

## PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Sunday, 29<sup>th</sup> April 2018 at 10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

### **PRESENT**

1. Professor A.K. Grover ... (in the Chair)  
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Amit Joshi
3. Shri Ashok Goyal
4. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi
5. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
6. Professor Keshav Malhotra
7. Professor Navdeep Goyal
8. Shri Prabhjit Singh
9. Professor Ronki Ram
10. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
11. Shri Sanjay Tandon
12. Dr. Satish Kumar
13. Dr. Subhash Sharma
14. Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha
15. Professor Parvinder Singh ... (Secretary)  
Controller of Examinations in place of Registrar

Dr. Ameer Sultana, Professor Anita Kaushal, Shri Harjit 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 deep sense of sorrow, I may inform the members about the sad demise of –

- (i) Veteran Journalist S. Nihal Singh, on April 16, 2018. He had donated a vast collection of books (Around 3000 in number, includes books in German, Russian, French and Malayalam and English), which were a part of his personal library, to the School of Communications Studies, PU, Chandigarh. He had also delivered the prestigious PU Colloquium on 11<sup>th</sup> May, 2016 entitled 'Indian Politics: The Tipping Point'.
- (ii) Professor Vipin Dewan, an Ex-Faculty member of University Business School, on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2018. He was spouse of a present faculty member Professor Smriti Sood.

The Syndicate expressed its sorrow and grief over the passing away of Veteran Journalist S. Nihal Singh and Professor Vipin Dewan and observed two minutes silence, all standing, to pay homage to the departed souls.

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

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

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

- (i) University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences (UIPS), PU, secured third rank among pharmacy institutions with an overall score of 76.50, in the 2018 National Institutional Ranking Framework (NIRF), released by the Shri Prakash Javadekar, Union HRD Minister at Vigyan Bhawan, New Delhi, on April 3, 2018. Prof. Kanwaljit Chopra, Chairperson, UIPS, received a Certificate from Union HRD Minister. In the overall rankings, where institutes like the Indian Institute of Science (IISc) and Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) competed, Panjab University has improved its ranking from 54<sup>th</sup> last year to 33<sup>rd</sup> with overall score of 50.94 this year. Further I would like to share that in the NIRF Rankings PU has been ranked 17<sup>th</sup> in Medical Category, 20<sup>th</sup> in University Category, 42<sup>nd</sup> in Management Category and 59<sup>th</sup> in Engineering Category. The Post Graduate Government College for Girls, Sector-11 and G.G.D.S.D. College, Sector-32 affiliated with PU, also are ranked at 68 and 82, respectively.
- (ii) Prof. A.S. Ahluwalia has been elected as President of the Punjab Academy of Sciences for the term of 3 years w.e.f. 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018.
- (iii) Panjab University, Chandigarh has been selected amongst the 11-Member Subject Expert Groups (SEGs) for pan India implementation of Unnat Bharat Abhiyan (UBA) new scheme of Government of India, Ministry of Human Resource Development. Other SEG Institution Members include 6 IITs (Kanpur, Delhi, Kharagpur, Madras, Roorkee and Bombay), IARI (New Delhi), NIRD (Hyderabad), AICTE and UGC. Panjab University is the only university which has been selected in this 11 members group. The SEGs will function as think tank and monitor progress of the scheme. PU has been assigned subject area 'Innovation and Design Education'. Prof. Rakesh Tuli, Sr. Research Advisor & J.C. Bose National Fellow and Coordinator, DIC at UIET, has been appointed as Coordinator for the SEG at Panjab University, Chandigarh. His job is to evaluate all the proposals which are related to research and innovation. Each Subject Expert Group (SEG) will have technical and non-technical members and representatives from field and administration to facilitate effective implementation of UBA 2.0.
- (iv) Prof. Manoj Kumar, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, has been appointed as Honorary Dean of Maharaja Agrasen School of Pharmacy, Maharaja Agrasen University, Baddi (HP) up to June 30, 2019.
- (v) Prof. Nirmala Chongtham in the Department of Botany, PU, has been invited to give a keynote lecture titled 'The Healing touch of Bamboo' in the World Bamboo Congress to be held in Mexico from 14-18 August, 2018. Prof. Nirmala under her stewardship as Coordinator of the National Team, will organize 3<sup>rd</sup> World Bamboo Workshop at Imphal from 4-8 February 2019 in collaboration with

Syndicate Proceedings dated 29<sup>th</sup> April/26<sup>th</sup> May 2018

World Bamboo Organization, USA and DICMA Trade from Mexico.

- (vi) Research article titled 'Immunoprotective potential of BamA, the outer membrane protein assembly factor, against MDR Acinetobacter baumannii' authored by Prof. Prince Sharma, has been selected as one of the top 100 Microbiology papers published in a Nature Publication 'Scientific Reports' in 2017.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma informed that one of their colleagues, Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu, MLA, has been inducted in the Punjab Cabinet. He is also a member of a present Senate.

**RESOLVED:** That –

1. felicitation of the Syndicate be conveyed to –
  - (i) Prof. A.S. Ahluwalia on having been elected as President of the Punjab Academy of Sciences for a term of 3 years w.e.f. 1<sup>st</sup> April 2018.
  - (ii) Prof. Manoj Kumar, University Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, on having been appointed as Honorary Dean of Maharaja Agrasen School of Pharmacy, Maharaja Agrasen University, Baddi (HP) up to June 30, 2019.
  - (iii) Shri Bharat Bhushan Ashu, MLA, on having been inducted in the Punjab Cabinet.
2. the information contained in Vice-Chancellor's statement at Sr. No. (i), (iii), (v), and (vi) be noted and approved.

The discussion on left out items of the Syndicate meeting dated 30<sup>th</sup> March, 2018 took place in the beginning of the meeting which has been made a part of the proceedings of that meeting (30<sup>th</sup> March, 2018). After consideration of the left out items, the items on the agenda of regular meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 from C-2 to C-6 were taken up for consideration.

After reading out his statement, the Vice Chancellor requested the members that let they should proceed with the agenda.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he would like to talk about the affidavit which was also discussed in the last meeting of the Syndicate. All the members have given in writing to him (Vice Chancellor) to withdraw the affidavit.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has already responded to it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that though he (Vice Chancellor) responded, but the decision of the Syndicate was something else where the Vice Chancellor has said that he could give another affidavit

mentioning that those were his (Vice Chancellor) personal views. In the Court, the Panjab University is a party because he has filed the affidavit as Vice Chancellor, Panjab University and not as Professor Arun Grover and that too through the Advocate of the University. As Professor Arun Grover, he (Vice Chancellor) is not the party. He reiterated that as per the decision of the Syndicate, he should withdraw the affidavit and he could do anything else on his personal level or as an individual. This is his personal submission. If he wants to file something on his own, he has no objection, but do not submit this affidavit as Vice Chancellor of Panjab University because the regulatory bodies i.e. Syndicate and Senate, many members including he himself are not against reforms. But it should be discussed as the Committee has been constituted by the Syndicate. If the report of that Committee has been received by the Vice Chancellor, he should submit that report to the Syndicate. If they come to know about something regarding the reforms, they knew from the newspapers only. But they cannot know anything without going through the report as to what has been done. He said that it is his submission that the Vice Chancellor should withdraw the affidavit filed by him and if he wants to give individual affidavit, he could do so. Then the University bodies would ask the Registrar to do as they deem fit.

The Vice Chancellor said that the affidavit was filed as he was asked by the Court to respond on October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016. He had submitted two sets of documents. All that he has done is that certain suggestions had been articulated in the document number 2. He has just given a background as to why some suggestions have been made which are listed in October 20<sup>th</sup> document. He has just given his assessment of why things need a change with some history. Alright, it is his personal assessment. He has already stated that he would inform the Court that this is his personal assessment. It is a public interest litigation and the Court had specifically asked that the Vice Chancellor should be given primacy in responding to it and so he has responded. He would just tell that he has responded. His term would end on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2018.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Committee was formed on the request of the then PUTA President. The matter was discussed and decided in the Syndicate itself to form a Committee. It means the Governing Bodies are interested in looking at the governance reforms. But from the affidavit it seems as if the governing body is a hindrance in governance reforms. But there is nothing that the governing body is a hindrance and that is why they are talking to withdraw the affidavit. A fresh affidavit could be filed after discussing it in the Syndicate.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is not about affidavit. It is just about procedure. The Court has asked him (Vice Chancellor) to file an affidavit. Nobody is against the governance reforms. There is no harm if the affidavit is filed after discussing it here. This is a statutory procedure as per the guidelines. If the affidavit is submitted after following this procedure, there could not be any problem. This is a very small issue. Why to make it such a big issue which would malign the image of the University. It would make no difference if the affidavit is filed again after discussion. He is just requesting for the image of the University. There is nothing personal in it for them. They could understand his (Vice Chancellor) feelings and they support it also that the reforms are needed. They all support his sentiments. It is not that they are against the Vice Chancellor. They are all with

him. They are only requesting that it will be better if the affidavit is filed through proper channel as per the provision and as per the working culture of the University. It should not look like as if the affidavit has been filed directly in the Court. It is a very small issue, otherwise, it would become a huge issue. The only issue is to file the affidavit after discussion and nothing else. There is nothing personal in it and they are just requesting him (Vice Chancellor) with folded hands in the interest of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would file another affidavit and tell the Court that the earlier affidavit was his personal opinion.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that his (Vice Chancellor) personal opinion cannot be as Vice Chancellor, however, he could do so after 22<sup>nd</sup> July.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Vice Chancellor has responded that he would file another affidavit and it would be in sequel to the affidavit which he has filed earlier. The Vice Chancellor has written in the response also that he would tell the Court that the affidavit submitted by him earlier, it was his comprehension and drafted by him also. So now if he writes this in the affidavit, he (Professor Ronki Ram) thinks that it is very clear that it was not an affidavit filed by the Syndicate and it was from him (Vice Chancellor). If the Vice Chancellor says that it his comprehension, where is the problem.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that till the time he is Vice Chancellor, he cannot file individually. They should see it legally whether he as Vice Chancellor could file it individually. It should have been discussed in the governing body.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he (Vice Chancellor) is their leader and in the interest of the University, he asked the Vice Chancellor to accept their request.

Principal S.S. Sangha suggested that the Vice-Chancellor might not do it himself, the Registrar could withdraw the affidavit.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Vice Chancellor should withdraw the affidavit and file a fresh affidavit.

The Vice Chancellor said that he would not withdraw the affidavit and restate that he will submit that it was his personal comprehension and he did not take the Syndicate into confidence while filing the affidavit. It is also a fact that he has been preparing and filing so many submissions which he has filed in the Court, also in the Supreme Court over this. Those have not been filed in his name. He would clarify everything to the Court. These submissions have been made. He had a major role in preparing those submissions, but he did not take Syndicate into confidence while preparing these submissions. Syndicate has had no difference or has not questioned him earlier when he filed the submissions. The Syndicate, at the moment, is questioning him as to why he has submitted the affidavit. So, he hereby, categorically states that he did not take Syndicate into confidence while submitting this affidavit. This is his personal view. If the Court wants to disregard his personal view, it is upto the Court.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 29<sup>th</sup> April/26<sup>th</sup> May 2018

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the submissions earlier made by the Vice Chancellor were shown to the Syndicate and there was no objection to anyone.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has not shown those submissions to anyone.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the earlier submissions used to come before the Syndicate to which the Vice Chancellor said, those may have come, but he has not shown. Continuing, Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the submissions made by the Vice Chancellor were shown to them after submission.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has shown the copy of this affidavit to them now. The Vice Chancellor said that he would categorically state that it was his personal opinion and he has not shown it to the Syndicate and the Syndicate members have serious reservation as to what he has submitted and would request to take it in that spirit.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked as to how this affidavit came into the domain of public and not in the domain of the Syndicate.

The Vice Chancellor said that the affidavit was filed in the Court and its copies were given to all the parties, that means, the representatives of Punjab Government, U.T. Government, Central Government and Haryana Government were given a copy. Even on that day, the day it was filed somebody came up and said that he is representing PUTA and he was also probably given a copy.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked as to how Haryana representative is a stakeholder.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have gone and joined the public interest litigation.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked does it mean that the Syndicate has no role as they have not been given any copy. It means they all are just sitting here. He said that he is just requesting him (Vice Chancellor) time and again.

The Vice Chancellor said that he has told whatever he had to say.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he has been in the Syndicate for the last 1½ years. On an average, in every Syndicate the Vice Chancellor used to give a statement 2-3 times that they are the governing body and they have to decide. Why they are mum on some matter? Why they are not speaking on this? When some punishment has to be given to a J.E., the Vice-Chancellor used to put the responsibility on Syndicate and said as to why they do not take action against him as he has committed corruption. If somebody has written a letter to the Chancellor, he (Vice Chancellor) says that it is indiscipline and asks us to take action against that person. They are the governing body and they have to take a decision. He said that this can be verified from the record. But here, it is a very big issue. Has the Court asked him (Vice Chancellor) to file an affidavit for reforms?

The Vice Chancellor said that the Court has not asked him.

Continuing, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Vice Chancellor filed an affidavit, did he not feel that the affidavit should have been discussed on this platform as earlier the Vice-Chancellor on every occasion used to say that the Syndicate is the governing body. An employee cannot write a letter to the Chancellor about his personal grievances, that is termed as indiscipline, but an affidavit is filed in the Court, without discussing it in the governing body, the affidavit which would decide the fate of the governing body. It is written in the affidavit that the position of Dean is compromised. He wanted to know as to which Dean's position was compromised and which incompetent person has become a Dean. He has filed an official affidavit in the Court, now he could say that he has filed in the personal capacity. But he has filed the affidavit in official capacity, it was filed through proper channel, it was filed as Vice Chancellor of the University saying that the position of the Dean is compromised. He wanted to know which incompetent Dean has been elected, which such incompetent person has been elected due to whom the University has suffered. He requested the Vice Chancellor not to make a personal prestige of all these issues. Nobody is against the governance reforms. He said that whatever issues, the Vice Chancellor has placed before the Syndicate in the last 1½ year, they by and large supported it. When there is an issue in the interest of the University, they have supported it in the Senate also. They have no personal agenda but even then they supported him on every issue. But for such a big issue, the Vice Chancellor did not feel it necessary to place it before the Syndicate. At least it should have shown to them. Now the Vice-Chancellor is adamant and did not want to withdraw the affidavit. He thinks that there would be no problem if the Vice-Chancellor withdraws the affidavit. It shows that the Vice Chancellor does not have faith in this Syndicate. Perhaps the Vice Chancellor thinks that the Syndicate would not approve the reforms which he would like to bring or it would create hindrance. As regards the filing of new affidavit, it somehow gives an impression to the Court that he (Vice Chancellor) would like to bring reforms, but the Syndicate does not want these reforms, so these are his (Vice Chancellor) personal views. They (Syndics) are doing politics and groupism. He (Dr. Subhash Sharma) again reiterated that they are not here to exercise groupism. He asked the Vice Chancellor if he has ever approached him (Vice Chancellor) for any personal favour. If they want to do reforms, then the reforms have to be done from this platform only because the Vice Chancellor used to say in the Syndicate that they are the governing body. He (Vice Chancellor) has submitted the affidavit in the Court without discussing and without taking the Syndicate into confidence, it seems to him that it is also a kind of indiscipline (by the Vice-Chancellor). If writing a letter by an employee to the Chancellor without approval is indiscipline, then, he is sorry to say that this action of the Vice-Chancellor also comes under the category of indiscipline. He is their worthy Vice Chancellor, they respect him a lot, he is a very good scientist and a good academician. He has run the University in a very good manner. They respect all that. But nobody is above the institution, even the Vice Chancellor could not be above the institution. He again requested that either he should withdraw the affidavit and if he (Vice Chancellor) does not do so, then he personally feels that the Vice Chancellor does not have faith on this Syndicate and there is lack of trust. If the Vice Chancellor does not have faith in them, then they cannot trust him (either). So, according to him, the powers which they have delegated to him (Vice Chancellor), they have to withdraw those powers as they are left with no alternative. There is so much lack of trust that the Vice Chancellor submitted such an

important affidavit in the Court and he did not feel it necessary even to consult them. So, he feels that till the time this lack of trust prevails, they cannot delegate their powers to the Vice Chancellor. This is his own opinion and the other members could give their opinion and then there is no other alternative. It is very painful but they have no alternative.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor that it is very small issue but see the manifestation of it in everyday's newspapers. He (Vice Chancellor) is their leader and they stood by him on every issue. Then why they should indulge in such a situation. It is a very small issue in the interest of the institution.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are ready for reforms.

Continuing, Dr. Amit Joshi said that they had been with him (Vice Chancellor) and even now they are with him. It is not that they are against him. He said that if he (Vice Chancellor) has accepted what the Court has said and requested that he should also accept their request.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if the Vice Chancellor is saying that the Court has not said it to him, then what was the urgency to give an affidavit.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor to accept their small request and they are not asking for much, just a little cooperation on one issue.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they feel it would not lower the prestige of any one.

Dr. Amit Joshi while endorsing the view of Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they will support the Vice Chancellor on every aspect and he would not have any complaint on this.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it has become a situation of deadlock as he (Vice Chancellor) is not accepting what all the Syndicate members are requesting. According to him, this type of situation has arisen for the first time when all the members of the Syndicate wanted reforms after discussion.

Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice-Chancellor to follow the procedure.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that this would also be a reform if the earlier affidavit is withdrawn on the suggestion of the Syndicate and then fresh affidavit is filed in individual capacity.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he would inform the Court.

Some of the members requested the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the earlier affidavit.

The Vice-Chancellor said, 'no comments', he has nothing more to say.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that as stated by Dr. Subhash Sharma, according to him, they go by that.



Dr. Amit Joshi requested the Vice Chancellor to accept their request to withdraw the affidavit as all the members of Syndicate are requesting him. He said that the Vice Chancellor should accept their request as they have at least this much of claim on the Vice Chancellor.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that since the Vice Chancellor has clearly refused that he has no comments on it and he is not going to withdraw the affidavit. It means he is not ready to listen to the Syndicate. He thinks no member has opposed it and the other members who have not spoken, they could also speak.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the Vice Chancellor has stated that he would file another affidavit in sequel to the one which he has filed earlier in which he would say that the affidavit filed by him earlier was not with the consensus or discussion or approval of the Syndicate, hence he would give in writing that the affidavit was his own comprehension and drafted by him. If he has said this, then he (Professor Ronki Ram) is not a part of the proposal to withdraw the powers of the Vice Chancellor and he expressed his dissent to this.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked under what rule, the Vice Chancellor could file such an affidavit.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he (Vice Chancellor) would file the affidavit as a person.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Vice-Chancellor has not filed the affidavit in individual capacity. If the Vice-Chancellor wanted to file the affidavit in individual capacity, then he should resign and do whatever he likes.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as most of the members started speaking together.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there is no problem in filing the affidavit in his (Vice Chancellor) personal capacity. But the affidavit which he (Vice Chancellor) has filed in the capacity of Vice Chancellor, that should be withdrawn, after that he could do whatever he likes.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that first the affidavit has to be withdrawn.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that since the affidavit has been filed without taking the Syndicate in confidence, that should be withdrawn.

Dr. Ronki Ram said that it is his opinion.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that the Vice Chancellor has filed the affidavit without the permission of the Syndicate, so he has to withdraw the affidavit to which some members said, it is alright.

The Vice Chancellor said that for him, the matter under discussion is the agenda which is pending. This is the third sitting of the Syndicate, so they should first discuss all the agenda items as this is very important.

Dr. Amit Joshi asked if the issue under reference is not important.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if in the situation of lack of trust, the agenda could not be discussed. If the Vice-Chancellor does not have trust in the Syndicate, then how could they discuss.

Principal Surinder Singh Sangha said requested the Vice Chancellor to listen to the members because the matter would become a big issue when it would go to the Senate.

Dr. Amit Joshi said this is a very small issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not allowing any discussion on this, and they are discussing of their own. According to him, it is their duty to first discuss this agenda.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he (Vice Chancellor) has circulated the agenda, until and unless he is responsible and answerable to the governing body, how he can say that the agenda should be allowed to be discussed. They are having patience and he (Vice Chancellor) says that whatever blunder he has committed, he is not ready to discuss and he wants the agenda to be discussed.

The Vice Chancellor said, 'no comments'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, what comments, they are not seeking any comments. He wonders why the members of the Syndicate are begging before him to withdraw the affidavit. He could understand the pain which he (Vice Chancellor) must have seen on 21<sup>st</sup> April. The kind of pain which the members were undergoing, the kind of anger which they have against the affidavit, today everybody is begging and telling that it is a very small issue. He thinks that in the history of the University, such a big blunder has not been committed by any of the officials of the University what to talk of the Vice Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor says, no comments. The Vice Chancellor misguided them in the last meeting also and he misguided them even today earlier that it was the Court at whose asking, he (Vice Chancellor) submitted the affidavit. When Shri Tandon asked, he (Vice Chancellor) said that the Court did not ask. The Vice Chancellor has to be very clear on this and let him tell him that may be it is in variance with the opinion of all other members, it is very-very serious matter, it is not going to have the implications for Panjab University only, it is going to have implications for the institution of the Vice Chancellor who does not bother about the mandate which is given in the Panjab University Act, which is given in the P.U. regulations, which is given in the P.U. rules. Do not forget that it is mandated in the Act that the Vice Chancellor will function as per the statutes and regulations and rules of the University. The Vice Chancellor is not above the regulations and to say that he will go to the Court and to say that it was his personal opinion, who has given him the authority to give the affidavit in the Court. Tomorrow, all 15 members, are they free to give anything on behalf of the University or even in personal capacity where they are not even a party and to say that it was in his personal capacity, he thinks, that they have to analyse the situation keeping in view what the legal provisions are. What is the *locus standi* of an individual in the public interest litigation as he is saying, unless he files an application to become a party and the Court allows him to become a party, only then he can say anything in the Court. To take so lightly the contention of the Syndicate members, he thinks, it clearly amounts to not only mistrust but to say to hell with members if they want to discuss the agenda, it is alright, otherwise he (Vice-

Chancellor) will not permit them to talk anything else about this agenda. The people wrote to the Vice Chancellor unanimously on 21<sup>st</sup> itself and he responded by saying that he will do this or that and today after almost eight days, he is still standing there only. That means, he (Vice Chancellor) thinks that the Syndicate consists of fools. Does the Vice Chancellor think that he is the only person who is interested in the welfare of the University and others do not have stakes in the University functioning. Alright, if he (Vice Chancellor) chooses for this, as proposed by Dr. Subhash Sharma that all the powers which have been delegated to him by the Senate or Syndicate, as the case may be, needs to be withdrawn in the interest of the functioning of the University, he would be the first one to second the proposal. Professor Navdeep Goyal affirmed it by his nodding.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and a couple of other members also endorsed the viewpoints of Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Ashok Goyal continued to add that it is nothing (more than), (as) one of the honourable members was saying that it is equal to a Secretary of Government of India filing an affidavit against the Government of India, and then saying that it is his personal view. He does not know under whose advice he (Vice-Chancellor) has done this. Earlier also on 20<sup>th</sup> October if he has filed the affidavits, it is their mistake that they (Syndics) did not go through what he was filing on behalf of the University, if he says that nobody objected to that earlier. Some of the members said that he has been showing it to them afterwards by sending emails or whatever it is. It means that he (Vice Chancellor) has taken it for granted that whatever is to be said in the Court on behalf of the University, he is the only authority as if he does not know that the Vice Chancellor has no jurisdiction to file any affidavit in the Court of Law on behalf of Panjab University. It is only and only the Registrar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that the first affidavit was submitted by the Registrar.

