, though they had a Senate meeting twice, but they did not take up the agenda items after the month of March. They had a Senate meeting in the month of May and also in July. The members had desired that the old Syndicate meetings items and also the Syndicate agenda; papers, might also be attached with the agenda papers. Owing to this, there were 600 papers in the agenda. Earlier, it was not done so. The agenda papers were less as there were separate volumes for annexures which the members did not normally bring with them. This time, every member has to bring it with him as the agenda was not separate. But this was demanded by the members. If the members have demanded it, they have no option but to agree and do it. They can go back to what they were doing earlier so that the Senate agenda papers be less and the references are there in the proceedings of the Syndicate. It is for the members whether they would like to bring it or not. This is the way to reduced the agenda papers. They can also adopt to send the annexures through soft copy. After getting the soft copy of the annexures, those who would require a hard copy also, they could send a message and they could be supplied the hard copy at the time of meeting.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they would always require a hard copy.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested that if they want to pass the items in the Senate, they should restrict the persons and give only 5-10 minutes to each item. If they give one hour time to each item, the items cannot be finalized.

The Vice Chancellor said that his algorithm for tomorrow's meeting of Senate is that not more than 5 minutes time would be given to each item to clear the 70 items. The people will raise their hands and only five persons will be picked up at random to speak. Everybody will not speak on every item. The Vice Chancellor further said that it is the duty of the Syndicate members to carry out the governance of the University. The issues which have been sent to the

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Senate, they have already been considered and passed by members who have been chosen by the Senate to carry out this responsibility. After they have sent these members and they have sent resolutions, which are by and large, unanimously approved by the Syndicate. If things are unanimously approved by the Syndicate, unless they have very basic hard differences with it, he was of the opinion that the Chairman should have the prerogative to decide as to how long a person would be allowed to speak. Nobody should be permitted to speak more than one minute on any item and not more than five persons speaking on a given item. The Senate meeting has to be a long meeting, everybody will get to speak as the meeting will progress. This should be algorithm for tomorrow meeting. For future Senate meetings, after the agenda is received by the members, they should inform the Chairperson in advance on which item/s he would like to speak in order to facilitate the office to collect proper record. He further said that as soon as the Syndicate proceedings are finalized and the items which are to be placed before the subsequent meetings of the Senate, that would be sent to the Senate members several months in advance. The items on which a Senate member has to speak, that Senate member would send an email communication stating that he would raise such and such points. If all the members intend to speak on every item, then they are defeating the purpose of the conduct of Governing Body of this University. This is not a Parliament where the members have a sitting of 70-80 days every year. The Senate meeting is held only 2-3 times a year. The meeting should be used by the Senate members to discuss policies and provide some guidance as to which way the University should go on. All these things have been mentioned in the book written by J.F. Bruce as to what the Senate should do. It has evolved over a period of decades that the elected members of the Senate feel compelled that it be must recorded that he spoke on such and such items. The Senate meetings are used as a platform as if this is a campaign exercise for the election.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that if they do this, they have to take care of two things, one that they will not send current agenda. If current agenda would be sent, then how a member would tell on which item he has to speak. Second, it will be the duty of the University to ensure that the agenda has reached to a member even if he is sitting at a faraway place.

The Vice Chancellor said that they can evolve such system that there would not be any item in the Senate meeting whose finalized minutes of Syndicate have not been completed minimum one month in advance. Except the items relating to budget, the other items would be pushed. Otherwise, there would be anarchy. As the time would pass, the whole time of Senate would be spent on cacophony and the real purpose of Senate would be lost. The elected members of the Senate have a compulsive need that they should be seen to be taking the matters of the people of their constituencies. But there are also nominated members of Senate who do not have any compulsion. With the result, as the time is passing, the nominated members of the Senate, though they are large in number, they are loosing interest in the Senate. The Senate members have to understand that by not attending to the Senate agenda, they are losing the confidence of the community, which is paying for running the University. The expense for the Senate also is being paid by the students. The University is running with their money, as about Rs. 290 Crores are coming from

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

the students fees and the rest of the money is coming from the Centre Government. But if they do not fulfil the responsibility of the Governing Body, then the people who are sustaining us financially, they will lose confidence in the way they are functioning. They have to be conscious as they are also being watched. They sometimes spend two hours on technicalities, this must be emphasized that whatever the Syndicate does, it has done it on behalf of the Senate. The Syndicate is not only elected on behalf of the Senate, they are coming, prima facie, on behalf of the faculties also. They are actually elected by only the Senate members who choose a given faculty. They are not actually elected by the teaching faculty. There are lots of lacunae in the system. It is a peoples' University. The confidence of the people has to be maintained.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal suggested that the items which have been passed by the Syndicate and placed before Senate for approval, they should depute a person to defend these items,

The Vice Chancellor said what he can do when the Syndicate members do not rise to defend the items. Rather, they are themselves engaging in the discussion there. There are few people who distribute themselves at different places and if he tries to stop one, the other start speaking from the other end. It looks as if the whole Senate is on fire. The has to be countered by the fire only, but nobody counters. Silence is not going to douse that fire.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said sometimes once the members are asked to raise their hands in support of the approval of the item, after that there should not be any discussion it.