Continuing Shri Ashok Goyal said that according to him, that more than ten affidavits have been filed in this very case on behalf of Panjab University and all of them have been filed by the Registrar, but this very affidavit has been filed by Professor Arun Grover, Panjab University. Why so? Instead of explaining, instead of clarifying the position, the Vice Chancellor says that he will not allow anybody to comment on it and he will also not give any comments and he will not allow anybody to speak on this issue.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not permitting this resolution to be moved.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, who says that his (Vice Chancellor) permission is required. If the Vice-Chancellor does not know, let him tell Mr. Grover, it is in this very House, more than 20 years back a resolution was moved that such and such person who happened to be the Vice Chancellor of Panjab University, who was presiding this meeting, it was proposed that a charge sheet be issued to him as per the charges and it was resolved in the Syndicate. Does he (Vice Chancellor) think that any Vice Chancellor would allow such a resolution to be passed?

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that then he (Vice Chancellor) should dissolve the Syndicate which was also endorsed by Shri Prabhjit Singh. Continuing, Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are just wasting their time. They come here, discuss the thing and resolve. They are not getting any salary, they are not getting perks. Why they are here? If they have to seek permission for everything, then he should dissolve the Syndicate. He may write to the Court or the Chancellor that they do not need any Senate or Syndicate, that is it, it is fine.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that though it is not provided for in the statutes, they could have still thought that it is graceful, had he filed this affidavit at least with the prior permission of the Chancellor and he forgot that he is not the Chairman of the Senate, it is the Chancellor who is the Chairman of the Senate and he is just officiating in his (Chancellor's) absence.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said, okay, the resolution is passed.

The Vice Chancellor said that these proceedings are being recorded, it will be minuted and sent to the Senate as well as to the Chancellor. Alright, it is their unanimous view with one dissent, if there is any dissent, it is okay with him. This will go to the Senate and also to the Chancellor. The Chancellor is his appointing authority, whatever action he deems appropriate he may take.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are withdrawing only those powers which have been delegated to him by the Syndicate and they cannot withdraw any other power.

The Vice Chancellor said, fine, he accepts that as he has no choice with him. They are to deal with the new Vice Chancellor, new Chairman of the Syndicate after 2½ months, they can deal with him. The powers which they have withdrawn from him, he accepts it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if the House agrees with him, he wants to propose something, i.e. the Syndicate withdraws its powers and recommends to the Senate to withdraw the powers delegated to the Vice Chancellor under the present circumstances because they are representing Senate. Secondly, they direct the Registrar to file an affidavit in the Court on behalf of Panjab University. Two-three members, i.e., Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma may sit together and draft the affidavit and submit it in the Court before 6<sup>th</sup> of May, 2018 i.e. before the meeting of the Senate. Thirdly, they would write to the Chancellor about the decision of the Syndicate and the Vice Chancellor is not ready to accept the decision of the Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram asked if he is talking about the decision on reforms.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it is regarding the affidavit as to what is the stand of the University. They would direct the Registrar to file an affidavit before 6<sup>th</sup> of May which should be shown to the three-four members of the Committee suggested earlier.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he would like to lay down what Shri Prabhjit Singh has suggested. He has suggested three-four suggestions. After the resolution to the effect that the powers

delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice Chancellor are hereby withdrawn, is carried, in the Syndicate unanimously. He has further suggested that the Syndicate also recommends to the Senate that the powers, if any, delegated by the Senate to the Vice Chancellor, be withdrawn with immediate effect. The third proposal which he seems to have made is, as he understands, that the Syndicate resolves to direct the Registrar to file an affidavit on behalf of Panjab University, Chandigarh, before 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2018 that the affidavit filed by Professor Arun Grover, Vice Chancellor, Panjab University on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 be treated as withdrawn. The fourth proposal he (Shri Prabhjit Singh) has made is that let the matter be reported through the Registrar to the Chancellor that the Syndicate has unanimously resolved, after discussion and requesting, the Vice Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit. While failing in its endeavour to get the affidavit withdrawn resolved, that the powers, as has been passed, be withdrawn. The Syndicate, taking serious note, resolves to report the matter to the Chancellor for taking appropriate action against the Vice Chancellor for having filed such an affidavit containing undesirable language against the members of the Governing Body, keeping in view the hurt sentiments of the members of the Senate and Syndicate.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the affidavit which has to be filed, should have been filed through proper channel.

Clarifying the point, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has stated that on behalf of the Panjab University, the affidavit should be filed by the Registrar. Now the question which remains to be seen is that there will be 2-3 people who will be looking into the drafting of the affidavit, but of course, it needs the assistance and help of an Advocate through whom the University is to file the affidavit. That Committee of three or four members, whatever they would decide, that Committee is also authorised to decide about through which Advocate, the affidavit is to be filed, after taking necessary legal advice in the matter, keeping in mind the seriousness of the issue. He said, he thinks, that is summed up to which the members said it is alright.

The Vice Chancellor asked if it is a unanimous decision of all of them to which the members said, yes.

Professor Ronki Ram, however, requested to record his dissent.

Dr. Satish Kumar Sharma said that before taking up the agenda, is there any possibility to give chance to the peace in the campus, in the meeting. He is very upset to see all this. It is his personal opinion. He is not for the dissolution of Syndicate's inherent authority, as enshrined in the Panjab University Calendar. He did not want that they should be given power beyond the Calendar. The Vice-Chancellor should also see the sentiments expressed by almost all the members. The Vice-Chancellor has a status bigger than the members in every aspect and chairing the meeting. Nobody is targeting the Vice-Chancellor personally but because of the nature of the affidavit filed. He requested the Vice-Chancellor to reconsider. He also requested the members to think over it. He has not witnessed such a situation in his 30-year association with the University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that is also painful for all of them.

Dr. Satish Kumar said that he could feel the sentiments of the members. He also wanted to say the same thing but his words could

be different, his appeal could be different but he is in agreement with what the members have expressed. He has never seen so many members requesting the Vice-Chancellor with folded hands to withdraw the affidavit. It is not a personal benefit. This could be an error of judgment of what the Vice-Chancellor has done as per his own wisdom while the other people have felt that this should not have been done. He again requested the members and especially the Vice-Chancellor to see the reason and they should try to work in cordiality.

Shri Sanjay Tandon that 2-3 things occurred in this matter, he was not present in the last meeting, but he read the things which appeared in the newspapers. While reading through that a common man takes the view, a very poor view of the University. In terms of any error of omission or commission which anybody has committed, all of them in best of their wisdom feel that this is curable. One is something which is not curable, they are in position to do. Just like that and what would be the headlines tomorrow, any of the good agenda which they are going to take up, is not going to be a part of the headlines, the part of the headlines would be that the Syndicate expresses anguish and distrust in Vice Chancellor. This is going to be tomorrow's headlines, which is not good for the institution. He wanted to know why the need came for filing the affidavit. But, he thinks, now his question would remain unanswered and he feels that even if it is answered at this level, it may not solve the issue. So, he is just surpassing it from that side. He personally feels that wisdom should prevail on all of them. Nobody is above the values, system, rules and regulations of Panjab University. They are here to protect the honour of the University and he thinks that everybody has expressed that thing. Even if he sees this from Vice Chancellor's point of view that filing of an affidavit and then if his cabinet (Syndicate) feels that this affidavit is not in consonance, there are many precedents even in government of the country when they have withdrawn their affidavits. He requested the Vice-Chancellor not to make it a personal issue. It is not a personal matter for which he was to feel bad about it. It does happen and accepting something that this has been done by oversight or something, he may not have to add any word, he should just say that his team of members of Syndicate disagree with this affidavit, hence he is withdrawing this affidavit and he would file a new affidavit in consonance with their viewpoint. He is sure there is nothing wrong in it. Why he (Vice Chancellor) is feeling that this should become an issue. Everyone is using the words with folded hands and with the request, etc. His personal view is that among the equals he (Vice Chancellor) is taking the Chair. There is no question whether somebody is junior or lower over here. They all are sitting here in best of their wisdom to take a call. What is the harm if the Vice Chancellor takes it in that spirit, the tomorrow's headlines would change. If he just remains stuck up on this point, the headlines would be very demeaning for the institution. So his position *per se* and the position of University *per se*, even if he has to diminish his position to save the position of the University, he is sure, he would be able to do it and he feels that all of them should do that including the Vice Chancellor. So, his advice/request, or whatever word they consider better, it would be that in all prudence, if the Vice Chancellor withdraws the affidavit, it would not affect anyone and the language which would go in the minutes otherwise, which was expressed by his colleagues, is harmful. So, all those things, which were discussed earlier might be removed and they just take it as on record that he (Vice Chancellor) has agreed to withdraw it and the matter ends.

The Vice Chancellor said let him reiterate that he would file before the Court that whatever he has filed, he did not consult the Syndicate. His colleagues have a different view point on it. It is their viewpoint that he (Vice Chancellor) should not have filed this affidavit at all. He has not stated in the affidavit anything which is against anybody in person. He has only stated things in generality giving a background. That the appointment of Dean has to be looked at, this is not his view, it is recorded in the NAAC report. It is also recorded in the NAAC report that the governance structure in the Act and statutes has to be looked at. So, all this was the part of NAAC report and not his report. NAAC Report is a report from fifteen members, statutory body of the Government of India and they are expected to respond to it. Next time when the NAAC team would come, they will ask for action taken on the report of the previous visit. So, it is in the background of all that. Effectively, whatever he is saying, it amounts to stating that it is his personal opinion. If his personal opinion is not acceptable to the Court, the Court would not accept it and he would write that if the Court thinks that the personal opinions are not to be considered or not to be taken cognisance of, the Court is at liberty to do whatever it deems fit. If any punishment is to be given to him by the Court or if any costs are to be imposed by the Court or whatever it is, he is prepared to take all that. All this will go to the Chancellor and the Chancellor would take the cognisance whatever he would like. Anyway, his appointment is at the pleasure of the Chancellor and he can take any action that he deems appropriate. As far as withdrawing of delegated powers which is there, he is okay with it. The new Vice Chancellor would come, tomorrow is the last day for receiving the applications. Already there is adequate number of applications. Some Search Committee or Selection Committee would get appointed and a new person would take over on 22<sup>nd</sup> of July. If the Chancellor asks him to proceed on leave, it is fine with him as he has enough accumulated leave and he would proceed on leave. Leave the matter to the Chancellor, leave the matter to the Court and he has nothing more to add.

Professor Ronki Ram said that it is a very democratic way they have been discussing for the last one hour and having views from all the members. It is not for the first time when the powers of the Vice Chancellor, Panjab University are going to be taken back by the Syndicate. It has happened earlier also. In the democracy, everybody has his own view point. If they do not agree with the view point of each other, let the public do it. This is the beauty of Panjab University Senate. This is the beauty of the Panjab University Syndicate. Vice Chancellor can give his/her own view, Syndicate can give its own view, Senate can give its own view, but they should not fight on that. If they disagree with the views of each other, let the public decide.

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

At this stage, the Vice Chancellor requested the members to wait for a few minutes, he went out of the House and the members continued discussion among themselves.

Shri Ashok Goyal summarised the resolved part of the Syndicate as follows:

- (i) the resolution that powers delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice-Chancellor under the Panjab University

Rules and Regulations be withdrawn from the Vice-Chancellor with immediate effect;

- (ii) further, it is resolved to recommend to the Senate that the powers, delegated by it under the Panjab University Rules and Regulations to the Vice-Chancellor may also be withdrawn from the Vice-Chancellor with immediate effect;
- (iii) resolved to direct Registrar to file an affidavit stating that the affidavit filed by Professor Arun Kumar Grover, Vice-Chancellor on behalf of Panjab University in the Punjab and Haryana High Court on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 without authority be treated as withdrawn. The Registrar be directed to file an affidavit on behalf of Panjab University before 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2018;
- (iv) the Chancellor be also informed through the Registrar that the Syndicate has resolved after discussion and requesting the Vice-Chancellor to withdraw the affidavit, while failing in its endeavour to get the affidavit withdrawn, the powers delegated by the Syndicate to the Vice-Chancellor be withdrawn. Taking a serious note, the Syndicate resolved to report to the Chancellor for taking appropriate action against the Vice-Chancellor for having filed such an affidavit containing undesirable language against the members of the governing body;
- (v) an affidavit would be prepared with the help of Shri Ashok Goyal, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma. This Committee would be free to have assistance from the Advocate of their own choice. The affidavit so prepared is to be submitted to the Court before 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2018, i.e., before the next meeting of the Senate.

On being asked by the Vice-Chancellor whether it is a unanimous decision of the Syndicate, Professor Ronki Ram recorded his dissent against it to which the Vice-Chancellor said, okay.

Before starting the agenda, Shri Ashok Goyal drew the attention to decision taken in the last meeting, though he knew that practically it would not serve the purpose. But since it was suggested by Shri Sanjay Tandon that to expedite the issues, the resolved part may be circulated amongst the members and rest of the discussion could be sent later on. The members would be at liberty to point any wrong recording within 3-4 days or whatever decided and on demand the DVDs could be supplied. Though he had his reservation and told that it might not be practically possible unless and until they know as what was the discussion, it would be difficult for the resolved part to be checked. They took a conscious decision that on some ticklish issues, the resolved part may be dictated here only. He is sorry to point out that even on an issue where the resolved part was dictated not only once but repeated thrice. There also the resolved part which has been circulated is totally at variance with what was dictated. One such item was which was presided over by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi regarding the appointment of Honorary Professor. It was dictated categorically word by word that the bio-data of the candidate be



signed by her which would be attested by the Dean of University Instruction and before sending, of course, the consent also needed to be taken, to the Chancellor, it may be sent to the members of the Syndicate so that the members knew what was being done. But it is written that the office will get the consent from the candidate and also her signature. This is the recording that she has given her bio-data countersigned by the Dean of University Instruction. Before sending it to the Chancellor, it will be circulated among the Syndicate members. But what has been circulated is that it be recommended to the Chancellor that the designation of Honorary Professor, be conferred on so and so after obtaining willingness from so and so and having her Bio-Data attested. The most important part which was repeated time and again before sending it to the Chancellor it should be circulated amongst the members of the Syndicate is missing. With due apologies, of course the Vice-Chancellor is not answerable to that, he would like to ask the Chairman, Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi that how this lapse has occurred.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi replied that he does not remember, it was circulated to him and to him the language appeared to be quite correct, so he approved it. The language which Shri Ashok Goyal is talking that the bio-data be attested and her willingness be obtained and thereafter it be sent to the Chancellor, it is okay for him. That is why he had said ok.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that, that means what about the sanctity of recording it here.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he does not remember as vividly as Shri Ashok Goyal could. But this was circulated to him and in fact, this language was missing.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether it was circulated to him (Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi) or confirmed by him.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that according to him the minutes were sent to several members including him.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are two things – one is to get it confirmed.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that when he saw the minutes and got a call from the Deputy Registrar (General) whether to circulate the minutes, then he looked at the minutes. In the minutes it was written that so and so is recommended for Honorary Professorship. Then he added a line which the DR(G) had missed out of the wording of the Syndicate which was that her bio-data would be attested as well as her willingness should be obtained. He had directed the DRG to add these two lines. After he had added that, of course, it was not circulated again and it was just issued. He had not again seen, but he is okay with the wording which the DRG had read out to him on telephone.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that meaning thereby that it has made it more serious that what Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi got, it is not even mentioned that willingness and attestation was also decided.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it was not mentioned.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that if it was not mentioned, an enquiry must be made as to how that resolved part was recorded and who is responsible for that and who has approved it. It is only after it came to Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi's notice and as per his memory he suggested that these two things be added. The third thing which he recollected, is pointing out and to verify and confirm his memory, he went through the DVD. Thereafter, he consulted Professor Keshav Malhotra whether he is right, who also went through the DVD. Professor Navdeep Goyal must also be remembering that he had said it that it would be better if he (Shri Ashok Goyal) dictate it again. They dictated it word by word. In spite of that how the recording was done as has been explained by Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi. That should be enquired into. Secondly, he presumed but it should be confirmed that this letter has not been sent to the office of the Chancellor. If it has not been sent, then at least, the copies of those bio-data which are attested as was decided by the Syndicate, be circulated at least today to the members of the Syndicate. Even if it has been sent, then they would see to it later on as to how to deal with that. The copies of that bio-data be circulated amongst the members.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the bio-data is already there and it be circulated after signing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the copy of the bio-data is already attached but the only thing is that it did not bear the signatures of the candidate and that was not attested.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has processed so many Honorary Professorships. He has never asked the candidate for this thing that they have to attest the bio-data. He did not know as to why the attestation is being asked. He has processed so many Honorary Professorship cases in this very House.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that now he has got the answer that it is he (Vice-Chancellor) who raised the question against the decision taken by the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Shri Ashok Goyal not to make an accusation.

Professor Ronki Ram enquired whether they have got the bio-data of the Honorary Professors which they have already appointed.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that in one case the appointment was cancelled because the bio-data was unsigned.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Honorary Professor appointed earlier to this case, the application was handwritten, it was Dr. Deepak Manmohan Singh.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has processed the cases for Honorary Professorship of Dr. Ashok Thakur and never asked him and nobody has asked him that he has to sign and attest the bio-data. Dr. Arvind Gupta, Deputy Chairman, NSA and currently Chairman of Vivekanand International Foundation in Chanakyapuri. Earlier, he was DG of IDSA, also Lal Bahadur Shastri Chair Professor. Nobody signed the bio-data.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what is the harm if somebody signs.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could do it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this is what they decided.

The Vice-Chancellor said, fine.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are not questioning anything.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be got done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that just arbitrary accusations could not be levelled.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not an accusation if he is asking. He is talking in a desirable tone. Why it was not recorded the same as it was dictated.

The Vice-Chancellor requested to have a break for 10 minutes.

After the break, Professor Keshav Malhotra said that last time it was decided that the minutes would be sent on Thursday and the members would send their response by Monday. The DVDs are not provided in time. He said that would be inquired into and informed.

Thereafter, the discussion on Item C-2 commenced.

**Extension in term of  
Dean Student Welfare  
and appointment of  
Associate Dean  
Student Welfare**

2. Considered the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that:
- (i) the term of appointment of Professor Emanuel Nahar University School of Open Learning, as Dean Student Welfare and Professor Neena Caplash Department of Biotechnology, as Dean Student Welfare (Women), be extended for one more year w.e.f. 01.06.2018, as the present term of both the Deans will come to end on 31.05.2018;
  - (ii) Professor Ranjan Kumar, Department of Physics, be appointed as Associate Dean Student Welfare w.e.f. 01.06.2018, as the term of present Associate Dean Student Welfare viz. Professor Rattan Singh, UIIS is upto 31.05.2018

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 1 and 2.2 appearing at page 107 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 reads as under:

1. "The Senate may, on the recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare for such a period and on such term and conditions as may be determined by them"

2.2 "The Senate may also, on the recommendation of the Vice-

Chancellor and the Syndicate, appoint a Dean of Student Welfare (Women) for such period and on the same term and conditions as for the Dean of Student Welfare out of the Amalgamated Fund Account. The Dean of Student Welfare (Women) would also be Chairperson of Grievance Committee for the code of conduct and discipline for avoidance of Sexual harassment.

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

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that the extension be given up to 30<sup>th</sup> July and then let the new Vice-Chancellor apply his mind.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this decision is to be taken by the Syndicate and not the Vice-Chancellor. Since the meeting of the Syndicate is in progress and earlier the extensions have been given for a year, so the extension should be granted for a year.

The Vice-Chancellor said that it is for the Syndicate whether it wanted to curtail or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there has to be no curtailment. Let them not put a new convention and go by the earlier practice.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that earlier the extension used to be given in May but in a case the extension was given in the month of September.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there would be no curtailment and extension be given for a year.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it meant that for another term.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the extension be given up to 30<sup>th</sup> August and when the team joins and if there is a balance, then the extension could be given for another year. If they grant the extension and then there is some imbalance, then it could create problems.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to for how much time the extension is normally given.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that one year extension could be given which is allowed up to a period of 5 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the issue is whether the Dean Student Welfare would become a member of the Senate or not. So they could have a compromise and give the extension up to 31<sup>st</sup> December or up to 30<sup>th</sup> October.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Dean Student Welfare is not a member of the Senate (ex-officio).

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that the extension be given up to 31<sup>st</sup> August.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the elections would be conducted before the mid-term break. However, the members could decide about the extension to be given.

A couple of members suggested that the extension be given up to 31<sup>st</sup> August.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if need, it could be extended later on.

The Vice-Chancellor said, fine. The term of the Associate Dean would also be for the same period.

**RESOLVED:** That it be recommended to the Senate that –

- (i) the term of appointment of Professor Emanuel Nahar, University School of Open Learning, as Dean Student Welfare and Professor Neena Caplash, Department of Biotechnology, as Dean Student Welfare (Women), be extended up to 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2018;
- (ii) Professor Ranjan Kumar, Department of Physics, be appointed as Associate Dean Student Welfare w.e.f. 01.06.2018 to 31.08.2018.

**Recommendation  
(No.1) of the  
Committee dated  
27.03.2018 to discuss  
the various  
representations made  
by students of  
Integrated-BE  
(Chemical)-MBA course**

**3.** Considered recommendation (No.1) of the Committee dated 27.03.2018 (**Appendix-II**), constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the various representations made by students of Integrated-BE (Chemical)-MBA course regarding reducing the course period from five and half years to five years for students already admitted for the session 2018-19.

**NOTE:** 1. It has also been mentioned in the minutes of the Committee at Sr. No. 2 that the integrated course have been removed by the AICTE and have not got UGC approval as well, therefore, it is advised not to run unapproved course. However, if the department is able to get it approved from any governing/regulating body like UGC, the department may continue to run the course. To compensate the revenue loss due to closure of this course, the department may increase the fee structure in its other courses.

2. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 21.01.2017 (Para 43) (**Appendix-II**) considered and resolved that the nomenclature of 5 ½ year B.E. (Chemical) with MBA being run by the

Institute of Chemical Engineering & Technology, be changed to 'Integrated B.E. (Chemical)-MBA' from the academic session 2017-18.

3. A copy of letter dated 05.04.2018 received from Chairperson, Dr. S.S.B.U.I.C.E.T enclosed **(Appendix-II)**

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is an issue of a degree which earlier was of 5 years duration which was later on extended to 5½ years.

The members suggested that it be approved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be effective for the current session.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the current session students would have to complete the credits.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he agrees with the House. It is mentioned that this degree is not approved by the AICTE or the UGC, then how it was started.

The Vice-Chancellor said that all the IIITs opened by Vajpayee Government have this degree.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendation (No.1) of the Committee dated 27.03.2018, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to discuss the various representations made by students of Integrated-BE (Chemical)-MBA course for reducing the course period from five and half years to five years for students already admitted for the session 2018-19, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Recommendations  
(No.5 & 6) dated  
27.3.2018 of the  
Executive Committee  
of P.U.S.C.**

- 4** Considered recommendations (No.5 & 6) dated 27.3.2018 (**Appendix-III**), of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C.

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations (No.5 & 6) dated 27.3.2018 of the Executive Committee of P.U.S.C., **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Minutes dated  
27.03.2018 (Item No.2  
and 4) of the General  
Body of PUSC**

- 5.** Considered minutes dated 27.03.2018 (Item No.2 and 4) (**Appendix-IV**) of the General Body of PUSC.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha pointed out that when the students are selected for international teams, the students are asked to deposit the money the very next day. The University also does not pay the money for this. Due to which the students face a lot of problems. The AIU reimburses the money later on. He suggested that a fixed amount of Rs.5 lacs or so be kept for this purpose to help the students selected for international teams and the authority be delegated to the Department of Sports to make the payments out of this fund.

The Vice-Chancellor directed the Finance and Development Officer to resolve the issue in consultation with Dr. Sangha.

Shri Prabhjit Singh pointed out that on page 14 para 2 it is mentioned that it is noted that the income from the financial year 2014-15 to 2016-17 has not been increased whereas the expenditure has increased 3 times. He could not understand as how this expenditure has increased.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that amount for the medal was fixed at Rs.25,000/-, that was an amount which was not even sufficient to take care of the expenses incurred by the students. That amount has been increased to Rs.1,50,000/- as the number of such students is very less. The amount paid by the University was low as compared with other universities.

Professor Keshav Malhotra enquired as to how to increase the income for this fund.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that to increase the income, the sports fee which is about Rs.70/- per year has been hiked by 10%.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that there is an audit objection as some of the Colleges are not paying the sports fee. There is no proper record. So, it should be got checked.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that the Director, Sports has to issue the letter and if some Colleges do not deposit the fee, action should be taken against such Colleges and the roll numbers be not issued.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that what Professor Keshav Malhotra is saying is right. If the Colleges are depositing the fee, then it is okay. But if the Colleges are not depositing the sports fee and even then the students are participating, then it has to be looked into.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that it is not only the sports fee but some Colleges also do not deposit the youth welfare fee. When he had organised the youth festival, some of the Colleges did not deposit the youth welfare fee. He had made a complaint about it. When the roll numbers of the students of such Colleges are withheld, only then the Colleges deposit the fee.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that as pointed out by Dr. Sangha that some Colleges are not depositing the sports fee, youth welfare fee or any other such fee, then the names of such Colleges should be placed before the Syndicate and action be taken. It is a kind of indiscipline. In future, more Colleges might also not deposit the fee.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the minutes dated 27.03.2018 (Item No.2 and 4) of the General Body of PUSC, **as per Appendix**, be approved;
- (ii) a letter be written to the Colleges which have not paid the sports fee, youth welfare fee and any other similar fee to submit the same failing which the matter be

reported to the Syndicate for taking the necessary action;

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha raised the issue regarding the fee to be paid by the students for the international sports event on the day of selection itself, the Vice-Chancellor directed the Finance and Development Officer to resolve the issue in consultation with Dr. Sangha.

**Report dated 5.3.2018 of PUCASH regarding complaint of the certain students of the Dept. of Public Admn. against faculty member of the Dept. of Public Admn.**

6. Considered report dated 5.3.2018 of the Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) regarding complaint of the certain students of the Department of Public Administration, against faculty member of the Department of Public Administration alongwith letter/representation dated 5.4.2018 of the members of the PUCASH.

**NOTE:** A detailed office note enclosed (**Appendix-V**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that he hoped that the members have read the detailed office note which has been sent to them in a sealed cover containing the history of the case and all the annexures have been attached with the office note. This matter was considered in the Senate and thereafter whatever was the decision of the Senate, the PUCASH looked into it and expressed their concern and gave him a letter which is also annexed with the office note. There was one more enquiry involving Shri Komal Singh and in the enquiry report it is written that a compromise has been arrived at between the complainant and Shri Komal Singh and the enquiry reports should not be put in the public domain. Since it was said that report would not be put in the public domain, that is why that report was not placed before the Syndicate earlier. But in view of the whole PUCASH coming to him and giving him a letter which is annexed here and pointed out that report, now the members have before them an input from PUCASH along with the report of PUCASH about which it had said that it should not be put in public domain, now everything is before the members and they are supposed to take cognisance of it as members of the governing body.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they could not discuss the issue and forward it to the Senate as it is.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not been able to lay his hands on what the Vice-Chancellor is referring to. But he just wanted to know for his knowledge is there any provision in any of the Acts whereby PUCASH has got the authority to question the decision taken by the employer. PUCASH has submitted its report.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he could not answer this. He has just made available everything that he had received. The report of PUCASH is dated 05.03.2018 (Annexure-II) where it is written that both the parties have agreed that this settlement will remain confidential and the same would not be shared publically. There is another Annexure-III dated 5<sup>th</sup> April, 2018. The members are supposed to read both these annexures in order that all of them know the entire case and the entire history is mentioned in the office with all the annexures. There are 33 annexures attached with it. Now it is clear that the voting in the Senate was held on two things out of the 3



major penalties. The option of major penalty of reducing the grade pay was not there at all as the person is already on the minimum grade pay (of Assistant Professor). They did all that in the Senate without knowing that the grade pay of the person was not Rs.7,000/- whereas the person is in the grade pay of Rs.6,000/-. So, they got misled in the Senate and the voting was held and now that voting has become infructuous.

On a point of order, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had said this on that day that while taking disciplinary action and awarding punishment, the pay scale, date of appointment, date of next increment due and all such other details should have been placed before the punishing authority otherwise they could not take a right decision.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it was a lacuna on their part. He has read some portion of the report.

The Vice-Chancellor asked as to why he (Professor Navdeep Goyal) had not read the report as he was earlier a member of PUCASH and is aware of the whole thing and could not say that he has not read the report.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever he has read from the report, it comes out that the complaint has been made by the whole of the class.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person should not have been allowed to teach the classes.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is not known as to who has allowed the teaching.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everything is mentioned in the report how the system has been duped.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the person went to the class in a drunken condition and misbehaved on which the students made a complaint.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person even appears before the PUCASH in a drunken condition.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the person appeared before the PUCASH in a drunken position, his medical was also got done, that is also misconduct.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the police had to be called at that time.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired as to what the PUCASH has recommended on it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the PUCASH got a compromise done.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that this is too much.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that whatever they discussed that day in the Senate about the numbers, let them keep separate. Now what is the additional complaint that they have to discuss. One is that the person went to the class in a drunken condition and the second is that he appeared before the PUCASH in a drunken condition also. These are the two additional things before them now. He enquired whether there is anything else.

Shri Sanjay Tandon enquired as to what is the issue before them and what they have to do.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the voting in the Senate was held wrongly.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the matter should be referred to the Senate.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the voting was held and the legal opinion has been taken, then why it should be sent to the Senate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon enquired as to what is the proposed resolution that they need to pass.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they are the members of the governing body and they have to see how the University is to be saved from such persons. Could they let this guy roam around and teach in the University? What are they doing?

Shri Sanjay Tandon enquired whether they propose that the person should be sacked.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could not do it, it is only the Senate which could sack the person.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they could recommend the sacking.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that instead of recommending, (let) it be directly sent to the Senate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that instead of discussing the issue, they should directly send it to the Senate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they should not save such a person by using such kind of words of not recommending. According to him, such a person should be hanged.

The Vice-Chancellor said that if such a person is hanged, then the SC/ST Commission would come in favour. He has been accused of so many things in this case.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if the Vice-Chancellor or Professor B.S. Ghuman have been accused in this case, the person was selected by Professor Ghuman himself. If such a person could accuse Professor Ghuman after having been appointed 10 years ago, could accuse the Vice-Chancellor, then the person could accuse everyone. Everyone who is guilty would always say that he has not committed the guilt. It is for the Senate to see. Since the Senate is

the competent authority, let them forward it directly to the Senate without any recommendation which could take the decision.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if they, 15 members of the Syndicate could not take a decision, how 90 members could take a decision. So, they could recommend the action to be taken.

The Vice-Chancellor enquired as to why the members are shirking their responsibility to make a recommendation.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if they move a resolution to remove the person and get the voting done for and against the same, for which the 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority is required, that is now clear.

The Vice-Chancellor said that they could hold a special meeting of the Senate on this single point agenda and tell everybody that it should be done. So, they could pass a resolution that the matters should not be discussed in a routine meeting of the Senate, convene a special meeting and give enough time to everybody to study it.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they in the Syndicate could recommend it that this person should be removed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it would be better.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that since some more charges have been framed, then why they are trying to save the person on previous charges. He asked Professor Keshav Malhotra as to why he is favouring the person.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a single point agenda should be there.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the Senate had decided the case.

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Professor Ronki Ram said that the Senate has not decided.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they had agreed that the person is a culprit and the maximum punishment is not to be given. There were two punishments which were proposed – one was to reduce to a lower rank and the other was removal, with a chance (of reemployment elsewhere). In the voting, one option got 18 votes and the other one 32 votes. The option getting 32 votes is for removal.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that the voting should be got done on a single resolution.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the matter should be sent directly for disciplinary action.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he has sent to the members the transcript of the complaints of the students and it is shameful that such things are happening in the University.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that single point agenda should be placed before the Senate. When the option which got 32

votes, it meant that most of the members wanted the removal. The same proposal be placed before the Senate for 2/3<sup>rd</sup> votes.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the meeting should be on single point agenda and let enough time be given to the Senate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Syndicate should make its recommendation. Are they just a forwarding agency that they are receiving some papers and forwarding the same to somebody? That means that they are not able to take their own decision. They should also say that they have studied the matter, debated on the matter and the Syndicate recommends to the Senate that this person needs to be removed from the job. Unless and until they do not take this action, the Syndicate's clear meaning does not go. If any person is trying to protect this person, according to him, that person is doing a disservice to the institution. This thing should not be allowed. He requested the members that if they want to save the University, they would have to stand by the student, by the people against such people and anybody who is doing it, is not doing a favour to the society.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he had just pointed out a technical issue.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that when he (Professor Keshav Malhotra) raises a point, it pinches. If the student had been his daughter and the person had behaved like this, he would have shot the man. What are they talking and are not able to decide on this thing. Dr. Subhash Sharma has told him that the people were giving praises to that person, that they should save him. Eighteen people have supported that person and saying that they are the staff members and have to save the other staff members. If it is so, then according to him, the University is bound to get closed. He said that if Professor Keshav Malhotra raises a point, it pinches. It pinches him when he faces those girls outside. He pointed out as to what that person is talking to the girls in the class.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi suggested that the person should be dismissed from service. They have been lenient.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person should have been given the 3<sup>rd</sup> major punishment.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that a resolution on the 2<sup>nd</sup> major penalty should be placed before the Senate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he recommends the 3<sup>rd</sup> penalty and not the 2<sup>nd</sup> one.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that no leniency should be shown and such a person should be hanged and shown so that others could not dare to do such things. But what they want to show to the society by saving such persons. If such an act would have happened with the daughter of anyone of them, could they talk in such a way.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there should be no compromise.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that there should be no discussion on it and they should take the decision by having one-sided. There are about 15 complaints and even (then) they are taking time to discuss

the issue. But why the Syndicate is fearing while making the recommendation. Let him move a resolution and whoever wanted to oppose the resolution, let him/her oppose and let the name of the person who opposes appear in the newspapers of tomorrow.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi requested Shri Sanjay Tandon to move a resolution.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let them not go by emotions. First of all, let them be sure that they want to give exemplary punishment to such a person. If they want to really give exemplary punishment, then they have to make sure that they do not go technically wrong so that he is not safe from anywhere. He suggested that if they want to have an exclusive meeting for this, it is better that it be legally examined as to whether the Syndicate could make any recommendation. As Shri Prabhjit Singh said about without any recommendation, they should try to read between the lines as to why he is saying so. Not that they are running away from recommending, but by recommending they have to make sure that the person does not get any stay from the court because whether legally they are permitted to make any recommendation.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that anybody could make the recommendation.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not so. The punishing body could not take anybody's recommendation. If it is proved on record that the punishing authority has taken a decision on the recommendation of somebody, that means that it is not the independent application of mind of the punishing authority. That is why in all the departments whether it is Government department or semi-Government department or big corporate centres.

Shri Sanjay Tandon while intervening said that he is talking on the point of Shri Ashok Goyal, that means that nobody who has even done the investigation, is also a recommendatory authority and they also say that the person has done wrong and should be given exemplary punishment. That is what they are saying.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Sanjay Tandon should not say like this that he is moving the resolution and one should be dismissed or shot. But they just could say that the punishment should be imposed.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that when they are putting a resolution they could say that Syndicate discussed this matter. All the material was placed on the table.

When Shri Sanjay Tandon was speaking that 'after discussion on this' Shri Ashok Goyal intervened to say that they cannot say 'after discussion' because there is a problem in it. Therefore, he suggested that the matter should be got legally examined.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that there is no one more legal person than him (Shri Ashok) as they do not know much about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if they do not want to give him (Shri Komal Singh), it is okay, then he is in agreement with Shri Sanjay Tandon ji.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should not entangle the issue in technicalities.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said if they keep in thinking so much on every issue, it would lead to the situation that they would not be able even to convey their feelings.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he did not whether they convey their feelings or not.

Shri Sanjay Tandon requested to record it that he want to recommend to award him the punishment.

Professor Ronki Ram informed that in the Senate meeting, voting was held on the issue. There were two options. Out of the two options, thirty two votes were cast in favour of one option and eighteen votes were cast in favour of other option. An issue was raised in the Senate that it is not 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority. So, this matter came to the Syndicate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal intervened to say that this matter has now come to the Syndicate with certain new facts.

Professor Ronki Ram said that now this matter is placed before the Syndicate to decide whether 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority is required. Secondly, some new facts have also placed before the Syndicate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh enquired whether the 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority is required of the present members or total members of the House.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the issue be got legally examined and let they should go in the Senate with strong footing so that there is no doubt in the mind of anybody while taking the sternest possible decision.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that there is no need of getting the matter legally examined.

The Vice Chancellor informed that he has prepared the data where he has given the attendance of all the Senate members in the last five years from where it was found that only once the 70 members were present.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed to his mind, Shri Manthri Prasad of VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur was dismissed from the service with 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the members present.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that precedent is there.

The Vice Chancellor said let they should call a meeting of the Senate sufficiently long away and giving this thing, they need presence of every member.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said the case of Manthri Prasad would be attached with the agenda paper.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if there is no requirement of 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the total members, then there is no need.

The Vice Chancellor said that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) has said that the 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the total members is required.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, 'no'.

The Vice Chancellor said that once Shri Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India, in the case of Shri Munish Verma had given his opinion that it should 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total members. This was his opinion recorded in the Senate meeting. He would have to stand by it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that let they now presume that it is 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total, to which the Vice Chancellor said it is 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total. Shri Ashok Goyal said then it is right what he (Vice Chancellor) is saying.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said then no decision could be taken.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should get checked the case of Shri Manthri Prasad.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that this shows that they are incompetent and they are not able to take any decision.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the opinion given by Shri Satya Pal Jain is not binding upon them.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should read what does it say.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they had already read this regulation in the meeting of the Senate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that everyone uses to twist the regulation as per their will.

The Vice Chancellor said that in order to implement the recommendations of the PUCASH regarding punishment there is a direction that the rules should be amended in such a way so that the punishment could be executed.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they did not amend the rules in time when such a thing came in the Sexual Harassment of Women at Work Place (Prohibition, Prevention and Redressal) Act, 2013, they did not make the corresponding change.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they should do it now.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that such a recommendation would come now.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it would take time.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is no deadline of 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2018. They can give the punishment. Whenever they require it, change the damn thing.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said while replying in affirmative said they should do it.

The Vice Chancellor said that at this time he (Shri Komal Singh) is just under suspension, which means he could not come to the class for teaching. They should recommend that the rule regarding requirement of 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the total members for taking a decision in such cases should be changed with that of 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the members present.

Shri Sanjay Tandon informed that even in the Parliament, there is no rule of 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the total members for passing a resolution. He said suppose there are ten people present in a meeting, would they keep on waiting for 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the total members to pass a resolution? The requirement of 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority is of the quorum required for holding a meeting. He informed that he also deals with the company laws.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said they should not worry too much about legal or voting. They should do their duty and they cannot go on postponing the decision. Let them should dismiss him. Let him go to the Court.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked the Vice Chancellor as to why he is pointing towards him. He has his opinion and he stands by his opinion. He does not know why without reading the Calendar they are commenting. He could show in the Panjab University Calendar, wherein it is written that 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the total members is required.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it is not written for that particular section.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total is written and 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the present has also been written.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that in the section relating to this, neither 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total nor 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the present has been written.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in this case it is written that 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the Senate is required which means all the members of the Senate i.e. all the 91 members.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that they should take the practical aspect of the things.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that neither there is written 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total or 2/3<sup>rd</sup> of the members present.

A pandemonium prevailed at this stage as most of the members started speaking together.

The Vice Chancellor informed that there was one person who got the fake superintendent appointed and they let him off because they were not having 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they have not yet let him off as the case is still continuing.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that this is like letting him off.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that till the time they do not take tough decisions, they will not be able to save the University. He requested to rise above all of their personal feelings and requested not



to interpret the law after seeing the face of the man. If it was somebody different, they would interpret it differently and if it is somebody else then they would interpret in that way. By doing this they are only trying to circumvent that the Syndicate will not recommend. He is saying that it is only a mechanism that they do not recommend it. Why they should not recommend it?

Shri Ashok Goyal said he is not against it and asked the members that they should recommend.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Syndicate has gone through the case and possible strongest exemplary punishment should be given.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that after doing what Shri Prabhjit Singh has stated, the Vice Chancellor should forward it to the Senate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that rest of the things would be decided by the competent authority.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to what decision has been taken. However, Shri Ashok Goyal himself stated that the Syndicate resolved to recommend to the Senate to award exemplary punishment to person.

The Vice Chancellor said, let him read the PUCASH letter which they gave him when they came to meet him on 5<sup>th</sup> of April, "In view of above the PUCASH is of the unanimous opinion that the action as recommended by the previous Committee should be taken at the earliest. Failure to take action or delay in action implies violation of the provisions of this legislation." This legislation means Sexual Harassment Act of the Government of India. "Furthermore PUCASH wishes to make submission that all the complaints of one accused be dealt with collectively so as to collaborate and strengthen the case. Thus, we hereby recommend that the recommendation of PUCASH with respect to the subsequently placed complaints be also placed before the Senate and Syndicate. Panjab University is one of the leading institutions of India with a large majority of female students must uphold zero tolerance policy for sexual harassment. There must be no impunity for the offenders. We would like to reiterate that any person who is found to be repeatedly indulging in such an offence must be dealt with strictly. It is requested that the opinion of PUCASH be placed before the Senate in its next meeting." The Vice Chancellor said that they should just say that they accept this thing to which some members said 'yes'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that keeping in view the serious note of the PUCASH the Syndicate resolves to recommend to the Senate to award the exemplary punishment. The report of the PUCASH and the letter dated 5<sup>th</sup> April, 2018 along with other papers be sent for consideration of the Senate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the other complaints be sent along with the case.

The Vice Chancellor said that a special meeting of the Senate be convened to consider the issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that according to him the decision regarding convening of special meeting be taken in the meeting of the Senate itself.

The Vice Chancellor said that otherwise the issue could not be considered.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this decision should be taken in the Senate itself that a special meeting be convened to consider this issue. Why anybody would object to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that they should give him authority to convene a special meeting of the Senate to consider this issue because in the normal meeting it could not be considered to which several members gave their consent to hold the special meeting.

After checking his schedule, the Vice Chancellor said that the special meeting of the Senate to consider this agenda would be held on Sunday, the 27<sup>th</sup> May, 2018.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that though 27<sup>th</sup> May is okay, but since the meeting is to be convened for considering single agenda item, the members who have to come from far off places, might not prefer to come. He said it should, therefore, be confirmed whether the 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority is required of the total members or the members present, because it would have to be informed to the House.

Professor Navdeep Goyal and Dr. Subhash Sharma requested to have 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the members present which was also supported by Shri Prabhjit Singh. Professor Navdeep Goyal further requested to check the case of Manthri Prasad.

Shri Ashok Goyal said if 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority of the present members is required, then there is no need to convene the Special Meeting of the Senate.

Professor Ronki Ram, Shri Ashok Goyal and Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this issue could be held in the meeting of the Senate to be held on 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2018.

The Vice Chancellor said that the members would not get time to read the case so it would be difficult to consider the case.

The Vice Chancellor said that either an additional meeting could be held on 27<sup>th</sup> May or on 2<sup>nd</sup> June. Since the members agreed to convene a sitting of the Senate, it was decided that the special meeting would be held on 27<sup>th</sup> May, 2018.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) report dated 5.3.2018 of the Panjab University Committee Against Sexual Harassment (PUCASH) regarding complaint of certain students of the Department of Public Administration, against faculty member of the Department of Public Administration alongwith letter/representation dated 5.4.2018 of the members of the PUCASH, be accepted;
- (ii) it be recommended to the Senate that exemplary punishment be imposed on the faculty member in question;

Syndicate Proceedings dated 29<sup>th</sup> April/26<sup>th</sup> May 2018

- (iii)** a special meeting of the Senate to consider this item be convened on 27<sup>th</sup> May, 2018;
- (iv)** all the documents related to this issue be also placed before the Senate;
- (v)** in order to substantiate the requirement of 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority, the decision taken by the Senate in the case of Shri Manthri Prasad, VVBIS&IS, Sadhu Ashram, Hoshiarpur be also quoted.

The Vice-Chancellor informed that the next meeting of the Syndicate would be held on 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2018 to which the members agreed.

( Parvinder Singh )

Confirmed

(Arun Kumar Grover)  
VICE-CHANCELLOR

**PANJAB UNIVERSITY, CHANDIGARH**

Minutes of the meeting of the SYNDICATE held on **Saturday, 26<sup>th</sup> May 2018 at 10.00 a.m.**, in the Syndicate Room, Panjab University, Chandigarh.