The Vice Chancellor said what he can do, the senior nominated members of the Senate intervene on their behalf. He said that he tried many times to check such members.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said at one time they had started sending an abstract and a pen drive and some hard copies were put on the table. The agenda was also sent on mail. However, since the agenda had been quite heavy, the file did not open sometimes. Secondly, it was sent in zip form which is not sometimes supported by many softwares. The abstract agenda was very handy to carry. The members who intend to have hard copy of the agenda, they should be provided. There was also a proposal to provide Tablets. In that connection he wanted to say that when their budget positions would improve, they can think of it also because such a practice is already there in the private sector. It may not be possible at this stage of time, but at the moment they can provide an abstract of the agenda, agenda items in pen drive and a hard copy of the agenda for those who intend to have it. They can provide this at least to the members of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that few of them should sit together and work out a proposal

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) for the time being, the present practice of sending the hard copies of agenda and annexures be continued. However, if the agenda is large then three or more number of volumes could be prepared; and

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

- (ii) the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to constitute a Committee to suggest suitable alternatives on the issue.

**Deferred item**

**31.** Considered the 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:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 14) 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.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that this item has also come in the month of January, at that time they were not having the names to which the Vice Chancellor said that now the names have been given.

The Vice Chancellor asked if would like to examine the names to which the members said 'no' they are not interested to examine as these are seniority-wise.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that the recommendation of Punjab Department were not there earlier. He asked whether the Guru Nanak Sikh Studies is a department or a Chair.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was named as a Chair. Those Chairs were supposed to have administrative structure attached to them and Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang is heading that Chair and will continue till her reemployment.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the charge of Guru Nanak Sikh Studies is perhaps with the Dean University Instruction to which the Vice Chancellor said that the D.U.I. has only administrative charge because she (Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang) cannot sign the financial matters as she has crossed the age of 60 years. All academic things are done by Professor Jaspal Kaur Kaang. This cannot be changed.

Professor Mukesh Arora wanted to know whether the Professors in USOL or in the Department of Evening Studies are counted in the University or they are separate.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that their appointments have been done by having advertisements for their respective departments. The Vice Chancellor added that these Chairs belong to certain departments.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the Chairs are of a subject to which the Vice Chancellor said that he knows where he (Professor Mukesh Arora) is hinting at and stated that he cannot have a Panjabi Professor of USOL to compete for this.

Professor Mukesh Arora further asked that the teachers who are being offered these Chairs, do they have any contribution in that field, it should also have been attached with the agenda papers. There are many teachers who have not taught even a single period of the subject. Their department is different from and they have not even a single article in the field. He stated that the work done by them in the field should be requisitioned so that it could be ascertained what they have done in that respective field.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not mix up the two things. These are just names and these names are attached to Professorships in the given departments. All that they have done is that they have separated Professors and the names of the Chairs. The name is being given to the senior most Professor in the subject. Chair could be named after somebody who belongs to a certain sub-field and Professor who has been given this title of this Chair, he has no contribution in that sub-field. That is the weakness of this whole recommendation. There is no correlation whether the name that is assigned to it has any connection with it.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that in discussion of the last meeting, the Vice Chancellor had said that whosoever would be given these Chairs, his work would be taken into account to which the Vice Chancellor stated that he had never said like this. Continuing, Professor Mukesh Arora said that Bhai Vir Singh Chair, in the past, was given to Professor Naresh, however, the Vice Chancellor said that now those are the things of past and he should forget all that.

On a query by Professor Mukesh Arora and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal, the Vice Chancellor said that the Chairs are being given only to the senior-most Professors whose age is less than 65 years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that these Chairs were given to those who are in the service of the University with the orders of the High Court.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that Professor Gurpal Singh is the senior most Professor in Panjabi.

The Vice Chancellor said that Professor Gurpal Singh is a part of Department of Evening Studies and these positions are not for the Professors of Evening Studies. The Professor who were given the Chairs, they are attached to certain departments.

Professor Mukesh Arora wanted to know the rules where it has been passed that these position are not to be given to the Professors of Department of Evening Studies.



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

The Vice Chancellor said that it was a decision that these Chairs would be given to the Professors of those departments only to which these were attached.

Professor Mukesh Arora and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that these Chairs are in Schools and not in the Panjabi Department.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not discuss it in this way and he stated that the matter is deferred and they should come prepared. Continuing, the Vice Chancellor said whatever work has been done in this regard, after the Syndicate and Senate had discussed these things. He requested the members to read all those minutes and see the spirit of it and then do it and he is not going to bring any more information in connection with this matter. They cannot have several hours of discussion on this at this stage.

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

**Confirmation of Shri  
Janak Ram Dhiman**

**32.** Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that Shri Janak Ram Dhiman, Deputy Registrar, Secrecy Branch, be confirmed w.e.f. 01.06.2016 against the post of Deputy Registrar vacated by Shri Devinder Kumar Marwaha on his retirement on 31.05.2016.

- NOTE:** 1. Shri Janak Raj Dhiman was promoted as Deputy Registrar w.e.f. 05.03.2009. He was retired from the University services on 31.03.2017, but his date of confirmation falls prior to the date of his retirement.
2. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XX**).

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that Shri Janak Ram Dhiman, Deputy Registrar, Secrecy Branch, be confirmed w.e.f. 01.06.2016 against the post of Deputy Registrar vacated by Shri Devinder Kumar Marwaha on his retirement on 31.05.2016.

**Inclusion of names in  
the existing Panel of  
Advocates**

**33.** Considered if, the following names of the advocates, be included in the existing Panel of Advocates/Legal Retainers of the Panjab University for the High Court.

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of the Advocate</b>
1.	Mrs. Naveender P.K. Singh
2.	Shri Baljit Singh Dhir
3.	Shri Shivoy Dhir
4.	Shri Mukesh Kaushik
5.	Shri Kanwaldeep Sachdeva
6.	Shri Bhuvan Vats

- NOTE:** 1. A copy of the existing panel of Legal Retainers/Advocates of the Panjab University for the term commencing 01.01.2015 to 31.12.2017 approved by the Syndicate dated 19.07.2015

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

(Para 52(R-x)) and 29.05.2016 (Para (R-vi)) is enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**).

2. An office note along with the bio-data of the above mentioned advocates is enclosed (**Appendix-XXI**).

**RESOLVED:** That the following names of the advocates, be included in the existing Panel of Advocates/Legal Retainers of the Panjab University for the High Court.

Sr. No.	Name of the Advocate
1.	Mrs. Naveender P.K. Singh
2.	Shri Baljit Singh Dhir
3.	Shri Shivoy Dhir
4.	Shri Mukesh Kaushik
5.	Shri Kanwaldeep Sachdeva
6.	Shri Bhuvan Vats

### Deferred item

**34.** Considered minutes dated 15.09.2017 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, pursuant to the decision of the Syndicate dated 25.06.2017 (Para 6), to study/examine the summary reports submitted by the CVO Panjab University in detail.

Shri Jarnail Singh asked if it is the same item which has come last time in the Senate for information to which the Vice Chancellor said, it is the same item. Explaining about the background of this item, Shri Jarnail Singh said that incidentally all the four members of the Committee, i.e. himself, Dr. Dalip Kumar, Dr. N.R. Sharma and Shri Subhash Sharma are also present here. While going through the recommendations of the Committee attached in as annexure, he said that remarks on Item 1 and 2(A) have been given. As regards Item No. 2(B), Page 3 of summary report, he stated that there was an observation, keeping in view the speech of various persons in the Senate, it was alleged that the weak point was that Professor Navdeep Goyal was in the know-how of things. But their observation was that there was a purchase committee and the guidelines of the CVC were that a person who has any interest cannot be a member of the Purchase Committee. In that Committee, Professor Navdeep Goyal as DSW was not a member of the Committee. The member was DSW (Women). DSW (Women) did not attend that Committee, but because the bidders were there, tenders had to be opened and allotted to the lowest bidder. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, DSW (Women) was again not there, but she signed the papers because those papers were with the agenda of the Senate. He had asked the Deputy Registrar (Estt.) to give these remarks here also, what he has stated here and hoped that his friends would testify what was resolved there and she (D.R. (Estt.) be asked to incorporate what was decided there and whatever they decide here in the Syndicate be sent to the Senate. This was the factual position.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is a table agenda and the report has not been attached to it. At least the report should have been attached to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that reports were with the agenda of the Senate.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Navdeep Goyal stated that it has not been attached with this table agenda and thus they have not brought the reports with them. He further stated that in the report, there are very serious issues and those needs to be discussed in the Syndicate.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that this items be deferred to be considered in the next meeting.

Shri Jarnail Singh said that the D.R. (Estt.) may also be asked to give the remarks what was decided in the meeting

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

### Deferred item

**35.** Considered interim Report 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:** 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.

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

### Deferred item

**36.** Considered 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:** 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

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

policy for laboratory/ technical staff and amendments made from time to time in that existing policy enclosed.

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

**Addition and amendment in rules**

**37.** Considered proposal dated 18.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXII**) with regard to the following addition of Rule 10 at page 255 and amendment in Rule 7 (i) at page 256 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009, pursuant to legal opinion of Shri Subhash Ahuja, Advocate in light of the decision of CWP No. 5017 of 2017 (Harsh Behal & Others Vs Panjab University & others, LPA 747 of 2017 Panjab University Vs Harsh Behal & others, CWP 11311 of 2017 Dhruv Chowla & others and CWP No.15939 of 2017 Navjot Singh Dhunna Vs Panjab University & others.