**PRESENT**

1. Professor A.K. Grover ... (in the Chair)  
Vice Chancellor
2. Dr. Ameer Sultana
3. Dr. Amit Joshi
4. Professor Anita Kaushal
5. Shri Ashok Goyal
6. Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi
7. Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu
8. Professor Keshav Malhotra
9. Professor Navdeep Goyal
10. Shri Prabhjit Singh
11. Professor Ronki Ram
12. Dr. Raj Kumar Mahajan
13. Shri Sanjay Tandon
14. Dr. Subhash Sharma
15. Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha
16. Col. G.S. Chadha (Retd.) ... (Secretary)  
Registrar

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

In the earlier meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> April, 2018, Items No. C-1 to C-6 were taken up. The rest of the items, i.e., from C-7 to C-24 along with Ratifications and Information Items were taken up. Thereafter, the items of the regular meeting of May (held on 26<sup>th</sup> May, 2018) were taken up.

**Minutes dated 16.03.2018 of the Committee to discuss the minutes of the meeting dated 05.04.2017 with regard to evolve guidelines for future handling of Hostel Purchases and Audit/pre-audit etc.**

**7.** Considered minutes dated 16.03.2018 (**Appendix-VI**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the minutes of the meeting dated 05.04.2017 (**Appendix-VI**) with regard to evolve guidelines for future handling of Hostel Purchases and Audit/pre-audit etc., in the light of communication received from the office of the D.S.W. dated 16.5.2017(**Appendix-VI**).

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there were two suggestions, one was regarding security because students are facing lot difficulty in getting security. So, that has to be accepted and the Wardens would see as to how it would be managed. The other is regarding converting of the mess into cooperative mess to which the students did not agree. So it should be referred back to the Committee. So, they accept the proposal No. 2 regarding release of security amount and the proposal No.1 regarding conversion of mess to that of cooperative mess be referred back to the Committee.

The Vice Chancellor said that the agenda could be finished even if he cannot sit throughout the whole thing, any one of them can preside over the meeting.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 29<sup>th</sup> April/26<sup>th</sup> May 2018

Some members suggested the Vice Chancellor to have rest and come after sometime.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested to take those items first where there is no discussion and also important to which all members agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That recommendation No. 2 dated 16.03.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the minutes of the meeting dated 05.04.2017 (**Appendix-VI**) with regard to evolving guidelines for future handling of Hostel Purchases and Audit/pre-audit etc., in the light of communication received from the office of the D.S.W. dated 16.5.2017 (**Appendix-VI**), **as per Appendix**, be approved and recommendation No. 1 be referred back to the Committee.

**Confirmation of certain Personal Assistants**

**8.** Considered recommendations of the Vice-Chancellor that the following Personal Assistants be confirmed in their posts w.e.f. the date mentioned against each.

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch/ Department	Date of Appointment	Date of Confirmation
1.	Mrs. Varsha Luthra Office of the Dean University Instruction	03.12.2009	04.01.2014
2.	Mr. Shankaran Kutty Nair E. Office of the Registrar	01.02.2010	01.11.2014
3.	Mrs. Harjinder Kaur University Institute of Engineering & Technology	26.04.2010 (A.N.)	01.08.2015
4.	Mrs. Veena Aggarwal Office of the Dean Colleges Development Council	29.09.2010	01.06.2016

**NOTE:** 1. The date of confirmation of these Personal Assistants is on the basis of availability of permanent slots.

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

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

Sr. No.	Name of the persons and Branch/ Department	Date of Appointment	Date of Confirmation
1.	Mrs. Varsha Luthra Office of the Dean University Instruction	03.12.2009	04.01.2014
2.	Mr. Shankaran Kutty Nair E. Office of the Registrar	01.02.2010	01.11.2014
3.	Mrs. Harjinder Kaur University Institute of Engineering & Technology	26.04.2010 (A.N.)	01.08.2015

4.	Mrs. Veena Aggarwal Office of the Dean Colleges Development Council	29.09.2010	01.06.2016
----	---	------------	------------

**Deferred item**

**9.** Considered request dated 14.09.2017 of Dr. Arvind Kumar, Assistant Professor, UIET, for counting of his past service for the purpose of promotion under the CAS, as has been done in the case of Dr. Latika Sharma, Department of Education and Dr. Naveen Gupta, Assistant Professor, pursuant to the orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court passed in CWP No. 8417 of 2005, filed by the Dr. Latika Sharma:-

**NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 27.02.2016/14.03.2016 (Para 44) has resolved that the consideration of the item be deferred until clarification from the UGC is received as decided by the Syndicate dated 23.01.2016/ 06.02.2016 (Para 34).

2. An office note along with chart showing the particulars in respect of past service rendered by the incumbent and also the particulars in respect of the case of Dr. Latika Sharma and Naveen Gupta, in this regard is enclosed.

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

**Deferred item**

**10.** Considered if, the security services of the University, be outsourced, pursuant to the letter received from Chief of University Security dated 16.04.2018, to meet the urgency of situations due to security concerns:

**NOTE:** 1. The Board of Finance in its meeting dated 13.02.2017 consider under agenda item 6 regarding outsourcing of Security Services to Punjab Ex-Serviceman Corporation and resolved that:

(i) XXX XXX XXX

(ii) "the term of present contract shall not be extended and before the expiry of present contract, cost analysis shall be made to determine whether to outsource these services and if the services are to be outsourced , then University Shall invite the open tender from all eligible agencies".

2. A detailed office note showing the cost if the University appoints the security guards by its own and from outsources is enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that their experience has been that instead of outsourcing the security persons, they should appoint them on contract.

The Vice Chancellor said that then they would be increasing the number of employees.

It was suggested (by the Registrar) to invite fresh tenders to which Professor Navdeep Goyal did not agree.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they can directly employ them. What is actually happening in security services and other service that they call for tenders, employ the persons, but the contractor gives them less salary and thus those persons did not come and also not perform their duty properly. He takes more money from the University to what if a person is employed by the University itself.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he is not able to understand that when a Guard is there in the PGI, he works very well, but when he is employed in the University, he does not work.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he does not work even in the PGI.

Professor Malhotra said that he does work there.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said the situation of the person visiting PGI is different, but the persons visiting the University, their situation is different.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it is very difficult to perform duty in the University where they have to deal with the students.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor is saying that they cannot appoint security persons without taking permission from the MHRD.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they should hold the discussion on this issue later on to which many members agreed.

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

**Minutes dated  
06.02.2018 of the  
Committee to examine  
and recommend the  
changes, if any, in  
existing Panjab  
University Ph.D.  
Guidelines, 2017**

**11.** Considered the minutes dated 06.02.2018 (**Appendix-VIII**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine and recommend the changes, if any, in existing Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines, 2017 in accordance with the UGC Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that in the minutes of the meeting to examine and recommend the changes in existing P.U. Ph.D. Guidelines, 2017, at page 95 of the agenda papers at one place it is 'prior to June 2017' but in the next Para it has been written 'w.e.f. June, 2017'. He said that it should be 'prior to June 2017' and requested to correct it. Though it is a typographical error, but it has changed the meaning altogether.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the enrolment for Ph.D. is before 2017, then the number of candidates would be half-half

between the Supervisor and the Co-supervisor but it would be one each after 2017.

The Vice Chancellor said that he had suggested them a way out. The way out is to introduce the notion of a Supervisor and a Guide. When two people are guiding a student, one person is a Guide in whose account the candidate would be counted, the other person in whose count the candidate would not go, it should be an internal arrangement in a given department or in a given faculty that a student is being guided by two teachers. The candidate would be considered attached with one person and the other who is cooperating with him because of I.P.R (Intellectual Property Rights) reasons or whatever it may be. The Research Degree Committee which will give him permission to write the thesis, that Committee would not give him permission till the time it receives consent from the other person. In this position, one can take joint students with two people.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan asked if there are only two persons in a department and they might not be on speaking terms with each other.

The Vice Chancellor requested him not to give specific instances. The point is, do not take some isolated things and argue. Let them should look at the generality of the problem. Panjab University is not the first institution which is facing this situation. He is telling them how others have resolved it. The problem is that this UGC directive is working against the people cooperating and guiding the students together. If two teachers are guiding a student together, would get the benefit of one student each. So, the number of students who are working with the given teacher would be reduced. To overcome that, they could guide one and for other they could be a Supervisor. As far as UGC is concerned, UGC does not know who is the Supervisor. This is an internal arrangement within a department or within a faculty where some counting is maintained that someone would not submit the thesis until approval from the Supervisor is not received, because they are to protect I.P.R. Some student could work with two teachers. It is not necessary that only one teacher has cooperated with him and get his work done. It may be there that his or her I.P.R. rights are gone, his or her publication rights are gone. So, what they do is an internal arrangement. The UGC just asks with whom the candidate is registered, it is told that he is registered with so and so person. But he is working with some other teacher of the University also as a co-guide. So, the name of Co-guide could be mentioned in place of Guide. That is why he is not saying Co-guide. Rather, he is saying that one is mentoring somebody and guide someone else. So, one is Guide at one place and Mentor at other place. So, they can take two students and they could overcome this half count business. This is being practiced by many institutions. It is also being practiced in many national intuitions. When a person is registered on paper with somebody else but most of the work is done with the help of two Supervisors. When there is some academic progress, they ask both the persons. This is the way out of this tedious situation because the UGC is not agreeing to this.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that when the promotion is done under the Career Advancement Scheme, it is asked as to how many Ph.D. students have been guided. Can a Supervisor say that he is a Guide of the students?



The Vice Chancellor said that CAS promotions are given twice in their entire life. Whether any student has been guided by him or not, such a thing is asked only at the time promotion to the post of Professor. The minimum which is required is only one student. He has been routinely doing the CAS promotions even today they have received a big bundle of CAS promotions. Only one candidate has to be guided and nothing else. So, this is a practical solution and they could think over it.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 06.02.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to examine and recommend the changes, if any, in existing Panjab University Ph.D. Guidelines, 2017 in accordance with the UGC Minimum Standards and Procedure for award of M.Phil./Ph.D. degree, **as per Appendix-**, be approved.

### Deferred item

**12.** Considered the matter regarding preparation of the guidelines for constitution of Inspection/Selection Committees for the Colleges affiliated to P.U pursuant to the decision of the Senate dated 21.1/17.2.2018 (Para I).

**NOTE:** Data Bank of the persons for the purpose is enclosed.

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

### Re-employment of Shri Shiv Kumar Verma, Deputy Librarian

**13.** Considered if

- (i) Pursuant to orders dated 15.03.2018 (**Appendix-IX**) passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 6401 of 2018, Shri Shiv Kumar Verma, Deputy Librarian, VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur, be allowed to continue in service on re-employment basis till he attain the age of 62 years, without prejudice to his legal right to monetary claims in the event of acceptance of these appeals to comply the court orders in CWP No.6401 of 2018 (Dr. Shiv Kumar Verma Vs. Panjab University and Ors.) or till the final outcome of the CWP filed by him, whichever is earlier.
- (ii) he be paid salary on the same conditions as the Vice-Chancellor has already ordered that in the court case (LPA No.1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and others and connected LPAs) be paid salary which they were drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order dated 16.08.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. P.U. and other excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone) as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the LPA filed by them. The final payment to all such appellants shall be adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit the prescribed undertaking.
- (iii) he be allowed to retain residential accommodation (s), if any allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions.

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

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if 3-4 persons say to pass it or defer it they are going ahead. They do not even get to know as to what is the issue. He does not understand whether they are sitting here just for information only. They cannot give their independent opinion on the issue. If there is some issue, then someone should brief it and it should be told on what points the opinion of the members is sought.

The Vice Chancellor said, well taken, well said.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said such a thing did not come anywhere. When they would go outside, people would ask if the case of Mr. Shiv Kumar Verma has been done approved or not, then they could only say that they have ticked in the agenda papers and he could tell only after looking those papers. So, they should approve the things like this.

The Vice Chancellor said it is well taken.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that Mr. Shiv Kumar Verma has come through the Court and so he has to be got continued.

The Vice Chancellor asked Professor Navdeep Goyal to brief about the issue.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for the Librarian, the age of retirement was enhanced to 62 years. They go to the Court and the Court allows continuing them.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked if they can say that no other case of this nature is pending.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said though there is no such case pending with them, but if it comes through the Court, then they have to do it.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if somebody did not go to the Court, can the University say that there is no such case pending. Why do they do something only if the Court pushes them? Why they do not make a rule that this will automatically happen so that tomorrow this kind of person does not have the need to go to the Court or need to knock the door of the Syndicate or need to talk to each one of them separately and try to get his work done. Why can they not have one solution? In the last meeting he has said that the Estt. Branch should say that such kind of agenda, there is no other person who is ignored for the same reason so that they are at par with everyone. It should not happen that one person who has contacted them, his work is done. Let they should be at par with everyone. He has also asked the Registrar to advise the Estt. Branch to write a note under the Item and they are not having such case pending and the rules are silent on this, that is why it is being placed before the Syndicate. Shri Ashok Goyal ji guided him that rules have been made for everything, when they have to do something above the rules, that comes to the Syndicate. Now it has become a precedent to everything above the rule. That is why all these cases are coming. He wants this information, he was guided on this information. If this is the thing, then they should have a sitting and say that rules should be same for all so that they have not to attach such a big agenda for an individual case.

The Vice Chancellor said that all issues which are related to retirement and going beyond the age of 60 years are in a mess because they are an Interstate Body Corporate. They have adopted the UGC guidelines or whatever the UGC regulations. It said that the age of retirement should be increased from 60 years to 65 years. But the MHRD does not approve the regulation for enhancing the age. The MHRD does not approve it because somewhere it is written that they will follow the Punjab Government. In Punjab Government the age of retirement is 60 years. So in all that mixed situation, people go to the Court and the Court liberally allows everybody to go upto the age of 65 years. In the case of Librarians, it is not 65 years, but in the UGC regulations it is 62 years. So, now when a Librarian goes to the Court, the Court takes a liberal view of this thing because the Court allows the people to go from 60 to 65 years, in spite of the fact that they have no approval for this.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that his question is other way round. He is taking from where Shri Sanjay Tandon left. What is University's view on this, whether they would like to for an appeal against this case or do they agree that he should be given 62 years? What is the stand of the University?

The Vice Chancellor said that they have a lawyer to defend them.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that Lawyers can say whatever they want to say. He asked as to what is the view of the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not his view.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that when the University has sent it to the Government for approval that it should be enhanced from 62 to 65 years, then the stand of the University is that it should be there.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked why the age of retirement for Librarians should be 62 years.

Shri Navdeep Goyal said because the UGC says so and they have adopted it.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the point of Shri Sanjay Tandon ji was that once the Court has given a stay, but they wait that when a person retires, he should go to the Court and thus they are helping the lawyers in flourishing their business. They should grant the extension on the basis of the stay already given by the Court in similar cases. Why he/she should go to the Court. Till the time a decision is taken by the Court, they should grant the extension automatically. If there is audit objection, the audit can be told that there is a Court case. There is no requirement as the Syndicate is a competent body.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they can do the other way round that they can file an appeal against it. They cannot allow somebody to continue till 62 years against the orders of the Court.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that this is what they want to do.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he has no interest to any side. His only interest is that the work should run meeting smoothly, to carry on the valued discussion other than the individualist discussion. His purpose is only this and this should be taken in that spirit. If the rule says that it should 60 or 62 years or 65 years, once this rule is there it should be applicable to everyone. If there is a rule for retirement at the age of 60 years, then the University should ask his Lawyer to fight for this till the end and they should stick to this rule, or they should decide that the age should be 62 years and they are not to go to 65 years. Either they should decide that everybody should be allowed to retire at the age of 62 years. It should not happen that as is the saying, "you show me the face, I will show you the rule". It should not happen to allow a friend to go up to 65 years.

The Vice Chancellor said that in this case there is no person specific decision. The matter is very clear that the Governing Body of this University had recommended the adoption of UGC recommendation and the Syndicate and Senate of the University has sent to the Central Government that the age of retirement should be enhanced to 65 years. The Central Government has not taken a call because the Central Government referred this matter internally to Punjab Government. The Punjab Government has kept quiet on it and it does not give a clear answer. So, in all this mess, people go to the Court and the Judge gives them the benefit of this thing. The Court used to admit it and there is no hearing. The case does not reach at the discussion stage.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if they have to go by the decision of the Court, then they should not bring it to the Syndicate for discussion, it should be placed before it only as an information item.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the regulation in this regard has been sent to the Central Government after passing it by the Syndicate and Senate. Till the time a decision on that regulation comes, they cannot change it.

Shri Gujot Singh Malhi said that the rule for retirement is 60 years. If the Court has wrongly given 62 years, they can go in for an appeal.

Professor Navdep Goyal said that the Court has not wrongly given 62 years.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that suppose the rule for retirement is 60 years and each individual has to go to the Court for 62 years, then can they take individual decision or can they take a collective decision. Can somebody guide them? He requested Shri Ashok Goyal to enlighten them.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they should be clear about what they want and what they cannot do. Actually, the University wants the UGC regulations to be implemented thus enhancing the age of retirement from 60 to 65 years and Librarians' age up to 62 years and that is what they want. But unfortunately, their hands are tied, they cannot do it. The teachers go to the Court, and since their hands were tied they could not give this concession to everybody in spite of the fact that stay has been granted to so many teachers. But they do not want to go into appeal also, because it is what they want. Let them should not hesitate in saying that it is litigation in connivance with

each other and so much so that Vice Chancellor also instructed the Counsel and the Counsel on record has said in the press that he has been instructed by the Vice Chancellor not to oppose any such thing. So what in fact they cannot get directly, they are trying to get indirectly from the Court. Now as a follow up of that Shri Tandon's concern is that why everybody should be supposed to go the Court. That leverage they do not have, that on the basis of one stay order, they can give that advantage to everybody because they are bound by the regulations which are approved by the Government of India. The moment they do it and take a decision that there is no need to go to the Court in similar cases, they will be pulled up by the Government that how they have made their own unwritten regulations when there is stay in one case from the Court. It is presumed that similar cases would also go to Court, it is not necessary that everybody would get stay. The other thing which he has already said about connivance, if they do not go to the Court, the Court would say that they are working in connivance. Otherwise everybody is right. As Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said, why did not the University go in for appeal. The cases have been going on for years together, earlier it has gone from 2000 to 2018. The only solution to this is that such items

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they would do what Shri Ashok ji has said.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the only solution where they are bound by the orders of the Court, actually they do not have any other option except to accept the orders of the Court, this item should have come under head 'for information' and not for consideration.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he disagrees with this because they still retain the right to go in for appeal.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when this item is put as information item, after having the information, they could ask the University to go in for appeal.

Shri Sanjay Tandon while endorsing Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that his point is strong and he has also proposed the same thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the information items, they after having noted the information, they say it is resolved that they should go in for appeal.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in this particular case, the Vice Chancellor cannot take a decision. The Vice Chancellor cannot take a decision on behalf of the Syndicate and that it is only for information.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they have no option what to follow the Court and having reserving their discretion to into appeal so the item on which they cannot take decision to say 'yes' or 'no' has to be for information, but if they want to go into appeal, then that discretion is always with them.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that in normal Court cases there is connivance, he agrees that. But in the normal court cases when the decision comes, it is sent for legal opinion to say whether it is a fit case for appeal or not, but they are not doing that because they are in connivance.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they are not in connivance.

Shri Ashok Goyal said not only in their University, there is no such system where they call for the legal opinion to know whether it is a fit case. That decision is taken by the Registrar or the Vice Chancellor at their level. This has been suggested in Syndicate number of times that Court cases are becoming so complicated day by day that everything is brought to the Syndicate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that let him (Shri Ashok Goyal) in other words which he is saying that why the University should go for appeal or why the University should not go. The Panjab University Teachers Association has been fighting for the last so many years for a status of Central University in the High Court and Supreme Court, but they failed to get it. So, why they were fighting for the Central University status, it was because of enhancement in retirement age to 65 years. The University has also from time to time given its own increase in the service through its own Syndicate and Senate i.e. 61, then 62, then 62 +1 +1+1 and then 65 years in one go. Once they were denied, some teachers went to Court. Still if they have to follow the conditions of UGC, given this, can the University say they are against it, on the one hand they are giving them extension. It looks quite genuine on the surface, but the reality is this that the University is not going to say that there should not be 65 years retirement age. If somebody has gone to Court, they cannot give a general ruling that everyone be given extension to 65 years.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that when they have done it earlier, the moment they would recommend it the announcement of the age of retirement from 60 to 62 years in year 1999. They had sent it to the Government of India and in anticipation of the government of India, they started retiring the teachers at the age of 62 years and they were pulled up the government as to who are they. When that order came, they again started giving a leverage to the teachers that they have two days' time with them. They would not implement it for two days and bring stay from the Court. They went to the Court and brought the stay. It continued upto four days.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that all such cases wherever there is similarity of the issues, they should be clubbed together so that there is no individual decision because A likes B and C likes D. It should not happen. He is trying to say that it should not happen with the name, it should happen with the rule. So, whatever is coming in this agenda one can say that the so and so persons are affected by this rule and they have gone to the Court, so they are giving this clearance so that it is closed once for all.

Shri Ashok Goyal said it happens like this and if there are five cases, all the five have gone to the Court.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that it may is being done with their consent but they can file an appeal for early hearing so that something is done in the case.

Professor Keshav Malhotra and Professor Navdeep Goyal said that hearing is being held every month.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that hearing is done in the fresh cases.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they have earlier decided that something could be done with consensus, it is okay and if there is some long discussion required on some item, that item could be deferred and the other agenda should be taken up.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that when they have to pass an item, then one person from the treasury benches should brief about the item. There are some persons who are not involved in the day to day working of the University. If somebody asks them as to what has been decided on an item, they just have to say that he would check it whether it is ticked in agenda papers or not.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) Pursuant to orders dated 15.03.2018 (**Appendix-IX**) passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No. 6401 of 2018, Shri Shiv Kumar Verma, Deputy Librarian, VVBIS & IS, Hoshiarpur, be allowed to continue in service on re-employment basis till he attains the age of 62 years, without prejudice to his legal right to monetary claims in the event of acceptance of these appeals to comply with the court orders in CWP No.6401 of 2018 (Dr. Shiv Kumar Verma Vs. Panjab University and Ors.) or till the final outcome of the CWP filed by him, whichever is earlier.
- (ii) he be paid salary on the same conditions as the Vice-Chancellor has already ordered in the court case (LPA No.1505 of 2016 Amrik Singh Ahluwalia Vs. P.U. and others and connected LPAs) which they were drawing immediately before the pronouncement of the order dated 16.08.2016 passed by the Hon'ble Court in CWP No.11988 of 2014 Bhura Singh Ghuman Vs. P.U. and other excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to anyone) as an interim measure subject to the final outcome of the LPA filed by them. The final payment to all such appellants shall be adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit the prescribed undertaking.
- (iii) he be allowed to retain residential accommodation, if any allotted to him by the University on the same terms and conditions.