- (I) Rule 10 in Bachelor of Law (LL.B. 3 year Course) to be incorporated at page 255 of the Panjab University, Calendar, Volume-III, 2009:-

“The migration for the vacant seat will be conducted strictly category wise on the basis of the inter-se merit of that particular seat (whether general or scheduled caste or backward class), e.g. if the vacant seat belonged to the reserved category of the scheduled caste or backward class then, the inter-se merit of that particular category i.e. scheduled caste or backward class will be considered as the case may be”

**NOTE:** Rule 1 to 9 already exists at page 254 & 255 in P.U. Calendar Volume-III, 2009 (**Appendix-XXII**).

- (II) Rule 7(i) in the migration Rules for 5 year LL.B. integrated Course, to be incorporated at page 256 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2009:

<b>Existing Rule</b>	<b>Proposed Rule</b>
7. (i) Migration will be done according to merit.	7 (i) the migration for the vacant seat will be conducted strictly category wise on the basis of the inter-se merit of that particular seat (whether general or scheduled caste or backward class), e.g. if the vacant seat belonged to the reserved category of the scheduled caste or backward class then, the inter-se merit of that particular category i.e. scheduled caste or backward class will be considered as the case may be.”  <b>NOTE:</b> Accordingly, the clause 10 (g) (i) related to migration rule for 5 year LL.B integrated course in the Handbook of Information

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

	2016 at page 141, be amended.
(ii) xxx xxx xxx	(ii) xxx xxx xxx

**NOTE:** Input received from the Department of Laws and UILS is enclosed **(Appendix-XXII).**

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that item No. 37 is related with admissions, therefore, they have to decide it, but they need to look into it. So, he suggested that the Vice Chancellor should form a Committee consisting of 2-3 people under the Chairmanship of the Dean of University Instruction and she would authorise the Vice Chancellor to take decision on behalf of the Syndicate. He suggested that at least two members from the Syndicate could be put on the Committee.

Dr. Dalip Kumar informed that there is already a Committee under the Chairmanship of Principal Gurdip Sharma and this should also be given to that Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal while supporting the view point of Dr. Dalip Kumar said, let it be given to the same Committee.

**RESOLVED:** That the matter be referred to the Committee already constituted on the admission related issue and the Vice-Chancellor be authorised, on behalf of the Syndicate, to take a decision in the matter.

### **Routine and formal matters**

**38.** The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(viii)** on the agenda was read out and unanimously approved, i.e.,-

**(i)** The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has re-appointed the following (Sr. No.1 to 9) as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) and Sr. No. 10 (Ms. Simranjeet Kaur) as Assistant Professor (purely on temporary basis) (subject to her nature of appointment will be decided after the final decision) at P.U. Constituent College, Nihal Singh Wala, Distt. Moga, w.e.f. the date they will start/started work for the session 2017-2018 upto the start of summer vacations 2018, against the vacant posts or till the post are filled in, on regular basis, through proper selection, whichever is earlier, in the pay-scale of Rs.15600-39100 + AGP Rs.6000/- plus allowances as per University rules, under Regulation 5 at page 111-112 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same term and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>
1.	Dr. Parminder Singh	Punjabi
2.	Mr. Sandeep Buttola	Sociology
3.	Dr. Shashi Kant Rai	Hindi
4.	Dr. Harjeet Singh	English
5.	Ms. Rajni Bhalla	Commerce
6.	Ms. Monica	Commerce

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

7.	Ms. Ritu Mittal	Economics
8.	Mr. Rajiv Kumar	Political Science
9.	Mr. Ashim Kumar	Mathematics
10.	Mrs. Simarnjit Kaur	Computer Science

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the re-appointment of the following as Assistant Professors on contract basis at P.U. Constituent College, Guru Har Sahai, Distt. Ferozepur, w.e.f. the date they start work for the session 2017-2018, against the vacant posts or till the new advertisement is released and appointment are made, whichever is earlier, at a fixed salary of Rs.30400/- on the same terms and condition on which they were working earlier for the session 2016-17:

Sr.	Name of candidate	Subject
1.	Shri Varun Maini	Computer Science
2.	Shri Pawan Kumar	Computer Science

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 17.08.2017 (**Appendix-XXIII**) that wardens of all the hostels be allowed to keep a sum of Rs.15000/- as petty cash in the hostel, which may be withdrawn from the Imprest amount of Rs.1lac and such petty and exigent expenses up to a sum of Rs.5,000/- (at one time), be allowed in cash and approved on the certification of the Warden of the respective hostels for their day to day needs.

- (iv) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the following concessions to wards of Kashmiri Migrants for admission to various courses in Education Institutions for the academic session 2017-2018:

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

**NOTE:** A copy of circular No. Misc./A-6/ 84247-84447 dated 10.05.2017 issued to all Chairpersons/Principals/ Directors/ Coordinators, All teaching Departments / Centres/ Institutes, P.U. and The Directors, P.U. Regional Centre, Ludhiana, Hoshiarpur, Sri Muktsar Sahib, Rural Centre, Kauni including Chairperson, VVBIS&IS, Hoshiarpur is enclosed (**Appendix-XXIV**).

- (v) The Vice-Chancellor in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the appointment of Shikha Dhiman as Part time Assistant Professor in Law, University Institute of Legal Studies, P.U. on an honorarium of Rs.22800/- p.m. (fixed) w.e.f. the date she starts work, for

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

teaching 12 hours week in the UILS for the Academic session 2017-18.

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Doctors working in B.G.J. Institute of Health, P.U. w.e.f. the dates noted against each, till further orders, with one day break after every six months, on the previous terms & conditions:

Name	Designation	Term upto	Date of break	Term start w.e.f.
Dr. Deepak Kaushik	Full-Time Medical Officer	28.10.2017	30.10.2017 <b>(29.10.2017 being Sunday)</b>	31.10.2017 onwards
Dr. Kajal Chawla	Part-Time Paediatrician	The Vice-Chancellor has already extended her term w.e.f. 11.07.2017 onwards i.e. upto the date on which new Doctor Joins duty in her place after afresh appointment, vide office orders No.11221-22/Estt. dated 28.07.2017		11.07.2017 onwards

- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has accepted the resignation of Dr. Neha Singla, Assistant Professor (Temporary), Department of Biophysics, w.e.f. 04.09.2017, by waiving off the condition of giving one month notice, under Rule 16.2 appearing at page 85 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, as she has joined as an INSPIRE faculty w.e.f. 05.09.2017 in the same department.

**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. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXV**).

- (viii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has extended the contractual term of appointment of the following Class ‘B’ employees for further period of one month i.e. upto 30.09.2017, on the previous terms & conditions:

Sr. No.	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

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

**Routine and formal matters**

**39.** The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(iv)** on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

- (i) To note and ratify the orders of the Vice-Chancellor that the pass percentage from 50% to 40% to SC/ST students for M.Phil./Ph.D. Entrance test, 2017, be reduced for this year only, to enable SC candidates to get their paper II checked.
- (ii) To note a request dated 02.09.2017 (**Appendix-XXVI**) received through e-mail of Dr. Jatinder Kaur, Principal, Guru Nanak College, Moga.
- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor has sanctioned the following terminal benefits to Smt. Usha Devi Wd/o Late Shri Dharam Pal, Cleaner, Construction Office, P.U. who expired on 09.05.2017 while in service:

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Kewal Kumar Assistant Registrar Conduct Branch	21.05.1980	31.08.2017	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Pardeep Kumar Ghai Junior Engineer (Civil) (Re-designated as Assistant Engineer) P.U. Construction Office	11.06.1981	31.08.2017	
3.	Mrs. Shalta Kumari Assistant Registrar Examination Branch	19.02.1982	31.08.2017	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
4.	Ms. Sushma Senior Technical Assistant (G-I) UIPS	01.06.1988	30.09.2017	
5.	Shri Dev Ram Library Restorer Department of Mathematics, P.U.	17.07.1986	30.09.2017	



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

6.	Shri Gomti Prashad Daftri P.U. Extension Library, Ludhiana	19.04.1973	30.09.2017	
7.	Shri Bishan Dev Security Guard Department of Zoology, P.U.	01.03.1975	30.09.2017	

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

While referring to **No. I-(i)**, Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that the reduction in pass percentage from 50% to 40% for the SC/ST students for M.Phil/Ph.D. Entrance test 2017 may not be done retrospectively. He further suggested that if they feel that it has to be done, then it should be done from the next year as the result has already been declared.

The Vice Chancellor said that the number of SC candidates in the University research stream is very low and the SC/ST Commission is very concerned why the University is having such a low number of research scholars in the SC/ST category.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that in large number of departments, i.e. about more than 50% or so, not even a single SC candidate has qualified.

The Vice Chancellor informed that they have very few SC/ST candidates taking admission in Panjab University. The candidates say that at least their second paper should be marked. As at present they do not mark the 2<sup>nd</sup> paper if the candidate is not passing in the first paper. The Vice Chancellor clarified that all that they have done is for proceeding to check the paper-II.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that they should check that this may not affect the ratio between the general category and the SC candidates category.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that a news has published in the Hindustan Times which says that the Panjab University is planning to reduce the pass marks for SC/ST candidates in Ph.D. Entrance Test to give advantage to Mr. Channi.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should not take these news so seriously.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that he saw the results of University Grants Commission and the people have passed the examination even with 7% marks.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said he agrees to what is being done, but, they should take care of one thing, suppose the seats for

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

SC in one department are filled, then if four more candidates come and fill the remaining vacant seats, it would not be fair.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal while supporting the view point of Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said it would then reduce the number of general seats.

The Vice Chancellor said that the University is under severe observation that the number of SC candidates registered for research, in large number of departments, is extremely small. He has solicited data from each an every department and the same is being complied. He informed that it is also happening here that there is a SC candidate who has complained to him that she is a JRF and is getting scholarship. When she came here, she has been asked to take admission in M.Phil and told that she cannot be given admission in Ph.D. How come a person is eligible to take admission for M.Phil and they are compelling her to not do her Ph.D., whereas she has a scholarship and the choice is hers whether she wants to do M.Phil or Ph.D. They cannot snatch away the choice from her. They cannot say that she is eligible for M.Phil and not for Ph.D. saying that she has got only 5 marks out of 20 in the interview.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu and Professor Mukesh Arora said that they should also see the other side also.

The Vice Chancellor said that the number of students who are qualifying for scholarship are applying to Panjab University for fellowship is very small. He said that they should look at the number of students who are getting scholarship for Ph.D. who are enrolled at Panjab University.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that the JRF examinations is cleared maximum by the SC candidates.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that the situation is opposite in the government colleges. If there are 25% seats reserved, out of 60 candidates, 40 candidates come from SC category. They have to give admission even to a compartment candidate.

The Vice Chancellor made it clear that the marks are being reduced in order to qualify them for the checking of their second paper.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu said that it should be ensured that they should given admission on the seats as per the rules.