**Deferred item**

**14.** Considered if, the proposal of the Global Education Advisers Group, to enhance the intake of foreign students, be approved as recommended by the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor held on 22.09.2017.

**NOTE:** A copy of letter No.2361/DIS dated 19.04.2018 of Dean International Students is enclosed.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Professor Navdeep Goyal requested to defer this item.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 29<sup>th</sup> April/26<sup>th</sup> May 2018

The Vice Chancellor said that if they give the permission, it could be implemented from the next year i.e. 2019-20.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they cannot hire the group immediately because it involves money.

The Vice Chancellor said that there was a proposal by someone saying that there is an agency which will help them to get some students from abroad. But for purpose, that person wants certain cut to which some members said he demands Rs. one lacs.

Professor Navdeep Goyal requested to take up this item later on.

The Vice Chancellor said that this proposal is from a well-wisher of the University. He does this job for many other universities, so he offered his service to them and promised to bring foreign students for the University.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said if the fee of the foreign students is more than the fee which they charge from the Indian students, it is okay because out of this a portion could be given to that person and then there would be a marginal extra income in the income of the University. Then instead of giving it to one person, they will have to evolve a proper methodology. Though the things are not questionable, but the methodology to be followed has to be better.

The Vice Chancellor said this is the proposal.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that idea is good.

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

**Minutes dated 15.03.2018 of the Committee regarding amendments/rate revision for the Hostel Rules for PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur**

**15.** Considered minutes dated 15.03.2018 (**Appendix-X**) of the Committee constituted, pursuant to the letter No.391/DSW dated 09.02.2018 (**Appendix-X**) regarding amendments/rate revision for the Hostel Rules for PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur to be incorporated in the concerned Handbook for the session 2018-19.

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 15.03.2018 of the Committee constituted, pursuant to the letter No.391/DSW dated 09.02.2018 (**Appendix-X**) regarding amendments/rate revision for the Hostel Rules for PUSSGRC, Hoshiarpur to be incorporated in the concerned Handbook for the session 2018-19, **as per Appendix**, be approved.

**Donation of Rs. 4 lacs by Dr. Darshan Singh**

**16.** Considered if, donation of Rs.4,00,000/- made by Dr. Darshan Singh, Emeritus Professor of P.U., Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of Endowment named as "Shishu Memorial Lecture" in the Department of UIPS and Guru Nanak Sikh Studies. The Investment of Rs.4,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment and the interest of the amount be utilized to organize a 'Shishu Memorial Lecture' in the memory of his revered daughter Late Prof. Shishu, in both departments every year on alternate basis.

**NOTE:** 1. Request dated 28.03.2018 of Dr. Darshan Singh is enclosed (**Appendix-XI**).



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

**RESOLVED:** That donation of Rs.4,00,000/- made by Dr. Darshan Singh, Emeritus Professor of P.U., Chandigarh, be accepted for institution of Endowment named as “Shishu Memorial Lecture” in the Department of UIPS and Guru Nanak Sikh Studies. The Investment of Rs.4,00,000/- be made in the shape of TDR for institution of an Endowment and the interest of the amount be utilized to organize a ‘Shishu Memorial Lecture’ in the memory of his revered daughter Late Prof. Shishu, in both departments every year on alternate basis.

**RESOLVED FURTHER:** That the appreciation of the Syndicate be conveyed to the donor.

**Provision for admission to the dependents of persons killed/incapacitated in November, 1984 riots and of persons killed/incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab & Chandigarh**

**17.** Considered if, the provision made in Syndicate decision dated 18.10.2015 (**Appendix-XII**), with regard to admission for sons/grandsons/daughters/ granddaughters/husband/ wife/brothers/sisters of persons killed/incapacitated in November, 1984 riot and of persons killed/incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab & Chandigarh, be extended the benefit for the session 2018-19.

- NOTE:** 1. The Syndicate in its meeting dated 1/15/28/29.05.2016 (Para 90) (**Appendix-XII**) had considered and resolved that the provision made in Syndicate decision dated 18.10.2015, for admission for sons/ grandsons/ daughters/ granddaughters/ husband/wife/brothers/sisters of persons killed/ incapacitated in November, 1984 riots and of persons killed/incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab and Chandigarh, as per appendix, be extended for the session 2016-17.
2. A copy of the circular No. Misc./A-6/85581-85781 dated 25.05.2017 vide which the said benefits was extended for the session 2018-19 is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XII**).

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired whether the benefit was given from 2015-16. He thinks that they have been extending it from 2016-17 and then from 2017-18 and now they are extending it for 2018-19. But they should say that as per the decision of the Syndicate dated 18.10.2015, the benefit which was given for 2016-17 and 2017-18 be also extended for 2018-19 and the wording should be changed accordingly.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the persons who were actually affected during the 1984 riots have already benefited by this policy, now there is a backdoor entry. Riots took place at Delhi or Kanpur, but the grand- daughter did not born at Delhi. Her birth place is Chandigarh, but they are giving benefit to the grand-daughter. There should not be black-mailing of Sikh riots. He is not against it and the

actual riot victim must be given the benefit. They are giving this benefit at the cost of general category. This should not be done.

Shri Ashok Goyal wanted to know whether it is over and above the normal.

It was informed (by the Secretary to Vice Chancellor) that the persons who had become incapacitated in those riots, their children do come for admission now.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said there is no doubt that the riot victim child must be given benefit, the granddaughter or grandson of that person, whose birth has not taken place at the place of riots, suppose the child was born at London, would they give him/her the benefit.

Shri Ashok Goyal asked if there is any mandate from the government.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that there is no reason to give this benefit to the grand children.

Shri Prabhjit Singh wanted to know as to how they would decide whether one affected by riots or not.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that for that they have to get a certificate from the Magistrate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the Magistrate could just verify that he or she is the granddaughter or grandson of the terrorist victim.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that terrorist violence remained only upto 1992 or 1993 which was also endorsed by Dr. Subhash Sharma.

Shri Ashok Goyal said what Shri Prabhjit Singh is saying that it should be limited to sons and daughters of the riot victims and not upto the grand children.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi while agreeing to it said this is a very valid point.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the benefit should be extended to sons and daughters only.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he would differ with the member. He has three such students whose father was killed and they were brought up by their grandfather.

Shri Ashok Goyal while clarifying it said that if the father is killed, his sons and daughters are eligible for admission under the riot victim quota.

Many members expressed their opinion for excluding the grandsons and granddaughters from the provision made in the Syndicate decision dated 18.10.2015.

**RESOLVED:** That grandsons and granddaughters be excluded from the provision made in Syndicate decision dated 18.10.2015 (**Appendix-**), with regard to admission for sons/grandsons/daughters/ granddaughters/ husband/ wife/brothers/sisters of persons killed/incapacitated in November, 1984 riot and of persons killed/incapacitated in terrorist violence in Punjab & Chandigarh w.e.f. the session 2018-19.

**Minutes  
28.02.2018  
Committee**      **dated  
of    the**

**18.** Considered minutes dated 28.02.2018 (**Appendix-XIII**) of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to decide as to whether faculty of Law should have:

- (i) Committee for regulating Undergraduate Programmes in Law (5 years Course) as well as LL.B. (3 years course) for the next session.

Or

- (ii) Undergraduate Board of Studies for Undergraduate Programme in Law (5 years course) as well as LL.B. (3 years course), which will be framed according to Rules and Regulations of the University for the next session.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there are two Boards of Studies, one for undergraduate classes and the other for postgraduate classes. But there was a view that only one combined Board of Studies should be there.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if they are doing this for Law Department, then they would have to do it for other departments also because undergraduate and postgraduate Boards also exist there. Dr. Amit Joshi further enquired if their University gives degree to those students who leave the 5 Years LL.B. Integrated Course after completing three years.

Principal Anita Kaushal said that there is such a provision in all the Universities, but this provision is not there in their University.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the students has a point perhaps there is a provision for giving them degree after completing three years in the Bar Council of India.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the degree is not to be given by the Bar Council, the degree is to be given by the University.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that they could give B.A. degree to those students after completing three years.

Professor Navdeep Goyal informed that Punjabi University, Patiala and G.N.D.U., Amritsar give B.A. degree to the students after completing three years.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that how it is possible that if a person goes for doing MBBS, but, after two years if he says that he could just cure hands and feet, so he should be given degree for that.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it would not be fair if a person who took admission for doing MBBS demands a B.A. degree after competing two years.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that when CET examination is conducted and a candidate appears for Hons. School course and suppose he chooses B.Sc. Hons. School (Chemistry), then he would come out of the department after doing M.Sc. His/her admission in M.Sc. would be done automatically and there is no test in between. But if he would like to leave the Course after completing three years B.Sc. Hons. School, he could do so.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said then there should be a provision for that.

Professor Ronki Ram said that if they go to any university abroad and go for integrated programme of Ph.D., if a candidate wants to leave the course in between, then the Masters degree is awarded. If one goes for Ph.D. (Sports), and does not complete the Course, one is given Masters degree.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that then they should not call it integrated course and call it B.A. plus LL.B.

The Vice Chancellor said that there is variation in it. There are institutions which permit an exit, but there are also institutions which do not permit. Take for instance IISER, Mohali. This has been discussed at length. Now these institutions are ten years old. Whether those who could not complete 5 Years Programme, should they be given an exit with a lower degree at some stage. If somebody puts in 4½ years in a course, but could not complete the Course, does the four years time of his life should be considered as useless or he should be given a simple B.Sc. degree after a minimum number of years and allowed to go.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that after combining the three years B.A. Course and three years B.A.LL.B., a 5-Years Integrated Course has been made. If they want to allow him to leave the course after three years, they could give him B.A. degree. He wanted to know which are the Universities in the region who are in favour of this and who are not in favour of this, what are the pros and cons. If they know it, it could be decided in no time.

The Vice Chancellor said that these are the courses which are regulated by Bar Council of India. First they should figure it out whether the Bar Council of India would allow them to run this course.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if they can give him B.A. degree, the Bar Council did not come in the picture.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have to get all the pros and cons and they should not decide it hastily.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they should form a Committee to look into this issue.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is purely an academic issue. It should not be discussed even before it is processed through various bodies at various levels, why, because even if they take a decision,

may be they frame the syllabus keeping in mind that they have to award some degree after three years, so that sufficient subjects, at least relating to Arts three years study. Let they should not forget that there is degree of B.Com. LL.B also. May they be able to give B.Com. degree after three years irrespective of the subjects he has studied. And thereafter, after B.Com, the candidate has to apply for M.B.A. and M.Com. also and they will ask him as to what subjects he has studied. What is the syllabus. It cannot be treated at par with the other degrees. So, let it be studied. It should also be taken into account whether Bar Council of India is hindrance or not. If they can do it what are the amendments needed in the syllabus. All these issues should be left to the academic bodies and then if a proposal comes that could be considered.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi why should they do it. What is the provocation for doing it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that there are many students who want this.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that let the students represent for it and then they would see to it.

The Vice Chancellor said that in IISER it is done on humanitarian ground.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, let the proposal come from the department.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that agenda item is something else i.e. to merge the two Boards and they are discussing about the degree.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes dated 28.02.2018 of the Committee constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, **as per Appendix-**, be approved.

**Letter dated 16.04.2018 received from Under Secretary, Vice-President's Secretariat, New Delhi, related to the salaries of teaching and non-teaching staff working in various Colleges**

**19.** Considered letter dated 16.04.2018 (**Appendix-XIV**) received from Under Secretary, Vice-President's Secretariat, New Delhi, sending therewith representation of the teaching and non-teaching staff of different Colleges affiliated to Panjab University, Chandigarh, regarding the issues related to the salaries of teaching and non-teaching staff working in various Colleges of Panjab University.

The Vice Chancellor said that it was an important matter and it pertains to colleges not paying proper salaries/full salaries. It is the same dispute that occurred during the last Senate meeting. This was a problem that the Colleges are not paying the salaries as well as the DA. What to talk of the affiliated colleges, there is no way out as the Punjab Government itself is paying Rs.15600/- and Rs.21600/-. The three years are about to complete. He had taken the matter with the Chief Secretary, Punjab but till now, there is no clarity in Punjab Government as to what they would do after the completion of three years of service.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the DPI has even said to the extent that they would not consider more cases, and after three years, no money would be given. It was the latest statement of the DPI.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that this is not the matter. He said that here he wanted to add something more. He did not want to name the colleges. There are teachers who have been working for the last 17-18 years, their pay has been lying stuck where it was. The real point was that in the name of the Punjab Government, all cases should not be intermingled.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that let the matter should be not confused. He said that what they were talking of the Punjab Government, that was applicable, only and only to the 1925 posts about which the Court has given orders.

The Vice Chancellor said that let him clarify. It had become a norm. It has become a norm in the sense that the managements which were earlier giving the full salaries, all those managements have started giving less salaries. Take the example of the DAV Management, which is a very rich Management which has also now started giving only Rs.15600/- and Rs.21600/- p.m. to all the new appointees in the last three years. Till the Punjab Government decision came in, they were giving full salaries.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu pointed out that the teachers who have been serving for the last 15 years, their salary remains the same and no increase has been made.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what did Aurobindo College do, they are not giving increments for the last three years.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that even then P.U. has given the permanent affiliation to the College.

The Vice-Chancellor said that what help they have provided to the teachers of the Aurobindo College.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that the Management is so arrogant that they do not even want to listen. The University Committee which had gone to the college, the Chairman of the college told the Committee, let the University should disaffiliate their college. They did not want to listen to the Committee and said that they should not be disturbed. This was the attitude of the Management.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the college should be disaffiliated after getting the report.

Shri Subhash Sharma said that it is not an obligation on the University to affiliate the Colleges and then bear their excesses and threats. The Management asks the Committee not to come and disturb them and if they want they could disaffiliate the College. He questioned that if all despite of all those mis-attitudes on the part of the college management, the University was not ready to disaffiliate them, then what could be done. He said that Principal R.S. Jhanji had visited the college and the management told that let they be disaffiliated and further asked that let they be not disturbed.

The Vice Chancellor said that Dr. Jhanji had said that as of now, there occurred no meeting between the management and the University committee.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that 18 teachers have been working in the College and if the University takes a decision to disaffiliate the College, what would be the fate of those teachers.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that two things should not be mixed. If the University takes the hard decision, in this way no college will remain with the University.

The Vice Chancellor said that this is not the case only with this College or Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College. He said whether it is a government college or a private college, in whole of the system there had entered a serious virus.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that whether he could ask a question. When they affiliate any college, did the University take the undertaking from that college that does they would be paying that salary. He asked if all the good infrastructure had been created, after that the good number of students joined and if they are running the educational system properly, was there a point in that. He said that let him present an alternate case. Suppose they have 500 colleges, which pay lesser salary, he said that he was just giving an example, all they were the educationists and they could guide him, 500 colleges paying lesser salary, then what is the fixed norm and if the 50 colleges were giving full salary, number of employment would be much more in 500 Colleges. So one has to take a holistic view in this thing because in this particular view, by seeing one particular college, the rules should not be framed. This College, if need be, should be dealt with, separately. He said that his point of view is that if they are able to generate more employment they could fix the salary at Rs.35000/- instead of Rs. 50000/-, just for example, is it not a good thing that a common man has at least got work.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the point of the Vice-Chancellor is that the Colleges which earlier were paying a salary of Rs.50,000/- p.m. have now started paying Rs.35,000/- on the premise that when the other Colleges are giving a salary of Rs.35,000/- why they should pay Rs.50,000/-. It has been prescribed in the rules that the salaries would be paid as per the rules of the University and it is one of the conditions of the affiliation.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that this case be sent to the Affiliation Committee.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the matter should be referred to the Affiliation Committee and the Committee should prepare complete guidelines. He pointed out that the guidelines were not proper regarding the grant of affiliation.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that each and every guideline is specified in the Panjab University Calendar.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that if the conditions are there, it should be seen as to how many conditions are being followed. He further suggested that the balance sheet of the college should be examined to see the salary being paid. He said that the computer teachers were being paid salary of Rs. 8000/-.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was sorry to point out that this type of infection in fact has also reached the University. He asked

what they were doing in the Campus, and what they were doing in the Constituent Colleges, it is the same thing what the private colleges were doing, because the University is short of funds. The colleges were being allowed to pay salary differently.

The Vice Chancellor said that it is not correct that the Colleges should stop giving the annual increments.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is right that it was not correct at all but they are not entitled to do this and when the Colleges are questioned, (referred to the Vice Chancellor's reference to the Aurobindo College), it has been told that Principal R.S. Jhanji had talked to the Chairman of the Management on telephone who refused to come to the College and told the Committee that either they should come to his factory or to his residence and said that he has no time. So much so the Committee had been told on their face that they had come here to spoil the academic atmosphere of the college and the Chairman of the Committee said that they would not come to the residence, the University had sent them to the college. It was not possible for them to visit his factory or his house, then he said that whatever they wanted to do, let them do it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Vice-President (of the Management) came to the University day before yesterday.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that again he was telling them that that person was not the Vice President of the Management but the Vice President of the Vardhman Textile Mills and he was nobody to represent the management. He was not even the member of the managing committee. He was the Vice President of the litigation and Commercial wing of the corporate sector and he was specifically asked by the Committee as to if he had any knowledge about the functioning of the college and pay structure, to which he replied, 'No'. He has got his statement recorded. He told that he has been told by his Chairman only to meet the Committee. He told that he knew nothing about the College whereas the Committee was there to enquire about the functioning of the College. He only questioned the Committee if they could tell him what were the terms of reference of the Committee and what was the scope of this Committee, what was the power of this Committee and under which provisions this committee had been constituted. This was the only question he asked probably he had to conduct his own enquiry into the functioning of the University and into the functioning of the Committee appointed by the Senate. He did not say that he (Vice-President) is at fault. Whatever he was sent for, he came and of course with a lawyer though the Committee declined that they were not a judicial or quasi judicial authority and they were only to have their (Management) views. Subsequently, they gave the reason that the Chairman could not come because of whatever reasons, the Principal could not come because he had to proceed on leave for unforeseen circumstances. The fact of the matter is that in the meantime, they (Management) had already moved the High Court against University.

The Vice Chancellor said that they had received nothing but he had heard something about it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had seen on the internet that a case has been filed against the Panjab University but there were some



objections and after removing those objections, the matter has been heard also and he has been given to understand that the notice has been issued to the University probably for 31<sup>st</sup> of May. If there is a problem he can understand that it could be because of the temperamental difference or different of viewpoints. Instead of resolving the issue, the Senate constituted a Committee with a view to resolve it.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked Shri Ashok Goyal as to what is his suggestion and what should be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that the point is that this is a very important issue and do not hurry up.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he knows it, but what is to be done.

The Vice Chancellor said that the discussion should be allowed to continue as this is a very important matter. The survival of the University and education system depends on this matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the Vice Chancellor was in fact very confident when the Punjab Government came out with this proposal of paying salary at the rate of Rs. 15600/- or Rs.21600/- p.m. This apprehension, at least he remember for himself, he (Vice Chancellor) must be remembering in the Senate, this is going to create problems in the other colleges also and the Vice Chancellor said, let they not stop the functioning, as Shri Sanjay Tandon has said for employment generation, they would force the government to regularise them after three years. If the colleges which are already paying a particular amount of salary and if they reduce it following this, it will become very serious and they will take it with stern hands. The Vice Chancellor further gave the statement that, for example, if the Managing Committees like the DAV Managing Committee reduces even a single penny, they will deal with them. This is what the Vice Chancellor is telling. He did not know that they have also started this.

The Vice Chancellor said that all the new courses that the D.A.V. College has got sanctioned, for instance, the 4-Year B.A. B.Ed. Course, for that he has said that they will not recommend approval for these new courses.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, that is what he (Vice Chancellor) has promised at that time.

The Vice Chancellor has said that these are new courses for which adequate amount of fee is being charged and so they will have to pay full salary to the teachers, but the colleges did not pay full salary.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the concession was given only in case of government colleges or private colleges who were not having sanctioned posts.

The Vice Chancellor said that this concession was given for 1925 posts which were sanctioned so that the grant-in-aid positions might not only go to the colleges affiliated to Punjabi University or the

Guru Nanak Dev University and else their colleges may not get these positions. They can wash their hands off for the future.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that it has been done in the case of new courses where contractual appointments were made for three years and the salary of Rs. 21600/- is being paid only in those cases and not for any other post.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, why the contractual appointments were made.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that only contractual appointments are being made.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that contractual appointments could be made in the case of grant-in-aid posts only.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that only government could do such appointments and not the private college.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, now he has said the right thing.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the teachers who had been working since 2005, even their salary has not been increased and they are getting the same salary.

The Vice Chancellor said, that is what he is saying, is this disease not spreading?

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this increasing day by day.

The Vice Chancellor said that he is not saying whatever is happening here, it is right, it is wrong and in that wrong big players have also joined. In that DAV colleges have joined and the Vardhman Group which opened this college, as if it is there corporate social responsibility. It is not a compulsion and it is not a profit making thing for the Vardhman Group. It is a kind of their sister concern. They have opened a good college for commerce education

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if he (Vice Chancellor) shares with the Committee as to what has transpired with them probably it would be proper to get it clear. He thinks that they are dealing with humans.

The Vice Chancellor said that the Registrar took upon himself the cause to reinstate the teachers of Aurobindo College of Commerce under regulation 9.2 of Chapter 8(E) Volume-I, 2007. Similarly, the case of Arya College is also being taken up.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu asked the Registrar if the process for regulation 9.2 of Chapter 8(E) Volume-I, 2007 has been started to which the Registrar said, yes, it has been started. Letter has been issued.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that that he does not know the contents of the writ petition which they have filed, probably that could be against the appointment of the Committee by challenging the jurisdiction of the university. They have to be very careful about it. He asked the Registrar that if any such letter has been issued, then

they must file the caveat knowing fully well that they are going to the Court and challenge it.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that notice has been issue to them and asked if they can file a caveat even after the notice.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he presumed that they have filed the writ petition against the appointment of the Committee and the jurisdiction of the University against appointing such Committee. Probably, the notice has been issued.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that they have neither officially received the copy of the petition nor the legal notice.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the order under regulation 9.2 of Chapter 8(E) Volume-I, 2007 which he (Registrar) sent probably yesterday that is not be the part of the writ petition which have been filed earlier for which the notices are issued to which the Registrar said, agreed. Now this decision of the Registrar is likely to be challenged by them for relief of stay, so caveat must be filed and he (Shri Ashok Goyal) suggested that Mr. Anupam Gupta may be engaged for this.

The Vice Chancellor said that they have already done it.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that unfortunately he has expressed his inability.