The Vice Chancellor said if a candidate is coming with SC Scholarship, how they could refuse him on the basis of interview. SC Commission will come down very heavily on the Chief Executive of the University. They will say, their staff on the basis of interview, which have no record, has rejected the candidate for which he has no defence. The Vice Chancellor said that they have never done it, but at the moment it is not clear how much candidate would come with this because whose first paper is not clear, he might not clear the second paper also.

Shri Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the chances are very bleak that more students would come by doing so.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Referring to Item No. **I-(ii)** regarding the case of Dr. Jatinder Kaur, Principal, Guru Nanak College, Moga, Dr. Gurdip Sharma said that such things are happening time and again. He stated that the Vice Chancellor has already constituted a Committee, but that Committee has not visited the Mukerian so far and Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu added that the Chairman of the Committee did not have the time for this. Professor Mukesh Arora asked to include one more case about which he handed over a document to the Registrar. Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma requested that the name of Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma may be added to that Committee.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma asked as to what is the case of Dr. Jatinder Kaur to which the Vice Chancellor said that they do not read, the email from her is attached. When he asked as to what is the stand of the University, the Vice Chancellor replied, it is what their stand is, what could be his stand. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma further said that there should not be any injustice to her. The way she is being terrorised and pressurised and asked to proceed on long leave, that should not be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is the challenge to the Governing Body of the University. How does the Governing Body take it. After all a member of the Governing Body is involved in it.

Principal Gurdip Sharma said that to suspend any employee, the charge sheet is to be ratified by the Registrar. So he requested the Registrar to take up such cases and not allow the management to do whatever they want. In many cases the management revoked the suspension in case of Principal B.C. Josan also. The Governing Body had first suspended him, but afterwards they realised that they did a wrong, and that was revoked.

Shri Jarnail Singh said they also did it in the case of Principal, Malwa College, Bondli, Samrala.

Principal Iqbal Singh Sandhu suggested that they should constitute a Committee consisting of Dr. Subhash Sharma, Professor Mukesh Arora and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal.

The Vice Chancellor said Dr. Subhash Sharma would Chair the meeting. The Vice Chancellor further stated that he also feels that what the management is doing, is not fair, but, what he can do, other than bringing it to their attention.

Principal Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that if Professor Navdeep Goyal does not have time, Dr. Rabinder Sharma should be made the Chairman of the Committee.

Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that for visit Mukerian and Dharamkot, the date should be fixed today itself.

The Vice Chancellor asked as to what has to be done for Item No. I-(ii), Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that first of all the Registrar should collect information from the college.

The Vice Chancellor said that if the management has issued a suspension letter, then they must have appointed someone as Principal and a letter must have been issued in this regard. He asked the Registrar to talk to the management that the Syndicate desires to

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

know the status of the Principal. Let the Governing Body be not seen as not taking any cognisance of this matter

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the information contained in **Items I-(i), I-(iii) and I-(iv)** be noted; and
- (ii) the information contained in Item **I-(ii)** be noted; the Syndicate expressed its concern on the issue and the Registrar be requested to talk with the Management about the status of the Principal; and a Committee consisting of Dr. Subhash Sharma (Chairperson), Professor Mukesh Arora and Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal be formed to look into this and other such issues.

### **General Discussion**

1. Dr. Subhash Sharma said that about 4-5 students from Ladakh had met him and apprised him that their Government provides a grant of Rs.1 lac per student for reimbursement of different charges if they are residing in the hostel. If such students stay outside a hostel, then the Government does not grant this money. He suggested that such students should be allotted the hostels.

The Vice-Chancellor said that at the moment they are not having so many hostels.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Research Scholars are also paying a rent of Rs.5,000/- for which they get the reimbursement. If the students of Ladakh could also pay such a rent, then it could be considered.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the students are ready to pay.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal to take up the issue with the Dean Student Welfare who would put up a note and it would be taken care of.

2. Professor Mukesh Arora requested that Dr. Devinder Preet Singh, the senior most Assistant Professor be appointed as Associate Professor.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it could be done only if there is a requirement of DCI.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that it is a requirement of the DCI and he handed over a document to the SO to Vice-Chancellor in this regard.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

3. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that about two years ago, the Syndicate had changed the supervisor of Ms. Mukesh Lata in the subject of Punjabi and the Vice-Chancellor had proposed the names of two supervisors including himself and Dr. Harbans Bhatti out of which one was to be chosen by her. She has submitted her thesis. Now the thesis section is not sending the thesis for evaluation on the plea that her supervisor is not approved. The candidate even has shown the approval of supervisor to the branch. He requested that the thesis be got evaluated.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that this was a decision of the Syndicate which could not have been conveyed to the branch.

4. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that in his College, a teacher has joined who has qualified the JRF. The Department of English asks the candidate to do M.Phil. instead of Ph.D.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is the choice of the student. He suggested that since in the Government College for Girls, Sector-11, a Research Centre in the subject of English has been created, the candidate could get enrolled in the Ph.D. there.

5. Professor Mukesh Arora said that a request of Ms. Yogita, from Dudhike for change of supervisor has also been sent. He requested to look into it.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that Ms. Yogita is a teacher at Dhudike and her supervisor is also from the same College. There is some dispute between them and the supervisor says that she would not allow her to complete the Ph.D. The thesis of the candidate is ready for submission but the supervisor is not signing the thesis. He requested that in this case the change of supervisor be allowed and a request in this regard has been sent to the Dean of University Instruction and the supervisor has given the consent to.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would ask the Dean of University Instruction to take up the issue with the Dean, Faculty of Education.

6. Dr. Dalip Kumar said that about 15 days back, the examination portal of the University was launched. He appreciated the efforts of Dean College Development Council for this. He requested that the ad hoc/contract/temporary teachers should also be allowed to register on-line on the portal so that there is a data pool of teachers for evaluation purpose.

The Vice-Chancellor said that only the teachers falling in the category of appointment as for 1925 posts are allowed. He said that some criteria has to be fixed like a minimum service of 2 years

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that for undergraduate the minimum requirement of experience should be 2 years and for postgraduate it should be 5 years.

The Vice-Chancellor requested to send a proposal in this regard.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the retired teachers of the Colleges/University, who are available for doing the examination, let them be also eligible for doing the examination work of the University up to the age of 70 years.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that as is said by Dr. Dalip Kumar, there is another related issue. He said that some of the Colleges are not sending the bio-data of the teachers. He specifically pointed out the name of a SGPC College at Jhar Sahib whose Principal is not sending the bio-data.

It was clarified (by the Dean College Development Council) that this data is not only for the examinations but also for the returns of the teachers also and if the data is not provided, the College would be taken as a defaulter College. This data would also generate the College returns.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that a letter from the Examination branch of the University has been issued, but the Principal is not sending the bio-data of the teachers.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that as pointed out by Principal I.S. Sandhu, it would provide the update of the Colleges. The Dean College Development Council office should issue the guidelines to the Colleges that if the information is not provided by 15<sup>th</sup> October because the semester examination would be approaching.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired from the Dean College Development Council as to how the teachers beyond the age of 60 years would be able to come to know that they have to register for the examination work.

It was informed (by the Dean College Development Council) that a separate deadline would have to be issued for such teachers as they would come directly.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they should give an opportunity to these teachers.

7. Shri Jarnail Singh said that some of the part-time teachers of the Colleges are protected by the orders of the Supreme Court but the Principals are not sending their names to the University. He requested that the Dean College Development Council should issue the instructions to the Colleges to send their names. Since these teachers are teaching the subjects, who would evaluate the answer sheets. These instructions should be particularly sent to the Government Colleges that the part-time teachers are eligible for evaluation. Such teachers could not be removed from the services as they are

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

teaching for the last about 25 years. Earlier, these teachers were working as examiners as also the head examiners.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the number of regular teachers vis-a-vis the students in the Colleges is shrinking. If the work is not divided, then the burden would shift to these teachers.

Shri Jarnail Singh requested that the Dean College Development Council/Controller of Examinations should issue the instructions to the Colleges.

8. Dr. Dalip Kumar said that there was an issue of five non-compounded increments. The Registrar and the Controller of Examinations have clearly given in writing that the Ph.D. is as per the new UGC guidelines. Even the Dean of the Engineering has also written that at the time the candidate did his Ph.D., there was no entrance test and the admission was made on the basis of GATE. That case is held up that the candidate has not come through entrance test. Since there was no provision of entrance test for admission to Ph.D., how the case could be held up. He requested that those cases should be taken up on priority.

9. Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the case of Dr. Kanwalpreet has been approved by the Syndicate but it was deferred in the Senate. He requested that it should be put in the agenda for tomorrow's Senate meeting. It is to be considered with the item related with Dr. Namita Gupta.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Deputy Registrar (General) to include the issue in the agenda.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier they were discussing the Board of Finance. But the case has to come for discussion as part of C-5, item from the Syndicate.

10. Principal B.C. Josan handed over a representation of the College teachers for re-employment on the pattern of Principals.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could do nothing in this as these matters are related with the Managements.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the teachers think that they are being denied this benefit.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that who would bear the expenses on re-employment. He is also in favour of it.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that when the item for re-employment of Principals up to the age of 65 years was taken up, he had requested that this scheme should be applicable for the College teachers also. Subsequently, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu have given a representation and that was not admitted on the plea that they

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

could not deal with the issues of the Colleges. The issue of the re-employment of Principals also relates to the Colleges. Therefore, for the teachers, it should be in the same reference.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the case of the Principals, the decision was that the advertisement would be given and if nobody is available, then the re-employment could be done.

Principal B.C. Josan and Dr. Dalip Kumar requested that the same pattern be followed in the case of the teachers also.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it would be difficult to argue with the Colleges on this issue.

Principal I.S. Sandhu said that he also demands this. He said that the Syndicate and the Senate have taken a decision regarding 5-day week in the Colleges but the same has not been implemented. He is also in favour of it that if the re-employment is being given to the Principals, the same should be given to the teachers also. But there are so many problems because till the time the State Government does not adopt it, it would not be applicable to the Government and grant-in-aid Colleges. If the Managements of the Colleges could meet the expenses for the Principals, then it should be given. It should not be diluted. The Punjab and Chandigarh College Teachers Union has sent representation to the Colleges, Vice-Chancellor, members asking as to why the re-employment is being given to the Principals. He is also in favour of re-employment for teachers. There should be a clear directive for all the Colleges whether grant-in-aid or unaided post, the Managements should bear all the expenses.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that the re-employment should be given to the teachers. Otherwise, it is blocking the promotion avenues of the teachers eligible to be promoted as Principal. The teachers have only one promotion avenue to be promoted as Principal.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is not correct. The teachers could become as Professors in the Colleges.