The Vice Chancellor said, no he has not expressed his inability. He spoke to him (Mr. Anupam Gupta) today. He said that that on 31<sup>st</sup>, he is engaged in some other work. The Vice Chancellor said that he told him, okay, he has so many good persons second in command who can represent him on 31<sup>st</sup> as the case is not going to be decided in the court in one day only. Mr. Anupam Gupta has accepted this case on their behalf and he said that he will tell the Court that he is engaged on 31<sup>st</sup>, but if nothing could be done then his confidante or his deputy would represent the University on 31<sup>st</sup> in this case. The Vice Chancellor said that he has spoken to Mr. Anupam Gupta in the morning.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu asked for a copy of the letter which was sent under regulation 9.2 of Chapter 8(E) Volume-I, 2007.

The Vice Chancellor said that the said letter is available with Principal R.S. Jhanji and he (Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu) could take that letter from him.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu requested to give that letter after lunch.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that under regulation 9.2, they have to take care of that issue. One of the teachers has been forced to write the resignation also and subsequently suspended and before they revoke the suspension under regulation 9.2. The teacher already stands relieved after having accepted her resignation. Now the College management says that it is not in the purview of the University, it was not the case of suspension, resignation has already been submitted, it has been accepted also and her terminal dues have also been paid. He thinks that everybody could understand that if somebody puts his

resignation who is a regular teacher, as per their service conditions, he has to give three months notice or to deposit three months salary in lieu of the notice period. If the employer terminates his services, either he has to give three months salary or three months notice. It is interesting that in this case the teacher has not been given three months notice nor three months salary, rather she was forced to write the resignation here and now.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that she came to meet him in his office.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has not met anybody and he also not spoken to anybody, this is what he has told himself. Within 10 minutes she was handed over the letter of acceptance of resignation not demanding from her three months' salary or not conveying that three months salary is condoned, not three months' notice is also condoned. After 3-4 days, she wrote a letter withdrawing the resignation to which they responded that the resignation was accepted on the same day and that three months salary cheque is being paid and the salary cheque vide number so and so is enclosed which clearly proves that she has not resigned voluntarily, actually, it is termination by the employer. He is saying this because whichever would be representing them in the Court, he has to be, in fact, told by the University as to how they (College management) are playing with the teachers and then, probably, one of the representative of the teachers met the Chairperson of U.B.S., and said that he has misunderstood and that teacher, in fact, the founder teacher of that College. She is double postgraduate, postgraduate from UBS, Chandigarh and postgraduate from Sri Ram College of Commerce and Ph.D. from their University. Because she was alumnus of Sri Ram College, she got up tie up of that college with Sri Ram College of Commerce which is the best college of commerce. The Chairman said that they understand and appreciate her contribution towards the development of this college and after having appreciated her services, he just want to say three words that they do not have any space for emotions in this institution. Go and took the resignation or then the words like, by his deputy, that if she does not leave this institute today itself, she would be slaughtered in the way the people are slaughtered in Iraq. Are they working in public institutions?

Professor Keshav Malhotra said, shame.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that these are few of the things which were shared, he wonders how that girl could tolerate and probably, persons like him under those circumstances, they have no alternative except to put the resignation. Everybody comes under shock. She must have been advised by someone to withdraw the resignation. He does not know by whom the management was advised to give three months salary. It did not come to their mind also that instead of asking for three months' salary, they paid her three months' salary. The management should have asked for three months' salary before accepting the resignation. This he is telling them only to prove that it was a forced resignation and not by free will. He does not what is going to happen because, generally, such a writ petition is not entertained by the High Court because they say it is a matter of evidence, they should go to the Civil Court and prove there that this resignation was not submitted out of free will, rather they were forced to bring evidence, bring witnesses and it may take years together to prove it. The only right which they can protect in the

meantime that in case they succeed in proving this, alright, the salary for all these years with back wages would be released, but here they are not only dealing with the money, they are dealing with an academician whose career also has to be kept in mind. They may be right in their position as corporate people treating it as a business, but they here in the University has to deal academics on priority and an academician on priority and her career on priority. So, why it has been the situation. This, in fact, is the outcome of commercialization of education that people want to pay minimum or maximum and that is how the leading education institutions also have started adopting the copy book style of corporate sector and for that they have to take a very cautious decision, how to curb this disease at the earliest, otherwise forget about the colleges, the University campus and the Panjab University is also going to be on the same way.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he would like add more in this. They have seen the actual functioning of the affiliated colleges. They have seen that the government colleges and various other colleges which have come up, like the college at Jalalabad or their constituent colleges. They have seen that in all government colleges in Punjab the scale at present are Rs. 21600/- and 15600/-. Where it is Rs. 15600/- they are not having NET qualified or Ph.D. teachers. They are giving Rs. 21600/- on their own by giving Rs. 10000/- from their own funds. The government of Punjab is not giving the money. So, this is the position. They are getting the salary which is due to them as per their qualifications. The DAV colleges and other colleges, they are basically following the similar pattern where the Senate comes in between. Now if the DAV colleges or any other colleges ask them to give more posts in the name of new courses, they cannot enforce such things in the courses which are already being run. But for the courses which they are now asking from them, here they can put a condition that they are asking for a new course and here the pay is this much. But even in those case they are not able implement that. What is the option with them. They should stop giving more posts. If they stop giving more posts, then they have to follow certain rules and regulations. Definitely, they cannot say that they cannot appoint people, but if they have to appoint people, the Syndicate and Senate have to find ways to implement this. What will happen? Like in the government colleges, there are no post being created, the standard of education is going down because they are not making any recruitment. Similarly, same thing would happen in the private colleges also. The University might do good thing by giving them the posts in the name of new courses and asking them to implement it. They would not implement it. Then how much action they could take. The University can say that in all those new self-financing courses where the affiliation has been granted, they are required to give full salary. If they are not doing it, they have to take action to cancel the new courses. Are they ready to do it? If they cannot do it, they will not be able to implement it, otherwise they would keep on discussing like this and they would be just silent spectators and they would not be able to do it very properly.

The Vice Chancellor said that the letter which they are considering which has come from the Central government is unsigned. Why has the Chancellor's office forwarded this unsigned letter, simply because somewhere they must have also felt that these issues are genuine and these need redressal.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that mainly the discussion was held on that day on the issue of suspension of Atam Vallabh College, but the letter which has been received now there are two more colleges, i.e., D.D. Jain and SDP College for Women. He said that he (Vice Chancellor) will be shocked that these two colleges are aided colleges. They are getting aid from the Punjab Government and not paying salary to the teachers. Why such a tendency is increasing day by day? Why it is happening? He added that it would increase more. Earlier their periodic inspection committees used to go. When a team goes from the university it creates some fear psyche in the minds of the college managements. It makes some difference whether it is 5% or 10%. He does not say that the impact could be hundred percent. He suggested that the Vice Chancellor should write to the Secretary Higher Education that they have got a letter from the Chancellor's Office regarding these irregularities and get these colleges inspected as to why the required number of teachers are not appointed. By doing so they can also tell the Chancellor's office that they have written to the Secretary Higher Education. He further said that these are aided colleges. It is a blackmailing. The self-financing courses have nothing to do with the aided posts. The posts which they have advertised and got the approval of penal, it is written in the advertisement that they would give full salary as per UGC grades. They are twisting the case. They advertise something else and get approval from the Vice Chancellor. After having approval from the Vice Chancellor, they do not give full salary. He said that they are talking about the 7<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission, in 90% colleges salary is not given even as per the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission. Even 4<sup>th</sup> Pay Commission salary is not given. The salary of a driver is Rs. 15000/- p.m. and the salary of the teacher is Rs. 8000/- p.m.

The Vice Chancellor asked, why are they tolerating all these things?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are tolerating. They are recommending the affiliation year after year to such colleges. They are the members of those Committees.

The Vice Chancellor said, why are they doing it?

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they go to the colleges and say that college be granted affiliation. That is the problem. No inspection needs to be done. What are they doing? Are they playing the role which they are supposed to play?

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that they are not doing it. So, in the Inspection Committee more outsiders and non-teachers should be included because they can put more pressure on the colleges.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he has latest information, but he does not know whether it is false or true. There is an allegation on some person that he got money from the college for getting the affiliation done. But the Chairman is saying that he has given the money.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that he has also come to know about it.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the person should give an affidavit and he would send it to the Chief Vigilance Officer.

Professor Ronki Ram said that such types of complaints are made by many of the Colleges. They could not say anything about. But there is a feeling in the general public that the Colleges are granted the affiliation on payment of money and lacs of rupees are collected for the affiliation. But there is no proof of it.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the Chairman of the Management Committee is saying in the presence of 4 persons that he has paid the money.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that how the Colleges not following the guidelines of the University are getting the affiliation for years together, how the affiliation is continued. Why they are not objecting to it? Why they are not disaffiliating such Colleges?

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that they should write a letter to the Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab regarding the two aided Colleges. The Inspection Committee be sent to Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College to look into the situation and take action against it.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that they are discussing the issue of 2-3 Colleges. It is the most important issue and they should not hesitate in spending whatever time is required on it. Dr. Subhash Sharma has pointed out that how the Colleges have been getting the affiliation. If money is not changing the hands, then what else is the other consideration that is also a question. The people have every right to say, whether somebody has taken the money or not, that they have done something otherwise how the illegal things have been approved. So people could say that it could be estimated as to how much money has been paid to the University. He would go one step further. If any Committee did not take the money or did not oblige the College and says that the affiliation is not recommended, then another Committee is constituted immediately after 15 days, which visits the College and grants the affiliation. How is it possible? Under the same circumstances, same number of teachers, same building, the same deficiencies, the second Committee visits and says that the earlier members of the Committee were negative and they are ready to sign wherever the College wanted. Then the Management says that they were ready to pay the money but the earlier Committee did not agree to whereas the other Committee accepted and affiliation has been granted. He is not saying that the former Committee did not agree to the Management or the latter accepted the money but how not to disbelieve the statement of one who has been able to manipulate a favourable report under unfavourable circumstances.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan intervened to say that the action should be taken against the person who has paid the money.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal asked as to how another Committee has been constituted over an already constituted Committee and what were the circumstances. He is raising question on everybody. The Affiliation Committee may refuse to take into account the report of the first Committee and try to depend upon the report of the second Committee and if the second Committee asks for the report of the first Committee, then it is said that the office has not shown it. So, the office is also under question as to why it has not put up all the papers before the Committee. The things are going from bad to worse and he did not want to disbelieve that the money is not changing hands but he could also not say that the money is

changing hands because all the members of the Committees are the Senators. He would not blame anybody other than the members of the Senate, who in fact should own the responsibility for the stage having reached at the present level and it is the responsibility of the Senate members only as to how to undo it. That is the collective responsibility.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they must do something at this stage to find a way how could they stop such things.

Continuing, Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is expressing his apprehension here only that 8-member Affiliation Committee has been constituted by the Syndicate to make recommendation on behalf of the Syndicate. According to him, one or two more members might side with him, he could get the visit of the Committee videographed and show the Vice-Chancellor where the members say let it be done and the things have reached a stage where as per the regulations, the recommendations of the Affiliation Committee, may be made to the Syndicate or may be made on behalf of the Syndicate, are supposed to go to the Senate but it has been stopped from going to the Senate or if go, these go in the form of information where no discussion takes place in the Senate and the Senators could also get the feel that since no discussion has to take place on the recommendations of the Affiliation Committee, whatever they do is correct and easy for them. That is why, though he was misunderstood, he had said that there is no provision of Affiliation Committee. Actually, it is the prerogative of the Syndicate which discusses the reports and recommend to the Senate. In one such meeting where the process was very much delayed in 2015-16, to take care of the job as the Syndicate members were in a hurry, a Committee was constituted to look into the affiliation cases and take a decision on behalf of the Syndicate. The next year in January also as if it is also a mandatory Committee on the lines of UMC Committee, it was said that the Affiliation Committee be constituted. Accordingly, the Affiliation Committee was formed. Next to next year as if it is a rule to frame the Affiliation Committee, an office note is put up to the Vice-Chancellor for orders to constitute Affiliation Committee and the Vice-Chancellor also did it because he thought that the Affiliation Committee has to be formed as per the rules. The whole system was hijacked in such a way that nobody could know as to what is happening. Earlier, the Colleges used to approach the Syndicate members and when the issue was placed before the Senate, then the Colleges used to approach all the Senators but now they have to approach only 5-6 members of the Affiliation Committee. But this year the Committee has 8 members and now the Colleges would have to approach those 8 members. He could say with guarantee, he did not know why he is disliked by the people like this, that he has never been approached by anyone. Why, he does not know it. He got a message on the phone here itself only when somebody was telling him that he (Shri Ashok Goyal) is also a part of the Affiliation Committee. He has received this message but did not reply to it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that he is also a member of the Affiliation Committee. Let they take a call on it that they would get the proceedings of the Affiliation Committee video recorded.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that there is nothing wrong in what Dr. Amit Joshi is saying.



Shri Ashok Goyal said that he was talking about getting the video recording done in the context that it is being said that the members take the money from the Colleges.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in such cases enquiry could be got conducted and the person found guilty should be punished.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that coming to the inspection, he had informed the Vice-Chancellor and also the Dean College Development Council ten times. A Committee was constituted for sending periodic inspection Committees to the Colleges. By chance as a coincidence or anything else, he was made the Chairman of that Committee for periodical inspection. He begged like beggars to call the meeting of that Committee so that they are able to send the Inspection Committee for periodical inspections, probably he is talking about the year 2015-16. But no meeting was held. He had requested the Vice-Chancellor also. Actually, they do not want to send the periodic Inspection Committees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had not stopped anything.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he is not saying that the Vice-Chancellor had stopped it. The Vice-Chancellor had constituted the Committee in terms of the Regulations of the Panjab University Calendar which in fact is mandatory to go. Shri Prabhjit Singh is rightly saying that the periodic inspections were not done.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is the job of the office of the Dean College Development Council.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that no Principal of the College wants these periodical inspections because they have to incur the expenditure of these Committees. Under the garb of incurring the expenditure on the Committees, the Colleges think that their misdeeds are not revealed to the University. This is the only reason. There are Colleges which are making profits. If a College is not making any profit and does not pay full salary, then that could be understood. As it is being pointed out about the DAV Management, Vardhman Group, he would add to it that the SGPC Colleges and Arya Colleges are also not paying full salary. One College is following the other in payment of salary. The position of the University is deteriorating because they have stopped sending the Periodic Inspection Committees and the Colleges have started paying full salaries.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Harpreet Singh Dua had said in the Senate that the Colleges which are not paying the full salary should be taken over by the University.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pointed out that the DAV Colleges have given an amount of Rs.150 crores to the DAV Management.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that during his two terms in the Senate for the year 2004-08 and 2008-12, he had been visiting the Colleges as part of the Committee and did not grant any affiliation due to such deficiencies.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that he has received a telephonic call that the teachers of the College whose suspension had

been revoked by the University, the Management is not allowing those teachers to enter the College.

Shri Prabhjit Singh suggested that they could take so many steps to improve the Colleges, such as, no new courses be granted to such Colleges, creation of examination centres be stopped for which there is a need of the will power on the part of the Syndicate and Senate. The disaffiliation is the last action which they could take against the Colleges.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu suggested that the periodical inspection of the Colleges should be started.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that coming to the serious subject presently in the hands of the Syndicate, the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar. Were these apprehensions not expressed in the Syndicate and Senate that what this Aurobindo College is going to do if permanent affiliation is granted to them. Were the facts not considered in the Syndicate that these are the shortcomings and could they consider the case for permanent affiliation in the presence of those who went there for granting permanent affiliation? Despite the shortcomings, the Committee has recommended permanent affiliation. The moment they granted the permanent affiliation, the College has come out with the first suspension.

Shri Sanjay Tandon requested to suggest as to what is to be done in the matter after having a short discussion.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the directions from the Chancellor's office are very explicit that the comments on the issue may be forwarded. The transcript of the recording of the meeting would be sent to the Chancellor's office.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that when the Inspection Committee visits the College, it is provided with a proforma which has a column related with the salary being paid to the teachers, the document of which has to be attached by the Management with the proforma. This proforma is submitted to the office of the Dean College Development Council and it is for the office has to check the same. All the data relating to the Provident Fund, payment of salary, strength of the students, etc. are available in the proforma.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as suggested by Shri Prabhjit Singh they should write to the Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab that the University has received a complaint of the Colleges from the Chancellor's office. Though the University is looking into the same at its own level, the Secretary be requested to enquire into the matter and advise the University. A communication be sent to the Chancellor's office that the University has written a letter and in the meantime the University is looking into the matter. In addition to this, the University is trying to put the system in place as per the regulations to be followed relating to payment of salary and other terms and conditions which are approved for the Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor said that let they first seek the information from the Colleges.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that the Inspection Committee be sent to these Colleges.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that if the inspection has been done, at least the inspection reports of these Colleges be checked to look into the deficiencies.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the inspection of the Colleges has been done, then they could say specifically whether the allegations are correct or not.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that one of the reasons is that they have not conducted the inspection of the Colleges.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that he is ready to go to these two Colleges about which the complaint has been sent to the Chancellor, namely, DD Jain College and SDP College for Women along with other members.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that he is also ready to go to these Colleges.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested the name of Shri Harpreet Singh Dua which was agreed to.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that the Professors of the University or the Chairpersons of the concerned Departments should be sent for the periodic inspection of the Colleges and proper guidelines be provided to them.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the suggestion given by Dr. Amit Joshi is a very good one otherwise mostly the Syndicate members show their willingness to be the members of the Committees.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the teachers' representative must be on such Committees.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not only having the list of the members of the present Senate but also of the previous Senate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma suggested that the Inspection Committees be sent to all the Colleges for periodic inspection and each member should be assigned one College and only in case of emergency, two Colleges could be assigned to a member.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the report submitted by the Affiliation Committee having the salary register should be objectively checked by the Dean College Development Council office and if any discrepancy is found, the action should be initiated immediately. It would make the things easier.

Professor Anita Kaushal said that a general circular regarding payment of proper salary be sent to the Colleges just to caution them that if they indulge in non-payment of proper salary, serious action could be taken against them.

The Vice-Chancellor said, okay. It could be done on the similar lines as the UGC asks from the University in a soft copy the salary account of each teacher of the University which is sent to Delhi. So, they could use that as a precedent and write to all the Colleges to send the details of the salary of the teaching and non-teaching staff to the University.

It was informed (by the Dean College Development Council) that they have developed an application which contains 55 modules and the Colleges have been requested to appoint a technically trained Nodal Officer who could interact with the University. The modules comprise the information like Provident Fund, Salary, strength of the staff and students, new courses, etc. They need to enforce that thing and let it be time bound. They could give one week's time to the College so that before the next meeting of the Syndicate that data is available in the soft copy and would be sent to all the members of the Affiliation Committee and to the members of the Periodic Inspection Committee. This process has already been started and 102 Colleges have submitted the complete information and they need to verify that data along with the report of the Affiliation Committee.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that the letter regarding the issue of Provident Fund should be sent immediately as most of the Colleges are not following the rules.

Dr. Amit Joshi suggested that the honorarium to the members of the Inspection Committee should be paid by the University.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it should be done because as it has been pointed out that the Managements sometimes under the grab of payment of honorarium put an amount of Rs.10,000/-, Rs.20,000/- or so in the envelopes of honorarium. Instead of the payment of honorarium and TA/DA by the Colleges to the members of the Inspection Committees everything should be paid by the University and the University should enhance the affiliation fee from which this payment could be made. It would improve the things.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is a good suggestion. But if the Colleges pay over and above the honorarium and TA/DA, how that could be avoided.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that presently the Colleges pay the honorarium and TA/DA in the envelopes which are handed over to the members of the Committees.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that there are some members who open the envelopes on the spot and return the excess money to the Colleges.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that but most of the members do not do so.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that if any Management says that they have paid extra money to the members of the Inspection Committees, first of all such a College should be disaffiliated as to why they have paid the extra amount. If any Management says that they have paid an extra amount of Rs.5 lac, then why such Colleges do not pay the proper salaries.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra and Dr. Amit Joshi to submit a proposal on enhancing the affiliation fee, payment of honorarium and TA/DA, etc. to the members of the Committees by the University.

Shri Ashok Goyal suggested that in addition to this, it be also ensured that the members of the Committees travel to the Colleges in a single vehicle instead of separate vehicles.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the issue of sending a reply to the Chancellor should be handled separately.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is good to discuss any item because from the discussion, so many issues come up and a solution to those could be suggested by the members.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the collective time of all of them is also important and sometimes it is not possible for some of the members to sit all day long. So, the members should consider this also.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan pointed out that about three months ago a decision was taken that they would follow the guidelines adopted by Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar for affiliation/inspection of the College and a Committee would be formed in this regard, but the same has not been implemented till date.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it was discussed there and then that they have a system in place which is far better than the system of GNDU.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that such a system is already working which has been prepared by Shri Harpreet Singh Dua.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu and Shri Prabhjit Singh enquired as to what is the resolved part of this item.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the resolved part is that the transcript of the meeting would be sent to Delhi; the information would be sought from these two Colleges; the information regarding salary, Provident Fund, etc. would be sought from all the Colleges; Periodic Inspection Committees would visit the Colleges and all this information would be provided to the Committees; a proposal would be generated that the honorarium and TA/DA would be paid by the University and not by the College and a proposal in this regard would be submitted by Dr. Amit Joshi, Professor Navdeep Goyal and Professor Keshav Malhotra; and also a letter would be written to the Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab regarding the complaint of these Colleges.

Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that a Committee should visit these three Colleges about which the complaint has been made. He along with Shri Prabhjit Singh is ready to visit these Colleges.

The Vice-Chancellor agreed to it.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) A caveat petition be filed against the Sri Aurobindo College of Commerce and Management, Ludhiana in consultation with Shri Anupam Gupta, Advocate;
- (ii) A letter be written to the Secretary, Higher Education, Punjab to enquire into the matter;

- (iii) A Committee comprising of Shri Prabhjit Singh, Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu, Dr. R.K. Mahajan, Shri Harpreet Singh Dua be constituted to visit the SDP College, DD Jain College and Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College;
- (iv) A general circular be issued to all the colleges not to violate the provisions of the Panjab University Calendar;
- (v) A Committee comprising from Professor Navdeep Goyal, Professor Keshav Malhotra, Dr. Amit Joshi be formed to prepare a proposal to enhance the affiliation fee so that the TA/DA to the Inspection/Affiliation Committees are paid by the University;
- (vi) Transcript of the deliberation of this Syndicate be sent to the Chancellor;
- (vii) Soft copy of the inputs/rules/regulations regarding affiliation etc. be provided to the Inspection Committees;
- (viii) The Deputy Registrar (Colleges) be directed to seek information from Shri Atam Vallabh Jain College, Ludhiana and D.D. Jain College, Ludhiana on the issue.

**Minutes dated 15.03.2018 of the Committee regarding the issue of admission of re-appear students in M.A./M.Sc. Courses**

**20.** Considered minutes dated 15.03.2018 (**Appendix-XV**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to review circular No. Misc./A-6/9008 dated 02.08.2017 (**Appendix-XV**) with regard to the issue whether the students of Panjab University, Chandigarh as well as the migrated students from other Universities who have re-appear/s in Undergraduate classes are eligible to take admission in M.A./M.Sc. Courses.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee under the Chairpersonship of Dean of University Instruction has gone into the details and submitted the recommendations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the recommendation of the Committee is that the students coming from other Universities could not be allowed this benefit because there is a requirement of migration. This is a good recommendation.

Shri Sanjay Tandon asked as to why such matters come to the Syndicate as the Departments could take care of.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that since it is a rule, it has to come to the Syndicate. Since there are different Departments which could make different rules, so a uniformity has to be there.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is not a rule but a regulation. Could they do anything in violation of the regulations? It has to be approved by the Syndicate and Senate and then to Government of India.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that earlier there was the concept of compartment and then because of the implementation of the semester system, the concept of re-appear started.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi enquired whether they could award a degree to a student having compartment. If they could not award a degree to such a student, then how could admit a student to a postgraduate course. It is not possible.

Professor Navdeep Goyal clarified that there is a condition that if the student clear the compartment, only then the admission could be confirmed.

Dr. Surinder Singh Sangha said that this all has been done because otherwise the students would not be able to take admission and there would be a loss of one year.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if a student is placed under compartment, he/she could proceed to the next class.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that in the University there was a provision till late 1960s that the students placed under compartment used to get admission to postgraduate courses. Thereafter the word 'compartment' has been replaced by 're-appear'. First of all, since the admissions are made on the basis of merit, a student getting the re-appear would not have a chance of getting the admission. To give a chance to such students that without wasting any time, that admission is always provisional. What to talk of the postgraduate degree if the student does not clear the re-appear within the stipulated period, the student would not even be awarded the graduation degree. So, the only idea is to save the time of the students. Otherwise if the student is entitled for admission to postgraduate course after clearing the re-appear, the student would have to waste one year. So, it is subject to the clearance of re-appear within a specified time and in case the student fails to qualify within that period, the admission to the course automatically stands cancelled. But in the item he did not know as to why this is to be made applicable to the students of the other Universities also. A student from other universities could not appear in the examination till he/she continues to be a registered student there. One could not be a registered student of two universities simultaneously. So, why such proposals are submitted.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that since the issue of admitting candidates from other universities is a new thing which they are not approving it. He enquired whether otherwise this is a practice which is in vogue.

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that only the nomenclature of 'compartment' has been changed with that of 're-appear'.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is for the information of members that if a student who could not clear the 10+2 examination either from the CBSE or Punjab School Education Board and has re-appear such a student is admitted to graduation provisionally. This was not the case earlier due to which the students used to take admission under Punjabi University since that facility was available there. So, they also thought to provide the same facility. It was so in the case of

the students of the Education Board whereas under the present item, they are discussing about their own re-appear students. There is nothing new in it.

Professor Ronki Ram said that in many Universities and Education Boards if a candidate has taken the migration, the registration number of the student there does not exist. So the migration means that if a candidate has migrated his/her bonafide status from that University and if wanted to take the any other University examination, he/she would have to register again. So, a student could not remain a student of two universities simultaneously.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that this is the reason that the Committee has not approved this provision.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that until a student is migrated, the result would not be declared.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that since it is a regulation, let it go to the Regulations Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor asked whether it would go to the Senate or any other path is to be adopted.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that first it would go to the Senate. Once Senate clears it, then it goes to the Regulations Committee. But in anticipation of MHRD, they could implement it.

Shri Ashok Goyal enquired as to what is the practice being followed.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that first it goes to the Regulations Committee, then to the Syndicate and then to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if the Senate has not taken the decision to amend the Regulations, how it is being sent to the Regulations Committee.

It was informed (by the Registrar) that normally any proposal which comes from any Faculty, it goes to the Regulations Committee which examines the proposal.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that if the Regulations Committee approves something, the Senate has the power to reject it. Then why should they go twice to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the work of the Regulations Committee is to draft the regulations and not to decide.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Registrar is rightly saying that after going through the Regulations Committee, the matter be put up before the Senate. But why they are taking twice to the Senate.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is a better option and it would make the things easy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that then why it should be placed before the Syndicate.



Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is placed before the Syndicate that in principle the regulations are approved.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that until the Cabinet approves any proposal the Parliament could not take up the Act. When they approve it, it would go to the Regulations Committee, it would be placed before the Senate for the regulations as well as for the decision. The first resolution would be to approve and the second to accept the regulations.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that whatever has been approved, let it go to the Regulations Committee.

Professor Ronki Ram said that for further knowledge in the Parliamentary system, there is a Parliamentary Committee. If a proper procedure is not followed, the Bill could never be passed in the Parliament before exhausting all the stages in a proper way. Similarly, the Senate has made a regulation to follow the procedure. He agrees with Shri Ashok Goyal that they have to follow the Panjab University Calendar.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has no objection what Shri Sanjay Tandon has suggested.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that it is not a question of somebody's suggestion, it is a question of finding a logic way. If they could not sit together and find a smarter and shorter way of doing things, they should do it. Otherwise they have to wait for a long period to take the decision. Shri Ashok Goyal is right in pointing out something which could not be done being a regulation. Why the concerned department does not say that it is not possible. All of them look towards Shri Ashok Goyal whether a decision taken by them is right as per the regulations. Instead the presenter should say that something is not possible instead of asking Shri Ashok Goyal. They should do such things to strengthen the system and not to strengthen the individual. If they do not strengthen the system, they would be approving the things and later on it would be pointed out that the Syndicate did not know about the rules and regulations.

**RESOLVED:** That the matter be referred to the Regulations Committee.

**Minutes dated 05.04.2018 of the Committee to enquire into the matter regarding concealment of facts by Shri Balwinder Singh while taking admission in Ph.D.**

**21.** Considered minutes dated 05.04.2018 (**Appendix-XVI**) of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to enquire into the matter regarding concealment of facts by Shri Balwinder Singh while taking admission in Ph.D.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 10.12.2017 (Para 14) (**Appendix-XVI**) while approving the minutes dated 04.08.2017 of the Committee to look into the complaint made by Shri Balwinder Singh, has authorized the Vice-Chancellor to constitute a Committee to enquire into the concealment of facts by Mr. Balwinder Singh while taking admission in Ph.D.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this person is creating havoc in the Chemical Engineering Department by his misdemeanours. He is continuously filing complaints against the faculty of the Department and whenever any complaint does not traverse forward according to his will, he does not hesitate even to file an FIR against a faculty member in the police. He is repeatedly doing it. He is registered for Ph.D. under the current Chairperson of the Department who went out of the way to protect him. All the same he is doing unacceptable things. A Research Scholar should not do such things. He is very old person and somehow his career has not gone the way it should have. Due to that frustration, the person is creating problems for the University. He had pleaded with the faculty and the Chairperson of the Department that a Research Scholar should not be permitted to do these things but then it was said that the person is a very brilliant one and so on. Somebody may be very intelligent but that does not mean that he could play havoc with the Department. So, the extension should not be given.

Shri Sanjay Tandon endorsed it that the extension should not be given.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if a person is making the complaints, could they stop such a person from doing the Ph.D.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that it is a different case as narrated by the Vice-Chancellor that it is a case of concealment of facts.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the person is not working towards Ph.D. but making complaints. The person has completed the time and has already been given the extension. So the extension should not be given.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if they did not want to give the extension, then there are other two items in which they are going to give the extension even up to 3 years.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he is not recommending the extension and if the members wanted, they could do so. To which some of the members said that they do not want to give the extension.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the item is not on the issue of grant of extension.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they if approve the minutes of the Committee, it means that they are not granting the extension.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that Shri Prabhjit Singh has rightly said that the item is about looking into the complaints against Mr. Balwinder Singh but here neither is the request for extension nor the Committee should have recommended that in view of the above he may not be granted the extension. Why, it is because such a man could go to the Court and get the relief. After considering the facts that he is habitual in concealing the facts, there is a recommendation dated 13.3.2018 that the competent authority may take suitable action against him. This did not come to the Syndicate. Thereafter, the Committee should have been constituted to consider his request for extension and both the items should have been brought to the Syndicate separately. While taking decision about taking action against him, they could have taken any decision that they wanted and

as far as the extension is concerned in view of the fact that it has not been recommended by the Department and by the Committee, they should have declined the extension also. They could decline the extension now but if the item is qua considering his request for extension. But the item is dealing with about his complaints and what action needs to be taken and the recommendation is that the extension may not be granted. That means that they are declining the extension as a matter of punishment which could not be done.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the matter before them is the concealment of the facts. The Committee which looked into that decided that since the person has done the concealment what should be the punishment for this. So, now since the Committee has suggested the punishment why should they get into such things. Different views have come and let they leave it to the Chair to decide.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the extension should not be given.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the extension has not to be given.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that the minutes of the Committee be approved.

**RESOLVED:** That minutes dated 05.04.2018 of the Committee, constituted by the Vice-Chancellor, to enquire into the matter regarding concealment of facts by Shri Balwinder Singh while taking admission in Ph.D., **as per Appendix**, be approved.

## **Withdrawn item**

**22.** Considered deferred item No.9 of Syndicate meeting dated 10.12.2017 relating to the request dated 27.06.2017 of Shri Ram Nath, Father in Law of Ms. Yogita Sarohi, Assistant Professor, P.U. Regional Centre Kauni, for her transfer to Panjab University, Chandigarh, pursuant to letter No. VPS-15/2/R/PU/2018 dated 09.04.2018.

- NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate dated 01/15/28 & 29.05.2016 (Para 76), has approved the recommendations of the Committee dated 21.07.2016 regarding framing a policy for transfer of faculty within the Panjab University System. Accordingly, circular has been issued to the concerned quarters vide No.8236-8936/Estt. I dated 26.08.2016.
2. The above item was placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 19.11.2017 (Para 27) and the consideration of the item was deferred. The same was again placed before the Syndicate in its meeting held on 10.12.2017 (Para 9), but the consideration of the item was again deferred.
3. An office note is enclosed.

Professor Navdeep Goyal suggested that it should be deferred otherwise there should be a uniform policy.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the point raised by Professor Navdeep Goyal is valid that all such cases should be considered together and a policy should be framed. No individual cases should be considered.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that his point is that they should not react to anything after reading the name of the person concerned. They should react to the policy. This item is being deferred continuously.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is because the University did not want to decline at all. So, they are deferring it because as per the policy it could not be done. So instead of rejecting, they want to defer it so that if at some stage a policy is framed, the case could be considered.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he would not comment on the individual cases.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that there are so many cases of transfer and suggested that a Committee be formed to frame the policy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the policy for such cases could not be framed because when a post is advertised, it is advertised for a specific place. For example, if the post has been advertised for UBS in Panjab University campus where the entry level is so high that if they transfer a person from the UBS, it creates a havoc in the Department.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that what Dr. Subhash Sharma is saying is that a policy could be framed which could also include that the transfers could not be allowed.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that such matters should not be placed before the Syndicate. The Establishment Branch should deal with the cases according to the policy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that if as per the rules, the transfer could not be effected, then it has been placed before the Syndicate.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the people go and approach the Prime Minister's office, Minister's office and Chancellor's office.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that it should be conveyed that they have such and such policy.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he is on the Board of the Gas Authority of India which has a plant in UP and the appointments are made for there and only after serving for a period of five years, they could be considered for other better places. But the persons approach the Minister, Member of Parliament and to him being the Director. When it was requested that the employee be transferred from Bareilly to Noida or Chandigarh, then the one-line answer was that the person could not be transferred to an office but only to a unit wherever such a unit is situated. Then it was said that it could not be considered. The Vice-Chancellor has to run the institution and they have to work for the betterment of the institution. Maybe after 20 years no one from amongst themselves might not be in the Syndicate but they should not be accused of taking a decision in favour of a person who

approaches some members of the Syndicate. He is also being approached by some persons. Let them not choose to react and go by the policy.

The Vice-Chancellor said that in the year 2016, a decision was taken and circulated vide No. 8836-8936/Estt.I dated 26.8.2016 which mentions "The Committee was of the view that when a person applies for the post advertisement in Panjab University, he applies for a particular Institute located at a particular place as per advertisement, say for Chandigarh or Hoshiarpur or Muktsar or Ludhiana etc. and gets selected through open/competitive selections from amongst the persons who had specifically applied for that Institute at that place only. Therefore, it is not advisable to transfer him/her from one place to other. In case, a person appointed at an Institute/place in Panjab University wants to move to another Institute/place in Panjab University, he/she has to apply for that Institute/place in Panjab University and compete with other applicants in open selections and at the time of interview his/her application should be considered, strictly on merit, without any bias". With the result that whatever was decided in 2016, it is a policy.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that as per the extant policy, the present case is not covered. Then why the item at all has been placed before the Syndicate and the Vice-Chancellor has explained that there is some pressure behind it. They should send a polite answer that as per the policy, it is not permissible and the matter ends.

The Vice-Chancellor said that a suitable and appropriate reply would be sent to the Chancellor.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he differs a little on it that the rejection at the level of the Syndicate should not have taken place because the Establishment branch has not taken the action.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the item is withdrawn.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that this should have been dealt at the level of the Vice-Chancellor and maybe as per the policy this is not possible.

**RESOLVED:** That the item be treated as withdrawn and the Chancellor office be informed accordingly.

**Enquiry report dated  
24.04.2018 submitted  
by Shri P.L. Ahuja in  
respect of Shri  
Kulwant Singh**

**23.** Considered if,

- (i) the enquiry report dated 24.04.2018 (**Appendix-XVII**) submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Officer, District & Session Judge (Retd.), against Shri Kulwant Singh, SDE (Electrical), Construction Office, Panjab University, Chandigarh for proceeding on Earned Leave (Ex-India) w.e.f. 04.04.2016 without getting the leave sanctioned and without prior approval for leaving the headquarters to visit Canada, be accepted.
- (ii) the above enquiry report is accepted, the penalty to be imposed on the delinquent official- Shri Kulwant Singh, SDE (Electrical), be decided.

- NOTE:** 1. As per rule 1.1 (II) appearing at page 74 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016, the post of S.D.E. held by Shri Kulwant Singh, SDE (Electrical) is a Class 'A' post).
- As per Regulation 3.1 (a) appearing at page 117 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, the Senate is appointing authority of Class 'A' employees
2. Regulation 3.3 appearing at page 118 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 speaks that the appointing authority shall be the punishing authority.
3. The minor and major penalties stand defined under rule 3 at page 114 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-III, 2016.
4. A detailed office note is enclosed **(Appendix-XVII)**.

The Vice-Chancellor said that this is an enquiry against Shri Kulwant Singh who had disappeared at some stage and came back just before when he was to superannuate.

Professor Ronki Ram said that he (Shri Kulwant Singh) has said that before going to Canada he had applied for ex-India leave and the office of the Registrar has recommended the leave and the application has been processed to the Vice-Chancellor office. Since he had already booked his travel scheme and mentioned in the letter, so in anticipation of that once it has been cleared from the Registrar's office, it was to go to the Vice-Chancellor office and said that he did not run away. This is the one version which now they have to see in the papers.

The Vice-Chancellor said that that version has no relevance.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that why should they submit someone's version. They should avoid of becoming the spokesman of a person. There is no issue if they accept or reject a case on the basis of a policy, but it should not be that a person approaches any member and that member pleads for the person.

Professor Ronki Ram said that there is a cross-examination statement of the Registrar appearing on page 94 of the agenda that "the delinquent did meet me on 02.04.2016 but it is incorrect that I assured him that the leave would be sanctioned".

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi asked as to what finally the Enquiry Officer says. The Enquiry Officer says that the charge is proved.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the charge is that the person applied for leave and went abroad. He pointed out that earlier also there have been some similar cases.

The Vice-Chancellor said that everybody knows about the track record of this person. There are other enquiries also against him. Why are they going out of the way to protect the people who should not have been protected at all? They should not protect the persons on technicalities.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that final result of the enquiry is known better to them.

Professor Ronki Ram said that the person says that he got the leave sanctioned for this.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that the leave was not sanctioned.

Professor Keshav Malhotra pointed out that there are some cases in which the leave is sanctioned after a period of 1-2 months after a teacher has returned after completing a Refresher Course.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that since the Syndicate is not competent, this should be referred to the Senate as it is the competent body.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that it is a better idea.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that does it mean that they fail to give their opinion. As Syndicate, they accept it and the person should be punished and send it to the Senate. This is one decision or they could say that they have read the report and the Syndicate had no decision to give on this, so it should be referred to the Senate. It means that 15 members of the Syndicate could not do anything in the matter. Then why the item has been placed before the Syndicate

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they must accept the report.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that by default it has come to the Syndicate and then to the Senate because it is the competent body.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that does it mean that they fail to give their opinion.

Professor Ronki Ram said that they must give their opinion.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that there is no doubt on the report and they have to accept it. Now the next question is as to what is the punishment.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that in the Senate, a division takes place 'for the teachers' and 'against the teachers' due to which some culprit is given the advantage and the overall position of the University deteriorates. Until they do not punish a wrong person and praise a good person, they could not move forward. As is the case for the students that until they do not praise a good student and tarnish a bad student, there would be no good results. This should apply to the teachers also. But here the colleagues start protecting the persons as earlier there was a case of a person involved in sexual harassment about which some members were saying that the person is a good one.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they should go by the Enquiry Officer report.

Dr. R.K. Mahajan said that in this case also, the issue of 2/3<sup>rd</sup> majority would become an issue.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that let them do their duty. He enquired as to for how long the person was absent. They have to take a decision whether they want to dismiss the person or any other punishment.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that they could not take a decision. They could only accept the report and send it to the Senate.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he could say with guarantee that nothing would happen in the Senate. They should at least recommend something.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that the report be accepted.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Syndicate decides to accept the report and they recommend the report as it is to the Senate.

Shri Ashok Goyal requested that he may be abstained from this decision because what unlawful is being done, he could not be a party to that. He has pointed out so many times that they could not touch the comma (,) or full stop (.), they could not recommend, they could not accept the report. What are they doing? Are they trying to benefit the person or trying to punish him? If the competent authority is the Senate, Syndicate is nobody to recommend or accept. It is only to be forwarded to the Senate without commenting anything. That is the law of the land. What they are doing?

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that he does not agree with Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they accept the report and request the Senate to punish the person. He disagrees with Shri Ashok Goyal.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the whole existence would become infructuous if they have no role to play on this thing.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he respects the opinion of the members and that does not stop him from giving his opinion.

Dr. Amit Joshi enquired whether the report would go to the Senate because of the employee being 'A' class officer.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, 'yes'.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that then this item should not have been in the agenda of the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that it is part of the agenda of the Syndicate otherwise technically it should not have come. In any other organisation, it could not have gone except to the competent authority. But since they have a regulation that everything to the Senate has to be routed through the Syndicate, that is why it comes.



But the regulation does not say that everything has to go to the Senate on the recommendation of the Syndicate. It is not the case. For example, in the case of appointment of Dean Student Welfare, Dean of University Instruction, it is on the recommendation of the Syndicate that the Senate has to do the appointment. But in this case the recommendation of the Syndicate is not mentioned. Even if it goes directly to the Senate, that would not be illegal. But since there is a regulation that everything has to go through the Syndicate, it has come to the Syndicate and they could simply say that the matter relates to the Senate, let it go there.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that he disagrees with it. They accept the report.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that as far as he knows, it is also mentioned in the Panjab University Calendar, the Deputy Registrar (General) must be knowing it better, that if any charge is framed against the class 'A' officers and an enquiry is constitute against them, that report should be taken up by the Senate. This is the regulation. So, such matters should not be placed before the Syndicate and should be sent directly to the Senate. The punishing authority is the competent authority.

Shri Ashok Goyal clarified that tomorrow they have to elect a member to the Dental Council of India for which the election has to take place in the meeting of the Senate, that matter has not been placed before the Syndicate. Since the election is to be done by the Senate, that is why it has gone directly to the Senate. If the report goes directly to the Senate, it would not be unlawful but if it goes with the recommendation of the Syndicate to the Senate, that may give the benefit. That is why he is pointing out this.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the punishing authority in this case is the Senate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they are not punishing the person.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he had pointed out it earlier also that they need not discuss the issues of disciplinary action. The Registrar has also given his observations on the report guiding that one of the charges stands proved as if they did not know how to read what is written by the Enquiry Officer.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that it does not matter.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that he has been dealing with such cases. He has dealt with the departmental enquiries and where he has been able to apply that the punishing authority has not taken the position in applying its mind, the person has got the relief right up to the Supreme Court.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that in future the disciplinary cases should be sent directly to the punishing authority. If it is the Syndicate, then the matters could be placed otherwise directly to the Senate. Then why so much wastage of paper is being done.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that the suggestion of Dr. Amit Joshi is welcome. At least with that they would not be doing anything

unlawful. A decision could be taken as a policy matter. If in some cases, the Vice-Chancellor is competent, that matter does not come to the Syndicate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that let they at least accept the enquiry report.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that how could they accept the report as the competent authority is the Senate.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the Senate is the competent authority to impose the punishment.

Shri Ashok Goyal said, no, disciplinary and punishing authority is the Senate as it is the employer.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that the report should be accepted and sent to the Senate for appropriate punishment and Shri Ashok Goyal should be abstained from it.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that it should also be mentioned that in future such cases should go to the competent authority.

**RESOLVED:** That –

- (i) the enquiry report dated 24.04.2018 submitted by Shri P.L. Ahuja, Enquiry Officer, District & Session Judge (Retd.), in respect of Shri Kulwant Singh, SDE (Electrical), Construction Office, Panjab University, Chandigarh for proceeding on Earned Leave (Ex-India) w.e.f. 04.04.2016 without getting the leave sanctioned and without prior approval for leaving the headquarters to visit Canada, **as per Appendix-**, be accepted and forwarded to the Senate, being the competent authority, for taking the decision on the penalty to be imposed.

**Minutes dated 05.12.2017 of the committee to study the case of Dr. B.B. Goyal, Professor U.B.S.**

**24.** Considered deferred item No. 35 of the Syndicate meeting dated 24.02.2018 (**Appendix-XVIII**) relating to the minutes dated 05.12.2017 (**Appendix-XVIII**) of the committee, re-constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to study the case of Dr. B.B. Goyal, Professor U.B.S.

**NOTE:** 1. The Committee has studied the case of Dr. B.B. Goyal, Professor U.B.S, relating to the following issues:

- (i) Recommendation of the Committee dated 13.02.012 (**Appendix-XVIII**) constituted by the Vice-Chancellor to examine the representation of Dr. B.B. Goyal of U.B.S. requesting to amend the orders of the Senate dated 11.06.2009 (Para LII), in the light of judgment of the Civil Court dated 28.03.2014 (**Appendix-XVIII**) in Civil Suit No. 1043 of 2.4.2010.