Dr. Shaminder Singh Sandhu said that it is not being implemented in the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the case of the Principal, advertisement has to be given and go through a process and reach a stage that no person is available. Is there any guarantee that for the teachers, the advertisement has been given and no candidate was available. This could be a possibility only in the case of rural area but not in a College like DAV, Chandigarh.

11. Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that last time a decision was taken that Shri Satish Padam be given some work. Till date no information has been given to him (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) as to what type of work has been allotted to Shri Padam. A resolved part has been sent to him that he has to look after his (Shri Padam) work. The decision was clear that



Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

the maintenance of the hostels is required and he would also go to Muktsar. A clear-cut letter has not been issued except that he would look after the works at Muktsar. He was to be given the work of maintenance and construction of the hostels and outstation works, but till date nothing is clear neither to him (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) nor to Shri Padam.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Registrar to have a meeting with Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma and Shri Padam.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) had a meeting with him and it was explained to him that Shri Satish Padam had been given task for Muktsar and Kauni projects and Shri Satish had visited Kauni and has submitted a report.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that he personally went to meet the Registrar.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he has given direction to the XEN that Shri Padam would be available for the hostels also.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that after a month, he went to meet the Registrar and asked about the responsibilities given to Shri Padam. The decision was to allot the work of hostels and outstation work. But the same has not been allotted but to go to Muktsar, which he has done. He requested that clear-cut works be allotted so that he (Shri Padam) could know as to what duties he is supposed to perform. So, there should be no complaints that neither Shri Padam performed any duty nor he (Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma) supervised the work. That is why he, taking it to be as a duty, is bringing this to their knowledge.

Professor Mukesh Arora suggested that the College Bhawan should be properly maintained.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma cited an example that Head Constable could not control a Head Constable. Shri Padam could be put under the control of the Registrar, Dean of University Instruction or the Vice-Chancellor but not under the control of another XEN as it is not proper.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he (Shri Padam) could not be given the financial powers.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that the financial powers of the works to be done by Shri Padam could be delegated to the Finance and Development Officer.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that such a thing should not be done that whatever decision is taken, but when it comes to implementation, it is done according to will.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the financial powers have to be given to the XEN because the tender specifications are to be prepared by him and technical decisions have to be

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

taken which have financial implications. Therefore, the financial powers have to be with the XEN.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that it would be better if both the XENs work together and there would be a check and balance.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that a clear-cut decision was taken.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that it was decided that Shri Padam would be given the independent responsibility of certain things like the public health.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that during the meeting it was not discussed and the Vice-Chancellor had talked about the responsibility of hostels.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that whatever decision has been taken, that should be implemented.

Shri Jarnail Singh suggested that whatever decision had been taken, the office orders should be issued.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that the written orders would be issued.

Dr. Rabinder Nath Sharma said that whatever is the due and the dignity of the XEN, that should be given to him.

It was clarified (by the Registrar) that the responsibility of the works could be assigned to Shri Padam but he could not be given any financial powers.

12. Principal B.C. Josan said that the Research Centres have been opened in the Colleges and are working smoothly. They are running 4 Research Centres and a Research Centre in English has been given to Government College and he had also gone there. The same team had gone to the MCM College and it refused the grant of Research Centre whereas it was approved for Government College. MCM DAV College is having 12 Ph.D. teachers whereas the Government College is having only two teachers. He requested that there should not be any partiality.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that there is a requirement of 3 teachers.

Dr. Dalip Kumar said that he wanted to correct Principal B.C. Josan as he had said two things which are not right, which is not known as to how he said so. The Committee was not the same as three members of the Committee were different. Secondly, there are 18 teachers in the Government College out of which 3 are Professors meaning thereby that they are Ph.D. degree holders. Three teachers of the Government College are already approved by Panjab University and 5 students are already enrolled. He was also a part of the Committee as nominee of the Director, Higher Education. He

Syndicate Proceedings dated 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2017

said that it is wrong on the part of Principal B.C. Josan to say that the Committee was the same. If the Committee was the same as was being said by Principal B.C. Josan, then the matter could be re-looked into. If four members of the Committee were different from the earlier members, then there is different dimension of the matter.

Professor Mukesh Arora said that even if a single member is different out of the earlier members, then it would be treated as a different Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Principal of MCM DAV College is also a Senator and she has not made any complaint. At least some representation has to be given by the head of the institution. The Principal has to send some written communication.

Professor Mukesh Arora and Dr. Dalip Kumar suggested Principal B.C. Josan to ask for the Research Centre for his College.

13. Principal Hardiljit Singh Gosal said that they were to visit Panipat and a date for the visit be finalised.

Dr. Gurdip Kumar Sharma said that he is the Chairman of that Committee.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that he was ready for the visit as and when asked by the Committee.

( G.S. Chadha )  
Registrar

Confirmed

( Arun Kumar Grover )  
VICE-CHANCELLOR