- (ii) Promotion order of Dr. B.B. Goyal from Associate Professor (Stage 4) to Professor (Stage 5) w.e.f. the due date of his eligibility i.e. 01.01.2009, under UGC Regulations 2010, already issued vide office orders dated 14.02.2013, in anticipation of approval of the Syndicate/Senate.
  - (iii) The matter pertaining to allegation/s (that corruption is prevailing in the University) levelled by him without mentioning the name of the person and proof thereof for which he was asked in terms of decision the Syndicate dated 15.05.2013/29.06.2013 (Para 34) to submit an affidavit, but he did not do so inspite of the fact that a copy of the said Syndicate decision was provided to him vide letter dated 30.09.2013, as requested by him.
2. The Senate in its meeting dated 11.06.2009 (Para LII) has resolved that the decision of the Senate dated 28.3.2009 (Para XXXIII) be modified to read as under:
- “That though promotion orders of Dr. B.B. Goyal as Reader be not withdrawn as a measure of concession, as he was promoted as Reader by the Syndicate decision dated 15.5.2014 w.e.f. 31.12.2001. He will continue to draw salary of Rs.12840/- w.e.f. 31.12.2001, i.e. the date of his promotion. The punishment of stoppage of increments with cumulative effective will stand till the said decision of the Syndicate.
- However, debarring him from undertaking any remunerative work in Panjab University should stand. He will start earning his normal annual increment only after the decision of the Syndicate dated 15.5.2014 whenever it becomes due”.
3. The recommendations of the Committee dated 13.02.2012 were placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 15.12.2012 (Para 22) (**Appendix-XVIII**) and it was resolved that the consideration of the item on the agenda be deferred and all the relevant decision of the Senate taken since 2000 should be appropriately enumerated together for a careful comprehension of the issues related to this item.
4. The minutes of the Standing Committee dated 21.05.2015 alongwith written statement of Professor B.B. Goyal, in term of Rule 3 at page 143 of P.U. Calendar, Volume III 2009 regarding

“Guidelines for Proceeding of Serious Charges of Allegations against the University, its officers and others” were placed before the Syndicate in its meeting dated 19.07.2015 Para 32 (**Appendix-XVIII**) and it was resolved that consideration of the item, be deferred.

5. Dr. B.B. Goyal Challenged the decision/s already taken by the Executive Body of the University i.e. Senate by filling Civil Suit No. 1043 of 02.04.2010. The said Civil Suit was dismissed by the Hon'ble Court and decided in favour of defendant University and against the plaintiff vide in its order dated 28.03.2014.
6. A detailed office note (**Annexure-XVIII**) showing the details of the case alongwith all previous meetings of Syndicate and Senate (**Annexure-XVIII**) and chart showing the details of all court cases (**Annexure-XVIII**), which were filed by the Dr. B.B. Goyal against the University.
7. As decided by the Syndicate in its meeting dated 24.02.2018 (Para 35), a note containing chronology of the events of the case is enclosed (**Appendix-XVIII**).

The Vice-Chancellor said that on page 123, it is mentioned that he (Professor B.B. Goyal) continues to put in all kinds of allegations. He has put in more allegations and a Committee has looked into it. There are proceedings of the Committee dated 5.12.2017. Whenever anything happens in the Department and if he (Professor Goyal) feels that he is being bypassed for one reason or the other, then he comes and starts shouting. When the Chairman of the Department had gone on a day or two leave, he (Vice-Chancellor) gave that charge to the Dean of University Instruction and not to Professor Goyal because of all these things. Then he started shouting in the Vice-Chancellor office. When he told Professor Goyal to apologize once and regret it, everything would be cleared. Once he accepted it but the next day backed out. It is very difficult to handle such things. His term is ending and he wanted this matter to end and for the last time he has brought the proceedings of the Committee before the Syndicate which have not been seen by the Syndicate so far.

Shri Sanjay Tandon enquired as to what is to be done now.

The Vice-Chancellor said that the Committee has recommended that “the allegations made by Dr. B.B. Goyal are without any proof, which is lacking in responsibility on his part, so proper disciplinary proceedings need to be initiated against him in terms of the provisions of Rule 15(c) at page 112 of P.U. Cal. Vol.-III, 2016.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that this is similar to earlier one and would go to the Senate.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that supposing a person makes a complaint and fails to prove the same, would they start the action against him. How it is possible? The complaint could be filed, that is all.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on page 125 of the agenda, it is mentioned that Dr. B.B. Goyal has alleged that corruption is prevailing in the University without mentioning any name or inducing any proof. If a person makes such complaints at any forum, that is not correct. Even he accuses that the corruption is prevailing in the office.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that one could not make such wild allegations.

Shri Prabhjit Singh enquired whether what Professor Goyal has said is in written. When they would initiate action, then the person could say that he has not said any such thing.

Professor Navdeep Goyal said that all this is in writing.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that if the complaint has been made in written, then it should have been a part of the agenda.

The Vice-Chancellor said that on page 178 of the agenda there is a decision of the Syndicate dated 15.05.2013 which says "Resolved: That Dr. B.B. Goyal, Professor, University Business School, be asked to submit an affidavit, with specific allegation/s against specific persons and proof thereof. If he did not submit the same, action be initiated against him as per University regulations/rules".

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that since the Syndicate has already taken a decision that the action should be initiated against him, then the matter should not have come to the Syndicate. Then they should take the action.

Professor Keshav Malhotra asked as to what action is to be taken. He said that Professor Goyal had met the Vice-Chancellor and had also apologized.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Goyal had said that he would apologize but when he was called, he backed out.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that right now they have to initiate the disciplinary proceedings against the person.

Shri Prabhjit Singh said that an annexure (p.179) is attached stating the brief history of the court cases filed by Professor B.B. Goyal. All the writ petitions have been dismissed.

The Vice-Chancellor said that Professor Goyal has consumed the earlier Vice-Chancellors Professor K.N. Pathak, Professor R.C. Sobti and now he himself.

Dr. Amit Joshi and Dr. Inderpal Singh Sidhu said that the action should be initiated against him and the person could again approach the Court against their decision as he is in the habit of approaching the Court.

The Vice-Chancellor said that he had asked him to give one-line regret and had accepted to clear the case but the next day backed out.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that they authorise the Vice-Chancellor and ask Professor Goyal to apologize.

The Vice-Chancellor requested Professor Keshav Malhotra to bring the person with apology and he would accept the same.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that he could try it.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if Professor Keshav Malhotra brings the person and he gives in writing, then it is okay otherwise the action should be initiated against him. Let them initiate the action and if after that the person submits his written apology, they would withdraw the disciplinary action.

Shri Gurjot Singh Malhi said that they would not withdraw the disciplinary action could consider withdrawing the same.

Professor Keshav Malhotra said that the disciplinary action should not be initiated.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that before the action is initiated, if what the Vice-Chancellor was saying regarding apology and if Professor Keshav Malhotra succeeds in it, the matter could end.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that the sanctity of the Vice-Chancellor office has to be maintained.

Shri Sanjay Tandon suggested that the action should be initiated.

Professor Keshav Malhotra suggested that it could be deferred till the next meeting or the Vice-Chancellor could take a decision as he deems appropriate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that if Professor Goyal satisfies the Vice-Chancellor by rendering the apology within two weeks, then it is okay otherwise they authorise the Vice-Chancellor to initiate the disciplinary action.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this thing should not be recorded.

Dr. Amit Joshi said that if it is not to be recorded, then what would be the resolved part.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the action should be initiated and they should give a message to the public that the Syndicate is serious in its functioning. Otherwise it looks like a way to circumvent the things if they authorise the Vice-Chancellor or say that the minutes should not be recorded. He stressed that the minutes have to be recorded. It could not be such a case that if Professor Goyal apologizes and the minutes are changed. How could they change the minutes.

Dr. Subhash Sharma said that they are not changing the minutes but only authorising the Vice-Chancellor.

Shri Sanjay Tandon said that the Vice-Chancellor instead of taking the action would place the matter again before the Syndicate.

Dr. Subhash Sharma and Professor Keshav Malhotra said that there is no need to place the matter again before the Syndicate.

Shri Ashok Goyal said that this item was not supposed to come to the Syndicate. If the Committee has recommended initiation of disciplinary action, that was to be initiated by the Vice-Chancellor being the prescribed authority. It need not come to the Syndicate. But the Vice-Chancellor wants that if Professor Goyal submits regrets, the matter would end. In this connection Professor Keshav Malhotra has suggested that he could persuade Professor Goyal. If Professor Goyal does not regret within 15 days, there is no need for permission of the Syndicate for initiating the disciplinary action as the Syndicate has already taken a decision.

**RESOLVED:** That Professor B.B. Goyal be given 15 days' time to submit his apology. If he fails to do so, the Vice-Chancellor be authorised to initiate further action as deemed appropriate.

### **Routine and formal matters**

**25.** The information contained in Items **R-(i)** to **R-(x)** on the agenda was read out, i.e.–

**(i)** In accordance with the decision of the Senate dated 22.12.2012 (Para XXI), the Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has approved the re-employment of Dr. K. Sherry Sabbarwal, Professor, Department of Sociology, Panjab University on contract basis upto 07.03.2023 (i.e. the date of her attaining age of 65 years) w.e.f. the date she joins as such with one day break as usual, as per rules/regulation of P.U. & Syndicate decision dated 28.06.2008 and 29.02.2012 on fixed emoluments equivalent to last pay drawn minus pension to be worked out on the full service of 33 years both in case of teacher opting for pension or CPF. Salary for this purpose means pay plus allowances excluding House Rent Allowance.

- NOTE:** 1. Academically active report should be submitted by her after completion of every year of re-employment through the HOD with the advance copy to DUI. Thus, usual one-day break will be there at the completion of every year during the period of re-employment. All other rules as mentioned at page 132 of Panjab University Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 will be applicable.
2. The Senate decision dated 29.03.2015, item-8 (C-20) circulated vide No. 3947-4027/Estt.I dated 11.05.2015 is also applicable in the case of re-employment.
3. Rule 3.1 appearing at page 132 of P.U. Calendar, Vol. III, 2016 reads as under:  
 “The re-employed teacher will not be entitled to any residential accommodation on the Campus. If a teacher was already living on the Campus, he/she shall not be allowed to retain the same for more than 2 months after the date of superannuation. The failure to vacate the University residential

accommodation after the stipulated period shall entail automatic termination of re-employment.”

- (ii) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has accepted the resignation of Shri Harsimran Singh Dhanju, Programmer (on contract), MIS/IAQC, P.U. w.e.f. 12.01.2018 (A.N.) by waiving off the condition to deposit a sum-equal to Pay & Allowances for the period falling short i.e. 15 days, in lieu of prior notice.

**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. Dr. Harsimran Singh had given one month prior notice for resignation vide application dated 28.12.2017 (**Appendix-XIX**).
3. Dr. Dhanju vide his request dated 12.01.2018 (**Appendix-XIX**) has submitted his resignation w.e.f. 12.01.2018 (AN) as he had been selected as Lecturer (Computer Science) in Department of Technical Education & Industrial Training, Govt. of Punjab & he has also joined there on 15.01.2018.
4. An office note enclosed (**Appendix-XIX**).

- (iii) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has re-appointed afresh the following faculty at Dr. Harvansh Singh Judge Institute of Dental Sciences & Hospital, purely on temporary basis w.e.f. 05.04.2018 for 11 months i.e. upto 04.03.2019 with break on 04.04.2018 (Break Day) or till the posts are filled in, on regular basis through proper selection, whichever is earlier, under Regulation 5 at page 111 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007, on the same terms and conditions on which they were working earlier:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation</b>
1.	Dr. Lalit Kumar	Associate Professor
2.	Dr. Shipra Gupta	Associate Professor
3.	Dr. Vishakha Grover	Associate Professor
4.	Dr. Puneet	Assistant Professor
5.	Dr. Poonam Sood	Assistant Professor
6.	Dr. Gurparkash Singh Chahal	Assistant Professor
7.	Dr. Sunint Singh	Assistant Professor



8.	Dr. Neha Bansal	Assistant Professor
9.	Dr. Rose Kanwal Jeet Kaur	Assistant Professor

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

(iv) The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the Academic Calendar for the 2018-19 (**Appendix-XXI**) for the Teaching Department/Regional Centre's of the Panjab University and its affiliated Colleges (Art, Science and Commerce) having semester system of the examinations as mentioned below against each:

1. University Teaching Department/ Regional Centre's having semester system of examinations. **Annexure 'A' (Pages 13-14)**
2. Affiliated Colleges and Undergraduate and Post Graduate courses having semester system of examinations. **Annexure 'B' (Pages 15-16)**

(v) The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has given the Current Duty Charge (C.D.C.) of the vacant post of Sub Divisional Engineer (S.D.E.) (Civil) to Shri Vinay Kumar Lalia, Assistant Engineer (Civil), Construction Office, P.U. without any financial benefits, subject to condition that the C.D.C. will automatically be treated as withdrawn as and when the vacant post of S.D.E. is filled in, on regular basis in the Construction Office.

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

(vi) The Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendations of the Academic/Administrative Committee dated 27.02.2018 (**Appendix-XXIII**) and anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has allowed the following modification/change in Regulation 6.2 with regard to evaluation of answer booklets of M.Sc. (Systems Biology & Bioinformatics) Semester System:

<b>Present Regulation</b>	<b>Proposed Regulation</b>
<p><b>6.2:</b> The evaluated answer booklets would be shown to the students, according to a schedule announced by the concerned department, within 15 days of the completion of examination. Answers would be discussed and the rationale of assessment explained to the students. After discussing the answer with the students, the teacher would finally submit the award list to the Head of Department/Coordinator.</p> <p>Answer booklets would be retained by the concerned teacher for one year after the declaration of the result. There would be no provision for re-evaluation.</p>	<p><b>6.2:</b> The evaluated answer booklets would be shown to the students, according to a schedule <u>announced by the Centre</u>, within 15 days of the completion of examination. Answers would be discussed and the rationale of assessment explained to the students. After discussing the answer with the students, the teacher would finally submit the award list to the Head of Department/Coordinator.</p> <p>Answer booklets would be retained by the concerned teacher for one year after the declaration of the result. <u>In case the students are not satisfied by the evaluation process, an</u></p>

<b>Present Regulation</b>	<b>Proposed Regulation</b>
	<u>independent panel of examiners with prior permission of DUI/VC should be appointed. The average marks given by two evaluators and the concerned teacher will be counted towards final marks.</u>

**NOTE:** 1. The Co-ordinator vide letter dated 14.03.2018 (**Appendix-XXIII**) has written that Rule 6.2 may be modified as above, but in fact it a part of Regulations and not of rules.

2. The approval of the Govt. of India for Regulations is awaited, hence the regulations of the above course are not available in P.U. Cal. Vol. II. 2007.

**(vii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has executed TIGR2ESS Collaboration Agreement (at Sr. No.5) (**Appendix-XXIV**) between Panjab University, Chandigarh, and University of Cambridge for the project titled “Transforming India’s Green Revolution by Research and Empowerment for Sustainable Food Supplies”.

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate has approved the minutes dated 21.03.2018 (**Appendix-XXV**) of the Core Committee (under Joint Admission Committee-2018) to discuss the matter regarding Reserved Categories for admission in B.E. Courses under JAC-2018.

**(ix)** The Vice-Chancellor, in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate, has approved the minutes dated 19.02.2018 (**Appendix-XXVI**) of the Committee to discuss and resolve the issue related to PULEET-2018.

**(x)** The Vice-Chancellor, subject to and in anticipation of the approval of the Syndicate/Senate, has granted Extra-Ordinary Leave (without pay) to Dr. Ajay Kumar Arora, Assistant Librarian, University Business School, P.U. for the period of one year i.e. w.e.f. 16.04.2018 to 15.04.2019, to enable him to join new assignment as ‘Librarian’ at Markanda National College, Shahabad Markanda and also allowed him to retain lien in his substantive post of Assistant Librarian.

**NOTE:** 1. As per orders of the Vice-Chancellor the Chairperson, UBS has also been informed vide letter dated 19.04.2018 (**Appendix-XXVII**) that no substitute will be provided against the leave vacancy of Dr. Ajay Kumar Arora as there is no panel of ‘Library Assistant’/Assistant Librarian exists in University.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the **Items R-(i) to R-(x)** be ratified.

**Routine and formal matters**

**26.** The information contained in Items **I-(i)** to **I-(viii)** on the agenda was read out, i.e. –

**(i)** In pursuance of the orders dated 28.02.2018 passed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in CWP No.28777 of 2017 (Dr. (Ms.) Paramjit Kaur and Ors. Vs. Panjab University & Ors.) in the same terms as CWP No.26006 of 2017, wherein the petitioners have been given the benefit to continue in service, in view of the similarity with the said case. The CWP No.26006 of 2017 (Dr. (Ms.) Sukhmani Bal Riar Vs. Panjab University and others), entire bunch of matters relation to the age of retirement (60 to 65 years) is pending. The Vice-Chancellor has ordered that:

(i) the following faculty members (who have attained the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years on the date mentioned below against each) be considered to continue in service w.e.f. the date mentioned against each, as applicable in such other cases of teachers which is subject matter of CWP No.26006 of 2017 & other similar cases and salary be paid which they were drawing on the date of attaining the age of 60 years without break in the services, excluding HRA (HRA not to be paid to any one), as an interim measure subject to final outcome of the case filed by them. The payment to them will be adjustable against the final dues to them for which they should submit an undertaking as per Performa:

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of faculty member and Department</b>	<b>Date of superannuation</b>	<b>To continue in service w.e.f.</b>
1.	Dr. Harpreet Pruthi, Professor, Department of English & Cultural Studies	31.01.2018	01.02.2018
2.	Dr. Paramjit Kaur, Professor, Department of Law	31.01.2018	01.02.2018
3.	Dr. Asha Maudgil, Professor, Department of Philosophy	28.02.2018	01.03.2018

(ii) the teachers residing in the University campus (who have got stay to retain residential accommodation) shall be allowed to retain the residential accommodation (s) allotted to them by the University on the same terms and conditions, subject to adjustment as per orders of the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court on the next date of hearing.

**(ii)** The Vice-Chancellor, has accepted the resignation of Shri Saurabh Dhawan, Assistant Law Officer, Legal Cell w.e.f. 31.05.2018 (including three months notice period), under Regulation 6 at page 118-119 of P.U. Calendar, Volume-I, 2007 and ordered that his monetary benefits viz. Provident Fund etc. be paid to him accordingly.

**NOTE:** 1. Regulation 6, page 118-119, Cal. Vol.-I, 2007, which reads as under:

“6. A permanent employee, recruited on or after January 1, 1968, shall give, at least three months’ notice before resigning his post, failing which he shall forfeit salary for the same period.

Provided that Syndicate may waive this requirement in part or whole for valid reasons.

Provided further that in case of an employee who is on long leave and resigns his post or his post is declared vacant under Regulation 11.9, the stipulation of three months notice shall not be required.

Explanation: long leave would mean leave for one year or more.”

2. Request dated 01.03.2018 of Shri Saurabh Dhawan is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**)
3. An office note is enclosed (**Appendix-XXVIII**).

(iii) To note report dated 19.03.2018 submitted by Chief Vigilance Officer, P.U., in respect of complaint made by Shri Gurbaksh Singh, Joint Manager, FCI (Retd.), Kothi No. 33, Phase-III, SAS Nagar, Mohali, Punjab with regard to award of Ph.D. degree by P.U. to Dr. Rattan Singh Jaggi on Sri Dasam Granth Sahib (Accession No.98408 accessioned on 18.03.1967 Call No. T 294.553) and tampering therein.

**NOTE:** The Syndicate in its meeting dated 17.05.2012 (Para 33)) considered the issue of supply of copy of Ph.D. thesis of Dr. Rattan Singh Jaggi entitled “Dasam Granth main Sangrahit Poranik Kritiyon Ka Vivechnatamak Adhiyan” to Shri Gurbaksh Singh Retd. and it was resolved that copy of Ph.D. thesis of Dr. Rattan Singh Jaggi entitled “Dasam Granth main Sangrahit Poranik Kritiyon Ka Vivechnatamak Adhiyan” be **not** supplied to Shri Gurbaksh Singh Retd. Joint Manager from FCI (Kothi No. 33, Phase 3BI, Mohali).

(iv) To note letter No. 5032 Estt./NIG-I/A-4 Dated 20.02.2018 (**Appendix-XXIX**) of Punjabi University, Patiala, that the post held by Dr. Amardeep Singh Marwaha, Assistant Professor, School of Management Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala, (presently working as Training and Placement Officer at UIAMS, Panjab University), has been declared vacant w.e.f. 20.10.2015 as per Regulation 23 at page 71 of Punjabi University Calendar Volume-I, as he had not joined his duty on 20.09.2017.

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

- (v) To note request dated 12.04.2018 (**Appendix-XXX**) of Dr. Dilbag Singh, Department of Mathematics and Dr. Abhijit Dan, Department of Chemistry, regarding release of their salary for the month of February and March, 2018.

**NOTE:** 1. The Vice-Chancellor has observed that PU should consider giving them salary in anticipation of reimbursement of grant later. Syndicate be informed.

2. A copy of orders of the Vice-Chancellor has been conveyed to F.D.O. and O.S. (G&P) for necessary action.

- (vi) The Vice-Chancellor, as authorized by the Syndicate (Para 5, dated 31.10.1984), has sanctioned retirement benefits to the following University employees:

Sr. No.	Name of the employee and post held	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Benefits
1.	Shri Gurdev Singh Junior Technician (G-IV) USOL	01.04.1977	30.04.2018	Gratuity and Furlough as admissible under the University Regulations with permission to do business or serve elsewhere during the period of Furlough.
2.	Shri Sanjeev Kumar Scientific Officer (G-I) Department of Physics	13.10.1982	30.04.2018	Gratuity as admissible under the University Regulations.
3.	Shri Gurmail Singh Carpenter (Tech. G-II) P.U. Construction Office	02.04.1993	31.03.2018	
4.	Shri Pyare Lal Security Guard P.U. Construction Office	15.06.1975	31.03.2018	

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

- (vii) The Vice-Chancellor on the recommendation of the Committee dated 09.03.2017 (**Appendix-XXXI**) constituted pursuant to Syndicate decision dated 21.01.2017 (Para 10) (**Appendix-XXXI**), has constituted a new Post Graduate Board of Studies in Architecture and Planning (**Appendix-XXXI**) for introduction of M. Architecture in the Chandigarh College of Architecture.

Syndicate Proceedings dated 29<sup>th</sup> April/26<sup>th</sup> May 2018

**(viii)** The Vice-Chancellor has allowed to invest an additional donation of Rs.7,00,000/- made by Professor DVS Jain for existing endowment namely 'Smt. Prem Lata and Professor D.V.S Jain Research Foundation', in the shape of FDR in the State Bank of India, Sector-14, Chandigarh @ maximum prevailing rate of interest for one year in the Special Endowment Trust Fund A/c No.10444978140.

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

**RESOLVED:** That the information contained in **Items I-(i) to I-(viii)** be noted.

( G.S. Chadha )  
Registrar

Confirmed

( Arun Kumar Grover )  
VICE-CHANCELLOR